

THE  
NUMISMATIC CHRONICLE  
AND JOURNAL OF THE  
ROYAL NUMISMATIC SOCIETY

EDITED BY  
JOHN ALLAN, C.B., M.A., LL.D., F.B.A., F.S.A.

HAROLD MATTINGLY, M.A., F.B.A., F.S.A.

AND

E. S. G. ROBINSON, M.A., F.B.A., F.S.A.

*Keeper of Coins, British Museum*

SIXTH SERIES—VOL. IX



*Factum abiit—monumenta manent.—Ov. Fast.*

LONDON  
BERNARD QUARITCH, 11 GRAFTON ST., W.1  
1949



## THE VARIOUS STYLES OF THE ROMAN REPUBLICAN COINAGE

THE news that a full study of the Roman Republican Coinage was left behind him by the Rev. E. A. Sydenham at his death and that there is some hope of an early publication has certainly awakened a more than casual interest in all students of that branch of numismatics. We are, at once, invited to take stock of the present state of our studies; we shall be challenged to go forward to attack the problems, as yet unsolved. The coin material is readily available in Haeberlin, Babelon (with the invaluable Addenda and Corrigenda of Bahrfeldt), and Grueber. For all his shortcomings, Grueber is still the best introduction to the subject as a whole. He *does* arrange his material in something like the true chronological order; he *does* take some account of the various styles, which suggest different mints. Of minor studies of points of special interest there has, of course, been no lack; the names of Cesano, Kubitschek, Le Gentilhomme, Sydenham, and myself come at once to mind. Dr. Pink of Vienna has at the moment in the press an exhaustive study of the moneymen of the Republic, which brings in some new ideas and which will certainly leave its mark on our studies. The time, then, is surely ripe for a new synthesis.

But for the disaster of the war, Sydenham and I were to have collaborated in this work. He and I discussed most of the main problems often and at length; much as we might disagree over details, our general approach was much the same. If, then, at this moment, I offer some studies of special points, it is in no spirit of rivalry with my old and valued friend. I should like to feel that I am collaborating, as far as it has been allowed, and am preparing some readers to appreciate his larger work.

When we have garnered the harvests of past research, Republican coins still present us with formidable problems. They are so laconic; how often is it obvious that much lurks below the surface! Research can take any one of several lines. We can examine the evolution of the types and their references to national or family history. We can have recourse to the "Prosopographia" and try to identify our moneymen with persons known from other sources. We can sift over the invaluable evidence of hoards. But, for the moment, all these

lines of research seem to be subject to the law of diminishing returns. The obvious references of types have been duly noted; where there is doubt of the interpretation, it is seldom possible to advance any farther. The study of persons will hardly yield much more at present. There are a few cases in which we are sure that our moneyers are identical with characters of general history. In many other cases, we cannot be sure whether we have to do with a man himself, or his son or cousin, it may be. In many other cases the moneyer is unknown apart from the coins. Pink is certainly right in deciding to try no further advance along these lines. With hoards, the position is different. There has been a considerable increase of the material since Grueber gave us his great conspectus. We also know better than of old how to interrogate a hoard. A fresh study will, without doubt, contribute much to our knowledge. But it will have to face serious difficulties. Only too often the information, which we urgently need, which must have been available to the first students, has been allowed to perish. For the whole of the earlier period down to *c.* 120 B.C., the record is so poor that we have to conclude that the demands of trade have almost completely overridden the claims of archaeology. Quite recently there was an important hoard of the Hannibalic War, which appeared on the market at Naples. It has been impossible for scholars to obtain more than a very imperfect picture of it. If some young and keen student would devote himself to this much needed study, he might well be rewarded with sensational results.

After types, persons, and hoards, what remains? Metrology? Most of us have come to admit that this is almost the last fortress to be stormed—that assault on it, until dates and mints are exactly known, is wellnigh hopeless. The general plan and ordering of the Roman coinage and financial administration? Good results can be won from this study, as Pink has demonstrated in his series of articles on the “Systematik” of the imperial coinage of the early third century and is now demonstrating again in his work on the Republican moneyers. But I prefer myself to leave this, his special line, to him and to turn back to a study, which has come under a shadow because of the uncertainties that surround it, but which is essential to our advance—the study of styles and mints.

I should like to begin with a statement of some first principles. Apart from its uncertainties, is the study of mints of much impor-

tance to our exact knowledge of the coinage? Pink thinks that that importance is comparatively slight. His method of work commits him to the theory—I cannot remember whether he anywhere states it in so many words—that the Roman financial system was planned from the centre and that, therefore, the exact locality of each issue does not affect the general plan much. The evidence, I submit, is against him. Rome appointed special quaestors for her provinces, both in Italy and overseas, and, with special quaestors, we must expect to find special moneyers also. If we throw together series of Roman coins, that were actually struck far apart, we are in serious danger of confusing our whole picture of the mints. However difficult, then, the study of mints may be, we cannot afford to neglect it.

Pink observes, with justice, that a glance over Grueber's plates does not always carry conviction of the truth of his mint attributions. Under Italy, for example, a very variegated material is collected. Some of the coins obviously belong, with coins assigned by Grueber, to the mint of Rome. Revision, then, there must certainly be. But revision will not consist merely in restoring to the Capital coins erroneously removed from it. Grueber's "mint of Rome" contains a good deal of material which may need to be shifted to other centres. There are too many issues which disturb the general picture. Pink himself makes much play with "special" and "supplementary" issues. In some cases, his names may be suitable enough; in others, where the discrepancy between the "special" and the regular issues is serious, it would probably be more satisfactory if he would recognize that the "special" issue is a non-Roman one.

Any organized mint is bound to have a certain continuity of life and working, a certain logic in its development. This continuity is not so much planned as natural; it may be looked for with confidence, wherever we have no reason for suspecting a violent interruption. The possible effects of such violent interruption may be studied in the period of Cinna and Sulla in Rome or of the Commonwealth and Restoration in England. Pink has made good use of this principle of continuity in its application to money—system, choice of denominations, and so on. I ask that it should also be applied to style and fabric.

By "fabric" we mean those minor details of mint work, which belong, not to the skilled artist who engraves the dies, but to the supervisor of the mint and his subordinate staff. Such details include

the size and thickness of the flan, the border, the size and arrangement of the lettering. Just because fabric is likely to be more a matter of habit than of the idiosyncrasy of a particular artist, it is, in general, a more reliable guide to mint attribution than style.

But style, too, is of vital importance, for all the pitfalls into which a student of it may tumble. Style is something personal to the chief engraver or engravers of the mint. If an engraver is transferred from one mint to another, his style, of course, moves with him. For such possible transfers of artists we must always be on the look out, or we may slip into error. Where we find the same style, with varieties of fabric, we must at once suspect transference of artist. It might be, of course, that a mint employed such a wide range of artists that it is impossible to establish a norm for it at any one period. But, in the Roman Republic, this was not ordinarily the case. The styles of its issues are amazingly stable. Even two moneyers, obviously of the same mint and period, have their minor differences of style. Occasionally, a moneyer shows on his coins styles so distinct, as to compel us to assume different artists—perhaps different mints. As a general rule, there is always one dominant style attributable to one artist or, at least, one school of artists. This being so, we may postulate that, when we recover the true plan of the Roman mints, we shall find something like continuity of style—broken only occasionally when an old artist died or was transferred to another mint or when a new artist was imported *extra ordinem*. With this thought in mind, let us turn the plates of Grueber's "mint of Rome". Almost along the whole line we find satisfactory sequences broken by unexplained divergences. For myself, I am convinced that this is proof that his arrangement still needs serious revision.

A mint may have—a large mint almost must have—a number of distinct shops or "officinae". We have found from our imperial studies of the third century that such shops may show minor differences of style characteristic of them. But such variations are usually slight; they may be due to the copying of one model by a number of subordinate artists. It should normally be possible to tell whether a distinction of style denotes *officina* or mint. Where the difference is small and not accompanied by differences of fabric, we shall think of the *officina*. Where it is larger or where, though small, it is attended by other differences, we shall prefer change of mint.

Style needs the seeing eye to appreciate it. It may be objected that judgement of it is incurably subjective. But this is not really the case. Often, style can be analysed into a number of minor differences of treatment, which, once observed, can be looked for. Mr. Sydenham has had great success with such close analysis. He and I found great encouragement in the fact that his studies of minute details usually led to the same result as my more general assessments.

I have borrowed the title of my paper from our great Italian master, Ludovico Laffranchi, who has published a series of valuable papers on the imperial coinage under a similar title. Laffranchi is naturally gifted with the seeing eye; he often sees what others may fail to observe, not because it is not there, but because his discrimination is peculiarly acute. My own studies over many years in the British Museum developed my own lesser gift to something like the same pitch. Mr. Sydenham, too, had a fine eye, trained by long and exact study. But we, who claim to see, would never ask that our results should be taken on trust. All we ask is that they should not be rejected out of hand, but that our critics should take the trouble to follow us and check our findings carefully for themselves.

In this first paper I shall try to give a general picture of the problems of style and mints in successive periods of the Roman Republic. I shall not, of course, exclude from consideration many other topics; but style will always be somewhere near the centre of my attention. In later papers I may be able to prosecute research on special periods. But the motto of Lucretius, *pedetemptim progrediens*, may well be remembered by the student of our subject. He will have to try many lines himself, in order to come at the truth; it would only be confusing to the general public of numismatics to throw all his preliminary researches at them, until some sort of order has begun to emerge.

#### PERIOD I. 269–c. 235 B.C. ROMANO didrachms and Aes Grave.

Also token bronze.

I must refer here to my paper in *JRS*. The conclusion there reached, that there are four distinct mints and that each of them issued didrachm and Aes Grave, must, I think, be accepted as a strong working hypothesis. The four issues differ in style, in fabric,



in types, and in the relations of silver and bronze. The evidence of dating suggests that the four issues were roughly contemporary. The evidence of history confirms the suggestion. It was just at this moment that Rome introduced a new financial order for Italy, with special new quaestors for the Italian "provinces".

What, now, of these four styles? Mint A (Rome) shows a style firm, large, and bold, with a deep shadowing of the eye on the obverse. Mint D (Tarentum?) shows a style similar, but perhaps distinct, with the same characteristic shadowing of the eye. The presence of symbols and letters, absent from Rome, proves that it is not the same mint. The artists are, however, of the same school. Mint B (Ostia?) has a finer, neater, more delicate treatment of types. Its obverse clearly owes something to the "Leucippus" head of Metapontum. But all the evidence that we can collect points to a circulation of its issues towards the north of Italy. If Ostia is the mint, it must have been striking for the needs of the north, before a mint in the Gallic "province" was available. We may plausibly conjecture that the artist was brought in from Metapontum. Mint C (Cales?) has a style of great beauty, perhaps a shade less subtle than B, but not unlike it in feeling. Exactly the same style occurs on a bronze coin of Beneventum, struck not before 269 B.C. A very similar style—I incline to assign it to the same artist—is found on silver of Nuceria in Campania.

Two of our styles, then, can be connected with mints in Italy. The other two, closely related, styles cannot be traced anywhere in the West. We may search the mints of Etruria, Naples, and Magna Graecia for their special quality—but in vain. But the styles must come from somewhere. It is in the highest degree unlikely that we have to do with the first works of a new school of Rome. These styles come from outside Italy, and not, it appears, on examination, from Sicily or Carthage. Alexandria, then, is the solution to our question—Alexandria, since 273 B.C. in alliance with Rome and, now, with her great coinage of the deified Arsinoe, struck with the same set of Greek letters as the Roman mint D. The Egyptian pieces are, without exception, much larger than the Roman, and this difference of scale makes a close comparison more difficult. But I think that the general characteristics of the styles of Roman mints A and D can be seen—particularly the deep shadowing of the eye.



In the first Roman coinage, then, we find an Alexandrian artist (or school), a Metapontine and a Beneventine.

Just a word about the Aes Grave. There is bound to be a wide divergence between the large cast pieces and the much smaller pieces of silver and token bronze. Still, it looks as if the artists of the Aes Grave in mints A, C, and D used models not unlike those of the silver. But, in Mint B, the Aes Grave is very coarse and peculiar in style, showing no close relationship to the silver. For all four mints the general evidence that didrachm and Aes Grave were issued side by side is very strong.

What is most remarkable about this first coinage of Rome is its mighty sweep. It is not a slow, tentative effort from the capital. It looks out towards Italy and even, overseas, to the new rich and powerful friend, Egypt. The absence of any influence from Naples is surprising, but unmistakable. Probably, there was deep commercial jealousy between the famous old Greek city and the upstart, Rome.

PERIOD II. *c.* 235–218 B.C. ROMA DIDRACHMS AND Aes Grave. Also token bronze.

The dates are by no means certain yet, but those suggested here are probably not wide of the mark. As in Period I, there are four mints at work, and each strikes silver and token bronze and casts Aes Grave. But there are significant changes. The legend ROMANO gives place to ROMA (except, perhaps, in mint D). There must be a shade of difference in meaning, but we cannot yet make it precise. In types, there are only minor variations in mints B and C, rather more change in D, a fairly complete change in A. More important is the fact that the relation of the metals to one another is now stabilized; the standards adopted are those of mint D in Period I—six scruples for the didrachm, two hundred and forty for the As.

As in Period I four mints are at work. But are they the same mints? In mint A, despite the change of types, continuity is reasonably assured. It is equally sure in D; perhaps the old types actually continued for a time. But, in mints B and C, there is a change of style, which has long puzzled us. I think that I can now suggest a convincing explanation. The two Italian styles—the Metapontan and the Beneventan—are eliminated; the style of Alexandria spreads from mints A and D to the other two. In both B and C we now find

that deep shadowing of the eye, which we saw to be characteristic of Alexandrian work. Period II is a period of stabilization, and stabilization took place along the lines of Alexandrian influence. There is no need to insist on one artist working for all four mints; it will be enough if we can agree that the four now show the style of the same school.

In mints A, B, and D the Aes Grave seems to follow, in general, the models of the silver. In mint C the Aes Grave is strangely rare and seems to follow the model of the silver of Period I. It has also a mint-mark, vine-leaf, which is not present on the silver. There are puzzles here that we cannot yet solve. But it looks as if Italian influence lived on longer in the Aes Grave than in the other metal.

The coinage of Rome continues to be that of a great Italian confederacy, with an important foreign ally. Students of history have been inclined to attach little importance to the alliance of Egypt with Rome, on the grounds that it did not lead to armed assistance in the First Punic War. But is it not very possible that Rome benefited greatly from Egyptian help even during the hostilities? We have seen for ourselves in the Second Great World War how benevolent a neutrality can be. Perhaps it was due to Egypt that Rome did not quite collapse under the colossal burdens of the fighting and ship-building.

**PERIOD III. c. 218–170 B.C. “Quadrigratus” didrachm and victoriatae drachm. Janus-Prow Aes Grave. Also token bronze. Occasional issues of gold.**

The general picture of this period is clear enough. Under the stress of the Hannibalic War, the Italian mints suspend issue; only in mint D are we reasonably sure that there was a resumption of issue till the coming of the X denarius. Gold is struck, probably in emergency. The silver is said to have been debased. The standard of the Aes is twice reduced, once from ten ounces of the later Roman pound to six ounces, then, again, from six to three. It is the absence of these reductions from the Aes Grave of mints B, C, and D that convinces us that those mints were not in issue at the time. If we read the story aright, Rome was left to carry the whole burden of coinage, and her types became universal, even if struck at other mints than Rome. The victoriatae is a drachm of the quadrigratus didrachm, and certainly

plays the part of its half over the major part of the period. But it has its own distinctive types of Jupiter and Victory. It probably began to be struck about 220 B.C.

What of the styles of the period? The quadrigatus has at least six distinct styles. Style A is a continuation of the first quadrigati of Period II. It is in high relief, shows the characteristic Alexandrian shadowing of the eye, and has two anklets on the brow of the young double-headed god of the obverse. B is clearly derived from A, but has dull, ugly features and a special treatment of the quadriga on reverse. C, a rare class, is derived from A, but with considerable difference of feeling, and has a special mint-mark, ear of corn. D is in lower relief than A and has its distinct, very gracious, portrait. It might be a continuation of A or the work of a new mint. E has a curious cherubic portrait, a low neck, and a special truncation of the bust. F shows a long, narrow neck, with features often curiously insipid. It has a notable variety of reverse. The Victory is shown at full length, not cut off by the line of the car, as in the other styles. We are sure, here, that another mint was at work.

The victoriate offers a number of problems. There are no victoriate to correspond to the quadrigati with ear of corn. On the other hand, there are many symbols and letters on victoriate without corresponding quadrigati. If all the earliest victoriate were without mint-marks, as is at least possible, the difficulty diminishes. We may hope ultimately to find victoriate to correspond to the various styles of the quadrigati. But the victoriate is still wrapped in doubt, and there is much research to be done before we can feel that we have pierced the veil of its mysteries.

Our authorities tell us, that the Romans in the Second Punic War debased their silver, which had till then been pure. Debased quadrigati we certainly have, but they look far more like ancient forgeries than emergency issues of the regular mint. Debased didrachms of mint B in Period I are also found; but we cannot place them late enough to fit in well with the story of debasement here. Once again it is wiser to suspend judgement.

The Janus As clearly runs a course more or less parallel to the quadrigatus. There is one marked variety in the libral series with prow to left. There are several varieties in the libral series with prow to right. The styles of the reductions are hard to grasp as the coins,

for the most part, are cast very coarsely. The smaller, struck pieces of the reductions follow the lines of the quadrigatus—especially of style A. Here, again, more research is needed. I believe myself that we shall find Janus Asses to correspond to all the main series of quadrigati, and that the libral series with prow to right will turn out to be late—a return to the old standard after the end of the Hannibalic War.

About styles two fascinating questions present themselves. What connexion, if any, is there between the quadrigatus and mints B, C, and D of Period II? What connexion, again, between the last of the quadrigati and the first of the X denarii?

As regards question one, there is no immediately obvious successor to mints B and C among the quadrigati, but succession does not seem impossible. In mint D we seem to see more clearly. That mint passed direct from its ROMA didrachm to the X denarius without the interposition of any quadrigati. The argument from style is remarkably strong. It seems hardly possible that Rome, after the war, should have ceased entirely to take account of her Italian “provinces”. We must expect, then, issues of quadrigati to correspond to mints B and C, even if they were not necessarily struck in the same cities. There are no provincial issues yet—except, perhaps, for Sicily, which was almost a part of Italy. It is not unlikely that we shall find a style of quadrigatus attributable to this province. Style E is the one that I should first consider.

As regards question two our work has still to be done. Here and there an obvious likeness between quadrigatus and denarius strikes us. For the most part, the sequence from one to the other is obscure. This is another important field for future research.

This third period is one of transition and, therefore, peculiarly difficult to read. For the moment, it must suffice to have underlined some of its main problems.

PERIOD IV. *c.* 170 (or earlier)—160 B.C. X denarius, quinarius, sestertius (Bellona-Dioscuri). Janus As (“sextantal” standard).  
Issue of gold (Mars-Eagle).

The quadrigatus didrachm virtually disappears; only one or two rare survivals have yet been recorded. The victoriate lives on for a time beside the denarius and its parts. The denarius has new types

and the mark of value X—apparently derived from Etruria. The quinarius is marked V, the sestertius IIS. The denarius is struck first at 4 scruples or even more, but soon begins to drop towards  $3\frac{1}{2}$  scruples. The Janus coinage retains its old types, but is now all struck, none cast. The weight of the As is at highest something over two ounces, but it soon begins to drop towards one ounce. It seems to be possible that some Asses were struck at about one ounce from the outset. It is debated whether it was now part token coinage.

The first question concerns the transition from the old nummus, standard silver coin,—the quadrigatus—to the new, the denarius. Did it take place at one stroke or gradually? Sydenham has suggested, with much probability, that the X denarius ran its first course in the extreme south, in Bruttium, from c. 187 B.C. onwards, and only displaced the quadrigatus after a period of experiment. This may well prove to be the truth. The succession of denarii to quadrigati in those mints, in which the quadrigatus was still being struck in 170 B.C., should be possible to find. The victoriate is closely associated with the denarius in at least two mints. In others it has beside it a quinarius, not a denarius. In many others, we find victoriate without denarii or quinarii.

The styles of the early denarii are many, and any doubt about a multiplicity of mints is removed by the symbols and letters that often occur. Very few of these can be interpreted with certainty, but the general picture is clear. Rome sets the standards and the types; but actual issue is far more widely extended than before. It is not likely that the Italian “provinces” have quite vanished from the picture; but each “province” may now have several mints. We might think of practical convenience as the motive, or a desire to flatter the vanity of municipalities. Sicily, as I have suggested, may well have at least one issue of her own.

The most interesting question awaiting fuller investigation is that of the “little talents of the West”. The new Roman system has three nummi, not one—the denarius, the quinarius, and the sestertius. Now, nummus does not yet mean just “silver coin”, but standard coin. Rome operates with three distinct standard coins, and these can at once be linked to the “little talents”—the denarius to the Alexandrian, the quinarius to the Neapolitan, the sestertius to the Syracusan. The victoriate itself is the last talent, the most reduced

of them all, the Rhégine. It is certain, then, that the new Roman system deliberately takes up into itself and concords the four "little talents", presumably including in its scope the whole extent of Italy and Sicily. As we have seen, the four denominations—denarius, quinarius, sestertius, and victoriate—are not all struck at the same mints; we must suppose that their distribution is connected with the range of the four "little talents". This is a fascinating problem, almost certain to yield interesting results; but the door does not open too readily to the keys that we can yet apply. The gold may have been planned as a permanent part of the system; as a matter of fact, it hardly seems to outlive the first few years.

This is a period of revolution. There is stabilization, necessary enough after the Hannibalic War, but deferred. But there is a new outlook, going out beyond Italy towards the East. The denarius, with its types of the victorious Roman goddess of war and the Saviour gods, the Dioscouri, as the type of Rome, is suited to advertise the new Rome that stretched her hands towards new power and wealth. The denarius was very soon equated to the Attic drachm, one of the dominant standard coins of the Eastern Mediterranean.

PERIOD V. *c.* 160–130 B.C. Denarius (Bellona-Dioscouri, Diana in biga, Victory in biga). Victoriate. Janus As (uncial).

The system remains much as before and the period cannot be exactly delimited from Period IV. The denarius is by now stabilized at about  $3\frac{1}{2}$  scruples. The victoriate has suffered a loss of weight comparable to that of the denarius. It soon goes out of issue. The quinarius and sestertius are no longer struck, and there is no more gold. The As observes a standard of about an ounce.

The new types of the reverse of the denarius probably had their historical occasions, but we are not yet certain of them. We might assign an approximate date of 150 B.C. to the Diana type, of 145 B.C. to the Victory, the year after the destruction of Carthage.

The great number of mints, observed in Period IV, is sharply reduced. A few issues, placed by Grueber under "Italy", are certainly not Roman. Grueber's "Rome" contains at least two distinct styles, probably of different mints. There may, then, be some four mints in all. Sicily, again, may have an issue, but there are no other provincial

issues that we can yet detect. There is clearly a return to a simpler system like that of Periods I and II.

De Salis, who arranged the Roman Republican coins of the British Museum, seems to have reckoned with two Italian mints, a Northern and a Southern. But it is hard to divorce the question of Italian mints from that of Italian "provinces". Those "provinces" were four in number, though some scholars follow Mommsen in supposing that the fourth was transferred at an early date to Sicily. We ought, therefore, to be looking for four distinct series, apart from Rome, of which one may be Sicilian. If fewer are found we shall have to look for evidence of the "provinces" that were privileged to have their own issues, and find reasons why the other "provinces" were not similarly favoured.

PERIOD VI. *c.* 130–112 B.C. Denarius (Bellona-Dioscuri, Victory in biga and other "charioteer" types). Janus As (still uncial, but the higher denominations gradually fall out of issue).

This, the period of the Gracchi, is full of interest and promise for the student. Conservatism in types begins to give way on the reverses. The relation of As to denarius is changed from ten to sixteen. The mark of value XVI is found on a few coins, then the new mark, ✖, though the old X may occasionally recur.

There are several indications of date to help us. The XVI issue is almost certainly of Gaius Gracchus, 123 B.C. Another issue seems to follow immediately on his death, *i.e.* *c.* 121 B.C. A third seems to belong to the foundation of Narbo Martius in 118 B.C.

A close study of Grueber's "Rome", with these indications to assist us, reveals the striking fact that there are two mints at work, closely related, but probably distinct. Have we to think of two mints in Rome itself? Or of Rome with Ostia beside her? Here, further study will certainly yield good results. Apart from these two mints there are new coinages from one or more mints, for the north, and, possibly, the beginnings of a new mint in the south also.

The new XVI denarius has certainly great significance. The change of valuation of the denarius is no minor adjustment; it carries important economic consequences. The As of sixteen to the denarius is exactly the twelfth of the victoriate—that is to say, the nummus of the victoriate talent. The relation of the victoriate to the denarius



is in the centre of the problem. We naturally think of the ambitious schemes for colonization in the South of Italy, first adumbrated by the Gracchans and then adopted, for their own purposes, by their political opponents. The mint (or mints) of the North must be connected with the wars in Transalpine Gaul.

The denarius with serrated edge makes its first appearance on the large scale. The issue of 118 B.C. for Narbo Martius was presumably designed for circulation beyond the Alps. Sydenham thinks that the "serrati" were all struck for provincial circulation and that the shape has reference to ideas of the wheel, as solar symbol. Others, myself among them, think that the primary object of serration was to show that the coin had a true silver core. Mint-marks, in the form of letters or symbols, begin to appear.

PERIOD VII. *c.* 112–91 B.C. Denarius, Victoriata (equal to half a denarius). Janus As.

The denarius begins to vary widely not only in the types of its reverses, but also of its obverses. Letters and symbols are common. Formulae, such as "argento publico", "ex argento publico", begin to appear. The victoriata was reintroduced about 105 B.C., but it is now only the half of the denarius, not three-quarters as formerly. For a time the As is hardly struck and there are issues of silver with no Aes at all. Then, *c.* 105 B.C., the As appears again and at a heavier weight, rather more than less than an ounce. The system of 123 B.C. harmonized denarius and victoriata by making the As equal to the nummus of the victoriata talent. It looks as if a new harmony was now sought—perhaps by restoring the denarius to its old tariff of ten Asses and by forcing the victoriata into the system as half the denarius. That such a measure would give an unfair advantage to Roman money over other is hardly evidence against the measure having been carried.

The two closely related mints, which we observed in Period VI, cannot be clearly traced. Grueber's "Rome" shows several distinct series, the relation of which to one another is not apparent; but definite evidence of two mints is so far lacking. There is certainly a continuation of the issues for the north—probably at several mints. Towards 104 B.C. a mint at Massalia may be plausibly conjectured. There may also be an issue in Cisalpine Gaul for the campaign of

Vercellae against the Cimbri. The mint in the south, of which the first traces, perhaps, appeared in the last period, is now certain. It was probably at Rhegium and served the requirements of the Jugurthine War. One issue—of M. Cato—might possibly be assigned to an African mint. Otherwise, provincial issues are still conspicuous by their absence.

PERIOD VIII. *c.* 91–70 B.C. Denarius, quinarius, sestertius. Janus As (semi-uncial). Occasional gold.

The old types of the denarius are almost completely discarded; there is free choice of types for both obverse and reverse. Symbols and letters are usually present; formulae, such as “*ex a. p.*”, are not uncommon. The mark of value, ✕, is seldom found. The quinarius and sestertius were only struck for a very few years. The victoriate—with the Victory reverse—ceases to appear. The As was reduced to half an ounce by the Lex Plautia of 89 B.C.; the sestertius seems to have been provided for by the same law. No ancient authority has helped us by explaining what these regulations implied. I think that the most probable explanation is that the As was now tarified at the fortieth of the denarius, the tenth, then, of the sestertius. But this system had no permanence. Aes went out of issue after a very few years, and the relation of As to denarius as sixteen to one probably returned; we find it established at the beginning of the Empire. Plated denarii—ancient forgeries or regular issues—the question is hotly debated—are very common. Serrate denarii occur freely—but not at the beginning of the Period. One view is that they represent an attempt to supply good money in an age of debasement and inflation.

This was a period of bitter civil strife, and some part of the discontinuity, observable in the coinage, may be put down to this cause. The mints of the north and south, noted in Periods VI and VII, are no longer to be seen; perhaps a single issue, assigned by Grueber to Gaul, is a last effort by the mint of the north. Some Italian issues the wars of the age will certainly have produced. We might expect to find issues for the northern armies of the Republic fighting against the rebel Italians, issues of Sulla in south Italy, when he came back from the east to overthrow the democratic party, possible issues of the Marians and the Samnites in their last desperate defiance of the

victorious Sulla. Some such issues may lurk among the very varied coinages assigned by Grueber to Rome in this period. The Italian rebels have a coinage of some variety and great interest. It uses both languages, Latin and Oscan, and will belong to at least two mints. Provincial issues begin to increase. There is at least one eastern issue of Sulla—probably in Greece. There is a second, which, if not eastern, must be of south Italy. There are coins of Sulla's lieutenants in Spain, *c.* 82 B.C. A coinage of the democratic party, carrying on its work after defeat in Italy under Sertorius in Spain, might be looked for; but I am now doubtful whether we can find it in the later part of the issue of serrati.

Several of the issues, notably those of L. Piso, seem to overstep the bounds of ordinary coinage. In his case—perhaps in several others—we may have to think of small private mints, created in emergency, to increase the normal supplies of money.

PERIOD IX. *c.* 70–49 B.C. Denarius. No Aes. Occasional gold.

The mark of value on the denarius is now obsolete. Symbols and letters only occur on a few issues. There is one set of "serrati" of considerable extent.

The coinage shows considerable variety of style, but does not fall naturally into sections that look like the work of different mints. We may have to reckon with the presence of more artists in the one mint in this age of rapid development. Italy being now united in the Roman citizenship, centralization of coinage in the capital might seem to be natural. Provincial issues are curiously rare. There is a certain issue of legates of Pompey in Spain. There may be one or two issues for Julius Caesar in Gaul, Cisalpine or Transalpine. But there seems to be nothing to represent the campaigns of Lucullus and Pompey in the east or the campaign of Crassus against Parthia. The vast issue of C. Piso, which looks more like a small private mint than the issue of an ordinary moneyer, might reasonably be connected with the great effort against the pirates under Pompey.

PERIOD X. *c.* 49–44 B.C. Denarius, quinarius, sestertius. Occasional gold. No regular Aes (a few issues, probably not Roman).

This is the age of Julius Caesar, fraught with destiny for Roman life in all its aspects. There is a main coinage, clearly belonging to

Rome. For two or three years this issue appears to be double—either struck in two *officinae* or in two mints. I think that a second mint, working closely with the Roman, is probable. The gold is issued separately from the silver; it was struck in Rome, but has a style of its own.

In these years of war, covering almost the whole extent of the Empire, provincial issues were bound to increase. Issues of Julius Caesar himself or his legates may be assigned to Gaul and Sicily with certainty, probably also to Spain, Africa, and the East; but much doubt still remains about the exact attributions. On the Republican side, we find issues in Africa and Spain, in Sicily and Ephesus. For the great campaign of Dyrrachium and Pharsalia, we find it hard to find coinage either for Caesar or for his opponents. As the Pompeian party fled direct from Rome to Greece it is not unlikely that one or two issues, which seem to show pure Roman style, were actually struck on the far side of the Adriatic.

PERIOD XI. *c.* 44–31 B.C. Denarius, quinarius (rare). Gold common, beside the silver.

No regular Aes. The curious “Fleet” coinage of Mark Antony and Octavian seems to show the beginnings of an As at a quarter of an ounce.

The workings of the mint of Rome are quite clear. It was striking with the name and portrait of Julius Caesar at the time of his death and continued for some months after. There was, then, a short Republican revival, when Octavian had drifted into alliance with the senate against Antony. After the compact of the Second Triumvirs the mint fell into their hands. The moneyers struck, side by side, types honouring the new potentates and types of the old style. The mint stopped abruptly in 41 B.C. and, as it seems, never reopened under the Republic. At most, there are two or three sporadic issues, which might break the aridity of the time.

It is only in accordance with the general movement of events that the provinces assume a new importance over against Rome. Quite a number of provincial issues are certain. The “Liberators”, Brutus and Cassius, have a large coinage from several mints, Apollonia and Sardes among them. Sextus Pompey strikes in Sicily, Murcus and

Ahenobarbus in the East, Cornuficius in Africa, Antony, alone or by his lieutenants, in Gaul, Cephallenia, Zacynthus, Cyrenaica, &c.

One point, that had fallen into obscurity, has recently been brought to light again. The Second Triumvirs, while they partitioned the provinces between them, all retained rights in Italy. The position was not unlike that of the four Allies in Berlin after the Second World War—all, in theory, of equal rank, one, in virtue of its presence in force, actually far superior. It now seems probable that each of the Triumvirs had his own mint in Italy and that to these mints belong coins, hitherto assigned to the provinces—to Gaul and the East for Antony, to Gaul for Octavian, to Africa for Lepidus. Servius, when he chances to refer to the mint of Antony at Anagnia, was not day-dreaming after all.

The transition from the age of Julius Caesar and the Second Triumvirs to the Empire has many points of interest and deserves a study to itself.

HAROLD MATTINGLY