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The Coinage of Carthago Nova and the Roman Fleet of Missenum: Imperial Triumphs and Local Deductiones

Fernando López Sánchez*

Abstract

Most coin issues from Carthago Nova may be linked to deductiones of Roman veterans. Discharged soldiers were settled in Roman colonies or municipia in especial ceremonies, which in the case of Carthago Nova were conducted by the duoviri quinquennales, who appear on almost every one of the city's coin issues. Most of the veterans settled in Carthago Nova served in the imperial fleet of Missenum and took part in a number of military campaigns in the period between 31 BC and 41 AD. The coin issues depicting military and religious motifs (RPC 149, RPC 162-164, RPC 174-177, and RPC1 157, 169, 172-174) form the main focus of this article and some of these will be reclassified in chronological terms, with reference to commonly-used reference catalogues.

Introduction: the complexity of Carthago Nova's coin issues

From the date of its foundation in the late third century BC, Carthago Nova was for almost two decades the main Carthaginian city in Iberia. Although road communications also played a role, its real importance lay in its maritime connections with a number of different Mediterranean harbours, lying as it did between the Mediterranean and the Atlantic Ocean. After the fall of Carthage, it remained the most important harbour in Roman Hispania and was a key port of call of the Western Mediterranean, connecting North Africa, Sicily and the Atlantic. Furthermore, well before the late first century BC, the route linking the city to the Latium and Campania via Ibiza and Sardinia experienced a major boost (Map 1). (1)

Despite its extraordinary infrastructure and the constant traffic of people and goods, Carthago Nova was never granted the distinction of being named the provincial capital by any of the Julian emperors. Such an honour was reserved, from the very beginning, for Tarraco. Although Carthago Nova was much closer to the rich mines of the Sierra Morena than Caesaraugusta, Tarraco, or Emerita Augusta, and at roughly the same distance as Colonia Patricia (Córdoba), the city did not mint a single imperial coin issue in gold or in silver during the Augustan period, in contrast to these other cities. Neither did Carthago Nova even mint a single coin between 209 BC and around 40 BC (Ripollès 2005, p. 82; Ripollès 1998, p. 346) and when it did, between circa 40 BC and 41 AD, it never attained the rate of production of Caesaraugusta or Emerita Augusta (Ripollès 1998, pp. 347, 361-362).

These breaks in coin production are no less mysterious than the chronological seriation of its issues. Numismatic classification has not proved an easy task, since neither the name of the city nor the minting authorities are always present (Ripollès 1998, p. 347). There is a clear preference for military types, featuring important Italian and Mauritanian names, characteristics which are atypical in modest civic coin issues such as these. The intention here is not to carry out a re-evaluation of Carthago Nova's coin series from a technical or metrological point of view, or indeed to present any previously unpublished issues or surprising new varieties. There are already notable works on this which may be easily referred to. There are, nevertheless, certain coins which have traditionally attracted the attention of numismatists and historians alike and these coins are studied here from a different perspective.

In this article, the study of Carthago Nova's coin issues is divided into five sections. The first of these addresses the series RPC1 149, with a trophy and the legend SABI-NVS/ C-M/ IM-P on the reverse. One of the first coin issues to be minted in Carthago Nova, this has generally been considered to refer to the city's foundation. The second section analyses the series RPC1 163 and 164, in which Agrippa is mentioned as duumvir quinquennalis 'in absentia', with two military trophies on the reverse. A third, section is dedicated to the coins of RPC1 172-174, which play a key role among all the other coin types of Carthago Nova. The obverse depicts a triumphal parade, which can scarcely be linked to Carthago Nova and probably in fact refers to Rome. The reverse depicts a temple, which may be con-
nected to other examples from the cities of Turris Libisonis and Caralis (Sardinia). A fourth section, meanwhile, studies the coin series RPC1 157, 169 and 172/173. The first of these issues chose for its most descriptive coin type (obverse or reverse?) a Victoria walking towards the right, with a palm branch and a wreath. Other issues, RPC1 169 and 172/173, though, celebrate Juba II as a Mauritanian rex and as a du-
unvir quinquennalis of Carthago Nova, while Ptolemy, on the other hand, appears only as an African rex. This section explores the possible connections between Carthago Nova and Mauritania in the early first century AD. Our final conclusions are presented in the fifth and last section, in which Carthago Nova's coinage is considered in relation to the current debate regarding the role of civic coin issues in the Roman world. It will be argued that the city's minting activity coincided with successive deductions of Roman veterans (usually one every five years) which were linked to a significant extent to the personnel of the imperial Ro-
man fleet of Missenum. In the period roughly between 31 BC and 4 AD important detachments of this fleet operated regularly from the port of Carthago Nova plying the routes from Africa and even, sometimes, probably all the way to the Bay of Biscay.

**CARTHAGO NOVA AND THE MARITIME VICTORY EX HISPANIA OF C. CALVSIUS SABINUS (28 BC)**

One of the first coin issues minted at Carthago Nova, RPC1 149, reads HEL. POLlio A(LBINVS) II Q(V) on the obverse, and depicts a female head with veil and diadem – Pias or Concordia (Fig. 1).\(^{(2)}\) The reverse, on the other hand, shows a military trophy, with the legend SABI-NVS/ C-M/ IM-P in three horizontal lines. For Grant, the Sabinus mentioned here refers to C. Calvisius Sabinus a commander, favoured by both Caesar and Octavian, who was proconsul in His-
pania between 31 and 29 BC (Churc 2004, pp. 132-134). Grant goes on to argue that the initials CM stand for Cons-
stitutor Municipi (FITA, pp. 160-161) and Beltrán agrees with him with regard to this coin issue celebrating the foundation of the colony, though Beltrán prefers to read the inscriptions C-M/ IM-P as Gnaeus Magnus Impera-
\(^{(3)}\)tor. The Spanish numismatist explains the presence of a G instead of a C by basing his view on Cassius Dio (43,30), who narrates how Pompey the Great was acclaimed Im-
peror after taking the city in 47 BC. The Sabinus in the coin legend would also therefore be related to this event, and, according to Beltrán, does not refer to C. Calvisius Sabinus, but to a certain M. Minatius Sabinus, proquaestor of Gnaeus Pompeius in certain denarii struck in 46/45 BC (RPC 470/11a).\(^{(4)}\)

It is easy to argue, however, that Beltrán's G for 'Gnaeus' is actually a clear C in every single coin of this issue and that the transliteration of CM into 'Gnaeus Magnus' and the subsequent association with M. Minatius Sabinus is therefore no more than pure speculation. It might also be argued that a recently-captured city would not choose to celebrate its captor in one of its first coin issues and in this sense C. Calvisius Sabinus seems a better fit than Pompey the Great as the man related to this coin issue of RPC1 149, as Grant indeed proposes. One argument against the inter-
pretation of the latter, however, is that the development of CM as Constitutor Municipium is not very convincing, as our Sabinus is hailed in RPC1 149 as Imperator, and not as Consistitor. Furthermore, his name is linked to a military trophy and not to a city founder ploughing the pomerium with a yoked bull and cow. The meaning behind the initials CM must therefore be sought in the circumstances which led C. Calvisius Sabinus to obtain the title of imperator and also of ex Hispania\(^{(4)}\) on the 26th of May in 28 BC.

As regards C. Calvisius Sabinus, Shipley notes that "we have no information as to his governorship in Spain, or the campaign for which he celebrated his triumph" (Ship-
ley 1931, p. 34). What we do know is that he served Caes-
\(^{(4)}\)ar and Pompey in 48 BC, during the maritime crossing of the Strait of Otranto which led to the landing at Oricus (Caes. BC. 3, 34, 35, 56[55]). During 38 and 37 BC, C. Calvi-
sius Sabinus also served as the admiral of Octavian's fleet, against another Pompey (Sextus) (App. BC. 5. 80-102; Dio Cassius 48. 46-48,54). Given Sabinus' maritime record and experience prior to being named proconsul in Hispania between 31 and 29 BC, it may safely be concluded that the victory celebrated in RPC1 149 probably took place at sea. The denarii RPC 511/2b, minted in 42 BC and in honour of the proconsul Sextus Pompey, serve as a clear example of this, as a naval trophy on the reverse is depicted along with the legend Praeff(ectus) Class(is) et Orae Marit(i)ae ex Sen(nato) Consul(usto), i.e. 'Prefect of the fleet and of the shores of the sea by decision of the senate' (Fig. 2). The leg-
\(^{(4)}\)end and trophy refer explicitly to Sextus Pompey's victory over Q. Salvidenus Rufus, when he was hailed imperator for the second time (Mag. Piae Imp. Iter.) Therefore the ab-
\(^{(4)}\)breviation CM on RPC1 149 coins may be interpreted in a similar way to the RPC 511/2b, with the semantic fields being considered as possibly related to 'Classis' and/or 'Maritimeae'.

Appian (5. 80), when describing C. Calvisius Sabinus' con-
\(^{(4)}\)frontation with Sextus Pompey in the Tyrrhenian Sea in 38 BC, mentions that Octavian "ordered the building of new triremes at Rome and Ravenna". This passage foreshadows the creation of the Roman fleets (of Missenum and Ra-
\(^{(4)}\)venna) which were to watch over the western and eastern Mediterranean respectively during the Empire. The exact dates for the inauguration of the Missenum fleet and its subsequent attachment to the Bay of Naples are unknown. Viereck believes that the western Mediterranean fleet was permanently linked to Missenum at some time between 27 and 18 BC (Viereck 1975, pp. 252-279; Morrison 1996, p. 172), though Pitassi, on the other hand, believes that this could only have taken place as of 22 BC (Pitassi 2009, p. 203). Nevertheless as has been pointed out by Meloni, "it is now widely accepted that the Missenensis fleet was not..."
always and entirely based at Missenum” and indeed it may be perfectly possible that the fleet’s assignment did not take place until sometime after its creation. In this regard, Pitassi points out that Agrippa first used his fleet at Missenum before sailing to take part in the battle of Actium with it (31 BC). It therefore appears possible that the official inauguration of the Missenum fleet took place in that same year of 31 BC, immediately after the Battle of Actium (the 2nd of September).

C. Calvisius Sabinus could have commanded the Missenum fleet in Spain in the years following Agrippa’s command, i.e. 31-29 BC. If this were the case, CM could logically be read as Classis Missienensis or Classis Missenatis. Furthermore, it is possible that Cassius Dio (51.20) informs us of the exact victory and area of operation in Spain which could be attributed to C. Calvisius Sabinus and his fleet. The Bithynian historian does not mention any Roman fleet in 51.20, but nevertheless he states that the Roman general T. Stilius Taurus defeated Cantabri, Vaccae, and Astures in northern Spain in 29 BC, only a year before Sabinus celebrated his triumph (28 BC). An inscription found in 1621 in Ilici (Elche, Alicante, Spain) also mentions that this very same T. Statilius Taurus was named imperator for a third time (T. STATILIO / TAVRO. IMP. / III. COS. II. PATRONO). If C. Calvisius Sabinus enjoyed a military triumph in Hispania in 28 BC, apparently thanks to the Missenum fleet, it does not therefore seem too far-fetched to assume that T. Statilius Taurus had the same forces in 29 BC in northern Spain as his successor to the command. Likewise, C. Calvisius Sabinus could have defeated the same Cantabri, Vaccae, and Astures as T. Statilius Taurus in 28 BC, or at very least the Cantabri and Astures, coastal communities of the northern Atlantic coast.

**CARTHAGO NOVA AND AGRIPPA’S TERRA MARIQUE TROPHIES (19/18 BC)**

The coin issues RPCi 162, 163, and 164 not only display major similarities to each other but were also minted in part by the same civic magistrates, indicating that they were coined at almost the same time. As RPCi 162 and 164 explicitly mention Agrippa as duumvir quinquaemnius (in absentia) of Carthago Nova (HIBERO PRAE. M. AGRIP. QVIN.) (Fig. 3), there can be no doubt regarding the chronology of these coins, which were surely minted successively during the years between 19 and 18 BC. It was then that Agrippa travelled to Hispania to put an end to the wars in the north that had at that time been dragging on for a number of years.

The coin types of RPCi 162-164 show several parallels with RPCi 149, in particular the depiction of a trophy on their reverses. Nevertheless, there are also differences between them. The engraver of RPCi 149 inscribed the legend on the reverse in three discontinuous horizontal lines, arranged around the trophy (SABI-NVS/ C-M/ IM-P), while the engraver of RPCi 162-164 preferred to follow the established conventions, inscribing the legend around the coin rim without any interruptions. This allowed sufficient space for the depiction of shields and spears at the base of the trophy and RPCi 162/3 even includes a curious V-shaped frame surrounding the trophy (Fig. 4). The bronze coins of RPCi 162/3 are quite similar to the denarii RRC12 265 (30/29 BC), which depict a trophy set on the prow of a galley to the right and a crossed rudder and anchor in a V shape at the base around the trophy (Fig. 5). The V-shaped frame around the trophy in RPCi 162/163 (19/18 BC) could therefore be viewed as nothing other than a highly schematic rudder and anchor, similar to those depicted in RRC 507/1a (Fig. 6). The types RPCi 162 and 163, like the coin issues RIC1 265, must therefore also refer to one of Agrippa’s naval victories. It seems likely that the engraver of RPCi 149 did not see any need to add an anchor or rudder to his coins because he was already alluding to C. Calvisius Sabinus’ maritime victory with the initials CM (Classis Missenatis). Likewise, the engravers who depicted an anchor and a rudder in RPCi 162 and 163 – even if only in a schematic form – did not require any inscription to highlight the contribution of the Missenum fleet to Agrippa’s campaign in Hispania. The differences between the campaigns of C. Calvisius Sabinus and M. Vipsanius Agrippa in Hispania can therefore be inferred on the basis of the choice of coin type. While RPCi 149 only seems to refer to a maritime victory of C. Calvisius Sabinus in Hispania, RPCi 162-164 suggests that M. Vipsanius’ success was a great deal more extensive.

RPCi 162 and 163 seem to celebrate a purely Roman maritime victory but the same cannot be said of RPCi 164. This last issue features numerous shields at the base of the trophy, seemingly representing a Roman victory on land, rather than at sea (Fig. 3). To this effect, the figure-of-eight shields depicted in the gold coins of RRC 507/1a, minted by M. Junius Brutus (imperator) and S. Casca Longus, resemble those engraved on RPCi 164, the only difference between them being the absence in RPCi 164 of war prows, which do however appear on RRC 507/1a. These final coin issues combined military and naval trophies, with prows and shields at the base, because they sought to emphasise the totality of the Roman victory, both on land and at sea (terra marique). The double military nature of RRC 507/1a is expressed separately in RPCi 162/3 and RPCi 164, and yet when they are considered in tandem, it is clear that they repeat the terra marique references of RRC 507/1a. The

---

(5) Meloni 1958, p. 93 (è ormai comunemente ammesso che la flotta mise- nese no staziona sempre ed interamente a Miseno); Vegetius, 4. 32: Nam Missenatius classis Gallian Hispaniarum Mauretaniam Africam Aegyptum Sardiniam atque Siciliam habebat in proximo. (6) CIL. II 3556.

(7) Act. Triumph.: Cap., ann. 719 =720 Varr.= 34 B. C. STATILIVS. T. STATILIVS. TAVRO. IMP. / III. COS. II. PATRONO. (Elche, Alicante, Spain) also mentions that this very same T. Statilius Taurus in 28 BC, or at very least the Cantabri and Astures, coastal communities of the northern Atlantic coast.

(8) See also RRC 335 and RRC 393, Useful comments on the subject on RRC 1, p. 335.
iconographic code chosen for the Carthago Nova coin issues of Agrippa of 19/18 BC is not to be considered random or capricious in any way. On the contrary, Agrippa’s campaign in north-western Iberia is better understood as forming part of a dual strategy, both maritime and terrestrial. Viewed in this light, its geographical focus also acquires a new significance.

Agrippa’s campaign in the Atlantic is only briefly narrated by Cassius Dio (54.11.2-5). The author (53.25) regards the Cantabri and the Astures as enemies of Rome between 26-19 BC, though in connection to the rebellion of 19 BC he only mentions the Cantabri. This fact has led most authors to accept that Agrippa did not fight against the Astures in 19/18 BC and did not go beyond the territory of the Cantabri (Roddaz 1984, p. 406), but despite the apparent modern consensus on this, Cassius Dio (54.11.2) is actually far more subtle in his words. The Bithynian historian says that “the Cantabri, who had been captured alive in the war (22 BC) and sold, had killed their masters in every case and returning home, had induced many to join in their rebellion” (Cary 1980, pp. 309-311). If read carefully, Cassius Dio does not limit Agrippa’s sphere of action to ancient Cantabria, but on the contrary he specifies that the Cantabri captured in 22 BC took refuge among other more powerful warriors than themselves, namely not Cantabri, but just as strong as if they were, and indeed so strong that they caused the loss of “many of his [Agrippa’s] soldiers” (Cassius Dio 54.11.4). These powerful warriors could be none other than the Astures.

Although current scholarship prefers to speak of the ‘Cantabrian Wars’, the truth is that Cassius Dio 53. 25-8 focused his narrative largely on the greater power of the Astures, and, furthermore, mentions no culminating defeat of the Astures before 19 BC. For example, when P. Carisius occupied Lancia, the main Asturian stronghold, in 25 BC, there is no mention of a previous assault on the site. It is stated simply that “Carisius took Lancia, the principle fortress of the Astures after it had been abandoned”. The Cantabri were, on the other hand, much easier to defeat (Cassius Dio 54.5.3) and for this reason Rome reserved its best general, P. Carisius, for the Asturian campaigns (Cassius Dio 54.5.1), while less reliable commanders – including the emperor Augustus – took charge of the Upper Ebro Valley (Cassius Dio 54.5.1). When P. Carisius turned his attention to the Cantabri, he was so effective that “most of them and the fiercest element perished” (Cary 1980, p. 293), while the survivors were reduced to slavery (22 BC). The Cantabri who in 19 BC fled from their masters and took refuge among more powerful warriors (54.5) have taken refuge among the Astures inhabiting the present-day Spanish provinces of Lugo, Orense, Oviedo and parts of León and Zamora. In this context, it may therefore be understood that in 19/18 BC Agrippa launched his double campaign, by land and sea, against the Astures, and not against the Cantabri.

Agrippa’s 19/18 BC land-and-sea campaign against the Astures, alluded to in RPCi 162-164, forced him to travel from the south of Hispania to the north (10). Although Asturias and Galicia were ultimately incorporated into the province of Hispania Citerior, with its capital in Tarraco, these two regions were, during Agrippa’s campaign, linked to Lusitania. (11) Pliny is quite clear in this respect (H.N. 4. 118), noting that Lusitanum cum Asturia et Gallaecia patere longitudine DXXXVI, Agrippa proedit. The building of the theatre in Emerita in honour of Agrippa (M. AGrippa. L. F. COS. III/ TRIB. POT. III) (12) supports the idea of a Roman land-based incursion starting from the south of Hispania in 19/8 BC, perhaps incorporating veteran contingents from this city and probably also from Colonia Patricia and Ulia (CIL II 1527). Likewise, the maritime campaign alluded to in RPCi 162-163 connected Carthago Nova, where Agrippa was named duumvir quinquennalis and patron, (13) with the city of Gades (Roddaz 1984, p. 409), where he was also made patron (RPCi 77-84). Furthermore, the aplustres represented on some Gades coins (RPCi 81-84) (Fig. 7) demonstrate the role played by the Strait for the Missenum fleet (Maps 1 and 2), as it journeyed from Carthago Nova towards the Atlantic Ocean. The foundations of Braccara Augusta, Lucus Augusti and Asturica Augusta just after Agrippa’s campaign (Roddaz 1984, p. 409) also support the idea that the main object of the 19/18 BC campaign was Asturias and Galicia and not Cantabria.

Agrippa declined all three triumphal honours after his campaign in honour of Augustus (Cassius Dio 54.11.6), and therefore his victory in Asturias and Galicia is not represented explicitly in RPCi 162-164, contrary to the case of RPCi 149. When Cassius Dio (53.26.1) mentions the settling of veterans in Emerita Augusta in 25 BC (“Augustus discharged the more aged of his soldiers and allowed them to found a city in Lusitania, called Augusta Emerita”) (14), he is not necessarily restricting the events to one year: other instances of the settlement of veterans could perfectly well have taken place afterwards, as Roman military activity in Iberia and Africa continued until well after this year. The constant references in Carthago Nova’s coin issues to the magistrates involved in Roman colonies and municipia in the admission of new citizens in the city’s census – the duoviri quinquennales – strongly suggest a continuous settlement of veterans in the city during a significant period of time. It is therefore logical to hold the view that the Roman campaigns in both northern and southern Spain between the years 28 and 18 BC were very similar in nature to the martial activity which

(9) Cary 1989, p. 311.

(10) He was also patron of Ampurias, although his interests in this city were probably more connected with activities in southern Gaul in 20 BC, and not with Ulia and Gades, both located in Baetica.


(12) CIL II 474; Roddaz 1984, pp. 416-417.

(13) M(A)R(CO) AG(RIPPAE)/L(VCI) F(ILIO), CO(N)/S(VLI) (III, QVINQVENNALIS) PATRON(O, COLONI); Koch 1979, pp. 205-214; Roddaz 1984, p. 414; Llorens 1994, p. 60.

(14) With legends Agrippa/ Municipi Pater(n)/ or Municipi (patronus) patroni/ Roddaz 1984, pp. 414, 604-605; Llorens Forcada 1994, p. 60 and note 143.

linked the Levant and Galicia in 138 BC. During that year, D. Junius Brutus fought in a campaign in Gallaecia with a large number of Lusitanian soldiers, moving from the south towards the north (App. 1b. 74) and after the campaign he rewarded them in the usual Roman manner with “land and town, which is called Valenta (agros et oppidum dedit, quod vocatum est Valentina) (Livy. Per. 55).”

**CARTHAGO NOVA AND AUGUSTUS’ EULOGIOUS TRIUMPH OVER THE ASTURES AND THE CANTABRI (24 BC)**

The Qua drans and Semis coin issues of RPCi 174-177, featuring the duoviri quinquevnales P. Turullius and M. Postumius Albinus, depict on the obverse a quadriga (looking right or left, sometimes galloping and sometimes standing), preceded by a vexillum (Figs. 8, 9). Over the quadriga, the legend reads V (R) I N K, usually interpreted as V(R)I(b)s I(ulia) N(ovalia) K(arthago). A tetrastyle temple is depicted on the reverse, with the legend Augusto (in the dative case) inscribed inside the tymanum. The temple is placed on a podium, sometimes depicted as a block (RPCi 174, 176, 177) and on other occasions in tiers (RPCi 175). In the Augustan period, there are no parallels in Hispania for a temple of such elegance (Llorens Forcada 1996, p. 73), neither in archaeological evidence nor in ancient texts (Etienne 1958, pp. 388-389, and note 8). Beltrán suggests that Carthago Nova may have followed in the wake of Tarraco’s demand in 15 AD and petitioned Tiberius at some time around 19 AD for the construction of a temple in honour of Divus Augustus (Tac. Hist., 1.78). Despite the attractiveness of this theory, it might be argued that there are many examples on Roman coins of tymanums which bear longer inscriptions, and the coin engraver would have had no difficulty in inscribing Divo Augusto instead of Augusto on the architrave of series RPCi 174-177. On the other hand, because the fact that Tarraco petitioned Rome for a temple honouring Divus Augustus does not imply that Carthago Nova necessarily did the same. The quadriga with vexillum in RPCi 174-177 depicts a triumphal march, which could only have taken place in the city of Rome and it is therefore more likely that the temple was linked to specific military victories- and as such would have been located in Rome itself on the Capitoline Hill- and not in Carthago Nova or Hispania.

The denarii RRC 385/1, coined by M. Volteius and dated around 76 BC, depict on the reverse a tetrastyle temple in honour of Jupiter Capitolinus (Fig. 10). This was the sanctuary that was usually associated in Rome with the triumphal march of a victorious Roman general. The stylistic resemblance between this and the building in RPCi 174-177 is striking. The temple itself was dedicated by M. Horacius Pulvius in 509 BC, although it later burned down in a fire and was reconstructed by Sulla in 69 BC as a hexastyle building (Fig. 11), which was then dedicated by Q. Lutatius Catulus. Although this hexastyle temple could not have served as a model for the coin in question, another more feasible link may be made to the temple to Jupiter Feretrius, also located on the Capitoline Hill. This relatively small tetrasty le temple was named after the “Thundering Jupiter” serving, as it did for several centuries, as a repository for war trophies (Fig. 12). The temple of Jupiter Feretrius had to be rebuilt by Augustus in 31 BC, owing to previous neglect and the loss of its roof (Sprencer 1954, p. 31). Such a building would have witnessed the march of the triumphal quadriga of Augustus after 31 BC and housed the trophies won in combat, and therefore it would seem highly plausible to identify the temple depicted on Carthago Nova coin issues RPCi 174-177 with this one.

Octavian’s triple triumph over Dalmatia, Actium and Egypt was celebrated in Rome between 13 and 15 August of 29 BC. At the time, Octavian had not yet received the title of Augustus (which occurred on 16 January in 27 BC), so this celebration may not be linked to the series RPCi 174-177, which mentions Augusto. Neither is the ceremony returning the standards lost by Crassus to the Persians, which took place in Rome in 19 BC, a possibility, as this would not have involved a triumphal quadriga. As was pointed out by Cassius Dio (54. 8.2), the emperor “rode into the city on horseback” before the standards were placed in the corresponding temple. Augustus clearly considered the 19 BC celebration as a simple ovatio rather than a formal triumph, or he would have rode over the Capitoline Hill on a quadriga (Cary 1980, p. 300, and note 1). Furthermore, the standards were deposited in a heavily-adorned hexastyle temple dedicated to Mars Ultor (Fig. 13) - very different from the austere, tetrastyle temple of Jupiter Feretrius.

The representation of the triumphal march on a Carthago Nova coin would logically refer not to a victory in the Balkans or in the East but to one in Hispania. It is worth noting that it was not rare for a Roman military triumph to be depicted on a local issue, at least in the Mediterranean of Octavian’s time. Many civic issues of the period depicted a tetrasty le temple facade with closed doors (set on a podium and sometimes with a globe or an eagle standing with its wings stretched out) and acroteria and antefixes along the line of the roof. This is the case, for example, of the coin series RPCi 622 and 624, from Turris Libisonis (Porto Torres) and Caralis (Cagliari) in Sardinia (Fig. 14, 15, Map 3). Grant, an acknowledged expert on the coin issues of these cities, generally assumes, as he does for Carthago Nova’s RPCi 149, that the legends and im-

---

(16) Schlesinger 1959, pp. 52-53; Martí Matías 2005, pp. 3-7 proposes another Valentia, rather than the present-day Valencia, as regards the reference in Livy. Nevertheless, the truth is that neither Livy’s passage nor any other reference found in inscriptions, texts or coins, provide proof for the creation of a Valentia in Lusitania. Furthermore, the present-day Valenta seems perfectly suited to Junius Brutus’ deductio.


(18) Beltrán 1953, p. 58; Llorens Forcada 1994, p. 73.


(20) Green 2004, p. 102; Nevertheless, as late as the beginning of 62 BC Caesar claimed, in bringing charges against Catulus, that many parts of the temple were still but half finished and that he wished to see Pompey entrusted with the completion of the work (Dio Cassius, 37.4.4; 43.16.6.).

ages on these coins are foundational in nature (FITA, pp. 205-206). The obverse legend of RPCi 622, M.L.D.C.P.(?) is therefore interpreted by this author as M. Lurius Deductor Coloniae Patrumus, in reference to the supposed founder of the colony, M. Lurius, in 40 BC\(^{(22)}\). With regard to the RPCi 624 series from Caralis, the RPC editors follow Grant in assuming that “the occasion of this series could be the constitutio of the new municipium”\(^{(23)}\). Nevertheless, as is shown by RPCi (p. 162), Grant’s proposed abbreviation for RPCi 622, M.L.D.C.P., appears highly unlikely and the interpretation of M. Lucius as the city’s patronus is even more problematic. Furthermore, just as in Carthago Nova, there is no evidence of any temple in the Sardinia of the Augustan period being depicted in the style of RPCi 622, and so there is no way of proving that this was linked to any kind of civic and foundational ceremony around the time of 40 BC. Bearing all these factors in mind, it seems more plausible to suggest that a hitherto unknown magistrate with the initials ‘P.M.L.’ served as Deductor Coloniae in Turris Libisonis, and that this magistrate was in charge of settling discharged soldiers at some time after 40 BC, though not exactly ‘in 40 BC’. The same may also be said of the Caralis issue RPCi 624, which mentions in the legend two entirely unknown suffetes (ARISTO MVTVMBAL RICOCE SVF),\(^{(24)}\).

The tetrastyle temple depicted in the Sardinian series RPCi 622 and 624 cannot, however, be linked with certainty to the temple of Jupiter Feretrius. It is nevertheless true that these “Sardinian” temples emphasize highly visible closed doors on their facades, as do the homologous “Spanish” temples. Visibly closed doors at the temple of Janus in the Forum Holitorium were usually linked to Roman imperatores on the occasion of major military victories which brought subsequent peace within the Roman world. It is therefore highly unlikely that RPCi 622 and 624 were minted in celebration of the foundation of Turris Libisonis and Caralis around 40 BC, but much more plausible that they actually commemorated a military triumph that took place in Rome at a later date. The striking similarity in style between the two coin types allows us to conclude that the military events in this temple should be connected with the works in this temple should be connected with the\(^{(25)}\). Cassius Dio states that Augustus did not care to celebrate his triumph in Spain, but he also adds that M. Vinicius was associated with Augustus’ victories because of his “successes in the German war (Cassius Dio 53.26.4) and that “a triumphal arch was erected in the Alps” (Cary 1980, p. 263).
In this last passage, Cassius Dio implicitly suggests that Augustus closed the doors of the Janus temple in Rome in 25 BC, but this event probably in fact took place after his arrival in Rome in the spring of 24 BC for the marriage of his daughter Julia to Marcellus, his nephew (Lacey 1996, pp. 42-43). Veterans of P. Carisius had been settled at Augusta Emerita in Spain (Cassius Dio 53.26.1), but it is quite logical too that the discharged veterans of Augustus were waiting for their settlements. Many demands were made on him after 24 BC via petitions of the Senate, including “to consent both to being named dictator and to becoming commissioner of the grain supply” (Cassius Dio 54.1.3), and implying that Augustus took care of many different affairs after his arrival. He was also asked to become censor (54.2.1), so that he could give priority to matters of a military nature such as the settlement of discharged veterans.

The composition depicted in RPC 174-177 may therefore be viewed as a portrayal of the triumphal honours accorded to Augustus in 25 BC, to the closure of the Janus temple in Rome, and to the arrival of Augustus in the spring of 24 BC. It is very likely that Augustus was accompanied into Rome by veterans from his campaign against the Cantabri and the Astures. As had occurred with the colonies of Turris Libisonis and Caralis, it may also be assumed that some of the veterans who took part in his entry in Rome were settled in Carthago Nova with a deducito made in 24 BC, on the occasion of the closure of the temple of Janus.

**Carthago Nova and the Roman-Mauritanian victories of 6/7, 17/18 and 23 AD.**

The victorious type chosen for the Carthago Nova coin issue RPC 157 (Fig. 16) is very similar to many of the victorious types minted by Juba II (25 BC - 24 AD) in North Africa (Fig. 17). The legend reads C. AQUINVS MELA II VIR QVIN, with a Victoria walking towards the right, holding a wreath and a palm branch. RPCI assigns this coin to the reign of Augustus, although with a question mark, and makes no more precise attribution regarding its chronology (RPCI, p. 93). Llorens Forcada, on the other hand, catalogues it as the ‘8th coin issue’ of Carthago Nova, dating it to after 31 BC. It is her view that the Hispanic Victoria with the wreath and palm branch is a reproduction of the Cyrenaican reverses of P. Scarpus, struck in 31 BC (RRC 546) (Fig. 18). This same author goes on to suggest that the sigla on the obverse (associated with the legend P BAEIVS POLLIO II VIR QVIN) allude to the first settlement of veterans in Carthago Nova (Llorens Forcada 1996, pp. 56-57).

RRC 546 could very well have inspired other coin series, too, outside the Cyrenaican region. Victoria walking towards the right with a palm and a wreath is certainly a type used by Juba II between 5 and 23 AD (years XXX-XXXXVIII according to the king’s royal calendar). The Cyrenaican denarii of P. Scarpus are nevertheless rare and chronologically restricted to the first months of 31 BC, while on the other hand the Mauritanian and Iberian series provide an exact match, both in the style of their reverses and in the bronze material used. Lastly, there are no examples of the Cyrenaican type found in an archaeological context in Hispania, but the Mauritanian one is present, as is evidenced by the bronze excavated near Sagunto, dated to Juba’s year XXXXVIII (23 AD). Another find originating in Carthago Nova, coined under the name of Rex Ptolomeus and recorded in an archaeological context in Iol Caesarea/Cherchell (Map 2), provides further support for the existence of maritime contacts between the kingdoms of Juba II and Ptolemy in Africa and Hispania, something which cannot, on the other hand, be demonstrated for Cyrenaica in the time of P. Scarpus. If it is understood that RPCI 157 does in fact follow a Mauritanian model rather than a Cyrenaican one, then its chronology should also be ascribed to 5-7 AD (Juba’s regnal chronology XXX-XXIII), 15 AD (Juba’s XXXX), 17/18 AD (Juba’s XXXIII), 21/22 AD (Juba’s XXXXIV), or 23/4 AD (Juba’s XXXXVIII). It was during these years that Juba II minted the Victoria walking to the right type (with the palm branch and the wreath) and this coincided with Roman-Mauritanian victories in North Africa. It might also be suggested that the Carthago Nova type RPCI 157, too, could well have been coined in connection with these Romano-Mauritanian triumphs.

The victorious Mauritanian type first appeared in Juba II’s years XXX, XXXI and XXXII (5-7 AD), coinciding with the joint triumph of G. Cornelius Lentulus Cossus and the forces of the African king. The same type appeared in the year XXXX (15/16 AD) celebrating a similar victory as in 5-7 AD although unfortunately barely anything is known about it (Coltelloni-Trannoy 1997, p. 50). A similar issue appeared at the start of the war against Tacfarinas, in XXXXIII (17/18 AD), celebrating the victories of M. Furius Camillus, once again in coalition with the forces of Juba II. In 20 AD, however, instability intensified in the north of Africa to such an extent that the legio IX Hispana was summoned there to join the legio III Augusta, under the command of the proconsul L. Apronius. With these means at his disposal, Q. Junius Blaesus achieved, apparently without any significant Mauritanian contribution, a great victory in XXXXVI (21/22 AD), earning him a triumph and the
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(33) Gozalbes, Ripollès 2002, p. 233 and 520, no 44.
(35) Mz. nos.194-201, 282.
(36) Mz. nos. 283.
(37) Mz. nos. 202-203, 284.
(38) Mz. nos. 285-287.
(39) Mz. nos. 288.
(40) Mz. nos. 280-282.
(41) Mz. nos. 202, 203, 284; Coltelloni-Trannoy 1997, pp. 50-51 and note 17.
(42) Tac. Ann. 3. 20-21; 4. 13.3-5 Vell. 2 116; Coltelloni-Trannoy 1997, p. 51.
title of imperator. In XXXXVIII (June of 23 AD), the Roman-Mauritanian troops won another great victory which practically brought the war to an end and it was only then that the legio IX Hispana finally left Africa for Pannonia (Coltelloni-Trannoy 1997, p. 51). The military operations of 23 AD were in fact the last of the long series of wars which united Rome and the Mauritanian monarchy in North Africa and immediately after this Ptolemy was recognised by Rome as Mauritanian rex (Tac. Ann. 4. 23-26).

Many years of conflict transpired between the first Roman-Mauritanian triumphs of 5-7 AD and the final victories of 23 and 24 AD, during which Hispania played a major role in Africa. Referring to a slightly later period, Rebuffat even speaks of a “[military] avalanche espagnole” (Rebuffat 1997, p. 292). The numerous issues coined by Tiberius in Sagunto which depict a war ship on the reverse (occasionally crowned by a Victory) may perhaps be related to the years during which the emperor oversaw the African conflict (15/6-24 AD) (Fig. 19). Rome supplied important logistical and maritime support from Hispania, presumably making use of the Missenum fleet, which left a mark on cities such as Gades (44) and Carthago Nova, where Juba II was made patron (CIL II 3417, Llorens Forcada 1996, p. 66), like Agrippa before him. Again following in the footsteps of Agrippa, who had been named duumvir quinquennalnis of Carthago Nova in 19/18 BC, Juba II also received the same honour, as is indeed portrayed in RPCI 169 (CN ATELLIVS PONTI II V QIVBA REX IVBAE F II V Q) (Fig. 20). It is the view of Roller that such an honour reflected the “politics and economy in the contemporary western Mediterranean” (Roller 2003, p. 156). Juba II’s actions in Gades and Carthago Nova form an exact replica of Agrippa’s dispositions in 19/18 BC, that given both aimed to exert military control over the two main ports of the Iberian ‘Mediterranean-Atlantic’. The position of patron and duumvir quinquennalnis of these two cities was probably linked to the coordination of the movements of the imperial fleet of Missenum between Africa and Hispania.

Throughout his reign in North Africa Juba II was supported by Rome and he must therefore have reciprocated by the provision of aid. One of the clearest opportunities to do this would have been in the settlement of veterans in Roman colonies and municipia and it seems that it was precisely with this in mind that Juba II was chosen as duumvir quinquennalnis of Carthago Nova. This also lies behind the representation of the Roman lustral instruments of the duumvir Laetilius Apalus in RPCI 169, both on the reverse and obverse and accompanied by the African-Egyptian symbols of Juba II. The lotus and the crescent are frequently explained in these Hispanic coins from a purely economic or religious perspective (45) despite the fact that, when symbols of Isis are found on Mauritanian coins, they also carry military and dynastic connotations. Isis is frequently depicted as Regina in the Mauritanian kingdom and therefore most of the African-Egyptian symbols that accompany her on coins – the crescent, the sun, the cow or ox and the uraeus – are also connected to military and regal aspects (Coltelloni-Trannoy, 1997, pp. 177-181). All of this leads us to conclude that Juba II and his colleague Laetilius Apalus took part in the lustral ceremony and were involved in the drawing-up of a new census of citizens at the time of the issue of RPCI 169. The new citizens that were settled in Carthago Nova by Apalus and Juba II may be assumed to have been discharged soldiers (perhaps Mauritanian auxiliaries?), who had played a role in some of the famous African victories of 6-23 AD.

The RPCI 172/173 coin issues are similar in many ways to the RPCI 169 series, though of course on this occasion it was Ptolemy, and not Juba II, who was being celebrated as a Mauritanian king (Fig. 21). The name Ptolemy, as rex, appears inside a wreath on the reverse of the coin, mirroring the way that the name Augustus, as emperor, appears on the obverse. In contrast to RPCI 169, there is in this issue no precise indication as to whether Ptolemy was named duumvir quinquennalnis, or any correlation on obverse or reverse between the Roman lustral symbols and the African-Egyptian ones of the Mauritanian kingdom (which only appear, minimised, in RPCI 172/80). It may therefore be concluded that the authority responsible for these issues was Juba II and not the new royal prince. These coins seem to have appeared immediately after the presentation of Ptolemy as the successor of Juba II in Caesarea in 5 AD (46), a hypothesis backed up by most of the scholars interested in these coin issues. RPCI 172-173 was indeed coined straight after 5 AD, then it could also be related to the celebration in 6/7 AD of the joint victory of C. LENTULUS COSUS and Juba II in Africa, which in turn also explains why the Mauritanian monarchy was at the time interested in Carthago Nova as a settlement town for veterans. Besides, coin series like RPCI 160 seem to have accompanied the settlement of a contingent of soldiers in Carthago Nova, and the character of these coins, even more than in the case of RPCI 172/173, point towards a dedicatio of former Mauritanian auxiliaries.

Out of the three possible time periods for the Carthago Nova series analysed here (5-7, 17/18, and 23/24 AD), 17/18 AD provides the best match for the quinquennial issues of RPCI 169. In 23/24 AD, Juba was already dead or on the point of dying and in this context the RPCI 172-174 series appears to fit in well with the presentation of the new prin-

(44) Avienus, Ora Maritima, s. 277-283; Llorens Forcada, 1994, p. 66.
(46) Coltelloni-Trannoy, 1997, p. 180, links the symbols of Isis as they appear on coins with triumphal ornaments in Caesarea (Mz. No. 195), in relation to a victory involving “une communauté de Romains (ou indigènes en voir de romanisation)!”. (47) Year in which Ptolomy assumed the toga virilis Roller 2003, p. 244 and note 3.
(48) The lotus and crescent are linked to this city during this specific time period Mz. nos. 351-356, Alexandropoulos, nos. 209, 212.
(49) Benabou 1976, p. 64 and note 79; Coltelloni-Trannoy 1997, p. 49 and notes 10-11; Roller 2003, p. 110.
cept, who became rex in 5 AD. The years of 23/24 AD, the transition period in between the kings Juba II and Ptolemy then appear as the only serious proposal for the coin issues RPCI 157, as no Mauritanian royal symbols or Mauritanian names are visible on them. The reverse of this coin type is identical to that of Juba II’s triumphal series (Victoria with palm branch and wreath) except that it includes complete Roman signa on the obverse. For this reason, it is possible that on this occasion the veteran deductio did not include any Mauritanian auxiliaries.

**Conclusions: the Missenum fleet, veteran deductiones and the issues of Carthago Nova**

Numismatists studying the local coinage minted during the Julian dynasty in Hispania are divided between those who consider that the army played a significant role and those who believe that this has been overvalued. García-Bellido, in her numerous studies on Hispano-Roman coins, has defended the relationship between civic coinage in Iberia and the Roman army, pointing out that there were “very clear administrative routes through which the army was provided with small bronze coinage of small denominations in coin issues from mints that were involved with the supply of the army, coinage that was transported in particular to the north-west of Hispania for the maintenance of troops”.

Despite the term “civic coinings must be connected with local needs more than with the needs of the Roman state or with state-driven coin issues”. Furthermore, he emphatically adds that “in Hispania it is not possible to link the production of the towns with payments to the army or with any other state expenditure”.

These academic discrepancies among Spanish scholars also have their counterparts on an international scale among those who study other areas of the Roman world. Mitchell, for instance, has attempted to prove, through a variety of different texts and inscriptions, that in the third century AD the cities of Anatolia and Asia Minor were expected to aid Roman military expedition forces crossing the region (Mitchell 1983, pp. 133-134). This essentially represents the archaeological theory proposed by Green, who back in 1941 linked the cities of Asia Minor and their products with legionary and auxiliary garrisons along the Danube (Gren 1941). While many of the civic communities of Asia Minor were never actually approached physically by any army, this did not mean, according to these authors, that the presence of the army was not felt (Mitchell 1983, p. 142). Ziegler went on to apply Green’s theories to coinage, pointing out that, as regards the exchange of products between different regions, “numismatics is able to contribute more to the subject of the ‘Roman army in the East’ than ancient historians have previously assumed” (Ziegler 1996, p. 119).

Rebuffat, on the other hand, has published a comprehensive study of the second and third-century AD coin issues of Asia Minor bearing Roman standards, going as far as asserting that it was the imperial legates or proconsuls, not the civic authorities, who were the true promoters of many of the local issues in the region (Rebuffat 1997, p. 414).

Disputing the views of Ziegler and Rebuffat, Katsari points out that imperial bronze coinage did not easily meet the needs of troops operating in a frontier region (Katsari 2011, pp. 235-236), and, following in the footsteps of Elton, she also expresses the opinion that “the intermittent process of minting and the large chronological space [of many of these minting cities], lasting one or more decades, could suggest the exact opposite of Ziegler’s theory” (Katsari 2011, p. 216). For Katsari, neither the movements of armies or the presence of established garrisons are helpful in explaining patterns in the production of local coinage and in the dispersal of civic money. She suggests instead that “extensive trading activities and the development of urban centres (are) the main factors for the monetisation of a region” (Katsari 2011, p. 220). With prudence and common sense, Elton also warns that “the reasons for striking local issues are not well understood” and he asserts that we do not know “how many coins were struck in any given period” (Elton 2005, p. 299). He concludes that “local minting was not necessary to facilitate the supply process” (Elton 2005, p. 297-298). Klose points out also that local festivities and other regional events, rather than the army, often prompted many of these local coin issues (Klose 2005).

These pages have not been written with the intention of defending or attacking any of these positions concerning the production and distribution of local coinage in Hispania. Nevertheless, the study of certain coin issues from Carthago Nova which might be considered to be particularly relevant demonstrates that there are certain aspects of both these divergent stances which seem to apply to this Iberian city. It may be argued, for example, that religious objects such as the simpulum, the aspergillum, the securis and the apex (Figs. 20, 22) are as common in the issues of Carthago Nova as are military artefacts. These religious objects were related, however, not only to the pontifex maximus or augur serving a Julian prince in Rome, but also to the local lustrum officiated over by the duoviri quinquennales (Fig. 23). The main role of the duoviri quinquennales (local censors) in a Roman colony or municipium was to register citizens and administer the census and, as in Rome,
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(30) Garcia-Bellido 2006, p. 674, and note 1 (“vías administrativas muy bien fijadas por las que se abastecía al ejército de numerario menor, de bronce, en partidas monetarias procedentes de unas cecas comprometidas con el abastecimiento militar y especialmente llevadas al NO (de Hispania) para el mantenimiento de la tropa”). See also the author’s bibliography as regards this data, pp. 721-722.

(31) Ripollés 1998, p. 384 (“las acuñaciones cívicas han de conectarse con las necesidades locales antes que con las necesidades del estado romano o con programas monetarios de origen estatal … en Hispania no es posible relacionar la producción de las ciudades con la remuneración al ejército o con cualquier otro gasto estatal”).

(52) Despite the term quinquennalis, few believe nowadays that the positions held by these duoviri were actually five years in duration. Instead, they probably lasted only one year, Llorens Forcada 1996, p. 29 and note 31, with bibliography.
to look after the *lectio senatus* and *recognitio equitum*, as well as the management of local finance and public works (Daremberg & Saglio II (a), p. 993). The census, commissioned to *IVviri* or *IVviri quinquennales*, took place in Roman colonies and *municipia* at the same time as in Rome, as was established in the *lex Iulia municipalis* (Daremberg & Saglio II (b), p.1000). Significantly, all of the magistrates recorded in issues from Carthago Nova were the *duoviri quinquennales*, and not simply *duoviri* (Llorens Forcada 1996, p. 29). In addition, many of these *duoviri quinquennales* were very high dignitaries, as in the case of Agrippa (*RPC* 164) (Figs. 3-4), Tiberius Nero (*RPC* 166), the Mauritanian king Juba (*RPC* 169) (Fig. 20), Nero and Drusus (*RPC* 179-181) (Fig. 24) and Caligula (*RPC* 182-184) (Fig. 25). Other (unknown) *duoviri quinquennales* of the city bore Italian names unrecorded in Hispania and probably had closer links to Italy than to Carthago Nova itself. In any case, all of these figures can be directly or indirectly linked to veterans settled in the colony of Carthago Nova. It is because of this and not merely for reasons of prestige that high Italian and Mauritanian dignitaries accepted civic responsibilities in the city. It seems then clear that Carthago Nova was not just another Roman city in Hispania. It is very likely that its magnificent port housed significant detachments of the imperial fleet of Missenum in the time between the Battle of Actium (31 BC) and the incorporation of Africa (41 AD)(54).

After analysing a few highly significant coin issues from Carthago Nova, it seems plausible to assert that Carthago Nova coins were to a large extent linked to the different settlements of Roman veterans in the city and it might also be suggested that there were probably as many coin issues in Carthago as there were *deductiones*. In partial response to the aforementioned question of Elton, the volume of production of civic coin series in Carthago Nova(54) was probably contingent on the number of veterans discharged on each occasion, which does not necessarily mean, of course, that the coin issues of Carthago Nova were produced to supply each veteran soldier with small-denomination coinage. Nevertheless, it does appear logical to believe that the production of these coins was linked to the roles undertaken by the local censors – the *duoviri quinquennales*. This role specifically included officiating at lustral ceremonies, and this was probably accompanied by speeches, marches and public manifestations of loyalty towards the family of Iulii, both in Imperial Rome and in Carthago Nova. Lastly, the diverse iconography displayed in these coin issues may be attributable to the different circumstances surrounding the discharge of each group of veterans. *RPC* 174-177 implicitly indicates, for example, that the veterans who were settled in Carthago Nova in 24 BC took part in the victorious arrival of Augustus into Rome. The veterans settled in 6/7 and in 17/18 AD (*RPC* 169, 172-174) fought, on the other hand, in the contemporary African wars and Mauritanian auxiliaries were probably included within their ranks.

Elton, Katasari and Ripollès are right to emphasise the essentially local characteristics surrounding the minting and distribution of small-denomination civic coinage in the Roman world, but, similarly, the influence of the international events behind these celebrations cannot be ignored. Had there been no Missenum fleet or regular military campaigns in Iberia or Africa linked to Carthago Nova, then the coinage dating roughly between 31 BC and 41 AD would never have been issued in the city. Future studies of the coin series of Hispania and Africa could perhaps explore further the role played by these ‘local festivities’ which are the veteran *deductiones* both in colonies and municipalities throughout the entire Mediterranean. In this regard, it may also be stated that it is probably no coincidence that the end of civic minting in the West should have coincided with the end of the Julian dynasty and its military campaigns across the Mediterranean.

**ABBREVIATIONS**


---

(53) The thesis is defended by Gimeno 1994: for references and further discussion, see also Arrayáis Morales 2005, p. 80.

(54) Llorens Forcada 1994, p. 95 estimates the total number of dies produced for every single coin issue.
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<td></td>
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<td>P BAEBIVS POLLIO II VIR QVIN, Victory standing, right, holding wreath and palm branch; Rev.: CAQVINVS MELA II VIR QVIN. Trustees of the British Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>17.</td>
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<td>RRC 546/2a</td>
<td>M-ANTO-COS-III-IMP-III, Head of Jupiter Ammon right; Rev.: SCARPVS IMP, Victory advancing right, holding wreath and palm branch. Trustees of the British Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>RPC 202</td>
<td>CAESAR DIVI AVGVSTAV (F) ACG(VS), bare head right, Rev.: L. SEMP GEMIN(0) I. VAL SVRA II VIR, galley right, SAG above. <a href="http://www.coinarchives.com">www.coinarchives.com</a></td>
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<td>20.</td>
<td>RPC 169</td>
<td>CN ATELLIVS PONTI II V Q(V), apex, securis, aspergillum and simpullum; Rev.: IVBA REX IVBÆ F II V Q(V), crown of Isis. Trustees of the British Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>21.</td>
<td>RPC 172</td>
<td>AVGSTVS DIVI F, bare gead, right; Rev.: CAETILIVS APALVS II V Q, diadem (with crescent and lotus above) enclosing REX POTOL. The Trustees of the British Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>RPC 167</td>
<td>AVGSTVS DIVI F, laureate head, right; Rev. C VAR RVF SEX IVL POL II VIR Q, simpulum, aspergilum, secures and apex. Trustees of the British Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>RPC 170</td>
<td>AVGSTVS DIVI F, laureate head, right; Rev.: M POSTVM ALBIN I. PORC CAPIT II VIR Q, togate male standing, holding simpulum and branch. Trustees of the British Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>RPC 179</td>
<td>TI CAESAR DIVI AVGSTI AVGSTVS P M, bare head, left; Rev. C V I N C NERO ET DRVSVS CAESARES QVINQ, confronted heads of Nero and Drusus. Trustees of the British Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>RPC 182</td>
<td>TI CAESAR DIVI AVG(V) F AVGSTV) P M, laureate head, left; Rev. C CAESAR TI N QVINQ (Q) IN V I N K, bare head, left. Trustees of the British Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Map 1.- The maritime road to Carthago Nova. Drawing F. López Sánchez

Map 2.- Cities in Spain and Mauretania. *RPC*, Map 2
Map 3.- Turris Libisonis (Porto Torres) in the north of Sardinia, and Caralis/Carales in the south. Drawing F. López Sánchez