

Série Histoire

3

ΤΥΠΟΙ

Greek and Roman Coins Seen Through Their Images
Noble Issuers, Humble Users?

Proceedings of the International Conference Organized by the Belgian
and French Schools at Athens, 26-28 September 2012

P.P. IOSSIF, Fr. DE CALLATAÿ, R. VEYMIERS (eds.)

Presses Universitaires de Liège

2018

Coin Images in Imperial Rome: The Case of the Emperor Nero

(Plates LVIII-LIX)

Johan VAN HEESCH*

INTRODUCTION: NERO'S MONETARY INNOVATIONS

The reign of Nero (13 October AD 54–9 June AD 68) played a crucial role in the evolution of Roman coinage. It is from this time onwards that the reverses of the bronze coins started to be very varied. The rather plain reverses with large SC's or wreaths became a thing of the past, and complex images with precise messages became the norm. While this is, of course, an over-simplification, it is interesting to understand the processes behind the changes. In contrast to the preceding reigns and all second-century coinages (when Rome was the sole mint), Nero's bronze coins were now struck in two mints: Rome and Lyons. This offers us a very interesting opportunity to compare the mint policy at both locations, to study the impact of the coin images and to consider the target audience of these objects produced in the imperial mints.

The monetary history of the reign of Nero is particularly important for numerous other reasons. Most changes were part of a reform that took place in AD 64. Nero withdrew old silver and gold coins from circulation and replaced them with coins of a reduced weight and a lower silver content. This explains how he was able to produce gold and silver coins on such an enormous scale and why his *aurei* were still circulating in the early third century AD.¹ Also in AD 64 the sole mint for gold and silver coins was transferred from Lyons, in Gaul, to Rome.² There was, however, a chronic shortage of bronze coins — especially in Gaul, the Germanies and Spain — and a new mint was created in Lyons to produce bronze coins. Nero also tried to reform the bronze coinage, by replacing the

* Director of the Coin cabinet, Royal Library of Belgium, Brussels.

1. On Nero's reform, see, for example, DUNCAN-JONES (1994), p. 115-125, 208 (circulation) and 217-230.
2. See METCALF (1989), p. 51-70; GIARD (2000), p. 22-31.

copper coins with brass ones and by introducing marks of value on them, but that experiment was very short-lived.³

In this paper, I will focus on Nero's bronze coinage. From the reign of Tiberius to Claudius, *i.e.* AD 14 till AD 54, bronze coins were in short supply in western Europe. To alleviate this situation, huge quantities of imitations were struck locally, and inundated the interior of Gaul, the Rhine frontier and newly conquered Britain.⁴ These copies were gradually replaced by officially minted Roman coinage during Nero's reign. His new coin issues were minted from the tenth year of the reign (AD 64) and were all struck between AD 64 and AD 68.⁵ They were made in two mints: Lyons and Rome. Although Roman mints did not sign or mark their coins at that time, it is easy to distinguish between the two mints: one has a globe below the neck of the emperor, and is of a style quite distinct to the coins without a globe. As M. Grant and D.W. MacDowall have shown, the "globe coins" are mainly found outside Italy,⁶ and are especially numerous in Gaul and the German provinces (Table 1). The difference is remarkable: the globe coins make up 80 to 95 % of all of Nero's bronze coins found in Gaul but less than 6 % of his coins found in Italy.⁷ Indeed, the distribution of this coinage generally is very interesting: for example, both series appear in almost equal quantities in Spain and around the Danube. H. Mattingly attributed the globe series to Lyons and this has never been questioned.⁸ Lyons is also mentioned as a mint for imperial gold and silver by Strabo and two inscriptions seem to confirm the location of a mint there in the early empire.⁹ For these reasons, almost all the gold and silver coins of the Julio-Claudian emperors are attributed to Lyons till AD 64. This is, of course, assuming that the coins were struck at a central mint, and not by a travelling mint as some might argue on the basis of the finds of coin dies all over Gaul.¹⁰

-
3. On Nero's coinage, see SUTHERLAND (1984) [= *RIC*] and MACDOWALL (1979). One of the best "recent" introductions to Roman imperial coinage is WOLTERS (1999).
 4. GIARD (1970); GIARD (1975); BOON (1988); VAN HEESCH (2009).
 5. GIARD (2000).
 6. GRANT (1955); MACDOWALL (1979), p. 15-24.
 7. For a clear table, see DOYEN (2007), p. 141.
 8. MATTINGLY (1923), p. clxiii-clxiv; SUTHERLAND (1976), p. 61-74.
 9. See SUTHERLAND (1976), p. 46-47 with references to Strabo 4.3.2 and *CIL* xiii 1820 and 1499.
 10. I do not believe in a travelling mint neither for gold and silver nor for bronze but the odd and wide distribution of official coin dies is a little disturbing. On these finds, see MALKMUS (2007), p. 175-179 list of the find spots.

	Rome %	Globe %	Number of coins
Italy	94	6	836
Spain	52	48	257
Danube	38	62	113
Southern Gaul	32	68	127
Central Gaul	18	82	3530
Northern Gaul	15	85	328
Germanies	10	90	452
Britain	5	95	265
Total			5908

Table 1. Non-globe (Rome) and globe bronze (Lyons) coins of Nero
(Data: J.-M. DOYEN [2007], p. 141).

ROME AND LYONS: ICONOGRAPHIC PROGRAM

Traditionally Rome struck a fairly uniform coinage. Bronzes of the Roman Republic are very stereotype and Augustus moneyers' *asses* from Rome show little to no variation; the same is true of his very common altar-coins from Lyons. Some variation can be observed from Tiberius onwards, but it is only from AD 64, that we find a large and systematic range of reverses.

Nero's coins are well studied and full catalogues can be found in D. MacDowall's book, C.H.V. Sutherland's *RIC* and J.-B. Giard's catalogue of the *Bibliothèque nationale de France* and his volume on the mint of Lyons.¹¹ Though there is some discussion about the exact number of issues, the sequence of the coin issues is clear and so is their chronology.¹² However, due to the numerous varieties, especially in the obverse legends, catalogues of Nero's coins can look discouragingly complex. To get a clear view of the actual minting program in Rome and Lyons, I have chosen to omit most of these secondary features of the obverses and the reverses: for example, the attributes of Roma (sometimes holding a *parazonium*, or a wreath or a victory), and the fact that the Janus temple has doors on the left and sometimes on the right side. The result is a straightforward scheme, providing a framework of what was produced in Rome and Lyons (Table 2). I do not pretend that the secondary features are of no importance (they may have been significant in the mechanism of controlling the

11. See previous notes (n. 2, 3 and 8) and GIARD (1988).

12. I did follow the scheme of minting as proposed by D. MacDowall and C.H.V. Sutherland (in *RIC*) but I do not agree with MacDowall's date for the introduction of Nero's bronze coinage and in this paper the dates proposed by Giard are accepted (*i.e.* AD 64): GIARD (1988) and GIARD (2000). See also VAN HEESCH (1980).

coin issues) but for my purpose here, these “details” prevent us from viewing the general pattern of coin issues.

The first bronze coin issues of Nero were not struck in Lyons, but in Rome only. Some 15 different reverse types are known, spread over five different denominations (*sestertii*, *dupondii*, *asses*, *semisses* and *quadrantes*; see Table 3). This large number of reverses for bronze was never seen before in the Roman mint. We see, for example, the emperor addressing the praetorian cohort, a scene of coin distribution to the people of Rome, the arch of Nero, the harbor of Ostia, and so on. A few months later exactly the same reverses are produced in Lyons (see Pl. LVIII-LIX). This program of the images on the reverses is summarized in Table 2: this table simply lists the number of different reverse types for most denominations in both mints for the years AD 64-67. Presented in this way, it immediately becomes clear that the development in Lyons was quite different from that of the Roman mint. In Rome the number of image types was reduced in AD 65 from 15 to 9 types (Table 3, including *semisses* and *quadrantes*). This decrease is even more pronounced for the *sestertii*, which were reduced from six to two types only. Quite the opposite happened in Lyons, where, for example, the Lugdunese *sestertii* increased from two to eight types, and that remained the situation for the following years. Table 3 gives only the total number of reverses and shows clearly that Lyons behaves in a completely different way from the mint in Rome.

These tables are a simplified picture of what happened as in reality several issues of coins were struck each year, though the reconstruction of the pattern of minting remains hypothetical. In AD 67 the number of types was reduced for the *asses* in Lyons, but the typological range of the *sestertii* remained at a very high level with eight different reverses. That this impressive range of images is maintained in Lyons over several years, contrary to what happened in Rome, must have had a special purpose. It is difficult to believe that this has to be explained only by a presumed higher productivity of Lyons. Nor, in my opinion, does it reflect a production system based on the different *officina* using different reverses. I prefer to explain the diversity in the Lyons mint as a deliberate choice of the mint authorities in Rome paying special attention to the coin issues intended for one of the richest provinces of the Roman empire.¹³ In this connection it is also relevant to note that the *sestertii* with the harbor of Ostia struck in Lyons have a different legend than those of Rome. Instead of *Portus Ostiensis*, the coins of Lyons read *Portus augusti*.¹⁴ Those who conceived the type were probably aware of the fact that the abbreviation in the inscription OST (for Ostia) was hardly comprehensible in Gaul.

13. On the wealth of Gaul: Velleius Paterculus 2.39; Josephus, *Jewish War* 2.371-373 (Loeb).

14. *RIC*², I, e.g. nos. 178-183 (PORT OST) and nos. 440-441, 586-589 (PORT AVG).

<i>SESTERTII</i>		<i>DUPONDII</i>		<i>ASSES</i>	
Rome	Lyons	Rome	Lyons	Rome	Lyons
Adlocutio	Adlocutio	Macellum	Macellum	Apollo	Apollo
Annona	Annona	Securitas	Securitas	Genius	Genius
Arch		Victory	Victory		
Congiarium					
Decursio					
Ostia					

AD 64

<i>SESTERTII</i>		<i>DUPONDII</i>		<i>ASSES</i>	
Rome	Lyons	Rome	Lyons	Rome	Lyons
Janus	Janus	Janus	Macellum	Janus	Janus
Roma	Roma	Roma	Securitas	Victory	Victory
	Adlocutio	Securitas	Victory		Apollo
	Annona				Genius
	Arch				Ara Pacis
	Congiarium				
	Decursio				
	Ostia				

AD 65-66

<i>SESTERTII</i>		<i>DUPONDII</i>		<i>ASSES</i>	
Rome	Lyons	Rome	Lyons	Rome	Lyons
Janus	Janus	Janus	Securitas	Janus	
Roma	Roma	Roma	Victory	Victory	Victory
	Adlocutio				
	Annona				
	Arch				
	Congiarium				
	Decursio				
	Ostia				

AD 67

Table 2. Overview of the reverses of Nero's bronze coinage in Rome and Lyons; *semisses* and *quadrantes* omitted (for these small bronzes see Table 3).

(Data: SUTHERLAND [1984] = RIC).

Another point of interest showing the importance attached to the iconographic program of the Lyons mint is the introduction of a new type in AD 65 in Lyons only. The coin in question, inscribed ARA PACIS, is a copper *as* with the *Ara pacis Augustae*, a monument in Rome honoring the emperor Augustus and erected by the Senate between 13 and 9 BC.¹⁵

	<i>Sestertius</i>	<i>Dup.</i>	<i>As</i>	<i>Semis</i>	<i>Quadrans</i>	Total
R: AD 64	6	3	2	2	2	15
L: AD 64	2	3	2	0	0	7
R: AD 65	2	3	2	0	2	9
L: D 65	8	2	5	2	0	17
R: AD 66	2	3	2	0	0	7
L: AD 66	8	2	4	2	0	16
R: AD 67	2	2	2	0	0	6
L: AD 67	8	2	1	0	0	11
R: AD 68	2	0	0	0	0	2
L: AD 68	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 3. Nero: number of reverse types in Rome and Lyons (based on *RIC*²).

IMPACT AND SITE FINDS

The great variety in coin types from the Lyons mint contrasts sharply with the data relating to coin finds from all over Gaul and in the German provinces. Generally, only the coin finds are studied and the iconographic program of Lyons is ignored. This approach suggests that military themes, including *Securitas* (on *dupondii*) and Victory (on *asses*), dominated the messages on the coins. This can conveniently be illustrated by the finds at Saint-Léonard in Normandy, in western France (but there are numerous other sites that present exactly the same picture). At Saint-Léonard 22,438 Roman bronze coins were found in a ford (Fr. *gué*, a crossing through water). Of the 2,503 coins of Nero, almost 1,828 were

15. *RIC*² nos. 418, 456-461, 526-531. See also MEISSONNIER (2005) where the author interprets the reverse of the altar of peace as a building erected in Lyons.

official *asses* struck in Lyons,¹⁶ and 71% of them are of the Victory-type (Table 4). This observation and other data from coin-finds would indeed suggest that the main theme of the Lyons mint was a military one.¹⁷ How, then, can we reconcile this with the huge variety of images that we see on the *sestertii*?

<i>Date</i>	<i>Apollo</i>	<i>Ara Pacis</i>	<i>Genius</i>	<i>Janus</i>	<i>Victory</i>	<i>Unident.</i>	<i>Total</i>
64-66	261	75	87	12	382	4	821
	<i>Apollo</i>	<i>Ara Pacis</i>	<i>Genius</i>	<i>Janus</i>	<i>Victory</i>	<i>Unident.</i>	
66-68	0	11	66	8	887	1	973
<i>Total</i>							1794

Table. 4. Saint-Léonard deposit : *asses* of Nero struck in Lyons.

Data: BESOMBES 2004, p. 34.

When we examine the percentage of *sestertii* in stray finds from western Europe (gold and silver included), numbers are always low and vary between 3% (northern Gaul), 7% (southern Gaul), and 9% (*limes*).¹⁸ But perhaps these percentages are misleading. Studying the target audience of a coin type using only stray finds, is equivalent to studying euro-cent coins and omitting the two-euro pieces and banknotes. Gold and silver, and also bronze *sestertii*, are almost always absent from site finds when they represent a high value (e.g. *aurei*: 1%-2%). On the other hand, *denarii* are almost exclusively found at third-century sites when inflation was so high that these coins served as “small” change. The same happened with the *sestertius*, which become increasingly present in finds from the second century onwards.¹⁹ The role of the *sestertius* in the first century AD is difficult to estimate; an exceptional find, such as deposit found in Pobla de Mafumet was composed of at least 140 *sestertii* and 12 *dupondii*, all issues of Nero’s predecessor Claudius I (AD 41-54).²⁰ Finds of *sestertii* in Pompeii also seem to be more numerous than in ordinary sites that are usually biased towards the smallest change available (*asses*). R.P. Duncan-Jones gives *sestertii* as being 23% of the coins found at Pompeii (till AD 79).²¹ This high figure makes sense as

16. BESOMBES (2004), esp. p. 34, n. 144 (Lyons: 2 *sestertii*, 280 *dupondii*, 1,828 *asses* and 6 *semisses*).

17. BESOMBES (2004) and for a very stimulating analysis of Nero’s coin types and their circulation, see KEMMERS (2006), p. 228-231.

18. DOYEN (2007), p. 139-140.

19. See for example VAN HEESCH (1998), p. 119 for data in northern Gaul and DOYEN (2007), *passim*.

20. CAMPO, RICHARD, VON KAENEL (1981).

21. DUNCAN-JONES (2007), esp. p. 14-15.

the finds in Pompeii are supposed to reflect the actual coins in circulation. The exact impact of the *sestertius* during the reign of Nero is difficult to determine. Of course, they were outnumbered by *asses*, but I suspect that, like the *denarii* and even *aurei*, they were much more frequent than the finds seems to show. Of some interest in this context is a small hoard found in a military fortress in Alphen on the Rhine. The purse contained 7 *sestertii* of Nero only, all in mint condition.²²

When we take into account the messages, especially those on the *sestertii*, we see that they are not limited to military themes, and this is also true for the gold and the silver coins of Nero. On the *sestertii* three of the reverses are military in character, three are civilian, and two can be both military and civilian. That these coin messages target different audiences is quite normal, as it is highly probable that soldiers as well as civilians received these coins as part of their pay.

That civilian reverse-types were also struck in Gaul with even greater frequency and with more varieties than in Italy is particularly interesting. One might wonder what significance the Gallo-Romans attached to images of the harbor of Ostia, of the *Ara pacis*, the temple of Janus (*pace p r terra mariq parta ianvm clvsit*), the *congiaria* or coin distributions to the people of the city of Rome (*cong II dat pop*), the market hall of Nero (*mac avg*), and the food supply of Rome (*annona avgvsti ceres*). These were all Italian themes.

These images have an immediate link to Rome as the capital of the empire, however, they glorified not only the emperor but also the grandeur of the City as the ideal example for the rest of the empire. They propagated the “seduction of civilization” in a world that was not yet fully Romanized.²³ Integration into Roman civilization was of great importance to the decision makers of that time. This is nicely described by Tacitus in a well-known passage on Agricola, who was governor of Britain and actively involved in the conquest of its more northern regions in AD 80. Tacitus writes:

He ... aided, them to build temples, market places, and homes ... Further, he provided a proper education for the sons of the nobility ... so that those who recently were unfavorable to the Roman language were now eager for its literature. So our dress came to be held in honor, and the toga was often seen. By stages they were led to the more acceptable vices, the porticoes, the baths.... In their inexperience they took this for *humanitas* when in fact it was part of their slavery.²⁴

Thus, we can see these Roman themes in Lyons as a kind of targeted advertising addressed to the provinces that were still in the process of transformation. Nero’s reign fits neatly between two reigns characterized by an active

22. KEMMERS (2004), p. 37-38.

23. WOOLF (1998), p. 67: “Seduction of civilization”.

24. Tacitus, *Agricola* 21; for a good translation, see WOOLF (1998), p. 69.

policy of Romanization. Claudius, his predecessor, urbanized Gaul, allowed senators from Gaul into the Roman senate and oppressed the Druids, and from the reign of Vespasian onwards, the Romanization of towns and the countryside is easily traceable in archaeological excavations.²⁵ It is not at all surprising that the active integration policy of Rome continued in the intermediate period, under Nero. This aspect of his reign is not well known as Roman historians have focused on the less honorable aspects of his reign. Although they mention that Nero gave 4 million *sestertii* to the city of Lyons after the great fire of the Gallic capital in AD 64, most of their attention has been drawn towards the revolt in Gaul and Spain.²⁶ It is probably worthwhile mentioning here the apparently exceptional building activities that took place in Britain during Nero's reign, even if they appear to be limited to regions south of the Thames at such sites as Sichester, Fishbourne and Bath.²⁷

The idea of "preaching" Rome's glory in the provinces may also help to explain the surprising distribution pattern of the extremely rare *sestertii* of the emperor Titus featuring the Colosseum and struck in Rome in AD 80; all examples have been found outside Italy! Five come from "around a rather tight geographical region in the area of modern Frankfurt am Main in Germany" and one from Ptujin modern Slovenia.²⁸

It would be interesting to map all the *sestertii* of Nero struck in Lyons, to verify whether certain types are more frequent in military sites and others more common in civilian settlements. It is beyond the scope of this paper to give a complete overview of Nero's bronze coins, but I have compiled a list of Neronean *sestertii* found in western Europe north of the Alps that offers an interesting view on the importance and distribution of the different reverses. Of the 143 *sestertii* of Nero, 106 coins were described as being struck in Lyons, 27 were attributed to Rome, and 10 to Rome or Lyons.²⁹ These identifications are not always watertight as the presence or not of a globe beneath the bust is not always clearly visible. Table 5 shows the coins grouped by reverse type, not taking into account the actual minting date or the coin issue.

25. FERDIÈRE (2005), p. 177-183. On Nero in general, see CIZEK (1982).

26. The Fire of Lyons probably happened in AD 64: Tacitus, *Ann.* 16.13.5-6 and Seneca, *Ad Lucilium* 14.91. See DECOURT, LUCAS (1993), p. 42-44 and 54.

27. FULFORD (2008).

28. ELKINS (2009).

29. See the appendix for more information on the provenances.

<i>Type</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Lyons</i>	<i>Rome</i>	<i>Rome or Lyons</i>
ANNOA	45	38	6	1
DECURSIO	33	22	7	4
ROMA	32	22	8	2
ARCH	16	12	-	
JANUS	9	8	-	1
HARBOR	5	4	-	1
ADLOCUTIO	2	-	2	-
CONGIARIUM	1	-	-	1
Total	143	106	27	10

Table 5. Frequency of Nero's *sestertii* as stray finds and hoards north of the Alps (data: see appendix).

It is clear that the most general types (*Annona*, *decursio*, *Roma*) are also the ones that are the most common ones.

The finds in the military settlement of Vindonissa in Switzerland and those of Liberchies, a civilian settlement in modern Belgium, as well as a small purse found in Alphen aan de Rijn (Netherlands) seem to suggest that the reverse types circulated side by side (see Table 6).³⁰ It would also be worth making a detailed inventory of the number of dies used to mint the Neronean *sestertii*. If the data from the finds (Table 5) reflect the volume of production, we should note that although most types were struck continuously at Lyons from AD 65 to AD 67, some types (Janus, harbor, *adlocutio*, etc.) are much rarer.³¹ Does this mean that these were originally intended for a more "limited" audience than the more common types?

Site	Annona	Arch	Decursio	Janus	Roma	Total
Vindonissa, CH (military)	2	3	1	1	4	11
Liberchies, BE (civilian)	2	1	2	1	1	7
Alphen, NL (military)	4	-	1	1	1	7

Table 6. *Sestertii* minted in Lyon found in Vindonissa, Liberchies Alphen aan den Rijn ('hoard').

30. Bibliographic references are given in the appendix.

31. I would like to thank Mary Jane Cuyler (University of Sydney) for sending me her data on the "*Portus ostiensis*" *sestertii*.

WHO DECIDED?

Who decided which types to mint? That, of course, is a question than cannot be resolved easily. From the evidence presented above, it is quite certain that the initiative during Nero's reign lay in Rome and that the reverse types were not a project of the officers in charge of the mint in Gaul. Lyons lay in an imperial, not a senatorial, province, and thus the coinage at that time was controlled by the Roman emperor and his administration. Some might argue that the emperor himself could intervene in these matters. Suetonius tells us that Nero: "placed the sacred crowns in his bed-chambers around the couches, as well as statues representing him in the guise of a lyre-player; and he had a coin struck with the same image."³² There are numerous examples of images associated with the Roman emperors: from the Capricorn of Augustus to the bull of Julian in the 4rd century, these coin types are mentioned in some detail in the written sources and always in association with the emperor. While we cannot consider them as proof of imperial initiative, we can speculate that there was at least some interest on the part of the emperor.³³ What the example of Suetonius demonstrates, however, is that people were well aware of the images on the coins.

Did the *tresviri monetalis* have a part in deciding which designs should appear on the coins? Although their names disappear from the coinage during the reign of Augustus, they continued to exist in Rome until the third century AD. And what about the *procurator monetae*, the head of the Roman mint, and the *a rationibus*, the finance minister of the Roman emperors? Liesbeth Claes reinforces the idea that typological changes under the reigns of Nero and Domitian occurred on two occasions, each corresponding with the removal of an *a rationibus*.³⁴ If so, then perhaps these freedmen were also in control of the images on Roman coinage?

CONCLUSIONS: ROME AS A "BRAND" NAME

The images and inscriptions for the different types of Nero's bronze coins were not chosen at random. The existence of two mints for bronze coinage during the reign of Nero, and for a short while under the Flavians, provides a unique opportunity to study the differences between them. The messages on the coins of both mints seem to have been developed by officials in Rome. Though the

32. Suetonius *Nero*, 25.2.

33. In the more recent past, 16th-17th centuries, some monarchs showed a very keen interest in how they were represented on their coins and medals. In 1534 pope Clemens VII discussed the quality of his coins and medals with Benvenuto Cellini: Benvenuto Cellini, *My Life*. *Oxford's World Classics* (2002), p. 120-121 (= Book I, 71).

34. CLAES (2014). On the choice of coin types, see also WOLTERS (1999), p. 290-308 and SUTHERLAND (1976), p. 96-100. On the interpretation of coin types, see the major work of NOREÑA (2011).

iconographic program is almost identical in both mints, the continuous diversity in the Lyons mint seems to correspond to a well-planned campaign of “targeted advertising” and glorification of Roman realizations. These coins were meant to propagate “the seduction of civilization”.³⁵ They aimed at some sort of assimilation or citizenship, but, of course, it is impossible for us now to estimate the real impact of this intention on the soldiers and/or civilians.

This survey of the coins of Nero suggests that while we can trace developments in coin design, and can determine to some extent the intended messages of the coins, it is much more difficult to study the impact of those messages. It should warn us not to base our conclusions on site finds only, and to recognize that hoards, site finds, die-studies and the full range of coin issues complement each other in the study and the interpretation of coin images, their issuers and their users.³⁶

POST SCRIPT

1. Mirror-boxes made of *sestertii* of Nero are surprisingly common. Of the 21 known examples, 13 were found in Germania and Gallia. The coins used to make these boxes are almost always *sestertii* of Nero struck in Lyons (20 out of the 21 mirrors!). Even if not all of these were made of halved *sestertii* (some covers are possibly casts), it is very well possible that these objects were official gifts. They illustrate in any case the “impact” of these coins of the emperor Nero! See, BESOMBES (1998); DAHMEN (1998).
2. Medallion bronze coins with large circular borders start to be “frequent” under Nero, most were struck in Rome (12), two are known from Lyons and 1 remains unattributed. They also illustrate the importance attached to these bronze coins. See MITTAG (2012²), p. 124-127.
3. On the harbor *sestertii* of Nero: CUYLER (2014).
4. On imitative coinages of the first century AD and their circulation: MARTIN (2015).
5. On the macellum, see now: BOCCIARELLI, BIZET (2016).
6. On Nero’s monetary reform, see also: BUTCHER, PONTING (2014).
7. VAN HEESCH (2016).

35. WOOLF (1998), p. 67.

36. This research has been funded by the Interuniversity Attraction Poles Program IAP 07/09, initiated by the Belgian Science Policy Office. I am most grateful to Dr Helen Wang for her comments on this paper.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BESOMBES, P.-A., “Les miroirs de Néron”, in *RN*, 153 (1998), p. 119-140.
- , “Le dépôt monétaire de 22.438 monnaies du gué de Saint-Léonard (commune de Mayenne)”, in *Trésors monétaires*, Tome XXI, 2003-2004, Paris (2004), p. 1-192.
- BOCCIARELLI, D., BIZET, M., “Le macellum Magnum et les dupondii de Néron”, in *RN*, 173 (2016), p. 271-281.
- BOON, G., “Counterfeit coins in Roman Britain”, in J. CASEY, R. REECE (eds.), *Coins and the Archaeologist*, London (1988), p. 102-188.
- BUTCHER, K. PONTING, M., *The Metallurgy of Roman Silver Coinage. From the Reform of Nero to the Reform of Trajan*, Cambridge (2014).
- CAMPO, M., RICHARD, J.-C., VON KAENEL, H.-M., *El tesoro de la Poble de Mafumet (Tarragona.) Sextercios y dupondios de Claudio I*, Barcelona (1981).
- CIZEK, E., *Néron*, Paris (1982).
- CLAES, L., “A note on the coin type selection by the *a rationibus*”, in *Latomus*, 73.1 (2014), p. 163-173.
- CUYLER, M.J., “Portus augusti: The Claudian Harbour on Sestertii of Nero”, in N.T. ELKINS, S. KRMNICEK (eds.), *Art in the Round: New Approaches to Coin Iconography*, Leidorf (2014), p. 121-134.
- DAHMEN, K., “Ein Loblied auf den schönen Kaiser. Zur möglichen Deutung der mit Nero-Münzen verzierten römischen Dosenspiegel”, in *Archäologischer Anzeiger* (1998), p. 319-345.
- DECOURT, J.-C., LUCAS, G., *Lyon dans les textes grecs et latins. La géographie et l'histoire de Lugdunum, de la fondation de la colonie (43 avant J.-C.) à l'occupation burgonde (460 après J.-C.)*, Lyon (1993).
- DOYEN, J.-M., *Économie, monnaie et société à Reims sous l'Empire romain. Recherches sur la circulation monétaire en Gaule septentrionale intérieure*, Reims (2007).
- DUNCAN-JONES, R.P., *Money and Government in the Roman Empire*, Cambridge (1994).
- , “Coin evidence from Pompeii and the Vesuvian cities”, in *Presenza e circolazione della moneta in area vesuviana* (2007), p. 11-26.
- ELKINS, N.T., “What are they doing here? Flavian colosseum sestertii from archaeological contexts in Hessen and the Taunus-Wetterau limes”, in *NC*, 169 (2009), p. 199-204.
- ÉTIENNE, R. RACHET, M., *Le Trésor de Garonne. Essai sur la circulation monétaire en Aquitaine à la fin du règne d'Antonin le Pieux (159-161)*, Bordeaux (1984).
- FERDIÈRE, A., *Les Gaules. Provinces des Gaules et Germanies, Provinces Alpines*, Paris (2005).
- FULFORD, M., “Nero and Britain: the palace of the client king at Calleva and imperial policy towards the province after Boudicca”, in *Britannia*, 39 (2008), p. 1-14.
- GIARD, J.-B., “Pouvoir central et libertés locales. Le monnayage en bronze de Claude avant 50 après J.-C.”, in *RN* (1970), p. 33-61.

- , “La pénurie de petite monnaie en Gaule au début du Haut-Empire”, in *JS* (1975), p. 81-102.
- , *Bibliothèque nationale. Catalogue des monnaies de l’empire romain, II, de Tibère à Néron*, Paris (1988).
- , *Le Monnayage de l’atelier de Lyon de Claude I^{er} à Vespasien et au temps de Clodius Albinus*, Wetteren (2000).
- GRANT, M., “The distribution of Nero’s copper asses”, in *NC* (1955), p. 21-37.
- HANEL, N., *Vetera I. Die Funde aus den römischen Lagern auf dem Fürstenberg bei Xanten*, Cologne-Bonn (1995).
- KEMMERS, F., “Caligula on the Lower Rhine: coin finds from the Roman fort of Albaniana (The Netherlands)”, in *RBN*, 150 (2004), p. 15-49.
- , *Coins for a Legion. An Analysis of the Coin Finds from the Augustan Legionary Fortress and Flavian canabae legionis at Nijmegen*, Mainz (2006).
- KRAAY, C.M., *Die Münzfunde von Vindonissa (bis Trajan)*, Basel (1962).
- MAC DOWALL, D.W., *The Western Coinages of Nero*, New York (1979).
- MAC DOWALL, D.W., HUBRECHT, A., DE JONG, W., *Description of the Collections in the Provinciaal Museum G.M. Kam at Nijmegen, XII, The Roman Coins, Republic up to Nerva*, Nijmegen (1992).
- MALKMUS, W., “Ancient and medieval coin dies: catalogue and notes”, in L. TRAVAINI, A. BOLIS (eds.), *Conii e scene di coniazione*, Rome (2007), p. 75-240.
- MARTIN, S., *Du statère au sesterce. Monnaie et romanisation dans la Gaule du Nord et de l’Est (III^e s. a.C. / I^{er} s. p.C.)*, Bordeaux (2015).
- MATTINGLY, H., *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum. I, Augustus to Vitellius*, London (1923).
- MEISSONNIER, J., “Un autel de la paix à Lyon sous Néron : approche numismatique”, in C. ALFARO, C. MARCOS, P. OTERO (eds.), *XIII Congreso Internacional de Numismática Madrid 2003, Actas I*, Madrid (2005), p. 727-738.
- METCALF, W., “Rome and Lugdunum again”, in *AJN*, 1 (1989), p. 51-70.
- MITTAG, P.-F., *Römische medaillons. Caesar bis Hadrianus*, Stuttgart (2012²).
- NOREÑA, C., *Imperial Ideals in the Roman West. Representations, Circulation, Power*, Cambridge (2011).
- PETER, M., *Untersuchungen zu den Fundmünzen aus Augst und Kaiseraugst*, Berlin (2001).
- REMY, B., *Les Monnaies romaines découvertes à Rodumna (Roanne, Loire). Essai de circulation monétaire*, Paris (1985).
- SURMELY, M., “Les monnaies antiques de Saintes”, in *Trésors monétaires*, 12 (1990), p. 69-99.
- SUTHERLAND, C.H.V., *The Emperor and the Coinage, Julio-Claudian Studies*, London (1976).
- , *The Roman Imperial Coinage, I, From 31 BC to AD 69*, London (1984²).

VAN HEESCH, J., "Review of D. MACDOWALL 1979", in *RBN*, 126 (1980), p. 247-249.

—, *De muntcirculatie tijdens de Romeinse tijd in het noordwesten van Gallia Belgica. De civitates van de Nerviers en de Menapiërs (ca. 50 v.C.-450 n.C.)*, Brussels (1998).

—, "Providing Markets with Small Change in the Early Roman Empire: Italy and Gaul", in *RBN*, 155 (2009), p. 125-142.

—, "Le programme iconographique de l'atelier de Lyon sous Néron (64-68 après J.-C.)", in *BSFN*, 71 (2016), p. 346-352.

WOLTERS, R., *Nummi Signati. Untersuchungen zur römischen Münzprägung und Geldwirtschaft*, Munich (1999).

WOOLF, G., *Becoming Roman. The Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul*, Cambridge (1998).

Appendix

Sestertii of Nero Found North of the Alps

In the following list, only the find spot and the relevant number of *sestertii* (between brackets) are given. The reverse types are listed in Tables 5 & 6. Only major sites were checked so this is not a complete list of all Nero's *sestertii*. *Sestertii* of unidentifiable type (reverse) were excluded.

Belgium, based on the database in the Coin cabinet of the Royal Library of Belgium: Grobbendonk (1), Kester (1), Liberchies (7), Messancy (1), Taviers (2).

France, for the Garonne hoard, see ETIENNE, RACHET (1984); for Roanne REMY (1985); for Saintes SURMELY (1990): Garonne (1), Roanne (1), Saintes (1; old collection not taken into account).

Germany, based on *FMRD* and for Xanten on HANEL (1995): Bingen, *FMRD* IV,1 (5), Hofheim *Erdlager*, *FMRD* V, 1,1 (2), Mainz, *FMRD* IV, 1-N1 (2), Moers/*Asciburgium*, *FMRD* VI, 3-4 (3), Neuss (*Koenen-Lager* included), *FMRD* VI,3/2 (23), Wiesbaden, *FMRD* V, 1-2 (3), Xanten (8).

Luxemburg, based on R. WEILLER, *FMRL* I: Dalheim (1), Titelberg (2).

Netherlands, based on the Numis-database (accessed on March 29, 2013) of the former Geldmuseum (Utrecht), KEMMERS 2004 for the finds in Alphen, MAC DOWALL, HUBRECHT, DE JONG (1992) for Nijmegen and J. VAN DER VIN, *FMRN*, III, 1 (2002) for Nijmegen/*Kops plateau*. Small hoards (purses) as those of Alphen and possibly one in Bunnik included: Alphen aan den Rijn (7+2), Ambt Montfort (3), Bedum (1), Bunnik (8), Den Haag (1), Neerijnen (1), Nijmegen / *Kops plateau* (4), Nijmegen (15), Valkenburg (5).

Switzerland, for Augst, see PETER (2001); for Vindonissa KRAAY (1962): Augst (7), Vindonissa (14).

United Kingdom (England & Wales only), based on the Portable Antiquities (PAS) database (accessed on March 29, 2013). Abergavenny (1), Caerhun (1), Caerleon (1), "Gloustershire" (1), Mydroilyn (1), Sarratt (1), Usk (5).

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

- Pl. LVIII, 1 *Sestertii* of Nero without and with globe beneath the truncation of the neck: Rome and Lyons (© Coin Cabinet, Royal Library of Belgium).
- Pl. LVIII, 2 *Annona* (food supply): *sestertius*, Lyons, RIC² 431 © NumismaticaArsClassica, Sale 51, lot 881.
- Pl. LVIII, 3 *Decursio: sestertius*, Lyons, RIC² 581 © Classical Numismatic Group, mail bid sale 75, lot 1006.
- Pl. LVIII, 4 Roma: *sestertius*, Lyons, RIC² 516 © Classical Numismatic Group, electronic auction, 293, lot 274.
- Pl. LVIII, 5 Arch: *sestertius*, Lyons, RIC² 432 © Classical Numismatic Group, electronic auction 271, lot 63.
- Pl. LIX, 6 Janus: *sestertius*, Lyons, RIC² 438 © Classical Numismatic Group, auction Triton XI, lot 893.
- Pl. LIX, 7 Harbour: *sestertius*, Lyons, RIC² 441 © NumismaticaArsClassica, Sale 27, lot 337.
- Pl. LIX, 8 *Ara Pacis: as*, Lyons, RIC² 526 © Classical Numismatic Group, electronic auction, 143, lot 202.
- Pl. LIX, 9 *Macellum: as*, Lyons, RIC² 402 © NumismaticaArsClassica, Sale 27, lot 336.





6



7



8



9