

ISTITUTO ITALIANO DI NUMISMATICA

# ANNALI

(ESTRATTO)



ROMA  
NELLA SEDE DELL'ISTITUTO  
MCMLXXXII

## THE COINAGE OF CORDUBA, COLONIA PATRICIA \*

Corduba, an originally native town which became first a Latin and then a Roman citizen colony, played an important role in the politics and life of southern Iberia under the republic and empire. The local coinage of the town (modern Córdoba) was issued at two different times. Once, under the native name for the community, a quadrans was minted. Later, under the new name, Colonia Patricia, a full series of early imperial *aes* appeared. These two issues are entirely divorced from one another although each is representative of the local Iberian issues of its day. The discussion which follows treats the two Corduban coinages as distinct. It is of primary interest, however, to note that the purpose of the two mintings was ultimately very similar.

### *Corduba*

#### Type

The obverse type of the Corduba coinage is a female head right with the legend CN(aeus) IVLIVS L(uci) F(ilius) Q(uaestor) in front around the border; three dots are behind the head<sup>1</sup>. The three dots

\* It is a pleasure to thank R. E. A. Palmer and K. Harl for help on iconographic and numismatic aspects of this paper. Commonly abbreviated works are: CHAVES = F. CHAVES TRISTAN, *La Córdoba hispano-romana y sus monedas*, Seville 1977; CREBM = H. MATTINGLY, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*, volume 1, *Augustus to Vitellius*, London 1923; CRRBM = H. A. GRUEBER, *Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum*, volumes 1-3, London 1910; FITA = M. GRANT, *From Imperium to Auctoritas*, Cambridge 1956; RRC = M. H. CRAWFORD, *Roman Republican Coinage*, Cambridge 1974; VIVES = A. VIVES Y ESCUDERO, *La moneda hispánica*, Madrid 1924.

<sup>1</sup> For minor variations see CHAVES, pp. 66-69. Chaves' treatment of the two coinages of Córdoba is generally excellent and puts the study of these series on a

indicate that the coin as originally struck was meant to be valued as a Roman quadrans. No exact Roman parallel exists for either the type or the legend. A more detailed discussion is in order.

The female head could be almost any female divinity<sup>2</sup>. The usual identification is with Venus, with due notice to the Iulius who signs the issue. Yet, the earliest Roman coin portraits of such a female (none an exact model for the Corduba piece) are not identified as Venus—they are 'a female' or 'a Victory' (with wings showing, but a similar head) or 'Pietas'<sup>3</sup>. Nothing—such as the small Cupid who often hovers over Venus' shoulder on Roman coin types—appears on the obverse to provide identification with the ancestress of the Julian *gens*. The fact that a bust of Venus was never portrayed on Roman coins before L. Sulla (a date long after the hoard evidence indicates that Corduba began minting) weighs against the supposed desire of Cn. Iulius to honor the goddess. Comparison and surmises can take one only so far; the evidence does not allow the identification of the female figure. She should be called simply a 'female head'.

Attempts (to my mind unsuccessful) at identification of the head have also been bound up with the reverse type. Most scholars have thought that the figure on the reverse of the Corduba coin was Cupid; most recently Chaves has argued forcefully for this identification<sup>4</sup>. No doubt a pastiche of known Cupids can produce a nude, winged male<sup>5</sup> figure facing left, holding a cornucopia in one hand, a torch or incense burner (*thymiaterion*) in the other. But no suitable single prototype for the Corduba reverse exists in Roman coinage or art<sup>6</sup>. Ulti-

much firmer footing than before. Her plates especially obviate the need to publish numerous illustrations with this essay.

<sup>2</sup> CHAVES, pp. 48–51 canvasses the possibilities.

<sup>3</sup> *RRC* no. 291 (114/113 B.C.); 306.1 (108/107); no. 308.1 (108–107).

<sup>4</sup> See CHAVES, pp. 51–56, 69–73. It must be admitted that this identification is possible.

<sup>5</sup> The sex of the figure is often in doubt and a bob behind the head could suggest a female figure. However on a few examples male genitals are visible, confirming the sex. The 'bob' is a helmet.

<sup>6</sup> Surely the funerary Cupid cited by CHAVES, p. 56 as holding a torch and cornucopia cannot be a model for a city's coinage. In general, winged male divinities are not numerous. Since Roman prototypes are lacking, perhaps a Greek or Hellenistic origin should be sought. Certainly heads such as the 'female divinity' on the obverse are common enough in the Hellenistic tradition. Winged figures likewise

mately two facts weigh against identification as Cupid: (1) the Corduba figure is slender and muscular while Cupid of the Hellenistic and Roman periods is almost always shown as chubby and squat; (2) on a few fine specimens a helmet is clearly visible on the figure while Cupid is nearly always bare-headed. Casting about for a male winged figure, the most likely possibility which arises is a *genius*, or protective deity. A coin of M. Antonius shows the possibilities: a winged figure stands left with a cornucopia in the right hand and a caduceus in the left<sup>7</sup>. The legend on the reverse of the Corduba piece might therefore be taken as a legend relating the figure to 'Corduba' as well as identifying the minting entity<sup>8</sup>.

Finally, to turn to the signer of the piece, let us look at Cn. Iulius L.f. Q. Chaves canvasses the various Iulii available and properly rejects them all<sup>9</sup>. It is the praenomen which catches the eye: no Iulius at Rome ever, so far as is known, bore the praenomen *Cnaeus*. Even in later times in the provinces a 'Cnaeus Iulius' is so rare as to be practically unique although the Iulii during the empire are virtually without number. This Cn. Iulius L.f. was probably not of any of the various branches of the Roman Iulii since, even though his father was a Lucius Iulius, a praenomen common in one branch of the Roman *gens*, no Roman Iulius of the republic was called Gnaeus. We seem to be dealing here with a Latin, not a Roman. As at the Latin colonies of Valentia

are not uncommon and particularly so in the art of southern Italy. Could Corduba have been inspired in its coinage type by a coin or statue from Magna Graecia or Sicily familiar to inhabitants because of the south Italian roots of settlers?

<sup>7</sup> Drawing at *CRRBM* 1.582 (38 B.C.) (not shown in the plates); identified as a *genius*. *RRC* no. 494.5 (42 B.C.) remains uncommitted: 'winged male figure'.

<sup>8</sup> I have seen at least one example of a coin with the name misspelled as *COR-DVA*. The *BAL* which is reported on some specimens exists on no verifiable copy and in particular the recent publication by M. Beltrán Lloris of the Corduba coins in his study of the *Castra Caecilia* finds ('Problemas de la arqueología cacereña: El campamento romano de Cáceres el Viejo (Cáceres). Estudio numismático', *Actas del I Congreso Nacional de Numismática, Zaragoza 1972* published in *Númisma*, 120-131 (1973-74), pp. 255-310) must be questioned: CHAVES, p. 59 has examined these coins and found no *BAL* among them; J. Hildebrandt, currently working on these coins, also reports in conversation that no *BAL* is to be found. M. GRANT (*FITA*, pp. 5-6) built a great superstructure upon these supposed *BAL* coins; his conclusions must fail as indeed must his whole discussion of the Corduba coinage since he dates it far too late (see below).

<sup>9</sup> CHAVES, pp. 57-58.

and Carteia, where Latin names overload the magistracies, at Córdoba an immigrant to Spain held the questorship<sup>10</sup>. This insight also helps to explain the peculiar coin type of the town. Córdoba was a Latin colony<sup>11</sup> and as such it chose its coin type with some imagination. As at the Latin colony Carteia, where individual elements, but not the coin type as a whole, are traceable to Roman and Hellenistic parallels, at Córdoba the magistrate selected a unique type suited to local desires but reminiscent of certain recognizable common types<sup>12</sup>.

The dies for the Corduba coins are numerous and range from those (presumably early) of fine quality to abysmally bad engravings. Only 60 of the 176 casts taken by me of the Corduba piece were legible enough to allow the categorization of either the obverse or the reverse. Only 24 coins had both obverse and reverse relatively clearly preserved. From these pieces 21 reverse dies and 30 obverse dies were isolated. This is probably somewhat under the total number. The number of extant specimens which Chaves records (282) also points to a large total issue. The deteriorating workmanship plus the large number of dies indicates that the Corduba coins were issued over a long period of time.

#### Date

The much discussed topic of the date of the Corduba coinage comes down to a choice between the late second century B.C. or the period around 50 B.C. Grant and others have defended the later date but the evidence of the coin hoards deals their theories a mortal blow. Specifically, the Azaila hoard has one Corduba coin while the Castra Caecilia finds contain many examples. The Azaila hoard seems to date from the Sertorian war while the Castra Caecilia finds do not come from

<sup>10</sup> Q(uinquennalis) would be anomalous at this time. R. WIEGELS, *Liv. per. 55 und die Gründung von Valentia*, *Chiron*, 4 (1974), p. 168 cf. n. 78 is probably wrong to explain the Q on Valentia's coinage as q(uinquennalis). Carteia, a Latin colony, had quaestors who signed coins (VIVES, 4, pp. 22-23 no. 5, 9; plate 126.5,9) and Valentia, another Latin colony minting late in the second century B.C. (R. C. KNAPP, *Aspects of the Roman Experience in Iberia*, 206-100 B.C., Valladolid 1977, pp. 125-131) probably had quaestors as well (VIVES, 4, p. 15; plate 125.1,2). On Italians in these towns see KNAPP, *Aspects*, p. 155.

<sup>11</sup> H. GALSTERER, *Untersuchungen zum römischen Städtewesen auf der iberischen Halbinsel*, Berlin 1971, p. 10.

<sup>12</sup> For Carteia's coins see VIVES, 4, pp. 18-20.

much later than 90 B.C., the date of the most recent Roman denarius. Therefore, the Corduba coins must date from, at the latest, the end of the second century<sup>13</sup>. This date accords well with its purpose as discussed below.

#### Circulation

A map of the recorded find-sites of Corduba coins indicates that, as one would expect, the coins circulated most heavily within the area of the Guadalquivir although examples have been found in northern Portugal, at Ampurias, and in North Africa<sup>14</sup>. The finds at Castra Caecilia (34 pieces) indicate that more than just the odd piece found its way out of the south. The most reasonable explanation of the circulation pattern is that soldiers carried the Corduba coins to far-off places.

#### Purpose

In thinking about the purpose of the bronze coinage of Ulterior in general and of Corduba in particular comparison with the contemporary situation in Italy is instructive. There, due to the lack of small change, imitations of Roman bronze, especially of the prow series, appeared in large numbers<sup>15</sup>. The most common denominations were the semis and the quadrans, although asses also appeared. These coins seem to have circulated in Italy along with 'official' Roman bronze.

The Castra Caecilia finds supply a similar picture of the state of the bronze coinage in Spain c. 100 B.C.: evidently all manner of bronze coins were circulating together since sextantal and uncial Roman coins

<sup>13</sup> CHAVES, pp. 80-88 canvasses the literature. She is perhaps unduly pessimistic about the value of the Castra Caecilia finds. She prefers a Sullan date, but for an unconvincing combination of typological and quasi-historical reasons. In addition, her discussion of the Castra Caecilia finds is unclear: the problems she raises seem to undermine her own case. As useful as is the discussion of the problem, her solution is overly dependent on the (to my view false) identification of 'Venus' and 'Cupid' on the coin. On Castra Caecilia see KNAPP, *Aspects*, pp. 81-83.

<sup>14</sup> See the map at CHAVES, p. 79. In addition I was shown a Corduba coin by a farmer who had discovered it while working the site of ancient Acinippo, near the straits of Gihraitar. Corduba coins are overstruck at Carisa while a Corduba type is struck over a coin of Olont.

<sup>15</sup> *RRC*, pp. 565-66.

were found with native coins of various southern Iberian local mints in addition to numerous (34) coins of Corduba<sup>16</sup>. Of fundamental interest is the fact that only four divisors of the Roman as were found – two semisses, one triens and one quadrans. However of the local coins most were divisors, including Corduba's 34 quadrantes. The coinage situation in southern Iberia seems to be similar to that in Italy with Roman silver supplying denarii and local bronze – be it imitations of Roman bronze, as in Italy, or looser type copies as in Ulterior – making up for the dearth of Roman bronze: Rome virtually ceased production of the as from 146 B.C. to c. 97 B.C. Although the city continued to mint divisors<sup>17</sup>, the quantities of the small coins were not enough to meet demands for small change. It is not coincidental that the coinage of the Latin colony Carteia, one of the most extensive republican series in Ulterior, includes only semisses, quadrantes and sextantes<sup>18</sup>. These coins, as well as, to a lesser extent, locally minted asses, filled a gap in existing coinage and the finds at Castra Caecilia provide a good illustration of how local and Roman bronze circulated together<sup>19</sup>.

The Castra Caecilia finds also point up perhaps the greatest single impetus for local issues of bronze coins: the requirements of the army. The soldiers were paid mostly in silver but once a man tried to purchase goods or services in a town change was needed. A town could at once supply the change which soldiery stationed in the neighbourhood would need and also make a modest profit on the mintings. Local issues would be especially important if some constraints were placed on the free circulation of such issues. The countermarked coins of various Ulterior towns indicate that some control over 'foreign' currencies was maintained whether or not a town had the ability to exclude completely another town's bronzes from its marketplace. To the extent that other local issues were excluded from a town's circulating currency, that town

<sup>16</sup> Cf. KNAPP, *Aspects*, p. 81.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *CRRBM* 1. xxx. The as issues are *RRC* no. 219 (146 B.C.), no. 290 (114 or 113 B.C.); no. 312 and no. 313 (106 B.C.); no. 322 (102 B.C.); no. 334 (?97 B.C.), after which asses are minted regularly once again for about 15 years.

<sup>18</sup> VIVES, 4, p. 27.

<sup>19</sup> Castra Caecilia itself is, of course, a ways distant from the Baetis river valley, the core of Ulterior. But the coins represent the pieces used in the daily life of the soldiers who occupied the site – soldiers presumably from the garrison of the southern rather than the eastern province.

would need its own bronzes to facilitate the needs of the soldiery. Even without constraints on the circulation of local issues outside the issuing local (and coin finds indicate that, whatever the law, local issues did circulate rather freely in other towns) the presence of a nearby salaried consumer group could necessitate a local issue to be sure that enough change was available on the spot. The presence of a body of men with cash to spend – soldiers, officers, entourages – provided the most likely impetus to Cordoba to mint and continue to mint its quadrans<sup>20</sup>.

### *Colonia Patricia*

#### Types

Issues of Corduba, Colonia Patricia, appear in denominations of sestertius, dupondius, as, semis and quadrans. So complete a series of *aes* coinage is virtually unparalleled in the Roman world of the early empire<sup>21</sup>. The types have been studied, but further refinements are possible<sup>22</sup>.

*Sestertius*: The obverse has Augustus, bare headed, facing left. The legend reads: PERMISSV CAESARIS AVGVSTI<sup>23</sup>. The head is evidently modelled on that of the 'Patricia' denarii<sup>24</sup>. The reverse shows

<sup>20</sup> Some pieces are quite barbarous and it cannot be ruled out that they are native imitations and not official mintings of Corduba.

<sup>21</sup> For example under Augustus Lugdunum's altar series (*CREBM* 94) does not have a quadrans. Caesaraugusta and Emerita Augusta in Spain lack a sestertius (VIVES, 4, pp. 62–66 (Emerita); pp. 75–86 (Caesaraugusta)). Pergamum (*CREBM* 115–6) lacks a quadrans.

<sup>22</sup> CHAVES, pp. 92–102. The denominations are not in doubt even though their metrology differs somewhat from the weights of comparable Roman coins. See CHAVES, pp. 116–19.

<sup>23</sup> PERMISSV given incorrectly by CHAVES, p. 99 but correctly as PERMISSV on p. 163. VIVES, 4, pp. 118 no. 1 has the legend wrong as well.

<sup>24</sup> *CREBM* plates 7–10. *FITA*, p. 220. The local coins imitate the denarii, not vice-versa (*FITA*, p. 122 n. 9). The old idea that the 'Patricia' denarii were minted at Corduba (e.g. C. H. V. SUTHERLAND, *The Romans in Spain*, London 1939, p. 148; H. MATTINGLY, *NC* ser. 6, 6 (1946), p. 130 (review of *FITA*) must be rejected: *FITA*, p. 122. T. Volk of the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge indicated to me in correspondence (1976) that his studies of these and other 'Spanish' denarii led him to believe that they were not minted at Córdoba or other Spanish sites. C.H.V. SUTHERLAND, *The Aes Coinages of Imperial Spain. Reflections for further Study*, *Nu-*

a wreath surrounding the legend COLONIA PATRICIA. This wreath is identified by Vives and Chaves as a laurel<sup>25</sup>. It must, rather, be an oak. A comparison with its prototypes and a correct understanding of its nature make this identification inescapable.

As Chaves sees, the prototype for the wreath is found in the *aes* coinage of the senate issued between 23 and 17 B.C.<sup>26</sup>. These coins bear the legends OB CIVIS SERVATOS (sestertii) and AVGVSTVS TRIBVNIC PTEST (dupondii). The OB CIVIS coins have a pair of laurel branches flanking the wreath which must be of oak since this was the decoration for saving the life of a citizen (*corona civica*). In addition serrated leaves and acorns are evident on a number of the types. The *tribunicia potestas* wreath is more clumsily made, perhaps due in some measure to the smaller scale of the dupondius denomination. The carelessness of the die cutter has caused some to interpret the wreath as laurel<sup>27</sup>. Close investigation rules this out: early types by Cn. Piso Cn. f. and L. Naevius Surdinus (23 B.C.) show serrated leaves and acorns, whereas laurel leaves, although occasionally interspersed with acornlike seeds, are always smooth<sup>28</sup>. Subsequent *tribunicia* issues stylized the wreath to the point where the leaves are oblong and smooth, but the reversion to serrated leaves and acorns in 21 B.C.<sup>29</sup> shows that an oak wreath was meant nonetheless. As Mattingly puts it, "after all, the 'corona civica' was an oak wreath and nothing else"<sup>30</sup>. Such a wreath was well suited to a reference to the tribunician authority: a tribune's major purpose was to save fellow citizens from injustices, a close parallel to the deeds which might win one a crown *ob cives servatos*.

The actual oak wreath utilized by the CP coins is not an exact copy of any Roman coin type. In addition to differences in rendering the leaves a dot (O) appears at the top between the ends of the wreath; this

*misma*, 72 (1965), p. 22 notes the possibility of joint influence by imperial, official images on both silver and local bronze issues.

<sup>25</sup> CREBM 28-39; plates 18-19.

<sup>26</sup> VIVES, 4 p. 117; CHAVES, pp. 93-95, esp. 95.

<sup>27</sup> On the identification of the material of these wreaths cf. CREBM 29 note and xcix-xcx.

<sup>28</sup> CREBM 29 no. 136; 30 no. 141; plate 19.1,2. For comparison see the laurel wreath at plate 16.12.

<sup>29</sup> CREBM 37 no. 187; plate 19.10.

<sup>30</sup> CREBM c.

dot is entirely absent from Roman prototypes but may derive from the 'O' of the legend OB CIVIS SERVATOS.

The basic reference of the wreath is evident: Augustus' decoration with the *corona civica* and his tribunician power. However, Corduba CP may also have presented Augustus with a gold wreath, as towns often did, and this may be the 'local' as compared with the 'imperial' reference of the type<sup>31</sup>.

The dies of this sestertius are few. I have identified only two, varying only slightly from each other<sup>32</sup>. The issue must have been a very small one.

*Dupondius*: The same obverse, a bare 'Patricia' head, appears again on the dupondius. The legend is the same as well: PERMISSV<sup>33</sup> CAESARIS AVGVSTI. The reverse differs from the sestertius however. A legionary eagle (*aquila*) facing left is flanked by two manipular standards (*signa*). Around the border runs the legend COLONIA PATRICIA.

The standards form a fairly common type. As a main decoration they appear first on a coin of C. Valerius Flaccus in Gaul in 82 B.C.<sup>34</sup>. The legend runs C(aius) VAL(erius) FLA(ccus) IMPERAT(or); presumably the type refers to his military command in general. Likewise a similar type of Cn. Nerius, issued as the Pompeians faced military exigencies in Italy in early 49 B.C., reflects a military need<sup>35</sup>. Further legionary issues with the type appeared in 31 B.C. in Cyrenaica complete with a legionary number: obviously the coins were minted for the army<sup>36</sup>. The only difference between these Roman military coins and CP's dupondius type is that the Roman eagle faces right while CP's faces left<sup>37</sup>.

Given these precedents one might expect CP's dupondii to be struck for military reasons. However the standards can symbolize the settle-

<sup>31</sup> SUTHERLAND, *Aes Coinages*, pp. 97-8 sees the wreath on the 'C.A.' coinages of the East as being a donation to Augustus from the κοινὸν Ἀσίας.

<sup>32</sup> CHAVES, pp. 104, 163; plate 4.3.6. VIVES, plate 165. I have compared casts of five coins.

<sup>33</sup> Again misread by VIVES, 4, p. 118 no. 2.

<sup>34</sup> *CRRBM* 2,388; plate 103.1-4; *RRC* no. 365.

<sup>35</sup> *CRRBM* 1, 504; plate 49.11; *RRC* no. 441.

<sup>36</sup> *RRC* no. 546.1; p. 744 n. 7.

<sup>37</sup> *CRRBM* 2,526; plate 116. On the 'standard' type see CHAVES, pp. 95-6.

ment of legions as well as their active service. A coin of Octavian makes this clear when it combines a plow and a *decempeda* with the *aquila* and standards: the coin refers to veteran settlements in the aftermath of the Perusine war<sup>38</sup>. In Spain the type seems to be associated frequently with the settlement of veterans as at Emerita, Caesaraugusta, Acci, Ilici and perhaps Carthago Nova<sup>39</sup>. This is probably the association of the type of CP as well. Augustus was in all likelihood responsible for a settlement of veterans in the old city; this reverse type seems to recognize the deed. In fact the numbers V and X, presumably referring to legions, are reported by Cohen and Heiss on a CP dupondius. Such a coin has never been verified although it is still used as evidence for legionary settlement at Cordoba in recent studies. Probably the erroneous reading derived from trying to make out the often badly smudged letters in the legend. García y Bellido assigns the II *Alaudae* and X to Córdoba – but there is no evidence for this posting<sup>40</sup>.

One other complementary interpretation of the dupondius reverse should be cited. On a gold coin of 8 B.C. these standards make their only appearance in Augustan coinage. The obverse of this coin commemorates Gaius Caesar's embarkation upon a military career. He is shown on horseback, galloping to the right and behind him are the standards<sup>41</sup>. The eagle facing right betrays the origin of the portrayal of the standards: the legionary coinages of twenty-odd years before. But the symbolism is evident – Gaius as commander. On CP's coinage, too, the type

<sup>38</sup> RRC no. 525.

<sup>39</sup> Emerita: VIVES, plate 141.7, 9–14, eagle right, with legionary numbers; Caesaraugusta: VIVES, plate 154.4–5, standards different; Acci: VIVES, plate 166 with legionary numbers and two eagles; Carthago Nova: VIVES, plate 130.10, schematized standards, eagle right; Ilici: VIVES, plate 133, slightly different standards, eagle left; Italica has PER AVG on the reverse, but no legionary numbers. Did this type merely reflect Italica's longstanding military orientation, or were veterans settled there as well? Cf. CHAVES, *Las monedas de Itálica*, Seville 1973, p. 119.

<sup>40</sup> H. COHEN, *Description historique des monnaies*, 2nd ed., I, Paris 1880, p. 150 no. 605. A. HEISS, *Description générale des monnaies antiques de l'Espagne*, Paris 1870, p. 298 no. 5 (labelled 'doutcuse'); plate 42.5. H. Galsterer cites the coin in *Untersuchungen*, p. 10 as does A. TOVAR, *Iberische Landeskunde*, part 2, vol. 1: *Baetica*, Baden-Baden 1974, p. 89. A. GARCÍA Y BELLIDO, *Las colonias romanas de Hispania*, *Anuario de Historia del Derecho Español*, 29 (1959), p. 453; CHAVES, p. 96. I find no *legio II Alaudae*; the V *Alaudae* is meant. These legions served in Spain under Augustus.

<sup>41</sup> CREBM cxiii, 85 no. 498; plate 12.15.

may allude to Augustus as *imperator*, war leader, just as the sestertius type recalls his role of protector of the people.

The relative smallness of the dupondius issues is attested by the number of dies employed. In thirty-four examples I isolated five obverse and five reverse dies. The reverses link the obverses although the differences in dies are miniscule. The few linked and almost identical dies indicate a small and brief emission—larger, to be sure, than that of the sestertius, but a far cry from the as and semis issues of CP.

*As*: The obverse shows the same 'Patricia' portrait of Augustus with the legend PERM(issu) CAES(aris) AVG(usti) in the border. The reverse is an oak wreath surrounding the legend COLONIA PATRICIA. It is readily apparent that the as type is a miniature of the sestertius type and so the remarks above are equally applicable here. The aspect that sets the as apart from the sestertius (and from all the other CP issues) is the size of emission. A careful examination of the casts of about 100 legible obverses and 80 legible reverses on some 145 coins has shown about 30 obverse and 20 reverse dies. In theory there should be more reverse dies than obverse dies since the die held in place should last longer than the one struck with the mallet. However my study does not bear this out. It should be added that, while four or five fairly distinct groups of dies can be identified<sup>42</sup>, distinguishing tiny variations within these groups can be a trying experience given the poor condition of most of the pieces. Some links can be made but unfortunately no neat and complete seriation emerges as did in the case of the dupondii. The number of dies does at least indicate an extensive minting of the asses.

*Semis*: The 'Patricia' head again appears on the obverse although in the course of the series it is altered considerably. The legend is PERM(issu) CAES(aris) AVG(usti). A few coins have two dots in front of Augustus' face. As Chaves has remarked, the similarities between the obverse type and the obverse of the asses are striking<sup>43</sup>. The same person or persons probably did dies for both denominations.

The reverse type is of more intrinsic interest. Within the border

<sup>42</sup> Cf. CHAVES, pp. 105–6 for the obverse, pp. 109–10 for the reverse. It would not repay the effort to quibble over minor disagreements with her system. Note, however, that the number of leaves on the reverse wreath is not constant, a fact which she does not note.

<sup>43</sup> CHAVES, pp. 107–8.

COLONIA PATRICIA appear a flamen's *apex* and a pontifex' *simpulum*. These symbols are readily explained as referring to Augustus' offices of *flamen Iulianus*<sup>44</sup> and pontifex<sup>45</sup>. In particular, a coin of 2 B.C.-A.D. 11 proves that the *simpulum* is symbolic of the pontificate. This coin shows Gaius and Lucius Caesar standing to the left and to the right. In front of Gaius is a *simpulum* while in front of Lucius is a *lituus*. These instruments indicate Gaius' priesthood and Lucius' augurate<sup>46</sup>. The fact that no other Roman coin shows CP's type indicates that CP chose these priestly instruments for some specific purpose<sup>47</sup>. Presumably they honor two of the more noteworthy of Augustus' priesthoods.

Another exegesis of the type exists if the parallel 'domestic' and 'imperial' explanations for the types of sestertius, dupondius and as are accepted. The semis' *instrumenta* could refer to local priesthoods instituted or continued in the new colony. The *lex Ursonensis*, a charter for the citizen colony of Urso in Spain, provides for local augurs and pontifices although no flamen is mentioned in the extant portions of the law<sup>48</sup>. If this *lex* was something like paradigmatic for other later Spanish citizen colonies then Corduba Colonia Patricia also had these priests although they are not mentioned in other sources. The coin type could celebrate local colonial priesthoods.

The dies of the semis issue present the same problems as those of the as issues. The main stylistic differences put the coins into a relatively small number of rough groups but minute differences in execution and worn coin faces make individual dies hard to isolate. Nevertheless,

<sup>44</sup> G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, Munich 1902, p. 285 n. 2. In principle Wissowa is not sure if each priesthood had its own 'symbol' (pp. 429-30). However some instruments at least can be safely associated with certain priesthoods. See below.

<sup>45</sup> Augustus was a pontifex from 47 B.C. although he became *pontifex maximus* only in 12 B.C.

<sup>46</sup> *CREBM* cxvi; plate 13.7-10.

<sup>47</sup> The closest Roman comparable coin is an *aes* issue of 9 B.C. commemorating Augustus as *pontifex maximus*. A *simpulum* and *lituus* appear at *CREBM* c; plate 20.1. Of the provincial town issues, Inlia Treducta uses the type (VIVES, plate 164.14-15); clearly it is merely copied from CP's coins as are a number of others in Treducta's emissions. Acci (VIVES, plate 166.6) also uses the type. I have not found it in other provincial issues.

<sup>48</sup> *ILS* 6087 section 66.

about twenty obverse dies and fifteen reverse dies seem to appear. Linkages again can be discerned but break down in the overall series because of the difficulty in deciding in many individual cases which die is being used. The quality of the semisses is higher than that of the asses, an indication that better dies were used, fewer coins were struck per die, or the coins circulated less. According to the number of dies, the semisses were issued in smaller numbers than the asses, but in larger quantity than the other denominations.

*Quadrans*: The obverse type is the normal bare head of Augustus left with the legend PER(missu) CAE(saris) AVG(usti). As in the case of the semis, the reverse is much more interesting. It shows sacerdotal instruments. From left to right an *aspergillum*, *patera*, *capis*<sup>49</sup>, and *lituus* appear. The issue was presumably coordinated with that of the semis for instruments are not duplicated. I have suggested that the reverse type of the semis refers to Augustus' flamine and pontificate. The quadrans' implements can also, in a general way, be related to his priestly offices. The *aspergillum*, or spinkler, was an instrument of the pontificate; the *patera* of the VII epulones, and the *lituus* of the augurs. Although the tripod is the usual symbol of the XV sacris faciundis, perhaps the *capis* in this instance takes its place. If so, the four major priesthoods of Augustus in the order as given, along with others, by Augustus himself (then of course *pontifex maximus*, not just pontifex) in the *Res Gestae* (chapter 7) appear to be noted on this coin<sup>50</sup>. A less daring analysis would attribute the *aspergillum* and *patera* to the pontificate, the *capis* and *lituus* to the augurate, thus symbolizing Augu-

<sup>49</sup> CHAVES, p. 97 calls this a 'vase' (*vaso*). She is clearly right in seeing that it is not a *praefericulum*, but does not identify it as a *capis*. See, for comparison, Octavian's coins of 37 B.C. (CRRBM 2.414; plate 105.12,14,15) which have on the reverse a *simpulum*, *aspergillum*, *capis*, and *lituus*.

<sup>50</sup> The problem of the symbols for particular priesthoods is difficult. Mattingly, CREBM cvi notes as symbols *simpulum* = pontifex, *lituus* = augur, tripod = XV sacris faciundis, *patera* = VII epulones. S. W. Stevenson, *A Dictionary of Roman Coins* (London, 1889) suggests *praefericulum*, *lituus* = augur (p. 96) (but p. 648 also suggests pontifex); *aspergillum*, *apex*, *securis* = pontifex (p. 96); *apex* = flamines, *pontifex maximus* (p. 62); *simpulum* = pontifex (p. 749); *patera* = ?*pontifex maximus* (p. 606); *aspergillum* = pontifex (p. 641). Wissowa, *Religion*, p. 429-30 hesitates in assigning individual symbols but suggests *simpulum*, *aspergillum* = *pontifex maximus* (cf. RE 2. 1725 (Habel)), augur = *lituus*, XV s.f. = tripod, VII epulones = *patera*. For the *capis* as a symbol of the VII epulones, however, see CRRBM 1.537 n. 2.

stus' two major priesthoods<sup>51</sup>. However the symbolism is resolved in detail, reference to Augustus' priestly activities seems highly likely. As in the case of the semis' type, the instruments could easily have also a parallel reference to local Cordoban priesthoods of the new citizen colony.

The dies of the quadrans present a much more perfect picture than those of the as or semis. A comparison of casts of 22 legible obverses and reverses (only twelve faces of 56 were illegible of the 28 coins examined) indicates that four obverse and seven reverse dies were used. Linkages exist for obverses one and two by means of reverses one to four; reverses five and six both appear with obverse three, while obverse four and reverse seven stand isolated, insofar as my sample indicates.

obverse	1	2	2	3	4
	^	^	^	^	
reverse	1—2	3—4	5—6	7	

Figure 1. Shared dies of the CP quadrans.

The quadrans is in general better preserved than the as. Was this small coin unpopular and relatively little circulated?

#### Size of issues

There is no satisfactory way to estimate how many bronze coins were struck from a single die<sup>52</sup>. However, relative size of issue can be estimated by comparing the number of dies in various issues. For CP coins I have estimated the following numbers of dies (see above):

sestertius:	2	obverse	2	reverse
dupondius:	5	obverse	5	reverse
as:	30+	obverse	20+	reverse
semis:	20+	obverse	15+	reverse
quadrans:	4	obverse	7	reverse

Comparing obverse dies, a ratio of 1 : 2.5 : 15 : 10 : 2 emerges. Chaves has done a fine job of cataloging most of the CP coins readily accessible to the public. She list 9 sestertii, 129 dupondii, 340 asses, 242 semisses, and 52 quadrantes. The ratio here is .35 : 5 : 13 : 9.5 : 2.

<sup>51</sup> For *lituus* and *capis* as symbols of the augurate see *CRRBM* 1. 393.

<sup>52</sup> For estimates on dies for silver coins see *RRC* 694.

Obviously, the survival rate of sestertii is abnormally low – many more must have been minted than are reflected in extant pieces. Likewise we should suspect that more than five dies were used to strike the dupondii. In general, however, the survival rate and numbers of the dies per issue indicate that the asses and semisses were the mainstay of the coinage system, just as we would expect. Sestertii seem more of an oddity than a useful coin, while dupondii and quadrantes were issued but in smaller quantities than the basic coin, the as.

### Purpose

Two aspects of the purpose of the CP coinage need to be considered, the general and the particular. On a broad view, the economic usefulness of the CP coinage, in conjunction with the bronze coinages of other local Spanish mints, is evident. On the other hand, the selection of types and the probable date of the issues indicates a commemorative purpose as well.

The dirth of bronze coins in the Augustan period continued despite Augustus' reordering of the *aes* coinage. Asses had been minted in the provinces from time to time since 82 B.C. but at the Roman mint asses were entirely lacking until the reign of Augustus and semisses until that of Nero<sup>53</sup>. It is symptomatic of the need for *aes* coinage in Spain that Cn. Pompey minted asses there in 46–45 B.C. while other bronze issues appeared in other provincial areas<sup>54</sup>. A particularly large bronze coinage had begun at the newly founded Augustan colony of Augusta Emerita about 25 B.C.; the precedent for local supply of bronze coins for general use had been firmly established in Spain for decades. Augustus, in his reorganization of the bronze coinage, allowed this tendency to continue, sometimes explicitly, as coins with *permissu Caesaris Augusti* show, but more often implicitly by not forbidding local bronze issues<sup>55</sup>. About as many towns in Spain under the early empire coined

<sup>53</sup> *CREBM* xiv; *CRRBM* 1.317. The need for bronze is exemplified by the many copies of Augustan *aes*: *CREBM* c, xxiv.

<sup>54</sup> *RRC* no. 471, 478–9. *CREBM* xxxiii.

<sup>55</sup> Coinage only by explicit permission was probably not enforced but just possibly a blanket permission to coin was issued to the imperial province of Tarraconensis since no *permissu Caesaris Augusti* coins appear although local coinage is extensive: *CREBM* xxiv. The coinages of Tarraconensis far outnumber those of Baetica. All those in Baetica coin with explicit permission: Iulia Traducta, CP, Ita-

as in the rest of the Roman world<sup>56</sup>. In a way this is not surprising given the long tradition of local coinage in the peninsula. These two tendencies – the shortage of bronze coins and the local tradition of minting – were complementary and continued to be so until the local coinages ended in the first century A.D.<sup>57</sup>. A basic economic purpose for the

lica, and Romula. In Lusitania Eborā and Emerita Augusta coin *permissu Caesaris Augusti*, but Pax Iulia's coins do not have this legend. Perhaps Pax Iulia's coins, rougher and more 'native' than the other types of Baetica and Lusitania, predate the general effort of the Augustan period to produce bronze through local mints. It is not clear why the major mint of Lusitania, Emerita Augusta, as well as the lesser town of Eborā, needed to coin *permissu Augusti* since they like towns of Tarraconensis were in an imperial province. Why should blanket permission to coin be given to one imperial province and not to its neighbor? The types of Eborā link the mint closely to that of CP. Were the imperial financial organizations of Baetica and Lusitania united? Perhaps the easiest solution is the most obvious: certain towns went to the trouble to ask explicit permission to coin, a permission which was implicitly granted to any town in Spain which wanted to mint (hence so many towns which record no 'permission'). Did some towns think that prestige accrued if the emperor himself gave his imprimature to their coinage? Once one town had 'permission' (in this case, Emerita) did others in the area (the old Ulterior) follow suit? Perhaps ultimately the reason for putting *permissu* on one's coinage is irrecoverable, but I incline toward a psychological rather than an administrative explanation. (The suggestion by J. M. DE NAVASCUES, *En torno a las series hispánicas imperiales, Numario Hispánico*, 1 (1952), p. 47 that *permissu* simply means that the town, not the imperial government, received the profits of coining has little to recommend it.)

<sup>56</sup> *FITA*, p. 297.

<sup>57</sup> CP ceases to mint long before the 'official' end of local Spanish bronze so I need not discuss in detail the controversies surrounding the cessation of town issues. Could it have been related to the transfer from Spain of all but one legion in the course of the first half of the first century A.D. and so the removal of a large salaried group of men and supporting suppliers in need of small change for their daily life? Cf. *CREBM* xviii–xix for a political reason for the suppression; M. GRANT, *The Decline and Fall of City Coinage in Spain*, *NC* ser. 6, 9 (1949), discusses economic reasons for the decline (p. 96) and political ones as well (p. 97–106). It is perhaps in the context of the end of local issues that the countermarked CP coins belong. This mark, C·PA for C(olonia) PA(tricia), appears on the reverse of worn asses (never on other denominations). It looks as if Córdoba reissued these coins, marking them to assert their genuineness when their legend had become badly worn (cf. *CREBM* xxix ff.). A shortage of bronze brought on by the gradual cessation of local Spanish town mints before increased official Roman issues could take up the slack would be a reasonable occasion for the recirculation of old, worn, previously withdrawn coins since new local bronze was no longer minted. The countermark probably dates, at the earliest, to the reign of Tiberius and more likely to that of Claudius or Nero.

CP coinage, as well as for the rest of the local Spanish bronze issues, seems established: they were meant to supply the *aes* coinage which the Roman government at the time would not<sup>58</sup>.

The frequency of denominations in the local issues supports an economic function. The most commonly used bronze coins were the dupondius, the as, and the semis. The largest salaried class in the empire, the army, utilized bronze coins extensively<sup>59</sup>. Since the needs of the army were always uppermost in the Roman plans for coinage<sup>60</sup>, the preponderance of these three coins in the supplementary local bronzes should not surprise. Of the 456 local Spanish issues (not mints) during the empire, 422 are of dupondii (54), asses (237) and semisses (131)<sup>61</sup>. Obviously the coins of everyday use were being minted, an indication

27 of 340 coins given in Chaves' catalog (pp. 167-175) are countermarked. If this is a representative sample (perhaps unlikely since countermarked coins, as a relative rarity, would be unduly represented in collections) then about 8% of CP asses were withdrawn and later recirculated. Cf. A. M. DE GUADAN, *Numismática ibérica y ibero-romana*, Madrid 1967, p. 89; *FITA*, p. 299 and n. 12; CHAVES, pp. 113-4. GUADAN's idea (Tipología de las contramarcas en la numismática ibero-romana, *Númi-sma*, 5 (1952), p. 89) that the countermarked coins are tessera is not convincing.

The countermark N(eronis) C(aesaris) A(ugusti) PR(obata) on a single piece from CP indicates that by chance or design the imperial government was concerned to affirm the coin's status as legal tender. The coin, countermarked on the obverse while all local countermarks appear on the reverse, is pictured as no. 417 in Chaves' plates where see also p. 113.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. *CREBM* xvii, xxiii. GRANT, *Decline and Fall*, pp. 104-5. This economic purpose is closely bound up with a financial purpose. The bronze coinage was needed in order for the town to meet financial obligations entailed in servicing the army and imperial civil officials.

<sup>59</sup> C. H. V. SUTHERLAND, *The Intelligibility of Roman Imperial Coin Types*, *JRS*, 49 (1959), pp. 46-55, p. 53, reports that excavations show that soldiers saw almost only bronze asses and dupondii. At Colchester, for example, the coins are 10% sestertii, 5% gold and silver, and 85% bronze. But a lost bronze coin is much more likely to remain lost: a more valuable coin is looked for very hard and so is less likely to remain for archaeologists later to find. Schulten's excavations at *Castra Caecilia* do confirm the large number of bronze pieces likely to be found in a military camp.

<sup>60</sup> *CREBM* xvii n. 6.

<sup>61</sup> This admittedly rough count derives from VIVES 4. Some of Vives' identifications are no longer accepted, but his data is good enough to provide a general idea of the frequency of denominations. Of other bronze denominations, only CP issues a sestertius while only Emerita issues a sextans. There are 33 issues of quadrantes.

that they were being issued, for a practical purpose. At CP the largest issue by far is that of asses, as indicated both by numbers of dies and extant pieces (see above), followed by the issue of semisses and dupondii. These mintings correspond to what we would expect from a coinage designed to be used in everyday life <sup>62</sup>.

The circulation of the CP coins also indicates that they were used in daily transactions. Close by, the CP coins are by far the most common local coinage at Munigua, while isolated pieces have been found all over Spain and even in the legionary camps along the northern frontier of the empire <sup>63</sup>. Soldiers must have carried them there as part of their circulating currency, although whether or not they would have been generally accepted by local businessmen in the north is perhaps doubtful.

It should be emphasized that the Roman government was not interested in 'controlling' these local issues too closely. Although the local issues such as CP's supplemented the official *aes* they were not controlled in the sense that coins were issued from a central point for the various local mints. The closest thing to a 'regional' control appears in the coinages of Ebora, CP, and Iulia Traducta which share a very similar type. However, virtually no die links among these coinages have been discovered <sup>64</sup>. Rather, the close similarities are due to a common die-cutter who moved from town to town as demand necessitated. There can be no question of central control.

<sup>62</sup> Only asses are countermarked, however. They must have formed the mainstay of the circulating medium and their number needed to be kept as high as possible – hence the recirculation of worn pieces.

<sup>63</sup> For the information regarding Munigua I am indebted to A. Stylow who is in the process of publishing the coins from that site which is being excavated by the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut. For distribution of finds in Spain see CHAVES, p. 121. For finds along the frontier cf. A. BALIL, *Moneda Hispánica en la zona Rhin-Danubio, Conimbriga*, 13 (1974), pp. 1–12. It is puzzling that no hoards of bronze coins have been found (as far as published material goes, at least) in Córdoba. This is contrary to the usual state of affairs in the more monetized cities of the empire; cf. M. H. CRAWFORD, *Money and exchange in the Roman world, JRS*, 60 (1970), pp. 41–43.

<sup>64</sup> Chaves in private conversation affirmed that she has found no links. In my own work with casts I intermixed with CP coins casts of 39 pieces from Traducta and 16 from Ebora. In every case except one the 'foreign' portraits were separated out in this 'blind' assessment of die similarities. Only in the case of a single quadrans of Traducta did the die seem to be the same as the one used for a CP quadrans.

The economic function of the CP coinage was so important that an economic purpose seems assured. But another factor influenced the decision to mint the CP issues: the visit of Augustus to Spain and, presumably, to Córdoba, in 15/14 B.C.<sup>65</sup> The types and portraiture of the coins, plus the fact that only CP issues bronze sestertii (so recently introduced in Rome) point to a date slightly after 19/18 B.C.<sup>66</sup> The absence of *P(ater) P(atriciae)*, which does appear on very similar coins from Ebora, indicates a date before 2 B.C. when that title was conferred<sup>67</sup>. The types, which surely were meant to convey a meaning<sup>68</sup>, seem to honor Augustus and at the same time to recall the establishment of veterans in a new citizen colony. A reasonable time for such a settlement would be after the Spanish wars were over in 19 B.C. I would suppose that Augustus visited Corduba shortly after he had authorized a veteran settlement and citizen colonial status there (cf. Dio, 54.23.7, 54.25.1). The coins then recall the veteran settlement (dupondius with standards) and colonial life as well as Augustus' civil, military and religious accomplishments. The coins would therefore date from 15/14 B.C. or shortly thereafter. In addition to the special commemorative value of the coinage, there would have been a special need for bronze change if, as I suppose, Augustus and his considerable entourage stayed in Córdoba itself. Perhaps nothing except the army generated so many cash transactions as an imperial visit: in the East during the empire local issues can frequently be traced to the visit of a large imperial entourage. The CP coins therefore met a very specific, as well as the more general, financial and economic needs. The sestertius issue must have been wholly commemorative and short-lived, to judge from its size. The other denominations had longer lasting mintings. Just how long they were produced is impossible to say, but presumably they ceased well before the disappearance of the last local Spanish issues near the middle of the first century A.D.<sup>69</sup>.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. CHAVES, pp. 102, 119-20; *FITA*, p. 128, 220.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. *CREBM* xvii. The first OB CIVIS SERVATOS and oak wreath type appears at Rome in 18 B.C.: *CREBM* xcix-c.

<sup>67</sup> VIVES, plate 165, Ebora no. 1; GRANT, *Decline and Fall*, p. 95. I prefer not to think that Ebora anticipated the official declaration.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. SUTHERLAND, article cited note 59 above.

<sup>69</sup> The close type similarities and the unity of the denominations strongly suggest that the five coins were issued at one time (cf. *FITA*, p. 220). However I would

*Conclusion*

The two issues of the Roman city of Corduba, one as a Latin, one a citizen colony, differ in the idea behind the choice of types but are similar in purpose. The early quadrans celebrates the *genius* of the Latin settlement while the imperial series recalls at once the founding of the citizen colony and the visit of Augustus to the town. The purpose of the two issues is, however, similar: each minting helped supply bronze coinage needed in everyday transactions. The mintings of Corduba, Colonia Patricia form an interesting and enlightening chapter in the history of the all too little studied local bronze coinages of the Roman *imperium*. It is to be hoped that in the future more attention will be paid to these local issues for they have much to tell about the life and history of the Roman world <sup>70</sup>.

ROBERT C. KNAPP

suppose that the asses in particular, but also the dupondii and semisses, continued to be produced for some time. The only other explanation for the large number of dies would be that a massive issue was turned out in 15/14 B.C. The deteriorating style of the dies rather points to an extended series of mintings.

<sup>70</sup> Many persons helped me in my study of Corduba's coins. I would like to thank particularly L. Villaronga and Francisca Chaves Tristán who were generous with their time and resources as well as extremely hospitable during my travels in Spain. Gratitude is also due to the Staatliche Münzsammlung (Munich) and B. Overbeck, the Gabinete Numismático de Cataluña (Barcelona), the Ayuntamiento of Seville, the Museo Nacional de Arqueología (Madrid), the Seminario de Arte y Arqueología of the Universidad de Valladolid, and to L. Cardim and J. L. Martínez who allowed me to make casts of their coins. Thanks too go to D. Nash of the Ashmolean Museum (Oxford), T. Volk of the Fitzwilliam Museum (Cambridge), H. D. Schultz of the Münzkabinett, Staatliche Museen (Berlin) and to the British Museum (London) and the Cabinet des Médailles (Paris) who sent me casts of their Corduba and CP coins. Unfortunately I was not able to consult the extensive collection of the American Numismatic Society (New York).

GIOVANNINI

[Sull'insieme delle osservazioni di Picard si riserva di rispondere altrove; qui vuole soltanto sottolineare che è certamente vero che i Romani hanno conservato il culto di Alessandro, ma la conservazione di tutti i culti era norma generale per i Romani che a questo dovevano la rinomanza della loro *pietas*; altrettanto vero però è l'odio accanito nutrito dai Romani nei confronti di tutto ciò che avesse collegamento con la casa reale macedone, come convincentemente risulta dalla lettura della fine del XLV libro di Livio.

Tiene poi a mettere in evidenza come dalla relazione di Knapp sia finalmente venuto in luce anche l'aspetto della moneta come mezzo di scambio all'interno della comunità, aspetto che era stato posto in ombra dalla discussione finora polarizzata eccessivamente sul ruolo della moneta come mezzo di pagamento dello stato. È certamente lecito cercare correlazioni fra spese dello stato e periodi di grandi emissioni, ma questo non deve far dimenticare come lo stato, normalizzatore di pesi e misure, debba aver certamente sentito anche la necessità di garantire la normalità delle transazioni fra cittadini mediante quella norma monetaria che lo stato stesso aveva stabilito.

L'osservazione dei casi in cui la scarsità di numerario ha dato luogo al cattivo funzionamento del mercato e procurato l'intervento dello stato; la presenza di piccolo numerario all'interno di comunità minori di Spagna, così ben sottolineata e compresa da Knapp, come pure altri casi di Italia e Grecia, devono costituire una spinta allo studio della moneta come mezzo di scambio, un aspetto che troppi studiosi tendono assai spesso a trascurare].

KNAPP

Although all of the papers presented have aspects of interest, material in four of the papers in particular relates to my own special concerns.

Santalucia: The important thing to note here is the fact that there was no counterfeiting law against producing 'unofficial' bronze coinage. Since the Roman government was obviously not as concerned about controlling the issuance of bronze as of silver and gold coinage, we can conclude that local units could, at times at least, issue bronze more or less as they chose, without incurring the displeasure of the central Roman government.

Burnett: The parallels to Italian coinage are evident when the local Spanish coinages are examined. Local bronze was minted without Roman authorization, in Italy as in Spain; types were chosen by the towns, not by the central authority, in Italy as in Spain; coinages continued

into the second and first centuries B.C. in Italy as they did, to an even greater extent, in Spain; the purpose of the coinages of the two areas was similar – to provide for daily needs of small change. The coinages of Italy were smaller than those of Spain, but this was presumably because of the proximity of the source of Roman money. Given the important presence of settlers in Spain from southern Italy, where the local bronze coinages are concentrated, it should not surprise that the habits of the two coinage areas are so similar.

Crawford: The extensive existence of imitation coinages in bronze is also very important to understanding the coinages of local towns in Spain. The existence and toleration of imitation bronzes is symptomatic of the lack of concern for 'regulating' or 'controlling' bronze coinages by Roman fiat, in Italy, Spain and elsewhere. In the case of imitation bronzes, once again the reason for making unauthorized copies of coins must have been the need for small change for daily transactions. Since there was no concerted effort to stop 'counterfeiting' in bronze, these imitations served their purpose well.

Giovannini: If G. is correct that local coinages were used to pay the Roman army in Greece, that procedure raises once again the question of the purpose of the Celtiberian denarii. These silver coins began to be minted in large numbers after the Roman occupation of part of the peninsula, and might be interpreted as a manner of using local units to supply coinage to pay Roman troops. However, the finds of the Iberian denarii are concentrated outside the occupation zones of the Romans in Spain, and such a distribution would be surprising if the coins were, indeed, used to pay the troops within the occupation zone. In various other ways the local silver of Spain behaves differently than that of local silver mintings in Greece, but Giovannini has given food for thought.

#### LO CASCIO

Volevo anzitutto rispondere ad alcune osservazioni che sono state fatte in merito al problema se sia possibile che le decisioni su quale e quanto numerario emettere siano state influenzate talvolta da esigenze diverse da quella di garantire il finanziamento della spesa dello stato, e in merito all'altro problema, connesso col primo, se sia possibile escludere l'esistenza, nel periodo considerato, di un « free coinage ». Parto dalle osservazioni di Michael Crawford su questi due punti. Crawford dice: il sesterzio è stato coniato solo durante periodi bellici e pertanto una spiegazione della ripresa della sua emissione con la *lex Papiria* va trovata tenendo presente questo fatto. Ma la *lex Papiria* è del 90 o del 92? Se è del 92, allora si è ripresa la coniazione del sesterzio, o per lo meno si è deciso di riprenderla, in un periodo non di guerra. Io non so se Mattingly abbia realmente dimostrato le sue argomentazioni