

VARIOUS NUMISMATIC NOTES

BY HAROLD MATTINGLY

Fellow of the Academy

THE first four of the papers are concerned with the continuing debate about the early Roman coinage. If the Morgantina evidence for the denarius has finally to be accepted, quite a number of alterations would have to be made, especially in (2) and (4). Perhaps, in spite of that, my statement of the case may have some interest for researchers, even if it is not to be final. The fifth is a continuation of a series in earlier volumes of *Proceedings*.

1. RUDI THOMSEN, 'EARLY ROMAN COINAGE', Vols. I-III, 1957-1961

AS the work of Rudi Thomsen,¹ based on extensive knowledge and long and deep consideration, has for some time now been in the hands of scholars, I think that it might be useful to set before them some criticisms from an older generation of research. Thomsen's views are bound—deservedly—to attract many adherents: I myself would be the last to question their value, as they open up new lines of thought. But the debate is not yet over, as the criticisms that follow will show. I shall assume that Thomsen's three volumes are accessible to my readers.

1. Thomsen places two 'Romano' didrachms with two corresponding issues of Aes grave before the generally accepted date of 269 B.C. for the first Roman silver.² Obviously he may be right. Our information may not be quite as completely accurate as we have liked to suppose. But—purely as a matter of principle—it is a question if we ought to give up a fixed date until we are actually forced to.

2. Thomsen assumes that reduction of weights always implies later dates. He refuses to conceive of a first period, in which

¹ I understand from correspondence with Dr. Buttrey that he feels that we have given too little attention to Dr. Thomsen's new views and to the find evidence from Morgantina. If this is so, it is not through lack of interest and sympathy, it is simply that we have been trying to digest some important new ideas and have not quite finished yet. If the Morgantina evidence is as sure as the team of archaeologists agrees, we shall have to fit our earlier schemes to it.

I have written with some positiveness of things that I have come to believe—but this should not be taken as evidence that I cannot change my mind.

² Thomsen, *Early Roman Coinage*, iii. 261 and 93 ff.

weights and the relation of \mathcal{R} to \mathcal{A} varied from series to series. Has he any right to reject without consideration? We ourselves have supposed that the Romans began by accepting and using variations which they found in various parts of Italy, but, finding this inconvenient, standardized weights in the second period.

3. Thomsen finds no evidence of multiplicity of mints in hoards or elsewhere. He does not think the 'Italian provinces' worthy of serious consideration. Therefore, while postulating mintage outside Rome for the 'Romano' didrachms, Mars and Apollo, he refuses to consider a system of four mints in two periods.

There is much to criticize here. That many hoards do not speak for local distribution of mints is denied by no one. It may be more significant that an occasional hoard speaks for it.¹

More important, the real check has never yet been applied—the careful check on the finding of sporadic coins—particularly of the small token Aes which would not be likely to wander far from home. This check, once made, would probably settle once and for all whether there was local distribution or not.²

As for the 'Italian provinces', it is admitted that our knowledge of them is very imperfect and that there is a difficulty over dates—269 B.C. for the first Roman silver, 265 B.C. for the provinces. But surely it will be a miracle if these financial districts do not ultimately prove to have a close connexion with the coinage.

One must add that the 'Systematik', which Haeberlin postulated and which seems to us the most fruitful idea ever yet applied to the first Roman coinage, under Thomsen vanishes almost completely. We have tried to do justice to it in the interrelations of our four mints in their two series. Thomsen obscures the fact that there are four 'Romano' didrachms and four 'Roma' didrachms—no more, no less, by removing the Diana-Victory from the 'Romano' because of its lighter weight, the quadrigatus from the 'Roma' because it undoubtedly outlives the other

¹ e.g. Basilicata (Lucania)

5 Diana-Victory: Romano 5 Mars-Horse: Roma

3 Apollo-Horse: Roma 1 Mars-Horse's Head: Roma

Ostia—Large hoard, exclusively Asses—

Janus-Mercury (heavy)

Apulia (?). More than 300 unciae of Diana-Diana series.

Sarzano Valley (near Capua). 17 quadrantes of heavy Apollo-Apollo series.

² It is by this method—and no other—that some knowledge of local distribution of early Gallic and British gold has been won.

three.¹ Thomsen's difficulty about four 'Italian provinces' and only three mints beside Rome is there, right enough, but we had not overlooked it: we had guessed that the 'Gallic province' might have been a later addition. On the evidence of style see our next criticism.

Radical though he essentially is, Thomsen is very like an English Conservative government. He holds his own views—which usually have much to be said in their favour—very strongly—so strongly that he considers it almost wrong to consider any views that conflict with them.

I add as a side note that the major goddess, who appears more commonly than any other deity, who is closely related to Apollo and who has the hunting-dog as her symbol can be no one but Diana. Alföldi's over-ingenious guesses about Rhomé-Rhea Silvia-Ilia must not be allowed to mislead us.² The Phrygian-Trojan suggestions of the helmet need not be alien to Diana. A helmet of this peculiar shape was actually dredged up out of the Lake of Nemi. It is unfortunate that Thomsen has gone back from his first sound instincts.

4. Thomsen now piles a heap of didrachms and Aes grave into the one mint of Rome, *c.* 269-235 B.C.

His main reason is that style is, roughly speaking, uniform. In this we entirely agree with him. In our Period I we found three styles: (*a*) 'Metapontine' for Mars, (*b*) 'Beneventine' for Apollo, (*c*) 'Alexandrine' for Hercules and Diana. Thomsen accepts our (*a*) and (*b*)—though he only calls them south-Italian without names—but puts our (*c*) to Rome and finds it continued in later series.

That this style (*c*) was used in Rome we do not deny. But it is exceedingly improbable that it was invented by Rome. As we look in vain for a western model, we naturally think of the great mint of Alexandria: Rome had recently made an alliance with Egypt. The question remains, was this new style restricted to Rome or was it used by her at other mints too? In theory, either possibility might hold. I confess that I am usually tempted to make style a strong argument for mintage—but, in this case, there are strong arguments on the other side.

Thomsen places in one mint (*a*) silver issues without symbols,

¹ Thomsen, *op. cit.* iii. 262 ff. It is an objection—perhaps a minor one—that Thomsen, by breaking up the 'Romano' series, may be obscuring a slight, though significant, change of meaning, from 'Romano' to 'Roma'.

² *Ibid.* ii. 160 ff.

Hercules-Twins, Apollo-Horse, (*b*) issue with symbols and Greek letter (or letters), Diana-Victory, (*c*) issues with symbol, Mars-Horse's Head, Sickle, Mars-Horse, Club. In (*b*) the symbols, changing, presumably mark mint authorities, in (*c*) the symbol, unchanging, seems to belong to the type and to mark a mint: the sickle (of Saturn) would naturally refer to Latium, the club (of Hercules) to Tarentum (?).

Thomsen—not having our four mints to work with—concentrates on Rome. Opinions here will clearly differ. I cannot myself see the possibility of such varied series belonging inside a short period to one mint. It is also a question whether the 'Roma' issues are not dated too early.

Thomsen links the Aes grave to the silver in much the usual manner, but he makes one definite change by pairing the Diana-Diana Aes with the Hercules didrachm, the Diana-Wheel with the Diana didrachm—instead of reversing the two pairs. He finds an argument for this in weights—an argument which seems to me rather strained.¹ But consider: we all agree that the Hercules didrachm is of Rome and that the Janus-Prow Aes is of Rome too. It is hard to doubt that the Diana-Wheel Aes with its unchanging reverse is the immediate predecessor of the Janus-Prow, which also never changes its reverse—must, therefore, be of Rome also. Hence, I would say Thomsen's change should not be made.

5. We come now to the Second Punic War and the climax of Thomsen's theories. The main points are:

In silver

The quadrigatus, which may have been introduced *c.* 235 B.C., was at first the main coin. Its later issues fell in a very short period—*c.* 215–213 B.C.—in or near Sicily.

It was followed by the denarius and victoriate, introduced about the same date, 212 B.C. With the denarius went its half and quarter, the quinarius and sestertius.

In gold

There was one issue (Young Janus-Oath Scene) *c.* 216 B.C.—a second (Mars-Eagle) with or just after the denarius.

In Aes

The As was reduced from 10 oz. to 6 oz. ('semi-libral' standard)—*c.* 217—or possibly earlier.

¹ Thomsen, *op. cit.* iii. 16 ff. Apparently he is only certain of one point—the Diana-Diana Aes is earlier than the Diana-Wheel.

It fell almost immediately to 'post-semi-libral' (sometimes called triental, sometimes—more appropriately—quadrantal standard: weight near 4 oz. falling away to 3).

It fell to 'sextantal standard' *c.* 212, at about the date of the denarius. (Even after that it was tending to fall still further. By 191 B.C. (Minturnae hoard)¹ Aes of under an ounce standard was already being issued.)

These astonishing propositions are partly the result of Thomsen's own researches, partly deduced from finds in recent excavations at Morgantina (see below).

It is over these propositions that the main fight will probably be waged. I have no doubt that the first rounds will go in favour of Thomsen, but the criticisms that I append should suggest some after-thoughts:

1. It is very difficult to crowd two very distinct classes of late quadrigati into Thomsen's very narrow limits. Thomsen himself thinks many of these coins irregular and therefore more or less negligible. But here he is wrong on point of fact. Certainly not all are.

2. The victoriate has usually been placed earlier than the denarius (*a*) because it belongs to the earlier class of silver, without marks of value; (*b*) because in some hoards, in which victoriate occurred with denarii, they showed more signs of wear.

3. By starting the 'Roma' didrachms at an earlier date (before 235 B.C.) Thomsen has shut out the possibility that they were products of Italian mints, cut off from production by the war.

4. There is fairly general agreement about the gold of *c.* 217–216 B.C. But the 'Mars-Gold' in 212 (or 209) B.C. or thereabouts gives rise to serious questions:

(*a*) The relation of $N-R=1:8$ —(the necessary result if the marks of value (LX, XXXX, XX) are in Asses, not sestertii, as Thomsen now agrees) seems unnaturally low. Thomsen assumes that the silver carried a plus value, the gold not: but this seems to be a grave stretch of Sture Bolin's theories, and will certainly not convince everybody. (See also below.)

Thomsen's assumption that 4,000 lb. or more of gold was converted into coin in 207 B.C. staggers my imagination. Some coinage, perhaps, is likely: but on that scale!

(*b*) It is hard to see why 'post-semi-libral' must follow so soon on 'semi-libral'. The further fall to sextantal is also surprisingly

¹ Thomsen, *op. cit.* ii. 197 ff.

sudden. Our authorities, who make sextantal follow libral, are—to be quite honest—embarrassing to everybody: they know nothing of the intermediate stages.

The theory of a continued rapid decline is quite unnecessary. It depends on one hoard—Minturnae. The date, 191 B.C., was suggested by indecisive evidence of a fire at that time. The coins went down as low as an As of half an ounce. Thomsen does very wrong in refusing the obvious conclusion: numismatically the hoard suggests a much later date: evidence quite inconclusive—the archaeologists judging otherwise.

But, it will be said, all your criticisms fail, as the find evidence of Morgantina is decisive against you. To which we can only answer:

(i) The evidence—if correctly seen—is very strong. There is no doubt of the integrity and conviction of the archaeologists involved. They were not out to grind any axe.

Well, what then?

(ii) Is the evidence correctly seen? The real question seems to be: were a number of separate burnings, of similar character, necessarily of the same date? It seems to be assumed that they must have been.

A doubt, however, arises. Serious fires can occur in times of peace, and, in this case, the particular disturbing element, the 'Hispani', continued to trouble Morgantina for years and years to come.

Here, the archaeologists may interpose: this is really our business, not yours—and the general verdict of archaeologists in many branches is unanimous in favour of late third-century date. Why all this worry about what ought to be accepted without question?

For very definite reasons:

(iii) The denarius of 212 B.C. stands by itself for the time being. We are not yet informed what denarii come next and with what Greek coins they are associated. There have been reports of denarii found with 'Hispanorum' bronze. But those denarii are as late as the 130's or the 120's—while our archaeologists are inclined to date the 'Hispanorum' bronze some forty years earlier—though Erism, who handled them first, prefers a later dating. Also, Thomsen, we know, thinks of denarii, with reverse Diana in biga, as beginning *c.* 200 B.C., and denarii, with reverse Victory in biga, not long afterwards. Again, we should incline to date some forty years later. We are seriously afraid that the 212 B.C. date of the denarius will open up a chasm in its develop-

ment—which must point to a grave error somewhere. We have checked very closely and cannot find the error in the later history of the denarius.

Thomsen has devoted himself with some diligence to destroying the arguments of Robinson and myself for a later date of the denarius.¹ In quite a number of cases he reasonably concludes 'this argument is indecisive': but, even if an argument is not decisive, does that mean that it carries *no weight*? Where he fails to make much headway is on such points as the Norican gold-rush or the cult of the Dioscuri. It remains tempting to associate the Mars-Gold, with its *N: R* relation of 1:8, with the drop of gold in value by a third. Robinson and I may have seemed to underestimate the importance that the Dioscuri always had in Roman belief. But we were not wrong in thinking that they acquired fresh prestige when they came to symbolize the Romans themselves as saviour gods in the East. And, if the Dioscuri charging with spears in rest are not a battle epiphany—well, what are they? Most important of all, Plautus's 'Trinummus' (? nickname of Attic tetradrachm—cf. Livy's Attic tetradrachm that weighs about three denarii) cannot be got rid of by however many pages of desperate attack. I myself think that we have something absolutely solid there. Anyhow, it is *impossible* to prove that that was *not* what the 'trinummus' was. If nothing else stood in the way no one could really be easy with a denarius of *c.* 212 B.C.—unless he were willing to admit, as Thomsen and his friends are not, that there might be a considerable overlap of quadrigatus and denarius.

A very valuable criticism by my son, Harold B. Mattingly, will be found in Spink's circular (1962). While quite independent of me it anticipates much that is said here.

2. JANUS—PROW R.

In 'The First Age of Roman Coinage', *Journal of Roman Studies* (1945), pp. 71 ff., I pointed out some difficulties in the behaviour of the Prow Libral R. series. Thomsen in the second volume of his *Early Roman Coinage* (ii. 27 ff.) has taken some trouble to refute the theory which I, very tentatively, presented—that the Prow Libral R. meant a resumption of the libral series after the Second Punic War. I should say today that his refutation was successful. The case that I presented was

¹ Today, I would give up my latest suggestion, 169 B.C., as out of the question—but somewhere near 187 B.C.—that is quite another matter.

imperfectly prepared and the evidence of hoards certainly seemed to be against it.¹ If I return to the subject today, it is because I believe that there are difficulties in the orthodox view which Thomsen—probably through my fault—has not had fully shown to him, and that I can now suggest a revised—or perhaps, I should say, a new theory which is far less vulnerable to attack than the old.²

When Haerberlin published his great book on *Aes Grave* there seemed to be no difficulty about the magnificent Prow series: there was ample room for it after 269 B.C.—beginning with Prow Libral R., in two clear series, and proceeding in due course to Prow Libral L. and the reductions. Today this is no longer the case. We have been forced to bring in the 'Latin' series of Aes grave before the Janus Prow and place that just after the First Punic War.³ By something like general consent we now date the series from c. 235 to 217 B.C. the year of the semi-libral reduction.

The question now is this—how do Prow Libral R. and Prow Libral L. fit into this new dating and how are they related to one another?

It is not quite obvious how an intricate argument should be presented—I will try to make it as clear as possible.

Haerberlin has proved⁴ that Prow Libral L. immediately precedes the first reduction in 217 B.C. Seeing that the chief cast denominations of that reduction follow it, we naturally conclude that the mint was Rome. The Prow Libral R., then, cannot come in between Prow Libral L. and the reduction.

Very well, then, you say: let us do the obvious thing and set Prow Libral R. before Prow Libral L. in the mint of Rome. That seems the obvious place for it—and there are several hoards⁵ that show Prow Libral R., with earlier Aes grave—but no Libral L.

But here our difficulties begin. Prow Libral R. will not settle comfortably into its appointed place. Here are the reasons:

¹ Thomsen, *op. cit.* ii. 27 ff.

² My suggestion was so tentative that it ought perhaps to have been critically examined rather than formally refuted. I did, however, repeat it, rather more positively, in *Roman Coins*, 2nd ed., 15 ff., so I am not complaining.

³ Pliny places it in the war: he thinks—in error, of course—that it was on a reduced (sextantal) standard.

⁴ There is a small group of Prow L., with weights definitely reduced, but not yet quite to the level of the reduction.

⁵ Ferento, Pozzaglia, San Germano—Thomsen, *op. cit.* i. 31 ff.

(a) Prow Libral L. like the Wheel series, has no uncia while Prow Libral R. has. Prow Libral L., then, seems to be the successor of the Wheel at the mint of Rome.¹

(b) Prow Libral L. has on the obverse of its triens a helmet very like those of the semis of the light Janus-Mercury and the Diana-Diana (Club) series. Prow Libral R. shows on its triens a different form of helmet with a bar on the bowl at back.

(c) Prow Libral R. in several details agrees with the first reduction against Prow Libral L. (Thomsen *op. cit.* ii. 28): that makes it very hard to place Prow Libral L. between them.

Add to that that Prow Libral R. interrupts the natural links between Prow Libral L. and earlier libral series and it is plain that what looked like the natural sequence cannot be the right one. We are left with the probability that Prow Libral L. was the issue of Rome from *c.* 235 to 217 B.C.

The undoubted fact that some libral hoards show Prow Libral R.—and no Libral L.—must not be forgotten. Why should Libral L.—if in existence—not have been included? Was it because Prow Libral R. so far outnumbered Prow Libral L.—by over twelve to one—if we work on Haerberlin's figures? Let these hoards, then, stand—as a problem still to be solved. They cannot cancel the weight of arguments (a)–(c) above.

Thomsen—without, I think, following quite our line of argument—thinks it more probable that Prow Libral R. and L. were issued simultaneously than that Prow L. followed Prow R. (*op. cit.* ii. 30, 31). Sydenham suggests that Prow L. was produced at a mint outside Rome. But is this really possible in view of the early link of Prow L. with the Wheel and its later link with the major denominations of the reduction? Surely the fact of the reduction must have been primarily advertised from the mint of Rome. That Prow Libral R. must be Roman we all seem to agree.

If, then, it is hard to assign Prows R. and L. to two distinct mints—if both have strong claims to be Roman—what can simultaneous issue of the two mean? Only that they must have been issued in two different sections of the same mint—and that those two sections must have served distinct purposes. What those purposes may have been we will consider shortly.

Prow Libral R. was certainly known in 217 B.C. for the struck

¹ In the system of Robinson and myself the succession would be immediate: according to Thomsen there would be a break between them. But Thomsen, though he links the Wheel to the Diana-Victory didrachm, not to the Hercules-Twins, still makes the mint Rome.

pieces of the reductions copy the direction, R., of its Prow.¹ But how far back did it go? Far enough for it to outnumber Prow Libral L. by twelve to one?² In view of the obverse of its triens, which differs so notably from earlier models of helmets, this seems very unlikely. It looks like a deliberate and late variation from Prow L.

We come now to Prows Libral R. and L. and their relation to the reductions. I have grumbled at Thomsen for being a trifle vague about the exact details—though, I now think, I was more to blame myself. Let us try to get the case quite clear. Prow Libral L. gave its direction of Prow L. to the cast pieces of the reductions (As—quadrans, decussis—triens).

In these, Prow R. is exceptionally rare in the first reduction, rare in the second, only becoming less uncommon towards its close.

Prow Libral R. gave its direction of Prow R. to all the struck pieces of the reductions (sextans—semuncia, triens—semuncia). Prow L., I think, never occurs here.

Although the direction of Prow R. is taken from Prow Libral R. there is no close copying of the exact configuration of the Prow, or of the obverse of the triens or uncia.

The result, though not entirely easy to understand, is clear enough. The reductions had behind them Prow Libral L. and Prow Libral R. The rule—seldom or never broken till late—was that the cast pieces took the direction of Prow L., the struck pieces the direction R.

What purpose can have been served by the two sections of the Roman mint that we have been postulating? I find it hard to imagine any purpose that would carry Prow Libral R. far back behind 217 B.C. The purpose that I am now going to suggest—special issue for home, Prow L., separate issue to keep libral standard alive, Prow R.—would imply a looking forward to quite irregular conditions—to war, in fact. If that were the case, Prow Libral R., unable to go far enough back in time to reach its enormous bulk,³ would have to continue long after Libral L. had ended—into the war and may be even after.

¹ I am here clearing up some inaccuracy in my original statement.

² If we use Haebler's figures Prow Libral R. totals are not far behind the totals of all other libral series. Its As out-numbers the Asses of all the other series.

³ Perhaps the earlier libral series may have suffered a lot from melting down and that may lead us to exaggerate the bulk of Prow Libral R., but we are concluding that Prow Libral R. and L. ran together: how explain the

This new solution will, no doubt, seem to many as dubious as my former one. But it cannot be refuted by the evidence of hoards: we shall now have to reckon with a longer range of libral issue, and we have not plunged into it wantonly. We have placed Prow Libral R. just here, because, after close examination, we could find nowhere else to place it—either before or after Prow Libral L. in the main Roman series, or in a separate, non-Roman mint, or in a series at Rome running far back beside Prow Libral L.

I will add a few more points in explanation or justification of this theory.

(A) The main suggestion is that Rome, with the war in mind, resolved to maintain the libral standard in theory, while submitting to reduction at home: that for certain branches of trade¹ she even continued to issue on the old standard—because reduced coins might not find acceptance. It would, perhaps, not be unnatural that the chief denomination, the As, should under these circumstances, be struck in unusual profusion.

(B) The silver quadrigatus, which in its relation to earlier issues, is so like the Janus As, was struck in good silver well into the Second Punic War—some of us think, perhaps even after. Zonaras tells us that the Romans after 217 B.C. were constrained to mix bronze with their silver. Masses of such debased pieces actually exist²—perhaps intended for use at home, while the good quadrigati circulated abroad.

This would be an exact counterpart of what we are postulating for the Aes—full value for outside Rome, reduced at home.

(C) There is nothing extraordinary if a coin of full value, no longer current at home, is still issued for foreign use—the English gold sovereign, which as far as England went died in 1914, was struck in mass for Arabia for years afterwards.

(D) If you study Livy's references to Aes in and after the Second Punic War, it seems to stand out that he reckoned in the old Asses of libral standard; not in the changing Asses issued from year to year. The numbers are nearly always round—not more

twelve to one supremacy of Prow R.? The extraordinary number of Prow R. Asses—1,168 against 368 of all other Libral series—as against 392 of its own next highest denomination, the triens, is remarkable and must have its explanation.

¹ Foreign (?): but in Italy there may have been some demand for un-reduced coin.

² I have been inclined to regard these debased pieces as late and, perhaps, unofficial. I may just have been wrong.

or less irregular, as if they were constantly being 'corrected',¹ cf. Livy xxii. 32, 217 B.C. 'Indici data libertas et aeris gravis viginti milia': Livy xxii. 27. 9, 210 B.C. exactly the same amount. 'Aes grave' in fact means Libral Asses.

The 100,000 Aeris of the Lex Voconia of 169 B.C. was reckoned later as 100,000 sestertii—the Aeris, then, clearly meaning Libral Asses.

If we compare the amounts given to the troops as booty we find (Thomsen, *op. cit.* i. 39 ff.):

56, 400, 120, 70, 80, 270 (= 1 lb. silver), 125, 300, 300.

If we regard Asses or Aeris here as meaning Libral Asses = sestertii, we get, in denarii:

14, 100, 30, 17½, 20, 67½, 31¼, 75, 75.

Compare the numbers given in denarii (Thomsen, *op. cit.* i. 43 ff.):

25, 25, 42, 50, 25, 15, 200, 100, 75, 45.

The range of values seems similar.

(E) The L. Aes of the second reduction have neat obverse rather like Prow Libral R. (group with no mark of value on obverse), reverse Prow R., in shape very like Prow Libral L. and the group of Prow Libral R. quoted above. It is much neater than Roman coins of the same reduction. The date is disputed. Thomsen would date it early *c.* 217–215 B.C., perhaps. The 365 Asses that Haeblerlin can quote for it seem inconsistent with a very short issue.

I am inclined to attribute it to Locri (rather than Luceria) during the troubles associated with Scipio's legate, Pleminius, *c.* 204 B.C. and to suppose that it copied Prows Libral R.—still being issued. If they were not, why should Prow R. suddenly appear again—here and in quite a number of coins of the second reduction?

One or two more points concern issue after the war:

(F) There is nothing extraordinary if a State, after winning a war, goes back to a standard that has been abandoned. England, after the Napoleonic War, went back to her gold sovereign. After the First World War she went back to the gold standard, though she was unable to keep on it. Such returns may be unwise—and wrong—but they do occur.

¹ In one passage, Livy xxii. 10. 7, correction seems certain: 333,333½ Asses of 6 oz. for 200,000 of 10.

(G) Libral Prow R. Asses—in their later phase, as I should arrange them, with marks of value on both sides—are very like some late quadrigati, which Thomsen places *c.* 215–213, which I would also place late. The mark of value on both sides of the As is something shared by these and by sextantal Asses. Thomsen (*op. cit.* ii. 29) notes, justly, that the mark is horizontal below bust, on the libral, vertical above bust on the sextantal. But is that sufficient reason for saying that the resemblance as far as it goes cannot be significant?

(H) Finally, the much disputed passage in Festus (Thomsen, *op. cit.* i. 35) does not confirm Thomsen's sextantal As of 212 B.C. If the payment of which Festus writes was *in* the war, it was in 204 B.C. and the sextantal reduction was in the same year: the issue of the new Asses, the payment and the rest are all part of one and the same decree of the Senate: the subjunctive moods prove that. Festus's words, 'that private individuals should not suffer serious loss', are sheer nonsense, if, as he says, there were only two standards—sextantal following libral. To lend libral Asses and receive back sextantal, losing four-fifths, is not 'to suffer no serious loss'.¹ If Festus is not writing nonsense, he knew of the reductions which he does not mention.

If his 'propter bellum' means not 'in', but 'after'—Festus writes 'gestum est', neutral,—not indeed 'gestum erat', definitely 'after', but also not 'gerebatur', definitely 'in'—the allusion might be to the final repayment of 25 'stipendia' in 187 B.C. On our theory of the continuing libral As, the sextantal standard would follow directly on the libral. Perhaps this is too much to hope for: perhaps Festus is just writing something too muddled to make sense.

3. 'BIGATI QUINQUESSIS'

from the notorious fragment of Festus *De Verborum Significatu*, (pp. 347 ff.), Thomsen, *Early Roman Coinage*, i. 135.

It is tempting to try and wrest a meaning out of this tantalizing fragment; but it is so fragmentary that nothing can be definitely proved or disproved out of it. I will, therefore,

¹ Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xxxiii. 44, misplacing the reduction in the First Punic War, says that the State made a profit of five parts (five-sixths, it seems: he imagines 2 ounces reduced from 12). He does not say that private individuals suffered little loss. It looks as if Pliny and Festus had, somewhere, a common source: as if Pliny had misconstrued it, to fit in with his false ideas about the first Roman coinage: as if Festus conceivably preserved a fragment of genuine tradition.

restrict myself to one thing that cannot be questioned—the appearance in l. 6 of the word ‘quinquessis’, following ‘bigati’ and ‘valebant d. []’ in l. 5.

The fragment certainly must have spoken of the decussis, the denarius of ten asses, which is twice the quinquessis. In ll. 1–3 we hear of the sestertius, the quarter of the denarius, as equal to two and a half asses, and in ll. 7–8 we hear of a raising of the count of the denarius from ‘ten to sixteen’ as we can supply from Pliny (Thomsen, *op. cit.* i. 19).¹ Thomsen (*op. cit.* ii. 187 ff.) remarks: ‘It is true that the words “bigati” and “quinquessis” stand next to one another but that this must mean that there is a grammatical connexion between them, is a simple postulate.’ A very odd comment—the postulate is a most natural one. Thomsen continues: ‘Even if there really existed such a connexion between these words, it is extremely daring to maintain that there is an identical relationship between “quadrigatus” and “decussis”.’ I have suggested above that we are bound to suppose that that relationship existed. Since, however, we cannot really argue on the matter, I will fall back on the certainty that Festus spoke of a half piece, the quinquessis—and, so far, did something which our other authorities, Pliny and Festus, never do: they are concerned only with the quadrigatus—certainly taken by them to be a denarius, with its types ‘bigae atque quadrigae’.¹ If the ‘quinquessis’ were *not* ‘bigati’, what were they? That awkward word ‘quinquessis’ cannot be juggled away—even from a fragment.

The interesting point is that quite apart from any possible evidence from this fragment, there is rather a good case for assuming that the ‘bigatus’ was actually the name of the half-quadrigatus—first struck with the same type as its whole, but with quadriga to L. not R., then represented by the coin of the same weight, but with changed types, Jupiter and Victory, which we call the ‘victoriate’. Where the literary authorities, in their lists of spoils, speak of ‘bigati’ the coin evidence leads us to look for victoriate. Thomsen (*op. cit.* ii. 187 ff.) gives a very fair summary of the case, as further developed by Neatby, but then proceeds to submit it to a devastating attack. His own explanation—that the ‘bigati’ of the lists of spoils were really denarii and

¹ Pliny (Thomsen, *op. cit.* i. 19) mentions them after 217 B.C., when the denarius was raised to sixteen asses. Festus, in our fragment, seems to place them *apud antiquos*, while the denarius was still worth ten asses. Paulus (*ibid.* 35) mentions them after the sextantal reduction. There is, it will be seen, a muddle about the dates.

that the victoriatas, for which we look in vain, were subsumed under denarii—well, it is ingenious enough, but I dread to think what Thomsen would have called it, had I made it. It cannot command the immediate acceptance which Thomsen seems to expect.

The fragment, we have agreed, is too broken to yield any certain result. But Stazio's devastating criticism of my suggestion (Thomsen, *op. cit.* ii. 189) is really quite unjustified. Why be so angry if someone tries to extract sense from a difficult passage? When there is other evidence for a 'bigatus' that is in fact a 'quinquessis' who dare assert positively that Festus did not expressly state the value? I know that I dare not. All I am positively asserting here is that the very mention of 'quinquessis' means that Festus was not simply repeating the old stories but bringing in the question of a half-piece. My only fault lies in trying to find out what it was—a fault of which neither Thomsen nor Stazio is guilty.

4. FESTUS, ONCE MORE

De Verborum Significatu, p. 347 (Thomsen, *Early Roman Coinage* i. 35)

'Sextantari Asses in usu esse coeperunt ex eo tempore, quo propter Bellum Punicum Secundum, quod cum Hannibale gestum est, decreverunt patres, ut ex assibus, qui tum erant librari, fierent sextantari; per quos cum solvi coeptum esset, et populus aere alieno liberaretur, et privati, quibus debitum publice solvi oppòrtebat, non magno detrimento adficerentur.'¹

'Sextantal asses began to be in use from the time when, because of the Second Punic War, which was waged with Hannibal [1], the Senate decreed that out of the Asses, which

¹ Pliny (quoted in Rudi Thomsen, *Early Roman Coinage*, i. 19) reports the change from libral to sextantal Asses, but he places it in the first Punic War and adds that the types of the new Aes were Janus-Prow. The State, he says, made a profit of 'five parts' (five-sixths—only repaying two Asses for twelve).

He is definitely wrong about the Punic War, wrong about the types of the new Aes, wrong about the weight of the libral As (10 ounces, not 12). He says nothing about private citizens 'suffering no great loss'.

If Pliny used the same source as Festus, he has deliberately altered it to suit his own false ideas of the early Roman coinage. The source, presumably, was the same: for Paulus (excerpt of Festus, p. 275 M.) repeats the curious error of Pliny about the reverse of the quadrans being a 'ratis', not a 'ship' ('Prow of ship' in Pliny).

Paulus (excerpt of Festus, p. 98 M.) seems to give a very abbreviated version, but, writing 'Bello Punico', not 'propter Bellum Punicum', seems to mean 'in' the war. Which war—First or Second—he does not say.

at that time were libral, sextantal should be made [2] and that, [3] when payment with these had begun, the people should be cleared of debt [4] and private citizens, to whom payment of debt was due from the State, should suffer no great loss' [5].

I add a few notes, in order to bring out the full meaning:

[1] 'Propter', 'on account of', not 'in'. 'Gestum est' is a neutral phrase. If you meant to exclude all doubt, 'gerebatur' would mean 'in', 'gestum erat' would mean 'after'. Paulus writes 'Bello Punico', 'in the Punic War'. Festus may have meant it—but he did not say it.

[2] Quite definite: libral Asses into sextantal—no mention of any intermediate stages.

[3] The subjunctives show that this is not comment, but part of the decree of the Senate.

[4] It is not made quite clear whether this is meant to be a single act or a series of recurring acts.

[5] If sextantal asses followed libral immediately, people who had lent libral Asses only received sextantal back—a loss of four-fifths—no great loss? What did the senate mean? Unless we suppose that they knew of the reductions which Festus has not mentioned, it seems sheer nonsense.

This is a difficult passage. I myself, as Rudi Thomsen has justly observed, have wobbled in my reading of it. But it is difficult for everybody—Thomsen himself included.

Thomsen (op. cit. ii. 171 ff.) quotes with glee the different views of the passage that I have taken over many years of research. It certainly shows that I am not infallible. I have never claimed to be. But, as long as I live I shall try to find the truth—until we can be agreed that it has really been found. But Thomsen should not suggest that our¹ last view (see below) is obviously 'an expedient interpretation, made with a view to justify their late dating of the denarius'. One should allow that one's opponents are trying to tell the truth as they see it.

Thomsen is so very sure that Festus means 'in the Second Punic War'; he says so several times, notes that that has been my opinion, and bluntly asserts that 'this is the obvious, unprejudiced reading of the passage'. I am not going to contradict him outright, for I still think it *possible* that that was Festus's meaning; but I am going to make clear to him what is implied in his view.

If the reduction was made *in* the war, it was in 204 B.C., the year in which repayment of debt began.² The reduction of the

¹ i.e. Robinson's and mine.

² Livy xxix. 16. 1 ff.

As, the beginning of repayment, the clearance of the debt, and the lack of serious loss to private citizens are all part of the decree of the Senate: the subjunctive moods make this clear beyond all doubt—I think that so far this has not been noted. I have shown above that the ‘lack of serious loss to private citizens’—part of the intention of the Senate, not a mere comment by Festus—appears to be nonsensical.

Thomsen (op. cit. ii. 243) refuses to accept the year 204 B.C., the year when repayment began, as the year when sextantal reform was carried out. But I have already proved that that is precisely what Festus reported. We know that Thomsen is confident that the reform belongs to c. 212 B.C. But he must *not* quote Festus in support of his view.¹

Finally, what of my theory that Festus may have got hold of a genuine tradition about the final repayment of 25½ ‘tributa’ in 187 B.C.? It is linked, of course, to my theory that Rome was again using the libral standard after the Second Punic War.² All I am pointing out is that Festus might then be literally right—sextantal Asses might follow directly on libral—he may have known that there had been other reductions earlier. We have only to accept the undeniable possibility that ‘propter’ ‘on account of’ did *not* mean ‘in the war’.

But Festus *may* have been talking nonsense. Need I apologize for giving him a chance of talking sense?

5. THE COINAGE OF c. 70–49 B.C.

This is a continuation of my paper in *Proc. Brit. Acad.* xlvii. 255 ff. As before, constant reference is made to Sydenham, *Roman Republic*, 131–7. For mint-marks the following abbreviations will be used: FR for Fractional Sign, L for Letter, N for Numerals, S for Symbol. (As a rule only noted when variable).

A. MINT OF ROME.

1. MONEYS (III VIRI AAA FF)

The only denomination in silver is the denarius. There is no gold and no Aes.

¹ Thomsen (op. cit. ii. 243) asserts very confidently that ‘if we were to use the Festus passage as a chronological clue, it would at most entitle us to establish 204 B.C. as a *terminus ante quem* for the sextantal reform, but even this would be squeezing too much out of Festus.’

This only illustrates what I have said in the text. If you will not accept what Festus does say, you must not make a show of using him.

² See above for a restatement of my theory in a revised—and less vulnerable—form.

<i>Moneyer and types of denarius</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Mint-marks</i>	<i>Notes</i>
(1) <i>c.</i> 67 B.C. M. Lepidus	S. 827-33	S	The symbols are remarkably like those of 3, M. Piso.
(a) <i>Obv.</i> Female head, diademed, r. <i>Rev.</i> Equestrian statue M. LEPIDVS			
(b) <i>Obv.</i> As on (a) <i>Rev.</i> As on (a), but also AN. XV. PR. H.O.C.S.			(b) <i>rev.</i> ANNORVM XV PROGRESSVS HOSTEM OCCIDIT CIVEM SERVAVIT
(c) <i>Obv.</i> Head of Alexandria, r. ALEXANDREA. <i>Rev.</i> M. LEPIDVS crowning Ptolemy V. TVTOR REG. S.C. PONT. MAX. M. LEPIDVS			
(d) <i>Obv.</i> Head of Vestal Aemilia, r. <i>Rev.</i> The Basilica Aemilia. AEMILIA REF. S.C. M. LEPIDVS			
(2) <i>c.</i> 67 B.C. C. Piso	S. 840-78	FR, L. N, S	An enormous issue with immense variety of <i>obv.</i> and <i>rev.</i> types and reverse legend (see S). C. Piso may have been a normal moneyer, but his issue almost looks that of an extra, private mint.
<i>Obv.</i> Head of Apollo, r. <i>Rev.</i> Horseman galloping r. C. PISO L.F. FRVGI			
(3) <i>c.</i> 67 B.C. M. Piso M.F. Frugi	S. 824-6	S	See above on 1.
(a) <i>Obv.</i> Bust with winged diadem, r. (Terminus) <i>Rev.</i> Patera and Knife in sheath—the whole in laurel-wreath. M. PISO M.F. FRVGI			
(b) <i>Obv.</i> Full-length figure of Terminus, facing. <i>Rev.</i> as on (a).			
1-3 are, perhaps, a triumvirate of the mint. If there was any coinage of moneyers in 70-68 B.C., it must be looked for towards the end of the previous period (Mattingly, <i>Proc. Brit. Acad.</i> xlvii. 260). We now place C. Hosidius Geta later, 4.			
(4) <i>c.</i> 63 B.C. C. Hosidius C.F. Geta	S. 903		Also strikes at Pisa (?), serrate and in a different style. We place Geta alone, because he has no colleagues, who, like him, strike at both Rome and Pisa. This seems to be the first appearance of the signature, III VIR.
<i>Obv.</i> Bust of Diana, diademed, r., with bow and quiver. III VIR GETA <i>Rev.</i> Calydonian Boar, attacked by dog and pierced by spear. C. HOSIDI C.F.			
(5) <i>c.</i> 61 B.C. P. Fonteius P.F. Capito	S. 900 f.		The <i>rev.</i> of (a) commemorates a Fonteius who had distinguished himself in the Gallic Wars. The meaning of the <i>rev.</i> of (b) is disputed. Probably T. Didius 'Imperator', while waiting for a triumph, had stayed in the 'villa publica'. It is not likely that he restored it.
(a) <i>Obv.</i> Bust of Mars, r. P. FONTEIVS P.F. CAPITO III VIR <i>Rev.</i> Soldier on horseback, thrusting spear at enemy, who threatens a third man. M. FONT. TR. MIL.			

- | <i>Moneyer and types of denarius</i> | <i>Ref.</i> | <i>Mint-
marks</i> | <i>Notes</i> |
|--|-------------|------------------------|--|
| (b) <i>Obv.</i> Head of Concordia,
r. P. FONTEIVS
CAPITO III VIR
CONCORDIA
<i>Rev.</i> The 'Villa Publica'.
T. DIDI. IMP. VIL. PVB. | | | For that we should expect
REF (<i>Refecit</i>). See J. R.
Hamilton, in <i>Num. Chron.</i> , pp.
224 ff.: he dates 60-59 B.C. |
| (6) c. 61 B.C. Faustus Sulla | S. 879-81 | | |
| (a) <i>Obv.</i> Bust of Diana, r.:
crescent: lituus.
FAVSTVS
<i>Rev.</i> Sulla seated: Bocchus
kneeling: Jugurtha kneeling
bound. FELIX | | | The <i>rev.</i> of (a) copies the signet-
ring of Sulla, with the surren-
der of Jugurtha. The <i>obv.</i> of (b)
has been thought to be a real
person — hardly Jugurtha,
? Bocchus. Faustus honours his
father, the dictator. |
| (b) <i>Obv.</i> Hercules (?) dia-
demed, r.: FEELIX
<i>Rev.</i> Diana in biga r.:
crescent with two stars.
FAVSTVS | | | |
| (7) c. 61 B.C. C. Serveilius C.F. | S. 890 | | |
| <i>Obv.</i> Head of Flora, r.: lituus:
FLORAL PRIMVS
<i>Rev.</i> Two soldiers facing one
another. C. SERVEIL. C.F. | | | For reference to first holding of
Games, cf. C. Memmius—16,
below, and Sufenas, A. 3, 1. |
| 5-7 are, perhaps, a triumvirate, the President signing III VIR. If Fonteius is not placed here, he would have to be placed earlier, c. 67 B.C., as head of a college, with M. Lepidus and M. Piso; in that case, C. Piso would be a supernumerary. | | | |
| (8) c. 55 B.C. L. Furius Brocchus | S. 902 | | |
| Cn. F.
<i>Obv.</i> Bust of Ceres, r.: wheat-
ear: barley-corn.
III VIR BROCCHI
<i>Rev.</i> Curule chair, between
fasces, with axes.
L. FVRI CN. F. | | | The <i>rev.</i> might refer to the
special 'Cura Annonae' as-
signed to Pompey. |
| (9) c. 55 B.C. Philippus | S. 919 | | |
| <i>Obv.</i> Head of Ancus Marcius,
r.: lituus. ANCVS
<i>Rev.</i> Equestrian statue on ar-
cade: flower.
AQVA MAR. PHILIPPVS | | | |
| (10) c. 55 B.C. Q. Pompeius Rufus | S. 908-9 | | |
| (a) <i>Obv.</i> Head of Q. Pompeius
Rufus, bare, r.
Q. POM. RVFI RVFVS COS
<i>Rev.</i> Head of Sulla bare, r.:
SVLLA COS | | | |
| (b) <i>Obv.</i> Curule chair: arrow:
laurel-branch. Q. POM-
PEI Q. F. RVFVS COS
<i>Rev.</i> Curule chair: lituus:
wreath. Q. POMPEI
RVF. SVLLA COS | | | |

Moneyer and types of denarius	Ref.	Mint- marks	Notes
<p>(11) c. 54 B.C. C. Coelius Calvus (a) <i>Obv.</i> Head of C. Coelius Calvus, Consul, r. C. COEL CALVVS COS. On tablet LD <i>Rev.</i> Head of Sol, radiate. Round and oval shields. CALVVS III VIR (b) <i>Obv.</i> As on (a), but HIS on vexillum on l. <i>Rev.</i> Seated figure at lectisternum. L. CALVVS VII VIR EP. C. CALVVS IMP. A.X. CALVVS III VIR</p>	S. 891-8		<p>The types celebrate the honours of the family—the moneyer's grandfather, Consul 94 B.C. IMP(erator), A(gur), D(ecemvir), and his father, SEPTEM VIR EPVLO. The letters on the tablet on <i>rev.</i> of (a) mean L(ibera) D(amno), referring to a 'Lex Tabellaria' passed in 106 B.C. by the Consul of 94 B.C. when tribune. There is much minor variation on the <i>rev.</i> of (b).</p>
<p>(12) c. 54 B.C. Brutus (a) <i>Obv.</i> Head of Libertas, r. LIBERTAS <i>Rev.</i> L. Iunius Brutus, First Consul, walking with three men. BRVTVS (b) <i>Obv.</i> Head of L. Iunius Brutus, First Consul, r. BRVTVS <i>Rev.</i> Head of Ahala, r. AHALA</p>	S. 906-7		<p>The references are to 'Heroes of Liberty'—the First Consul, who had his own sons put to death for trying to restore the Tarquins, and C. Servilius Ahala, who killed Spurius Maelius for 'affecting tyranny'. It is not quite clear who the men on the <i>rev.</i> of (a) are: Sydenham says L. Iunius Brutus, between two licitors, preceded by an 'accensus'.</p>
<p>(13) c. 54 B.C. Q. Cassius (a) <i>Obv.</i> Young head bare, r.: sceptre. <i>Rev.</i> Eagle on thunderbolt: lituus: jug. Q. CASSIVS (b) <i>Obv.</i> Head of Vesta, r.: Q. CASSIVS VEST <i>Rev.</i> Temple of Vesta: voting urn. Tablet A.C. (c) <i>Obv.</i> Head of Libertas, r. Q. CASSIVS LIBERT. <i>Rev.</i> As on (b).</p>	S. 916-18		<p>The <i>rev.</i> of (b), (c) refers to the trial of Vestal Virgins in 113 B.C., presided over by an ancestor of the moneyer. On tablet A(bsolvo) C(ondemno). Alföldi interprets the <i>obv.</i> of (a) as a young Romulus.</p>
11-13, Perhaps a triumvirate.			
<p>(14) c. 52 B.C. L. Torquatus <i>Obv.</i> Head of Sibyl, r. SIBYLLA <i>Rev.</i> Tripod, on which is amphora: two stars: torque. L. TORQVAT. III VIR</p>	S. 835-7		<p>There is probably a reference to Sibylline oracles, concerning Roman plans to interfere in Egypt. But such plans ran over many years and cannot determine the date.</p>
<p>(15) c. 52 B.C. Q. Pomponius Musa (a) <i>Obv.</i> Head of Apollo, r. Q. POMPONI MVSA <i>Rev.</i> Hercules standing r. HERCVLES MV SARVM (b) <i>Obv.</i> As on (a)—varied. No legend. <i>Rev.</i> Each of the nine Muses, with varying symbols and in varying poses. Q. POMPONI MVSA</p>	S. 810-23		

<i>Moneyer and types of denarius</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Mint-marks</i>	<i>Notes</i>
(16) <i>c.</i> 52 B.C. C. Memmius C.F.	S. 920-1		For first holding of Games, cf. C. Serveilius, 7, above, and Sufenas, A. 3, 1.
(a) <i>Obv.</i> Head of Ceres, r. C. MEMMI C.F. <i>Rev.</i> Captive at feet of trophy. C. MEMMIVS IMPERATOR			
(b) <i>Obv.</i> Head of Quirinus, r. C. MEMMIVS C.F. QVIRINVS <i>Rev.</i> Ceres seated l.: serpent. MEMMIVS AED. CERIALIA PREIMVS FECIT			
14-16, perhaps a college.			
(17) 49 B.C. Q. Sicinius	S. 938		As Sicinius also strikes with the Praetor, C. Coponius—in the East—and no other moneyer does so, we are placing him by himself.
<i>Obv.</i> Head of Fortuna, r. FORT. P.R. <i>Rev.</i> Winged caduceus, palm-branch, wreath. Q. SICINIVS III VIR			

Since Karl Pink's happy deduction from the denarius of L. Flaminius Chilo (III VIR PRI(mus) FL(avit)—S. no. 1088) we can be reasonably sure that the signature, III VIR, which we now meet for the first time, denotes the President of a college of III VIRI AAA FF. The other two members of the college must be presumed to sign with their names only. It must not, of course, be assumed that all coins were issued by colleges. We can, indeed, point to two III VIRs who seem to have worked alone. But we have chosen to work on the hypothesis that the issues were usually made by colleges. The numbers work out nearly right—two men signing with names only to each III VIR. Even if issues did not run quite as evenly as we are assuming, our dates should not be seriously at fault.

The issues of Curule Aediles are, presumably, of Rome and follow on here as A. 2. It seems reasonable to assume that only coins signed AED. CVR. S.C. or EX S.Cs should be assigned to these magistrates.

Men who sign their names, with S.C. or EX S.C., are not regular moneyers: *they* need no special authorization from the Senate.¹ We shall discuss this group in A. 3 below.

Rome is clearly the chief mint. A few issues—first serrate, then non-serrate—certainly belong to a northern mint (Pisa?). One moneyer, L. Roscius Fabatus, may belong to Lanuvium. Some, if not all, of the S.C. moneyers may belong to Praeneste (see discussion under A. 3).

There is still no close agreement about the order of moneyers.

¹ Exceptions are rare and probably have special causes.

We may consult E. Babelon, *Description historique et chronologique des monnaies de la république romaine*, 2 vols., Paris, 1885-86; H. Grueber, *Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum*, 3 vols., London, 1910; and, more recently, Karl Pink, 'The Triumphal Monetales and the Structure of the Coinage of the Roman Republic', *ANS Numismatic Studies*, no. 7, New York, 1952; and Andreas Alföldi, *Schweiz. Num. Rundschau*, 1954, 5 ff.

Alföldi has given us a wonderful collection of material, with denarii enlarged by a half, and an abundance of valuable suggestions. But he ignores the mint of Pisa (?), is not much concerned with finding colleges, and breaks what seem to me clear laws in finding curule aediles who do not sign AED. CVR. S.C. or EX S.C. and ordinary moneyers who sign S.C or EX S.C.

Looking back on the list of moneyers, as I have arranged them, I note the following points of interest or difficulty:

1. C. Hosidius Geta is very close in style to M. Plaetorius Cestianus, curule aedile *c.* 66 B.C. It seems unlikely that he is quite as early as we once thought (*c.* 70 B.C.): if so, he must now come down a little after 66 B.C.

2. P. Fonteius Capito is, in style, rather like Geta—not unlike M. Lepidus and M. Piso (*c.* 67 B.C.) or Faustus Sulla (*c.* 61 B.C.). I have preferred the later date, *c.* 61 B.C., but without full certainty. If we shift him up from *c.* 61 to *c.* 67 B.C., we need a III VIR for 61 and C. Hosidius Geta—the only likely candidate—really seems to be earlier.

3. The colleges of *c.* 55 and 54 B.C. are probably correctly dated, but their exact composition is open to revision.

4. The college of Torquatus (*c.* 52 B.C.) may be called in question. Torquatus and Musa have usually been placed well up in the 60's, though Memmius has been set later. All three moneyers appear late in hoards. The fine, rather florid, style that distinguishes them is, perhaps, not to be found till the late 50's. It was a study of Alföldi's plates that led me to this conclusion.

5. It seems likely that the coinage was so spaced that most years had an issue of one kind or another. Cicero mentions one moneyer (50 B.C.?) of whom we have no coins. Perhaps in years in which there was no strong public demand for coins, moneyers issued, at most, small token issues for their friends. Whether the Pisa (?) moneyers were normal III AAA FF from Rome or a second special college is not easily decided. Perhaps the former alternative is preferable. We have no certain example of Rome and Pisa (?) striking, with different magistrates, in the same year.

<i>Moneyer and types of denarius</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Mint- marks</i>	<i>Notes</i>
2. CURULE AEDILES			
(1) <i>c.</i> 69 B.C. P. Galba <i>Obv.</i> Head of Vesta, r. S.C. <i>Rev.</i> Knife, simpulum and axe. P. GALB. AED. CVR.	S. 838-9		Sydenham dates <i>c.</i> 65 B.C.—a little too late, as our date may possibly be a little early.
(2) <i>c.</i> 66 B.C. M. Plaetorius Cestianus (a) <i>Obv.</i> Bust of Cybele, towered, r. CESTIANVS <i>Rev.</i> Curule chair. M. PLAETORIVS AED. CVR. EX S.C.	S. 808-9	S	Cestianus was Praetor in 65 B.C. The <i>obv.</i> of (b) is a kind of Panthea, a goddess of many attributes. Alföldi, most persuasively, makes her out to be Isis.
(b) <i>Obv.</i> Bust of Goddess, helmeted, r., with a wreath of many components. CESTIANVS S.C. <i>Rev.</i> Eagle on thunderbolt. M. PLAETORIVS M.F. AED. CVR.			
(3 and 4) <i>c.</i> 58 B.C. M. Scaurus and P. Hypsaeus <i>Obv.</i> King Aretas kneeling, holding camel and olive-branch. M. SCAVR EX S.C. AED. CVR. <i>Rev.</i> Jupiter in quadriga l. P. HYPSAE. AED. CVR. C. HYPSAE COS. PREIVE CAPTV.	S. 912-3		The date is recorded by Cicero (Pro. Sest. Liv. 116). There is a good deal of minor variety, especially on the <i>rev.</i>
(5 and 6) 54 B.C. A. Plautius and Cn. Plancius (a) <i>Obv.</i> Head of Cybele, towered, r. A. PLAVTIVS AED. CVR. S.C. <i>Rev.</i> Bearded figure kneeling beside camel. BACCHIVS IVDAEVS	S. 932-3		Again the date is sure. 'Bacchius Iudaeus' is unknown. He is apparently, like Aretas, 3, 4, <i>obv.</i> , a prince suing for peace.
(b) <i>Obv.</i> Head of Diana, r. CN. PLANCIVS AED. CVR. S.C. <i>Rev.</i> Goat standing r.: quiver and bow.			

This is the only period in which coinage of curule aediles was at all common. A P. Fourius Crassipes struck as curule aedile in *c.* 86 B.C., S. 735.

There is no issue of this kind after 54 B.C. Perhaps, in the disturbed condition of Rome in the years that we are discussing, there was an unusually strong urge to win popular support by extravagant display at the Games. The issue of special coins for the shows would help to advertise them. Scaurus, we happen to hear, almost ruined himself.

Here, fortunately, all dates are exact or very nearly so, so that these coins can be used to date others.

<i>Moneyer and types of denarius</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Mint-marks</i>	<i>Notes</i>
3. S.C. OR EX S.C. MONEYERS			
(1) c. 63 B.C. Sufenas	S. 885		The <i>obv.</i> , Saturn of the 'aerarium', suggests that the moneyer was a quaestor. For first holdings of Games, cf. C. Seruilius, A. 1, 7, and C. Memmius, A. 1, 16.
<i>Obv.</i> Head of Saturn, r.: harpa. SVFENAS S.C. <i>Rev.</i> Roma, crowned by Victory, seated l. on arms. SEX. NONI PR. L.V.P.F.			
(2) c. 62 B.C. P. Hypsaesus	S. 910-1		Hypsaesus was curule aedile in 58 B.C. (A. 2, 3 and 4: cf. <i>rev.</i>): if he was now quaestor the date will be about right. Sydenham is wrong to combine the two issues.
(a) <i>Obv.</i> Head of Neptune, r.: trophy. P. YPSAE, S.C. <i>Rev.</i> Jupiter in quadriga, l. C. YPSAE COS. PRIV. CEPIT (b) <i>Obv.</i> Bust of Leuconoe r.: dolphin P. HYPSSAE S.C. <i>Rev.</i> As on (a).			
(3) c. 60 B.C. C. Considius Nonianus	S. 886-		The temple of Venus Erycina in Rome was just outside the Colline Gate. Before the battle Sulla camped outside it.
<i>Obv.</i> Bust of Venus, r. C. CONSIDI NONIANI S.C. <i>Rev.</i> Temple on hill. ERVC			
(4) c. 58 B.C. M. Iuuentius Laterensis	<i>Not in S.</i>		A unique coin in Berlin: serrate. Cicero mentions a quaestor of this name, who had given games at Praeneste. Date perhaps earlier.
<i>Obv.</i> Bust of Hercules, r. Under chin, B.: the whole in laurel-wreath. S.C. <i>Rev.</i> Driver in quadriga, l., holding laurel-branch and reins. LATERENS			
(5) c. 55 B.C. P. Crassus M.F.	S. 929		P. Crassus, son of the triumvir, brought Gallic cavalry to serve in the Parthian War. The elder Crassus, by a successful cavalry charge, saved the Battle of the Colline Gate, when it seemed almost to be lost.
<i>Obv.</i> Bust of Venus, r. S.C. <i>Rev.</i> Knight leading horse by bridle. P. CRASSVS, M.F.			
(6) 54 B.C. Faustus Sulla	S. 882-3		The son of the victor of the Colline Gate.
(a) <i>Obv.</i> Head of Hercules, r.: lion-skin. FAVSTVS (in monogram) S.C. <i>Rev.</i> Four wreaths round globe: aplustre: corn-ear. (b) <i>Obv.</i> Bust of Venus, r. <i>Rev.</i> Three trophies: jug: lituus. FAVSTVS (in monogram).			

<i>Moneyer and types of denarius</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Mint- marks</i>	<i>Notes</i>
(7) 53 B.C. Messalla F. <i>Obv.</i> Bust of Roma (?) helmeted, r. with feather: spear over l. shoulder. MESSALLA F. <i>Rev.</i> Curule chair: below, sceptre and diadem. PATRE COS. S.C.	S. 934		The father was the Consul of 53 B.C. The types have not been satisfactorily explained.
(8) c. 52 B.C. M. Plaetorius Ces- tianus	S. 799- 806	S	M. Plaetorius has often been placed high up in the 60's, and so been taken for the man who struck as curule aedile c. 66 B.C. But his appearance in hoards seems not to be very early and we are now doubtful whether his fine, rather florid style can be so early either (cf. note on L. Torquatus, A. 1, 14). Note the definite refer- ence to 'Praeneste—Fortuna Primigenia' and her oracular lot. I have by me a suggestion, which I cannot at the moment verify, that the temple of the <i>rev.</i> of (a) is one of Fortuna Equestris. A dedication to that goddess would come appropriately after the cavalry charge which won the Battle of the Colline Gate.
(a) <i>Obv.</i> Bust of Fortuna (?), l. <i>Rev.</i> Temple, with anguiped giant in pediment. M. PLAETORIVS CESTIANVS S.C.			
(b) <i>Obv.</i> Bust of Fortuna, r. <i>Rev.</i> Boy acolyte holding a lot. SORS M. PLAETORI CEST S.C.			
(c) <i>Obv.</i> Female bust, r.: hair in net. <i>Rev.</i> Jug and torch. M. PLAETORI CEST EX S.C.			
(d) <i>Obv.</i> As on (c). <i>Rev.</i> Winged caduceus. M. PLAETORI CEST EX C.S.			
(e) <i>Obv.</i> Young male head, r. <i>Rev.</i> As on (d).			<i>Obv.</i> According to Alföldi, young Romulus.

We have already noted that these men were not III AAA FF: had they been, they would not have needed the special authorization by the Senate (S.C. or EX S.C.). Sufenas, no. 1, was apparently a quaestor (cf. his obverse, Saturn). P. Hypsaesus, no. 2, curule aedile in 58 B.C., may well have been a quaestor c. 62 B.C. Laterensis, no. 4, was, on Cicero's evidence, a quaestor. P. Crassus, no. 5, may well have been a quaestor in 55 B.C., when he returned from Gaul to Rome. Faustus Sulla was quaestor in 54. Messalla, no. 7, seems to have held some office in 53 B.C., the year of his father's consulship. As he was not a III VIR of the mint, he was probably quaestor. Of M. Plaetorius, no. 8, we can only say that, if our date is right, he was probably son or nephew of the curule aedile of c. 66 B.C., A. 2, no. 2. It is quite probable that all these men were quaestors. The only other likely guess would make them special commissioners for coinage.

The next point is the connexion with Praeneste. It is avowed in the types of Sufenas, no. 1, and M. Plaetorius, no. 8 (b), probably implied in the reverse of C. Considius, no. 3. Laterensis, no. 4, is definitely connected by Cicero with Games at

Praeneste. The sons of the victors of the Colline Gate, P. Crassus, no. 5, and Faustus Sulla, no. 6, would fit well into the context. Only for two, P. Hyspsaeus, no. 2, and Messalla, no. 7, have we no clear indication.

A possible explanation now comes looming through the mist. These men—predominantly Roman quaestors—had the task of celebrating Games at Praeneste and striking coins for them.¹ The coins might be struck for Praeneste at Rome—possibly in Praeneste itself: the style is not noticeably different from the Roman of the time.

The Games of Praeneste were certainly those of the Victory of Sulla, founded by him in 81 B.C. to commemorate the victory of the Colline Gate. Our authorities quote them among the great Games of Rome and give no indication of their celebration anywhere else. Yet here, for a time, we are certainly finding them in Praeneste.

A whole series of questions arises to which we have no positive answer. My son, Harold B. Mattingly, discussing the denarius of Sufenas, no. 1,² has pointed out that his obverse, Saturn, marks him as a quaestor and that there is no real evidence that the first Games were given, as has been supposed, by a praetor: it is of quaestors only that we hear later. In the reverse legend of Sufenas, then, there is an unexplained P., which may refer to Praeneste—'PR(imus) L(udos) V(ictoriae P(raenestinos) F(ecit)'. In the light of Cicero's evidence about Laterensis, no. 4, this suggestion is extremely attractive.

But here the questions begin. Did a Sufenas, Sex. Nonius, first give the Games in 81 B.C.? Did a later Sufenas, M. Nonius, give the Games in 63 B.C. and refer back to the first giver?³ We cannot be quite sure. At any rate, Games seem to have been given at Praeneste down to c. 52 B.C., after which there is no further trace of them on coins.

M. Plaetorius Cestianus is unlike our other S.C. (EX S.C.) moneyers in having four obverse and reverse types—unlike the rest, who have one or, just once, two.

Clearly, the last word on these subjects has not yet been said. There is one last question which can be answered. Why was

¹ There may, of course, have been other functions of quaestors, of which we do not know.

² H. B. Mattingly, *Num. Chron.* 1956, 189 ff.

³ As only *one* Sufenas is clearly indicated on the coin (*Sufenas* on obverse, *Sex Nonius* on reverse) one wonders whether a transference of the Games from Rome to Praeneste took place in 63 B.C.

Praeneste ever the scene of the games? Because she had been the centre of the last desperate resistance of the Marian faction. It was from that centre that the wild attempt to sack Rome stemmed. The capture of Praeneste really meant the end of the war. Sulla set out to create a new Praeneste, converted now from its former evil ways: it was with this redeemed Praeneste that the Games of Victory could be associated.

B. NORTHERN MINT (PISA?).

1. MONEYS

<i>Moneyer and types of denarius</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Mint-marks</i>	<i>Notes</i>
(1) <i>c.</i> 63 B.C. C. Hosidius Geta <i>Obv.</i> Bust of Diana, r. GETA III VIR <i>Rev.</i> Calydonian boar, attacked by dog and pierced by spear. C. HOSIDI C.F.	S. 904		Serrate. The same moneyer, not serrate, at Rome—A. 1, 4. The Pisa (?) issue has broad flan, large <i>obv.</i> and <i>rev.</i> types. The Rome issue has rather small flan and small, compact types. If our date is right, there may be a connexion with the conspiracy of Catiline, which ended in battle in north Etruria.
(2) <i>c.</i> 62 B.C. or later. M. Aquilius <i>Obv.</i> Bust of Virtus, r. III VIR VIRTUS <i>Rev.</i> M. Aquilius, Consul, raising kneeling Sicily. M'.F.M'.N.M'. AQVIL. SICIL.	S. 798		Serrate. Very close in style to 1, even closer to 3 and 4, his colleagues. The <i>rev.</i> type of 3, 4, Rome and Italy, makes one think of Caesar's policy in Cisalpine Gaul and the date might be a little later. There are gaps in the Pisa (?) series.
(3)-(4) <i>c.</i> 62 B.C. Kalenus, Cordus <i>Obv.</i> Jugate heads of Honos and Virtus. HON. VIR. KALENI <i>Rev.</i> Roma standing l., extending r. hand to Italia, standing, winged caduceus. ITAL. RO. CORDI	S. 797		Serrate. Kalenus and Cordus are second and third in the college of M. Aquilius. The two never strike apart. The <i>obv.</i> shows two favourite gods of the army, the <i>rev.</i> a 'Concordia' of Rome and Italy.
2, 3, 4 are a college.			
(5) 56 B.C. Longinus <i>Obv.</i> Head of Vesta, l. Varying letter. <i>Rev.</i> Togate figure, standing l. dropping into chest, tablet inscribed V LONGINVS III V	S. 935-6	L.	Not serrate. The conference of Luca is the occasion. Serration at Pisa (?) now stops, but the style and the large flans remain distinctive. The presence of Romans in numbers at the conference possibly accounts for the stoppage of serration.
(6) 56 B.C. Paullus Lepidus <i>Obv.</i> Bust of Concordia, r. PAVLLVS LEPIDVS CONCORDIA <i>Rev.</i> Trophy, L. Aemilius Paulus: Perseus and two sons. TER PAVLLVS	S. 926		Not serrate. The <i>rev.</i> commemorates the surrender of Perseus and his sons to an ancestor of the moneyer in 168 B.C.

			Mint- marks	Notes
<i>Moneyer and types of denarius</i>				
(7)	56 B.C. Scribonius Libo ¹ <i>Obv.</i> Head of Bonus Eventus, r. BON. EVENT. LIBO <i>Rev.</i> Well-head between lyres. Variable symbol. PVTEAL. SCRIBON.	Ref. S. 928	S.	Not serrate. The well-head was a meeting-point for financiers in the Forum. This moneyer might represent Crassus, as Paullus Lepidus Pompey and Longinus Julius Caesar.
(7A)	56 B.C. Paullus Lepidus and Scribonius Libo <i>Obv.</i> As on 6. <i>Rev.</i> As on 7, but PVTEAL SCRIBON. LIBO	S. 929	S.	Not serrate. A combined issue of 6 and 7. The <i>rev.</i> is varied, so as to include the name of Libo.
5, 6, 7 are a college.				
(8)	c. 51 B.C. M. Acilius. <i>Obv.</i> Head of Salus, r. SALVTIS <i>Rev.</i> Valetudo standing l. holding snake. M. ACILIVS III VIR VALETV	S. 922		Not serrate. 8, 9, and 10 are close in style and appear at the same date in hoards. The style seems to be of Pisa (?) rather than of Rome. The types may refer to the recovery of Pompey from a serious illness.
(9)	c. 51 B.C. L. Vinicius <i>Obv.</i> Head of Concordia, r. CONCORDIA <i>Rev.</i> Victory flying r. holding palm-branch, to which four wreaths are attached. L. VINICI	S. 930		Not serrate. The wreaths on <i>rev.</i> may refer to victories of Pompey.
(10)	c. 51 B.C. Ser. Sulpicius <i>Obv.</i> Head of Apollo, r. SER. SVLP. <i>Rev.</i> Naval trophy: by it two figures standing, one with hands bound.	S. 931		Not serrate. The <i>rev.</i> may refer to the slave-market at Delos (sacred to Apollo) after Pompey's victory over the pirates. 8-10 all seem to refer to Pompey.
8, 9, 10 are a college.				
2. TRIBUNUS AERARIUS				
c.	63 B.C. T. Vettius Sabinus <i>Obv.</i> Head of Titus Tattius, r. SABINVS S.C. A <i>Rev.</i> Togate figure in biga, holding club (?): corn-ear. T. VETTIVS IVDEX	S. 905		Serrate. In style very close to B. 1, 1, Geta. A probably means 'Tribunus Aerarius', Army Paymaster: since 70 B.C. these men could be 'Iudices'. The moneyer may have been connected with trials of the Catilinarians, if the date is right.

This mint is not yet very well known. Sydenham recognizes the serrate issues as 'Italian Provincial', but not the non-serrate. Yet the sequence of style is fairly clear, and may still be seen, after 51 B.C., on coins with large flans such as Sydenham, pl. 26, nos. 941, 944, 945, 952, 953, 959B; pl. 27, nos. 1008, 1010, 1011. Serration stopped with the conference of Luca—perhaps, because of it. Pisa, while very near Luca, is still in Italy. It is

possible that Caesar, wishing to use the mint, transferred it to Luca, which was in Cisalpine Gaul.

The moneyers who struck at Pisa (?) may have been normal III VIR AAA FF of Rome. We cannot anywhere indicate different moneyers striking at Rome and Pisa (?) in the same year. Issue by colleges is the rule. One President, C. Hosidius Geta, seems to have no colleagues. T. Vettius, who is close enough to him in style to look like a colleague, is an exceptional moneyer (S.C.), perhaps striking as Army Paymaster, 'Tribunus Aerarius'.

C. MINT OF LANUVIUM (?)

MONEYERS

<i>Moneyer and types of denarius</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Mint-marks</i>	<i>Notes</i>
c. 58 B.C. L. Roscius Fabatus <i>Obv.</i> Head of Juno Sospita r. Varying symbol.	S. 915	S	Serrate. Style not unlike Rome, but the serration marks the coin as something out of the ordinary.
<i>Rev.</i> Girl standing R. feeding snake: varying symbol. FABATI			

The obverse refers to the great goddess of Lanuvium, the reverse probably to a feature of her worship. The moneyer came from that city. Sacrifices were offered annually at Lanuvium for the Roman people. It is quite likely that on these occasions the Roman guilds were represented. The symbols, which are very numerous and seem always to go in pairs, related to one another, may very well, as Sydenham suggests, allude to these guilds. The coinage, then, in all probability was struck *for* Lanuvium, possibly in that city.

D. MINT OF PRAENESTE (?)

Of the moneyers signing S.C. or EX S.C., whom we have collected under A, Rome (?) 3, some, at least, were striking for Praeneste—possibly in that city itself. It seemed advisable, as there were a number of them, to leave them, provisionally, in the capital.

There seems to be no likelihood that more mints will be discovered. The period has its peculiar interest. It leads directly up to the great Civil Wars, and it can be articulated in distinct sections, coinage of moneyers, coinage of curule aediles, coinage of men mentioning no office (quaestors?), with marks S.C. or EX S.C.

HOARDS

Hoards often reveal a very troublesome feature. They reach a definite peak—which should logically mark their close—but carry on with a number of stragglers, which may run on for quite a number of years, but leave too many gaps to be of much use for dating. These stragglers may occasionally have been introduced by accident in modern times. But, no doubt, the maker of a hoard might at some time lose interest and drop in an extra coin now and then. In dealing with such hoards there is only one thing to do: note the peak, but treat the stragglers as what they are.

We can now proceed to some observations on hoards that cover our period: Sydenham, nos. XXXII–XXXIX.

XXXII *Ossero*, 475 D, may be placed a little too late in 68 B.C.
 XXXIII *Compito*, 995 D, 23 Q, 1V, is placed much too late in 62 B.C.

Its composition, with 23 Q and one victoriate, takes us back to earlier hoards—XXIII, XXVII, XXIX, XXXI. Why this kind of composition is restricted to a short period in the 70's we do not know.

The latest coins, Faustus Sulla (Venus) and C. Considius Nonianus, are certainly stragglers.

XXXIV *Casaleone*, 714 D, 317 Q. Again, much too late, 59 B.C. The very large number of Quinarii takes us back to XXIII, 78 B.C.

All its latest coins, then, are stragglers—Kalenus–Cordus, Faustus Sulla (Felix), C. Servedius, Q. Caepio Brutus. There are far too many gaps for us to put it, with Sydenham, in 59 B.C.: even for the stragglers that date is rather early.

XXXV *San Gregorio*, 563 D. This looks more like a genuine hoard, though, after c. 67 B.C., there seems to be a little slackening off before we reach the moneyers of 56 B.C. Sydenham's date, 54 B.C., seems to be a little too late.

XXXVI *Broni*, 100 D. Sydenham's date, 54 B.C., is about right, as it includes the curule aediles of that year: it might possibly run a little later.

XXXVII *San Cesario*, c. 4000 D. As the college of M. Acilius, L. Vinicius and Ser. Sulp. is included, Sydenham's date, 53 B.C., may be two years too early.

XXXVIII *Cadriano*, c. 2000 D. Date, 50 B.C., about right. L. Torquatus makes an unexpectedly late appearance.

XXXIX *Carbonara* (2), 450 D. Sydenham's date, 48 B.C., is

obviously somewhere near right, as it contains Q. Sicinius and C. Coponius.

What we need—and have not got—is a hoard that splits our period at *c.* 60 B.C. There is no massing of hoards on 63 B.C.—perhaps, a hint that the conspiracy of Catilina caused far less alarm than Cicero imagined. *San Gregorio*, XXXV, is the only hoard that could conceivably be placed in the late 60's, with a few stragglers.

The trouble is that original accounts of hoards are often very imperfect and also not easy to get at. When the main record is of 'latest coins', we only get part of what we want to know—namely, all the latest issues, their numbers and their condition. A re-examination of the whole material, with the methods of modern research, would certainly be rewarding.