

NUMIDIAN KINGS AND NUMIDIAN GARRISONS DURING THE SECOND PUNIC WAR: COINS AND HISTORY

FERNANDO LÓPEZ-SÁNCHEZ

Universitat Jaume I, Wolfson College, Oxford

SUMMARY: The silver series of Apollo with a prancing horse and Punic lettering was minted in Agrigentum in the years 211/210 B.C.,¹ on behalf of the main body of cavalry of the Numidian chief Mottones, whilst the bronze series of Persephone/Demeter with a prancing horse was coined in Morgantina on behalf of a smaller Numidian detachment based in that city at the same time. Mottones fought in Sicily first on the side of Carthage against Rome, and then for Rome against Carthage. This change of allegiance can be traced in his Sicilian series. The Apollo issues with the figure of the prancing horse on the reverse provide an excellent clue for tracing all the Numidian garrisons of Hannibal and Mottones in Italy during the Second Punic War. These garrisons were based in the towns of Capua-Mons Tifata, Arpi, Salapia, Thurium, Larinum, Beneventum and Luceria at different times between the years 216 and 208/7. In Spain the series with the prancing horse were minted in Carthago Nova at the years 212/211-209, on behalf of the Numidian troops of Massinissa.

Keywords: Hannibal, Apollo, cavalry, Campanian, Carthage, mint, town, issue, ears of corn, garrison, Massinissa, Mottones, Numidian, Persephone, Prancing horse, Punic, reverse, Rome, series, war.

RESUMEN: Las series monetales de plata con Apolo con un caballo encabritado y letras púnicas fueron acuñadas en Agrigento en los años 211/210 a.C.² Estuvieron destinadas al principal cuerpo de caballería númera presente en Sicilia, a las órdenes de Mottones. Otras series monetales con el caballo encabritado, esta vez de bronce y con Perséfone/

1. All dates are B.C. unless indicated otherwise.

2. Todas las fechas son a.C., salvo indicación contraria.

Démeter, fueron acuñadas en Morgantina y estuvieron pensadas para un destacamento nómada más pequeño, presente en esta ciudad durante estos mismos años. Mottones luchó en Sicilia, primero del lado de Cartago y contra Roma, y después del lado de Roma contra Cartago, y este cambio de alianzas es perceptible en sus series sicilianas. Las emisiones de Apolo con el caballo encabritado en el reverso proporcionan una excelente guía para el seguimiento de todas las guarniciones nómadas de Aníbal y Mottones en Italia durante la segunda guerra púnica. Estas guarniciones se localizaron en Capua-Monte Tifata, Arpi, Salapia, Thurium, Larinum, Benevento y Luceria en distintos momentos entre los años 216 y 208/7 a.C. Las series hispanas con el caballo encabritado fueron acuñadas en Cartago Nova en los años 212/211-209 y estuvieron destinadas a las tropas nómadas de Masinisa.

Palabras clave: Aníbal, Apolo, caballería, caballo encabritado, campano, Cartago, ceca, ciudad, emisión, espigas, guarnición, guerra, Masinisa, Mottones, nómada, Perséfone, púnico, reverso, Roma, serie.

NUMIDIAN COINS IN SICILY: MOTTONES IN AGRIGENTUM AND MORGANTINA (211-210)

The half shekels, quarter shekels and eighths of shekel with a male head crowned with ears of corn on the obverse and a prancing horse on the reverse³ (Fig. 1) were linked, until well into the twentieth century, with Hiempsal II, king of Numidia between 105 and 62.⁴ Despite the fact that the Numidian cavalrymen fought in a very similar way to their Campanian counterparts,⁵ the Punic legends *ht* and *t* inscribed under the bellies of the prancing horses clearly denote a North African, and not a Campanian, origin for these coin series.⁶ However, and contrary to all expectations, these issues have not appeared in the areas of North Africa controlled by the Numidians, this is in stark contrast to the significant numbers that have been found in the most important Sicilian hoards of contemporary coinage of the Second Punic War (213-210).⁷ The issues with the prancing horse are therefore considered

3. It is perhaps simply a matter of chance that no shekels have been found. The chronologically and stylistically parallel series of the pachyderm minted at Agrigentum does contain shekels, but not eighths of shekel, MANFREDI, *Monete Puniche*, 334-335. See also below.

4. MÜLLER, *Numismatique*, 38; CHARRIER, *Description*, 19-20, PL. 4, NOS. 53-57; BURNETT, «The coinage of Punic», 385; MANFREDI, *Monete Puniche*, 209.

5. FARISELLI, *I Mercenari*, 134-137; WUILLEUMIER, *Tarente*, 188; LAUNEY, *Recherche sur les armées*, 188.

6. ALEXANDROPOULOS, *Les monnaies*, 393-399, PL. 4-5, NOS 1-26; MANFREDI, *Monete Puniche*, 305, nos. 201, 205, 206; 307-312, nos. 1-29.

7. MANGANARO, «Un ripostiglio».



Fig. 1.1 AR. ¼ Shekel. Agrigentum. 211 BC. (Mottones). 1.90 grams. Wreathed head of Apollon right. Prancing horse right, below, Punic *ht*. Classical Numismatic Group, Electronic Auction 104, Auction date: 22 December 2004, Lot number 18.

Carthaginian in character and linked to the division of the Carthaginian army commanded by Himilco, which disembarked in Heraclea Minoa in the year 213 with 25,000 infantry, 3,000 horseman and 12 elephants⁸ (Livy, 24.35.1-3) (Map 1). The prancing horse coins also appear in Sicilian hoards in conjunction with others of a similar style (shekels, half shekels and quarter shekels), all with a laurel-wreathed head on the left and an elephant marching on the right of the obverse⁹ (Fig. 2). The letter «aleph» inscribed under the elephant in this series has led to it being associated with Agrigentum, the town in which Himilco established his headquarters in Sicily, and the prancing horse series are therefore considered to have been minted there.



Map 1. Cities of Sicily during the 3rd century BC. LE BOHEC, Y. (1996): 64, pl. 11.

8. BURNETT, «The coinage of Punic», 384-386.

9. MANFREDI, *Monete Puniche*, 334-335, Nos. 5-7.



Fig. 2. AR. ½ Shekel. Agrigentum. 213-210 BC. (Himilco). 3.28 grams. Laurate male head left/Elephant right. Punic letter in exergue (aleph). Gemini, LLC, Auction V, Auction date, 6 January 2009, Lot number 56.

It is clear that the bust depicted on the obverses of the series falsely attributed to Hiempsal II does not display the characteristics that the Numidian kings normally show in their coin series from the year 208 onwards (sharp features, long hair and goatee beard). Nevertheless, neither Walker¹⁰ nor Burnett¹¹ support the identification of the likeness with the pro-Carthaginian Sicilian general Hippocrates, or even with Hannibal, preferring to link it to Triptolemus, owing to the ears of corn in his hair. As these authors point out, likenesses of men with these ears of corn appear in Punic issues from before the Second Punic War,¹² which makes it all but impossible to link it with any degree of certitude to either of these Carthaginian generals. Charrier and Muller were not, however, far from the truth in attributing the series which we now know to be Sicilian to a Numidian king. The letters *het* and *taw* inscribed under the belly of the steed have long been associated with the Semitic term *mmlkt* (royalty or leadership) (Fig 3).¹³ This explains, for example, the existence of issues with legends reading «Massinissa the king» (*mn/ht*)¹⁴ (Fig 4) or «the king Adherbal» (*ht/l*) (Fig 5),¹⁵ though in the case of some of Massinissa's series the coin engravers did not think it necessary to spell out the name of the sovereign. The letters *het* and *taw* under the belly of the steed were considered sufficient to indicate the royalty of the character to whom they referred elliptically (Fig 6).¹⁶ It must therefore be concluded that the Sicilian series with the prancing horse and *het*, or *het* and *taw* Punic letters is North African in neither its minting nor its distribution, though it most certainly is in terms of its ethnic and monarchical appeal.

10. WALKER, *Some hoards*, 269-88.

11. BURNETT, «The coinage of Punic», 384-386.

12. BURNETT, «The coinage of Punic», 384.

13. MANFREDI, *Monete Puniche*, 98-99.

14. MANFREDI, *Monete Puniche*, 311, No 21.

15. MANFREDI, *Monete Puniche*, 312, No 28.

16. MANFREDI, *Monete Puniche*, 311, No. 22.



Fig. 3. AE. Numidia. 204-202 BC? (Syphax). 10.04 grams. Diademed and bearded head left/Horseman galloping left and Punic legend *sphq hmmlkt* in cartouche below. Classical Numismatic Group, Mal Bid Sale 57; Auction date: 4 April 2001, Lot number 663.

The site-finds of Morgantina have- to a greater extent than those of any Sicilian hoard - allowed us to establish with great precision the date of coining of the prancing horse series in the years 211/210, rather than simply in the generic period from 213-210.¹⁷ This conjunction of chronological (the years 211/210), typological (Numidian prancing horse), and epigraphic data (Punic character) allows us to suggest that the half shekels, quarter shekels and eighths of shekel in question may be attributed to the authority of prince Mottones, Hanno's equestrian assistant in the last phase of the war in Sicily. It is most probably with this Mottones, an important equestrian commander of mixed Numidian and Carthaginian origins from Hippou Acra,¹⁸ often mentioned in Livy, 25. 40. 5-10; 26. 21. 14-16; 26. 40. 3-12; 27.8.18,¹⁹ and very close to Hannibal (Livy, 26.40.5-7), that the Sicilian series with the legend *ht* and *h* must be linked. In the year 211 Mottones was sent from Italy to Sicily by Hannibal with 3,000 mounted Numidians and 8,000 infantry troops, with a view to redressing the situation and providing support for the Carthaginian cause in Sicily (Livy, 26.21 14: *Post projectionem ex Sicily Marcelli Punica classis octo milia peditum, tria Numidarum equitum exposuit*).



Fig. 4. AE. Numidia. 208-148 BC. Massinissa. Male head left, below Punic letters *mn* /Horse prancing left, head of Ammon above, below, Punic letters *ht*. MANFREDI, *Monete Puniche*, 311, no. 21.

17. BURNETT, «The coinage of Punic», 385.

18. HOYOS, *Hannibal's*, 131, 265 and notes 15, 17; Livy, 25.40.12 calls him *degeneris Afer*.

19. HAMDOUNE, *Les auxilia*, 27-28.



Fig. 5. AE. Numidia. 148-88 BC. Ardebaal. Male head left/Horse prancing left, head of Ammon above, below, Punic letters 'l. MANFREDI, *Monete Puniche*, 312, no. 28.



Fig. 6. AE. Numidia. 208-148 BC. Massinissa. Male head left, below Punic letters *mn* /Horse prancing left, head of Ammon above, below, Punic letters *ht*. MANFREDI, *Monete Puniche*, 311, no. 22.

It is logical that all the silver issues of the prancing horse are attributed to the mint of Agrigentum, since it is known that the city was Mottones' principal base (Livy, 25.40.10; 26.40. 2,7). There were, however, other Numidian garrisons in Sicily in the years 211/210, for example, at Heraclea Minoa, which housed three hundred Numidians (Livy, 25.40.11). Morgantina was even more important, as is revealed by the fact that, as soon as he disembarked in Sicily, Mottones went to this city to put down a revolt instigated by Rome (Livy, 26.21.14: *Ad eos Murgantia et Ergetium urbes defecere*).²⁰ The town was vital to the Carthaginian strategy in the island, as peace there meant peace in many other towns, and the same was true of revolt (*Secutae defectionem earum Hybla et Macella sunt et ignobiliare quaedam aliae*). Morgantina was, however, important above all for its strategic value, situated as it was halfway between Syracuse and Agrigentum, and because it was a fundamental supply depot for any army that wished to control Sicily. This singular importance of Morgantina explains why it was the mobile forces of Mottones that were chosen to put down this revolt (*Et Numidae praefecto Muttine vagi per totam Siciliam sociorum populi Romani agros urebant*), and there is no doubt that after the revolt had been pacified, a significant Numidian garrison was established there. The half shekel and the three quarter shekels found during

20. Morgantina had already undergone a significant anti-Roman revolt only shortly after Himilco's disembarkation in Sicily, LAZENBY, *Hannibal's War*, 108.

the excavation of this site must clearly be linked to an important North African garrison in the town. As regards the bronze series with a veiled Persephone/Demeter and ears of corn on the obverse and a prancing horse with the letter *het* on the reverse²¹ (Fig. 7), Burnett believes that they were probably coined in Agrigentum, together with the silver series. It must however be recognized that the large number of coins found in the town of Morgantina (24) from this small series suggests the opposite.²²



Fig. 7. AE. Morgantina. 211 BC. Veiled and wreathed head of Persephone-Demeter right/ Prancing horse right, garland above, Punic *h* below. MANFREDI, *Monete Puniche*, 334, no. 3.

The bronze series with a victory garland coined in the mint of Morgantina, perhaps in celebration of the crushing of the revolt by Mottones (Fig. 7),²³ is joined by the more common series depicting a filleted palm behind a horse (Fig. 8).²⁴ Unlike the (Celt)iberian coinage from around 100/90 B.C. and many other classic Mediterranean issues, where the civic horseman is shown performing the civic *dokimasia* (or *transvectio equitum*) (Fig. 9),²⁵ the Numidian horsemen of Morgantina are not depicted as citizens. In the years 211/210, the Numidian horsemen of Mottones were based in a military garrison introduced in Morgantina, and as such they were not represented as civic cavalrymen at the city's coinage. It is likely that the Numidian horsemen were involved in military parades in Morgantina, but they were never a civic guard like the one shown on the Parthenon frieze in Athens or on the (Celt)iberian issues. The representation of Persephone in these issues, shown in relation to Apollo and to the displaced and mercenary soldiers,²⁶ also reinforces this non-civic allusion to a foreign garrison. Morgantina was not the only town to mint this type of coins, and many other Italian (see below), North African²⁷ and even Hispanic towns²⁸ used this same kind of reverse to denote the maintenance of a Numidian garrison in the vicinity.

21. MANFREDI, *Monete Puniche*, 334, NO. 3.

22. BURNETT, «The coinage of Punic», 385; MANFREDI, *Monete Puniche*, 209-210.

23. MANFREDI, *Monete Puniche*, 334, NO. 3.

24. *Ibid.*, 334, NOS. 1 AND 2.

25. LÓPEZ-SÁNCHEZ, «Los auxiliares de Roma».

26. FIELDS, «Apollo: God of War».

27. MANFREDI, *Monete Puniche*, 311, NO. 25.

28. *Ibid.*, 420, NOS. 191-194.



Fig. 8. AE. Morgantina. 211 BC. Veiled and wreathed head of Persephone/ Demeter right/ Prancing horse right, filleted palm behind, Punic *h* below Classical Numismatic Group, Electronic Auction 130, Auction date 4 January 2006, Lot number 116.

The existence of Numidian garrisons in Sicily constitutes a proof of the dynamic presence of Mottones on the island. There is no doubt that having bases at Agrigentum and Morgantina favoured Mottones' offensives and skirmishes in Sicily, nor that this was of great help to the Carthaginian cause (Livy, 26 40.3: *Hanno erat imperator Carthaginienus, sed omnem in Mutine Numidisque spem repositam habebant*). This was true to such an extent that Carthage's position in Sicily in the year 211 only remained hopeful because of the actions of Mottones, and Polybius, in a fragmentary passage which is not clearly dated, records Rome sending an embassy to Egypt in order to obtain food supplies, since the cost of the Sicilian medimnus had reached the exorbitant level of fifteen drachms (Polybius, 9.11). Brunt is probably right in claiming that the sending of this embassy to Egypt can be dated exactly to the year 211, when Rome received grain imports from neither Sicily nor Sardinia,²⁹ at a time when the threat of Hannibal in Campania, and even in Lazio, prevented these fertile regions from being productively managed.



Fig. 9. AE. Iltirta. 90 BC. 24.97 grams. Male head right, three dolphins around/Horseman holding palm frond in right hand, left hand on rein, riding right; Iberian Iltirta below, Classical Numismatic Group, Triton XII, Auction date: 5 January 2010, Lot number 8.

29. BRUNT, *Italian Manpower*, 269-277; CORNELL, *Hannibal's Legacy*; 104.



Fig. 10. AR. ½ Shekel. Agrigentum. 210 BC. (Mottones). 4.14 grams. Male head right wearing wreath of grain ears; small pellet before and behind/Horse prancing right. Punic letter *h* below, all in a wreath, Classical Numismatic Group, Electronic Auction 104, Auction date, 22 December 2004, Lot number 17.

The successes of the Numidian chief in Sicily were not, however, to benefit the Carthaginian cause for ever. As the courage of Mottones had revealed itself to be one of the greatest obstacles to the achievement of a Roman victory in Sicily, Rome decided to win him over to their side. After the Numidian chief had been unjustly deprived of his command in favour of the son of Hanno (Livy, 26.40.9),³⁰ Mottones, who considered this to be an insult to his status, entered into secret negotiations with the Roman commander Laevinus, who had arrived in Sicily at the end of the year 210 (Livy, 26.40.1). In the aftermath of a heavy defeat for Hanno near the Himera river, Mottones opened the gates of the town of Agrigentum to the Roman forces on a day agreed previously with Laevinus, and Hanno and Epicydes were forced to flee to Africa. Livy (26.40.14) also reports that six other Sicilian towns were conquered by Mottones for Rome, while 40 more surrendered of their own accord and 20 were betrayed. Mottones' actions on Rome's behalf not only passed control of the entire island into the hands of Rome, but was also to prove providential for the Romans, as it enabled the reestablishment of grain provisioning (Livy, 26.40.15-6). As a reward for his distinguished service, Rome bestowed Roman citizenship on Mottones, who duly became Maarkos Oalerios Mottones (Livy, 27.5.7), and guaranteed his continuing command of the almost 3,000 mounted Numidians that still followed him.³¹



Fig. 11. AE. Morgantina. 211 BC. Veiled and wreathed head of Persephone-Demeter right/Prancing horse right, Punic *h* below, all in a wreath. MANFREDI, *Monete Puniche*, 334, no. 4.

30. LAZENBY, *Hannibal's War*, 119.

31. *Ibid.*, 172.

It seems valid to consider that the Numidian series of Agrigentum and Morgantina with a wreath on the reverse entirely surrounding the prancing horse signals the new alliance between Mottones and his garrisons, and Rome (Fig. 10, 11). The inclusion of wreaths on coins was a device that had been employed by towns like Melita in Malta³² or Cossura in Pantelleria³³ since the end of the third century (Fig. 12), in keeping with the new pro-Roman affiliation adopted by these *poleis* after the fall of Sicily. The appearance of wreaths on the coin issues of the Punic world and in the Western Mediterranean also tends to be associated with obedience to Rome on the part of the issuing mint. From this viewpoint, it must be understood that the Morgantina and Agrigentum issues which adopt this wreath on the reverse were coined in the year 210, and after the issues which do not display it. The adoption of these new garlands on the reverse as seen in the Agrigentum and Morgantina coins indicate precisely the beginning of the pro-Roman phase and the friendship between Mottones and Lavienus.³⁴ The letters *het* and *taw* were from then on substituted by simply *het* on silver coins, and so the Agrigentum series were standardized with those of Morgantina, where this epigraphic variation had always been used. The survival of the *h* in the second pro-Roman series of Agrigentum, as well as in the Morgantina series, indicates an unwillingness to modify in any way the recognition in Sicily of Mottones' status as a Numidian chief.



Fig. 12. AE. Islands of Cossura. Circa Late 3rd-Early 2nd Century BC. 7.06 grams. Head of Isis left, wearing khaft and necklace, being crowned by Nike flying before/Punic *yrnm* within wreath, Classical Numismatic Group, Triton V, Auction date: 15 January 2002, Lot number 280.

32. MANFREDI, *Monete Puniche*, 325, No. 1.

33. *Ibid.*, 326, Nos. 1-2.

34. *Ibid.*, 335, No. 8.

NUMIDIAN COINS IN ITALY: HANNIBAL'S GARRISONS IN MONS TIFATA-CAPUA, ARPI, SALAPIA, THURIUM, BENEVENTUM, LUCERIA AND LARINUM (216-207)

The silver and bronze series of Agrigentum and Morgantina with a prancing horse on the reverse are important Sicilian issues *per se*. They are, however, not unique in the central Mediterranean, since in the 3rd century there were also other coinages with this same figure in the southern half of the Italian peninsula. In this regard, Rudi Thomsen points out the clear similarities between a number of coin issues of the towns of Arpi (*HNI*, 633, 634, 635, 644, 645),³⁵ Salapia (*HNI*, 692),³⁶ Thurium (*HNI*, 1928),³⁷ Beneventum (*HNI*, 440),³⁸ Luceria (*HNI*, 668)³⁹ and Larinum (*HNI*, 623)⁴⁰ (Maps 2 & 3). The author considers all of these to be «incontestable imitation(s)» of the *Romano-Roma* didrachms with a prancing horse attributed to Rome (*HNI*, 275, 314).⁴¹ A small number of these issues also have eight-pointed stars (the Arpi didrachm), or stars with 15 or 16 rays, placed over the prancing horse (libral As of Luceria), probably referring to the associations with the sun of the Apollo or Persephone depicted on the obverse. Thomsen, however, appears to have lost hope as regards the analysis of all these Italian coins, as, in his words, «the reverse does not give any definite information on the origin of the coin».⁴² The author confesses too that he has been unable to decipher the obverses: «the Apollo type in question is so common that it is impossible to trace the true prototype». Thomsen does, nevertheless, show great intuition in perceiving that the figure of the prancing horse on the reverse «may be due to inspiration from either the Carthaginians or the Sicilian Greeks».



Map 2. Cities of Central Italy. RUTTER, *Historia Numorum*, Map 3.

35. RUTTER, *Historia Numorum*, 76-77, PL. 12.

36. *Ibid.*, 80, PL. 13.

37. *Ibid.*, 155, PL. 32.

38. *Ibid.*, 59, PL. 6.

39. *Ibid.*, 79, THOMSEN, *Early Roman Coinage*, 104-109.

40. *Ibid.*, 74, PL. 11.

41. *Ibid.*, 47, PL. 5; THOMSEN, *Early Roman Coinage*, 105.

42. THOMSEN, *Early Roman Coinage*, 105.



Map 3. Cities of Southern Italy. RUTTER, *Historia Numorum*, Map 4.

The precise chronological dating of all these series seems to have been a step too far for Thomsen, who very honestly confesses her confusion. As regards this and the libral as of Luceria (Fig. 13), the writer claims that «it must certainly have been copied from the Apollo didrachm in view... but, in the case of this coin also, we are unable to give a precise dating».⁴³ Other numismatists both before and after Thomsen have dared, however, to assign precise chronologies to these series. Sambon, for instance, believes that the Larinum bronze of the head of Minerva with a Corinthian helmet on the obverse and the legend *Ladinei* was minted around the year 250⁴⁴ (Fig. 14), a dating very little modified by Rutter *et al* (250-225).⁴⁵ According to this classification, the bronzes of Luceria must be seen as contemporary to the similar *Romano-Roma* series with the prancing horse, that is, in all cases preceding the Second Punic War:⁴⁶ around the year 260 for the didrachm with the head of Apollo and the 16-pointed star on the reverse (*HNI*, 275)⁴⁷ (Fig. 15), and around 230 for the figure with the head of a beardless Mars on the obverse, and a prancing horse and club on the reverse (Fig. 16).⁴⁸ Rutter *et al* argue quite rightly that the legend *Benventod* inscribed on the issues of the Roman colony of Beneventum (Fig. 17) suggests a chronological origin later than the year 268 for these coins, given that the town abandoned the less auspicious name of Maleventum precisely in that year (Livy, 9.27.14; Pliny, *NH*, 3.105). It is the belief of Rutter

43. THOMSEN, *Early Roman Coinage*, 107.

44. SAMBON, *Les monnaies antiques*, 118, 122, No. 200.

45. RUTTER, *Historia Numorum*, 74.

46. SAMBON, *Les monnaies antiques*, 421-445.

47. RUTTER, *Historia Numorum*, 47.

48. *Ibid.*, 49.

et al that the legend *Benventod* must have been chosen in commemoration of the change of name of the town, and because of this they prefer to assign to the appearance of this Beneventum series a date of issue around the years between 265 and 240.⁴⁹ Rutter *et al* suggest a similar chronology before the Second Punic War for the bronze issues of Arpi (*HNI*, 645) (Fig. 18), since these series, like the *Romano* series with the figure of the prancing horse in the hoards of Morino (*IGCH* 1995 = Crawford *RRCH* 54) and 1862 (*IGCH* 2005 = Crawford, *RRCH* 28),⁵⁰ are in a relatively poor condition. As regards the silver didrachms of Arpi with the legend *Δαιος* (Fig. 19), for the above authors dating goes as far back as the years 325-275, owing to a supposed metrological alignment of Arpi with Tarentum around the year 280.⁵¹ Finally, Rutter *et al* also consider the Thurium bronzes with the bust of Apollo facing right as ancient in origin (*HNI*, 1928) (Fig. 20),⁵² with an approximate minting of the year 280.



Fig. 13. Libral As. Luceria. 212 BC. C. Modio Cr. F. L. Pulio L. F., Laureate head of Apollo right/Horse prancing left. Above star. THOMSEN, *Early Roman Coinage*, 106, no. 15.

There is, however, one very important exception in the chronological cataloguing of Rutter *et al*: they consider that the final issue of the Arpi series (*HNI*, 645) (Fig. 18) is contemporary with the town's defection to Hannibal (215-212), and that the Salapia bronzes also follow a chronology centred on the Second Punic War (225-210) (Fig. 21).⁵³ If this dating is accepted, there can therefore be little doubt that the majority of these issues must be seen as pro-Carthaginian, and that they must be linked to the important Numidian garrisons which were set up in these towns after the battle of Cannae (216). We are fortunate in this case to have at our disposal reliable information from Pliny *NH* 3.104 and Strabo 6.3.9, who relate how the governor of the town of Arpi, Daïos, loyal to Rome up to the year 216, defected and made an alliance with Hannibal after the battle of Cannae (App., *Hann.*, 5.31). The legend *Pyllōs*, inscribed on the coins of Arpi (*HNI*, 645), also appears on those of

49. RUTTER, *Historia Numorum*, 59.

50. *Ibid.*, 77.

51. *Ibid.*, 76.

52. *Ibid.*, 155.

53. *Ibid.*, 80.

Salapia (*HNI*, 685-6, 690, 692) and Rubi (*HNI*, 809),⁵⁴ and so it seems clear that this refers to the same individual, thus proving that Arpi and Salapia shared the same leaders and common policies, and that Salapia defected to Hannibal at exactly the same time as Arpi. As a result of this new pro-Carthaginian alliance, from the year 216 onwards, the towns of Arpi and Salapia had at their disposal important Numidian garrisons. It is known that the garrison of Salapia was made up of 500 Numidian horsemen (Livy, 26.38.6-14), who fought very bravely against the forces of Marcellus which took the town in the year 210, and that only 50 of the horsemen survived.⁵⁵ The exact number in the Arpi garrison is not known, but it must also have been significant, judging from the speech delivered to the inhabitants of the town by the young Fabius in the year 213, in which he urged them to «cease paying tribute to Africa» (Livy, 24.47.5).⁵⁶ The towns of Arpi and Salapia were as close to Hannibal as Capua itself, and, like that city, Arpi and Salapia also served him as winter headquarters in the years 215/4 and 214/3. It therefore seems clear that all the coin series with prancing horses minted in Arpi and Salapia must have been connected with these towns' support for Hannibal's war effort in Italy in the years 216/215-210. Some particular issues may even contribute specific information on some of the roles played by these towns in Hannibal's geostrategy; the Salapia coin series in bronze, for example, which depicts on the obverse Apollo with a quiver on his shoulder and the legend Σαλαπινον, and on the reverse a prancing horse under a trident and the legend Πυλλου (*HNI*, 692),⁵⁷ forms proof of Salapia's role as the main Carthaginian port in the north of Puglia. It is possible too that Hannibal's decisive support for Arpi and Salapia helps us to understand the very *raison d'être* of the battle of Cannae, and the two towns' great strategic importance for Hannibal in terms of communication with Macedonia was certainly reflected in the stationing there for a number of years of two important garrisons of Numidian horsemen.



Fig. 14. AE. Larinum. 208 BC. Head of Minerva, wearing Corinthian helmet/ Horse prancing right, above star and below *Ladinei*. THOMSEN, *Early Roman Coinage* 106, no. 15.

54. RUTTER, *Historia Numorum*, 76.

55. LAZENBY, *Hannibal's War*, 170.

56. *Ibid.*, 88.

57. RUTTER, *Historia Numorum*, 80, PL. 13.



Fig. 15. AR. Didrachm. Capua. 216-211 BC. 7.35 grams. *Romano*, Laureate head of Apollo to left/Horse prancing to right, above star of sixteen rays. Leu Numismatic AG, Auction 86, Auction date: 5 May 2003, Lot number 647.

In terms of Carthaginian strategy, Arpi may be considered even more important than Salapia. Arpi was the first of the two to be attacked by Rome, and the governor of the town between the years 216 and 213,⁵⁸ Daio, must be linked not only with the town's bronze coinings, but also with the didrachms catalogued by Rutter *et al* as between the years 325 and 275. The style of these silver coins (with Persephone on the obverse and a beautifully-drawn horse on the reverse) fits in well with the artwork of the Carthaginian issues typical of the Second Punic War (Fig. 19). The horse depicted on the reverse, besides, may be related to the presence in the town of a more significant and mobile Numidian garrison than that of Salapia, where the variant *HNI* 692b,⁵⁹ with a prancing horse and palm, may be found (Fig. 21), in exact parallel with the way this figure is present in the secondary mint of Morgantina (Fig. 8). The series *HNI* 692b must be identified with the 500 Numidian horsemen from the permanent garrison at Salapia, while on the other hand the Arpi didrachms may have been coined on behalf of a more important and mobile Numidian detachment, probably linked to Hannibal himself, who spent the winter of the year 215/4 in the town.



Fig. 16. AR Didrachm. Capua. 216-211 BC. 6.18 grams. Head of Mars right, wearing crested Corinthian helmet, club behind/Horse prancing right, club above, *Roma* below, Classical Numismatic Group, Triton IX, Auction date: 10 January 2006, Lot n.: 1257.

58. RUTTER, *Historia Numorum*, 76.

59. *Ibid.*, 80.



Fig. 17. AE. Beneventum. 212 BC. 7.03 grams. *Benven-tod*, Laureate head of Apollo left/ *Pro Pom*, horse prancing right, pentagram above. Classical Numismatic Group, Triton V, Auction date: 15 January 2002, Lot number 11.



Fig. 18. AE. Arpi. 216-213 BC. 8.10 grams. Bull butting right, ΠΟΥΛΛΙ below/Horse prancing right. Classical Numismatic Group, Electronic Auction 94, Auction date: 21 July 2004, Lot number 3.



Fig. 19. AR. Stater. Arpi. 216-213 BC. 7.04 grams. Head of Persephone to left, wearing a barley wreath, to right, grain ear/Horse prancing to left. Above star of eight rays. Leu Numismatik AG, Auction 81, Auction date: 16 May 2001.



Fig. 20. AE. Thurium. 212-211 BC. (Mottones) 2.33 grams. Wreathed head of Apollon right. Prancing horse right, *Qoy* above. Monogram below. Münzen & Medaillen Deutschland GmbH, Auction 13, Auction date: 9 October 2003, Lot number 40.

As Thomsen points out, the didrachms and bronzes of Arpi and Salapia display remarkable typological parallels with the figure of the prancing horse of the region of Campania. To the extent that, were the legend *Romano* or *Roma* excluded, it would not be unreasonable to ascribe these issues to the Numidian garrisons stationed on Mons Tifata, near Capua, between the years 216 and 211. The proportion of Numidian and Celtic horsemen in the cavalry of the Mons Tifata garrison was so overwhelming that, as in the case of Arpi, a major Roman figure, here Varro in person, attempted to convince the citizens of Capua to remain loyal to Rome and not to become «a province of the Numidians and the Moors» (Livy, 23.5.11-13).⁶⁰ In this respect it is highly significant that Celtic imitative coins of the *Roma* type (Fig. 22), with a protome of a horse on the reverse, have been found in the Po Valley and in Bohemia (Fig. 23). These coins are attributed to the *boii* Celts, long-term allies of Hannibal and always enemies of Rome. There is no question that the *boii* Celts fought in Campania, but it is most unlikely that they did so on the side of the Romans, and even less likely that they were almost the only group to imitate this coin type with the protome of a horse in the Po Valley for solely economic motives. There seems little doubt that it was the *boii* who copied the *Roma* type with the protome of a horse formed part of Hannibal's cavalry at Mons Tifata, and this is one of several reasons to question the affiliation to Rome in Latium of many of these coin types with the epigraph *Romano* or *Roma*. Another, perhaps even more potent, reason to doubt this affiliation between the *Roma* of the epigraphs on Campanian coins and the city of Rome in Latium is the absence of any relationship between any of the figures engraved on these series and any recognized types from the city itself.

60. LAZENBY, *Hannibal's War*, 88.



Fig. 21. AE. Salapia. 216-210 BC. 5.83 grams. Laureate head of Apollo right, X behind/Horse prancing right, palm branch and (X) above, Classical Numismatic Group, Electronic Auction 215, Auction date: 29 July 2009, Lot number 8.

In relation to these issues, Crawford claims that the didrachms with the head of Hercules on the obverse and a she-wolf with twin cubs and the legend *Romano* on the reverse (HNI, 287) (Fig. 24) «cannot be assigned with any certainty to a particular mint and it is perhaps best to be agnostic rather than assign it to Rome».⁶¹ We may go a step further, however, and wonder whether this issue and others of the very numerous *Romano-Roma* series (HNI, 266-267, 275-317)⁶² were minted in Rome at all, or under its supervision in Campania. The Heracles shown on the obverse of this issue is very similar to the one depicted on a distinctive Capuan coin with an Oscan inscription (Fig. 25) and a number of not insignificant issues in silver and bronze with the legend in Oscan *Kapu* (HNI, 479-510) (Fig. 26)⁶³ are attributed to Capua, the second largest city in Italy and the most important of all the towns in the peninsula allied with Carthage. Capua was the ethnic name of this city –from *Καμπανο* or *Καππανος*⁶⁴– but this was probably not its only name. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 1.73.3 recounts that, after the death of Aeneas, his kingdom was divided up between his three sons, Ascanius, Romulus and Remus. The first of these inherited power over the Latins, founding Alba among other towns. Nothing is known about Romulus, the second son, but it is said of Remus, the third, that he founded four towns in Italy: Capua, Anchisa, Aeneia and Rome.⁶⁵ According to Dionysius Hal., 1.73.3, Capua was a city of Trojan origin⁶⁶ and, although the norm is to think of a Roman influence over Capua and not vice versa, a fragment of Cephalaon of Gergis (FGH, 45F8 = *Etim. Magn.* 490G) shows Romulus and Remus, sons of Aeneas, as the founders of Rome and of Capua at the same time (Fig. 27).⁶⁷

61. CRAWFORD, *Coinage and Money*, 31.

62. RUTTER, *Historia Numorum*, Pl. 5.

63. *Ibid.*, 64-66, Pl. 7-9.

64. *Ibid.*, 64, Nos. 476-478.

65. SALOMONSON, «Telephus und die römische», 26-30.

66. NIESE, «Die Sagen», 490; SCHUR, «Griechische», 145; MARTÍNEZ-PINNA, «Rhome: el elemento», 95; MARTÍNEZ-PINNA, *La prehistoria mítica*, 145.

67. RICHMOND, «Review», 218; MOMIGLIANO, «Review», 100; MARTÍNEZ-PINNA, *La prehistoria mítica*, 144.



Fig. 22. AR. Didrachm. Capua. 216-211 BC. 6.71 grams, Head of Mars right, wearing crested Corinthian helmet, decorated with a griffin/Horse head right, wearing bridle, bit and reins, sickle behind, *Roma* below. Classical Numismatic Group, Triton IX, Auction date: 10 January 2006, Lot number 1254.



Fig. 23. AR. Drachm. Capua. 216-211 BC. 4.06 grams. Head right, wearing a diadem in the form of a helmet visor but with wavy hair above, to right geometrical ornament/*Roma*, Head of bridled horse to right, Leu Numismatik AG, Auction 83, Auction date: 6 May 2002, Lot number 559.



Fig. 24. AR. Didrachm. Capua. 216-211 BC. 7.20 grams. Diademed head of Heracles to right, club and lionskin over his shoulder/*Romano*. She-wolf suckling twins to right. LHS Numismatik AG, Auction 100. Auction date: 23 April 2007, Lot number 371.



Fig. 25. AE. Biunx. Capua. 216-211 BC. 13.56 grams. Diademed head of Herakles right, club over shoulder/Lion walking right, holding spear in its mouth, two pellets above, Classical Numismatic Group, Mail Bid Sale 67, Auction date: 22 September 2004, Lot number 59.

Capua must therefore be considered as a kind of Campanian Rome, in the same way that the *Urbs Quadrata* was established in a Rome in Latium. There are a number of Hellenic coin issues with the legend *Athenai* (or *Athe*), and not all of these should be ascribed to the Athens of Attica, Greece; this does not appear to be a cause of confusion for numismatists or historians. Besides, there are innumerable Hellenic and Italian towns which represent on the obverse figures of the helmeted head of Athena-Minerva, and similarly the representation of Minerva-Roma in Italy, or the use of the title «Roma», during the Second Punic War should not be automatically connected to the Rome of Latium. *Romano(rum)*, too, is a genitive formulation found in coin legends that has nothing to do with Latium, and a great deal to do with Greek Campania, and likewise the figures of Mars and the protome of the horse (*HNI*, 266-7; 278, 297-299), of the lion walking towards the right (*HNI*, 278), or of Apollo with a prancing horse and star (*HNI*, 275) have little relationship with Latium. In contrast, all these figures are entirely pro-Carthaginian, and must be seen in the context of the issues of the pro-Hannibal Capua of the Second Punic War. Almost all *HNI* coins from 266 and 275-317 must similarly be ascribed to the pro-Carthaginian Capua of the years 216-211. The «Kapu» series, on the other hand, may be related to the *chora* of the city of Capua.

The didrachms with the head of a laurel-wreathed Apollo on the obverse and a prancing horse on the reverse (*HNI*, 275, 306) (Fig. 15) should be seen as coins minted in the city of Capua, but earmarked for Hannibal's Numidian garrisons of Mons Tifata, or other similar locations. The great similarity between these didrachms and those of Arpi may indicate that these *Romano* issues perhaps coincide with the first period when Hannibal was in and around Capua, that is, the years 216-214. This in turn explains the mixture of Capuan *Romano* and Arpi coins in the hoards of Morino (*IGCH* 1995 = Crawford *RRCH* 54) and 1862 (*IGCH* 2005 = Crawford, *RRCH* 28), given that both Arpi and *Romano* series are attributed to the years 216-211 and destined for troops of Numidian origin. On the other hand, the issues with Mars on the obverse and

Roma and a prancing horse on the reverse may be understood as successive issues to the first ones bearing the figure of Apollo, but equally earmarked for pro-Carthaginian cavalry stationed on Mons Tifata or other locations in the vicinity of Capua (Fig. 16, 22, 23).



Fig. 26. AE. Quincux. Capua. 216-211 BC. 26.16 grams. Head of Minerva right, wearing triple crested Attic helmet/KA-PU (in Oscan)/Pegasos flying right, five pellets below. Classical Numismatic Group, Triton VII, Auction date; 12 January 2004, Lot n: 6.



Fig. 27. AE. Capua. 216-211 BC. 1.35 grams. Head of Telephus right, wearing Phrygian cap/Hind right suckling Telephus. Numismatica Ars Classica, Auction O, Auction date: 13 May 2004, Lot number 1018.

Arpi, Salapia and Capua-Mons Tifata were home to very important Numidian garrisons in Italy, and this is reflected in the highly distinctive coin series with the prancing horse. These garrisons were in Italy between the years 216 and 210, but no longer, as their cities were then abandoned or fell into enemy hands. Livy 26.38.14 relates how, after the loss in the year 210 of

Salapia with its garrison of 500 Numidian horsemen, Hannibal never again enjoyed superiority in cavalry in Italy (*nec deinde umquam Poenus, quo longe plurimum valuerat, equitatu superior fuit*). Livy's claim may appear exaggerated, as Lazenby believes, especially bearing in mind that Hannibal possessed several thousand Numidian horsemen in the years before 210.⁶⁸ Livy 26.40. 4-12 does express, however, the disastrous effect that the fall of Salapia had on Hannibal, immediately prior to the defection of Mottones to Laevinus in Sicily. As Hannibal had sent Mottones to Sicily in the year 211 with a decisive force of 3,000 Numidians, the loss of 500 African horsemen in Italy in the year 210 was indeed, in the words of Livy, a catastrophe for the already depleted Carthaginian cavalry in the peninsula. Thanks to the coin series catalogued by Rutter *et al* as *HNI*, 1928⁶⁹ (Fig. 20), we know that these 3,000 horsemen left for Sicily from the town of Thurium, mainstay of Carthaginian power on the south coast of the Italian peninsula during much of the war.

The small bronze coin series *HNI* 1928, minted in Thurium, shows on the right of the obverse a head of Apollo with short hair and ears of corn in it (this is not mentioned by Rutter *et al*). On the reverse, there is a prancing horse on the right, with an abbreviation under it which is thought to be an inscription of ethnic character. This type of bronze coin is small, of around 15 mm in diameter and weighing three grams. If the figure on the reverse is to be related to the issues of Arpi, Salapia and Romano-Roma, as Thomsen suggests, it must be recognized that this is an issue earmarked for the cavalry of the Numidian army. However, while the reverse is important, the most interesting element is the obverse. The Apollo of issue *HNI* 1928 is identical, with its short hair, ears of corn and style, to the bust depicted on the fractions of shekel minted in Agrigentum on behalf of Mottones (Fig. 1, 10). There is no reference to the royalty of Mottones in this issue (*ht*), but this is only to be expected in a civic issue minted in an Italian town allied with Hannibal. This series must in any case be considered to have been coined in the year 211 and in the context of Mottones' preparations for the move to Sicily. Mottones' Numidian cavalry had doubtlessly contributed to the capture of Tarentum in the year 212, one of Hannibal's greatest successes in the war, given that it also prompted the defections of Metapontum and Thurium to Carthage's cause (Livy, 25.15.7). Appian's *Hannibalic War* 6.35 also indicates that Heraclea passed over to the Carthaginian side at that time, making the entire region of the southern Italian coast safe for a maritime operation like that which was planned for Sicily in the year 211. Because of this, and owing to the extraordinary similarity in style between the series of Thurium and Agrigentum, it seems clear that it was from Thurium that Hannibal decided to send his reinforcements to Agrigentum, and that the coin engravers of each mint were one and the same, from Thurium. The Thurium issue also helps to clarify the true nature of the Agrigentum

68. LAZENBY, *Hannibal's War*, 170.

69. RUTTER, *Historia Numorum*, 155, Pl. 32.

bust: it was not Triptolemus, as claimed by Burnett and Walker, but neither was it Hannibal or Epicydes, nor even Mottones. The bust represented in the Agrigentum issues of the year 211-210 alludes in fact to Apollo: an Apollo quite different from the norm, who is depicted with short hair with ears of corn in it, owing to his special relationship with Persephone, but at the end of the day it is Apollo.

The features and hair of the Apollo represented in the bronze issues of Beneventum (*HNI*, 440) (Fig. 17)⁷⁰ and Luceria (*HNI*, 668) (Fig. 13)⁷¹ are more in keeping with other Italian issues. These issues with the prancing horse, and in the case of Luceria with a star over the steed, must be considered to have been earmarked for a variety of Numidian garrisons. It is known that Fabius ordered Gracchus to go to Beneventum and his son to Luceria in the year 214 (Livy, 24.7.10),⁷² Fabius' aim was to prevent Hanno from moving north unopposed from Bruttium as far as Campania. According to Livy 24.15.2, this Carthaginian general possessed 17,000 infantry troops, most of whom came from Bruttium or Lucania, but also 1,200 horsemen, almost all of whom were Numidians or Moors.⁷³ Hanno suffered an overwhelming defeat at Beneventum, fleeing with just 2,000 men, almost without exception Numidian and Moorish horsemen (Livy, 24.14.16). It is clearly not to the years 214/3 that a few scanty philo-Numidian series from the towns of Beneventum and Luceria must be attributed, but in the year 212, when the population of Capua, in desperation, begged for the help of Hannibal, who at that time had just conquered Tarentum, and the latter sent a cavalry contingent of 2,000 horsemen to Beneventum from the south, this time with greater success. In the year 212 the Carthaginian cavalry, made up largely of Numidians, did manage to inflict a heavy defeat on its Roman adversaries (Livy, 25.19.1-2). Titus Sempronius Gracchus himself, who happened to be in Luceria at the time and had seemingly not witnessed the defeat at Beneventum, was killed in a second encounter with the forces of Hannibal (Livy, 25.16-7).⁷⁴ Both towns, Beneventum and Luceria, seem to have been left without significant Roman forces in the year 212. The philo-Numidian series, both in Beneventum and in Luceria, must as a result be ascribed precisely to this Carthaginian attempt to provide assistance to Capua from the south of the Italian peninsula. The two issues should be considered as a testimony of the presence of a variety of Numidian garrisons in these towns under the command of Hanno, and these garrisons remained there until they were expelled by Q. Fulvius Flaccus (Livy, 25.13-4).⁷⁵

70. RUTTER, *Historia Numorum*, 59, PL. 6.

71. *Ibid.*, 79; THOMSEN, *Early Roman Coinage*, 104-109.

72. LAZENBY, *Hannibal's War*, 101.

73. *Ibid.*, 102.

74. *Ibid.*, 113.

75. *Ibid.*, 112-113.

Almost all these pro-Carthaginian issues minted in Italy on behalf of Numidian mounted troops seem to be concentrated in the phase of the war in which Hannibal presented a real danger to Rome (216-210). The bronze Larinum issue (*HNI*, 623) (Fig. 14)⁷⁶ appears to be the only one that may be attributed to the second period, when Hannibal was experiencing difficulties in Italy (210-203). The Larinum series with a prancing horse on the right and a star above on the reverse, but this time with the head of Minerva wearing a Corinthian helmet on the obverse, has in common with earlier issues that it was related to a Numidian offensive in Italy, or, to be more precise, with the reconnaissance raid which Hannibal organized to the town in the year 208, only fifteen miles from the Adriatic and in the same region as Salapia and Arpi.⁷⁷ Hannibal intended to join up with the army of Hasdrubal, which had recently crossed the Alps. Livy 27.42.10-13 refers to the progress of Hannibal's Numidians, who formed the spearhead of his northward march, and, although Lazenby casts doubt on Livy's claim that Hannibal reached as far north as Larinum,⁷⁸ the existence in this town of a series with a philo-Numidian style rearing horse is proof of the validity of Livy's testimony. Hannibal's wait for his meeting with Hasdrubal took place in Larinum, and that was also where he must have heard the disastrous news of the defeat and death of his brother in the battle of Metaurus in the year 207 (Polybius, 11.3.2).⁷⁹

The Carthaginian coin type with a prancing horse on the reverse is uncommon in the West, but is concentrated particularly in Numidian Africa. The seven Italian mints mentioned earlier made this type solely because of the presence of Numidian garrisons in the vicinity. Some Arpi and Salapia series, in contrast to those of Agrigentum, Morgantina or Thurium, have proper names inscribed on the surfaces of the coins, and in this regard it is significant that the coins of the greatest value of all, the didrachms of Arpi (*HNI*, 633), are those engraved with the name Dasios or Daïos (Δαίου), the very same who appears in Appian *Hannibalic War* 5.31 as the one who surrendered in person to Hannibal after the battle of Cannae. Pyllos, on the other hand, does not seem to have been so important a personality as Daïos, and indeed his name is limited solely to the bronze coins of Arpi and Salapia (*HNI*, 645, 692). The legend in the genitive case Τρωδαντίου, associated with the horses with palm of the Salapia garrison (*HNI*, 692b), probably refers to the greatest official of the town shortly before it fell into Roman hands in the year 210. All these names may in any case be linked to important magistrates in the towns, given that the latter were probably responsible for the task of supplying provisions and lodging for the Numidian troops in the town. It seems unlikely, however, that the magistrates were the direct commanders of the Numidian units. This

76. RUTTER, *Historia Numorum*, 74, Pl. 11.

77. LAZENBY, *Hannibal's War*, 185.

78. *Ibid.*, 185.

79. *Ibid.*, 190.

interpretation is also supported by legends including the names of the towns or other non-Numidian names with civic connotations. As regards Larinum, there are no proper names (*HNI*, 623: *Ladinei*), but at Beneventum (*HNI*, 440: *Benventod*) the inscription *Pro Pom* appears, and this may be connected to a magistrate, while at Luceria, the legend (*HNI*, 668), *C. Modio CR. F. L. PVIIIO L. F.* seems to refer to two local magistrates.

It seems logical that the issues with a prancing horse from the two Sicilian mints, Agrigentum and Morgantina, as well as those from one peninsular Italian one, Thurium, might be linked with Mottones. The Numidian cavalry which was in Agrigentum, Morgantina, Heraclea Minoa or elsewhere in Sicily in the years 211-210 was in the final analysis under the command of Mottones, referred to as a *praefectus* by Livy 26.21.15. For centuries it was typical for chiefs or «kings» allied to Rome to be described as *praefecti alae*, that is, commanders of a cavalry unit of variable size. The famous Batavian chief of the first century, Julius Civilis, for example, appears twice in Tacitus' narrative for the year 68, though he was the prefect of only one cohort (*Tac. Hist.*, 4.16.1; 4.32.2), but his brother Iulius Paulus also led a second cohort, and there is evidence of other Batavian nobles being leaders of the remaining six cohorts out of the total of eight which were allied to Rome at the time. In a loose sense, Iulius Civilis seems to have been the figurehead of all the Batavian cohorts (*Tac., Hist.* 4.33). Though it is no more than a speculative hypothesis, it is conceivable that the organization of Mottones' Numidians was similar to that of the Batavians of the first century A.D. The chronological continuity noticeable in the early issues of the prancing horse in Sicily after their termination in peninsular Italy in the year 211 strongly suggests that Mottones was the most important Numidian leader in Italy before the year 211, and that the Numidian garrisons of Mons Tifata, Arpi, Salapia, etc. may have been made up of detachments which ultimately obeyed his orders. The local *praefecti* of these Italian garrisons may or may not have been related to Mottones by blood, but it is nevertheless very likely, as in the case of the Batavians, that they all belonged to the Libyan-Phoenician aristocracy linked to Carthage.

NUMIDIAN COINS IN IBERIA: MASSINISSA IN CARTHAGO NOVA, THE LEVANTE REGION AND THE GUADALQUIVIR VALLEY (211-206)

Like Sicily and Italy, Iberia also minted coin series for its Numidian troops. These coins were silver shekels of around 23 mm in diameter with the bust of Tanit/Persephone with a crown of ears of corn on the obverse, and a prancing horse with an eight-pointed star on the reverse (Fig. 28). The most significant finds containing this type of coin have been those of Seville (2), the Gades



Fig. 28. AR. Shekel. Carthago Nova. 212-211/209 BC. 6.91 grams. Wreathed head of Persefone/Tanit left/Horse prancing right, star above, Classical Numismatic Group, Mail Bid Sale 58, Auction date: 19 September 2001, Lot number 12

area (3), Mogente (1), Cheste (6),⁸⁰ Valeria (2), and above all the so-called Tangier hoard (13).⁸¹ These Carthaginian coinages in Iberia are attributed by Villaronga and Alfaro to the period between the years 227 and 221,⁸² believed to be contemporary with the decisive phase of the expansion of influence of Hasdrubal in Iberia.⁸³ Villaronga also establishes that this issue, which he calls «Class VII»,⁸⁴ was coined at neither Carthago Nova nor Akra Leuké, but in Seville or the surrounding area.⁸⁵

For Villaronga, this «Class VII» follows a «Class VI», made up of gold coins with the same type of reverse, showing the prancing horse on the right, but without a star.⁸⁶ On the obverse there is in this case a female bust facing left with a wing attached to the back, which has led to the belief that this was a representation of Nike. Villaronga also divides these issues into two types (with or without a small globe under the horse), and into two groups (with or without a palm symbol on the obverse). There are no archaeologically documented Iberian hoards which contains this kind of gold staters inside,⁸⁷ though it is possible, as this numismatist suggests, that these coins have been considered part and parcel of international commerce, and not Hispanic in nature.

These «Class VI» gold staters and «Class VII» Hispano-Carthaginian silver shekels with the figure of the prancing horse do, however, display details which

80. VILLARONGA, *Las monedas*, 75 (Cheste), 77 (Mogente), 78 (Gades), 80 (Sevilla), 82 (Valeria), 87 (synoptic chart); VILLARONGA, «Diez años de novedades»; ALFARO ASÍNS, «La ceca de Gadir», 32.

81. VILLARONGA, «The Tanger Hoard», 151, pl. 35, nos. 36-48.

82. ALFARO ASÍNS, «La ceca de Gadir», 32.

83. ALFARO ASÍNS, *Los Bárcidas*, 70-79; VILLARONGA, *Las monedas*, 127.

84. VILLARONGA, *Las monedas*, 127, 137, 149-150, pl. 9, nos. 71-80.

85. ALFARO ASÍNS, «La ceca de Gadir», 32.

86. JENKINS / LEWIS, *Carthaginian Gold*, 116-117, pl. 22, nos. 454-460.

87. VILLARONGA, *Las monedas*, 126.

betray a very high standard of manufacture, and this is one of the reasons that make it difficult to believe either the chronological dating usually ascribed or the geographical range from the Atlantic coast of the south northwards. In the case of the shekels, the alignment of the axes is decidedly regular, fixed as it is around the 12 o'clock mark,⁸⁸ and regular alignment of this kind is associated with Carthaginian issues coined in official stable mints.⁸⁹ The hypothesis of a mint at Seville does not fit in with the regular alignment of these issues, which in contrast suggests an important established mint like that of Carthago Nova, the Punic capital of the region. There is no doubt that Gadir and its hinterland in the direction of Seville were areas of Phoenician-Semitic culture at the end of the third century, but this does not mean that this town necessarily followed the Punic military policy. As an independent town, it is unlikely that Gadir, or its hinterland towards the Guadalquivir, should have become bases for Carthaginian operations in the years immediately before the Second Punic War. The military operations of the Carthaginian army in the vicinity of Seville were indeed highly significant, but they did not occur before the campaign of Ilipa in the year 206,⁹⁰ and there is indeed no written evidence saying that in the years 230-220 the area of the lower Guadalquivir was a high priority for the Carthaginian military effort. From this point of view, a historic parallel with the activities of the Byzantine Carthage of the sixth and seventh centuries A.D. in the same region might help us to better understand the evolution of an expansionist Carthage in the Iberia of the years 237-218. In the sixth and seventh centuries, as in Barcid times, the influence of Byzantine Carthage in Iberia began in Carthago Nova and spread through Lorqui (Lorca) towards Castulo and Baecula and from there across the Guadalquivir valley and towards the interior of the peninsula through Oretania and the land of the Olkades (Map 4). The towns of the south coast, including Gadir, were of secondary importance to the geopolitical and military policy of Carthage between the years 237 and 209,⁹¹ and in the Barcid period as in the Byzantine, the fundamental military activity of Carthage took place from a base at Carthago Nova and from the south-east towards the interior, rather than from the mouth of the Guadalquivir northwards.

Robinson believed that the shekels with the elephant minted in Sicily (Fig. 2) were in fact manufactured in Spain,⁹² but while today it is known that these shekels were produced in Sicily between the years 213 and 210, the Siculo-Italian characteristics of the engravers of the Spanish shekels (Fig. 29) is very clear to the experienced numismatist.⁹³ Besides, the production of the elephant series in Spain was very small, and it is found in very few Hispanic

88. VILLARONGA, «The Tanger Hoard», 151.

89. CALLATAY, *Les monnaies grecques*, 40.

90. LAZENBY, *Hannibal's War*, 144-156.

91. HOYOS, *Hannibal's Dynasty*, 63-86.

92. ROBINSON, *Punic coins*, 43, 52-53; BURNETT, «The coinage of Punic», 387.

93. MANFREDI, *Monete Puniche*, 210 and note 450.

hoards, which indicates that dates as early and as wide-ranging as is normally suggested (from the year 237 onwards for a number of years) are unlikely. The degree of wear on the elephant shekels found in the Mazarrón hoard, situated very close to Carthago Nova, is insignificant when compared to other issues considered to be much later in origin,⁹⁴ and it must therefore be understood that these elephant issues played no part in financing the Barcid conquest of Iberia from the year 237 onwards (Villaronga's Class III).⁹⁵ They were, on the contrary, coined at some time between the year 212/211, when the new Italo-African reinforcements disembarked in Carthago Nova, and 209, when the Punic capital in Iberia fell into the hands of Scipio the Younger. This series were minted to be given to elephant drivers who had settled in Carthago Nova in a ceremony involving a military parade, a *dokimasia*, similar to those normally arranged in the ancient world for cavalry units.



Map. 4.

94. VOLK, T. (2006): 214-215.

95. ALFARO ASÍNS, «La ceca de Gadir», 31.



Fig. 29 AR. Tridrachm. Carthago Nova. 212-211 BC. 11.26 grams. Laureate head of Melqart left, club over far shoulder/African elephant right. Gemini LLC, Auction V, Auction date: 6 January 2009, Lot number 511.

The so-called hoard «of Morocco» or «of Tangier» also plays a key role in the cataloguing of both Hispano-Carthaginian series in general, and the prancing horse series in particular (13 examples were found in it). Villaronga himself considers that this hoard was hidden in the years 211-210,⁹⁶ a correct date arrived at largely thanks to the presence within it of seven shekels with the elephant figure of Agrigentum (213-210) and a fraction of a shekel with the garlandless prancing horse of Mottones (211).⁹⁷ It is Villaronga's view that the chronological range for the minting of the coins hidden in this hoard must be between the years 237 and 210. However, and as he himself points out, the issues with the figure of the prow of a ship on the reverse, thought by him to have been coined at Gadir around the year 237 (Class II) (Fig. 30)⁹⁸ are in the same excellent state of conservation as those minted in the years 211/210.⁹⁹ The issues with the prow must be assumed then to have been coined in the year 212 or 211 at Carthago Nova, and not in the year 237 at Cadiz. These coinings in fact coincided with the massive Carthaginian troop reinforcements which allowed the Barcids to have at their disposal three significant armies in Spain in the years 212/211.¹⁰⁰

The series with the prancing horse on the reverse which were minted in Iberia display clear parallels with the Apollonian-type issues of the same type coined in Italy and Sicily between the years 215 and 210¹⁰¹. In the case of the gold staters, Alfaro also points out the great similarity between the «Nike»

96. VILLARONGA, «The Tanger Hoard», 162.

97. *Ibid.*, 154, NOS. 91-97.

98. ALFARO ASÍNS, «La ceca de Gadir», 31.

99. VILLARONGA, «The Tanger Hoard», 160.

100. LAZENBY, *Hannibal's War*, 130.

101. VILLARONGA, *Las monedas*, 61-62 correctly points out the relationship between these issues.

depicted on the obverse of the Hispanic coins and the one represented on those minted by the pro-Hannibal Bruttians in the south of Italy (*HNI*, 1989).¹⁰² The appearance of symbols on the obverse and reverse in this Hispanic series implies a fast, rhythmic production on the part of the coin engravers. The Bruttian series with Nike on the obverse have been correctly dated by Rutter *et al* and other numismatists to the years 211-203,¹⁰³ and the Hispanic gold issues could not have been coined before the Second Punic War, as their chronology runs parallel to that of the Italian series and thus after the year 212. Similarly, the Hispano-Punic silver series with the prow of the ship also have a parallel in Italy, both in terms of their general style and in the adoption of symbols which provide the issues with a chronology (the sea horse and the dolphin). The vast majority of Hispano-Carthaginian issues may not therefore be ascribed to the years 237-206, but to the years between 212/211 and 206. The figure of the prancing horse with the star must consequently be considered to be Italian in manufacture and Numidian in terms of who it was destined for, and it should also be understood that these issues, both gold and silver, were minted by the Carthaginian authorities at Carthago Nova and for the mounted troops of Massinissa, who were present in Spain between the years 212 and 206. Massinissa was the only important Numidian commander who was active in Iberia¹⁰⁴ during the Second Punic War after the years 212/211, and it is to him that these series must be attributed.¹⁰⁵

Massinissa fought on Carthage's behalf in Iberia, at Ilorci (211),¹⁰⁶ Baecula (208),¹⁰⁷ Ilipa (206)¹⁰⁸ and in other lesser skirmishes.¹⁰⁹ The hoards of Seville, the Gades area, Mogente, Cheste, Valeria and Tangier which contain shekels of Numidian affiliation indicate the areas in which Massinissa fought for Carthage's cause, namely the south-east and east of the peninsula (inland as far as Cuenca) and the Guadalquivir valley. These Numidian series are not related to the conquest of Iberia by Carthage, but with its defense against the Roman enemy from the year 212 onwards. Although Massinissa and his Numidian troops fought in Hispania on behalf of Carthage until the year 206,¹¹⁰ it is likely that the vast majority, and perhaps all, of these issues were minted between the disembarkation of Massinissa at Carthago Nova in the years 212/211 and the capture of the city by Scipio the Younger in the year 209. This coincides with the period when the combined troops of Massinissa and other elements of the Carthaginian army were most organized in their struggle against Rome.

102. RUTTER, *Historia Numorum*, 32

103. *Ibid.*, 160, pl. 33.

104. While it has been suggested that Naravas may have been in Iberia, there is no evidence whatsoever that this Numidian prince ever set foot in Iberia, HOYOS, *Hannibal's Dynasty*, 52.

105. ACIMOVIC, *Scipio Africanus*, 34.

106. LAZENBY, *Hannibal's War*, 130-131.

107. *Ibid.*, 142-143.

108. *Ibid.*, 150-151.

109. *Ibid.*, 143.

110. *Ibid.*, 198.



Fig. 30. AR. Shekel. Carthago Nova. 212-211/209 BC. 7.40 grams. Diademed male head left/
Prow of Galley right with shield on its deck, below dolphin right, Classical Numismatic Group,
Triton VIII, Auction date: 11 January 2005, Lot number 13.

CONCLUSIONS

Professor M^a Paz García-Bellido has often stressed that Carthaginian coin series, or those of Punic affiliation, never possessed an established repertoire of iconography, and in general terms this assertion remains true. An in-depth examination, however, of the iconographic variations employed in Carthaginian coin series appears to show that there was a distinction between series earmarked for different military and ethnic groups. The aim here has been to show through one instance, the coin series with the figure of Apollo-Persephone with ears of corn and a prancing horse, the characteristically precise nature of the relationship between production and distribution which existed in the Punic world. In this article I have concentrated on the Numidian component of the Carthaginian army, but there were also other parts of the army with different coin series, just as there were a large number of pro-Carthaginian civic issues in the West, especially in Italy. Issues of different value were at times used incredibly frequently as payments for the military (bronze coins for garrisons or military encampments), while others were uncommon and widely spaced out timewise (shekels for campaigns).

The experience of the modern historian and numismatist tends to be rooted in a classic Graeco-Roman framework, and the history of the Punic Wars, about which pro-Roman authors have ensured we are relatively well-informed, has generally been understood as the catalyst of Roman expansion in the Mediterranean. Although Spain is known to have shown a greater degree of sympathy for the Punic cause than the norm, there can be little doubt that the military, civic and coin-producing complexity of the Carthaginian world has not yet been fully understood, in contrast to the obsessive research that

has taken place into the first, or most important, Roman or Latian issues in Italy. The Carthaginian issues, completely integrated in the Greco-Italian world of which they were part, always depended heavily on Sicily and on Magna Graecia in general, and it would perhaps be logical therefore to view Carthage as another Hellenic superpower with its interests and allies in Italy. It is possible that coin production in the Italy of the third century is much more comprehensible if Carthage is placed in a more central position, and the supposedly omnipresent role of Rome itself reexamined to some degree. Such an inversion or clarification of roles might also be usefully applied to other regions and coin issues in the West, from Cadiz to the Po Valley.

To conclude, it may be relevant to point out that, while Carthage and Carthaginian civilization was not Hellenistic in character but Semitic, its army was certainly Hellenistic in nature, and to an extreme degree. In the West, only Carthage managed to exploit, with all its consequences, the model of the professional army as understood by the Seleucids or the Antigonids. That is, by the frequent use of mercenaries and their payment in coins, at least partially. While there has rightly been increasing comparison of the power of Carthaginian and Roman armies, Carthage was always obliged to attend to interests and allies which were a great deal more widely scattered than those of the Romans, which explains, for example, Hannibal's continuous movement in Italy from one place to another every few months or even weeks or days. Unlike Rome, which tended to entrust specific missions to particular individuals or army units, Carthage generally rotated the same soldiers and generals within a very wide geographical area. This *modus operandi* of the Carthaginian army is fundamental to the understanding of Punic coin production, and the only Hispanic feature of a large proportion of Hispano-Carthaginian coin series is the fact that they were minted in Iberia, given that they were both engraved by and earmarked for North African, Campanian or Siculo-Italian recipients.

Philo-Carthaginian coin series are more numerous than Carthaginian ones in the strictest sense. All empires are made up of a centre and a periphery, of allies and sympathizers, and the Second Punic War cannot be fully comprehended without an understanding of all these factors. Carthage did not lose the war solely because of its military defeats, but also because of the trickle of allies defecting to the Roman cause, which with the passage of time became a flood. The case of Mottones and his change of alliance in Sicily, reflected in coin issues, is paradigmatic in this sense, and the coinages of Numidian garrisons in Italy provide evidence too of Carthage's dependence on continuous support from its allies and on their accompanying logistical routes. Under such a degree of stress, it is therefore no surprise that the Carthaginian machine should finally have ground to a halt, but, while it lasted, this military and monetary operation fulfilled with notable success the mission with which it had been entrusted.●

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

PRIMARY SOURCES:

- APPIANUS: WHITE, H. (1972): *Appian's Roman History. Volume I*. Cambridge (MA)-London. Harvard University Press-William Heinemann LTD. The Loeb Classical Library. (First printed 1912).
- DYONISIUS OF HALICARNASSUS: CARY, E. (1968): *The Roman Antiquities. Volume I*. Harvard University Press-William Heinemann LTD. The Loeb Classical Library. (First printed 1937).
- POLYBIUS: PATON, W. R. (1993): *The Histories. Book IV*. Cambridge (MA)-London. Harvard University Press-William Heinemann LTD. The Loeb Classical Library. (First printed 1925).
- PLINIUS: RACKHAM, H. (1969): *Natural History. Volume II. Libri III-VII*. Cambridge (MA)-London. Harvard University Press-William Heinemann LTD. The Loeb Classical Library. (First printed 1942).
- STRABO: JONES, H. L. (1954): *The Geography of Strabo. Volume III*. Cambridge (MA)-London. Harvard University Press-William Heinemann LTD. The Loeb Classical Library. (First printed 1924).
- TACITUS: MOORE, C. H. (1998): *The Histories. Books IV-V*. Harvard University Press. St. Edmundsbury Press LTD. The Loeb Classical Library. (First printed 1943).
- TITUS LIVIUS: FOSTER, B. O. (1926): *Livy IV. Books VIII-X*. London-New York. William Heinemann-G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- TITUS LIVIUS: MOORE, F. G. (1984, 1970): *Livy VI, VII. Books XXIII-XXV, XXVI-XXVII*. Cambridge (MA)-London. Harvard University Press-William Heinemann LTD. The Loeb Classical Library. (First printed 1943).
- TITUS LIVIUS: SAGE, E. T. (1961): *Livy IX. Books XXXI-XXXIV*. Cambridge (MA)-London. Harvard University Press-William Heinemann LTD. The Loeb Classical Library. (First printed 1935).

SECONDARY SOURCES:

- ACIMOVIC, A. (2007): *Scipio Africanus*, New York-Lincoln-Shanghai, I Universe.
- ALEXANDROPOULOS, J. (2000): *Les monnaies de l'Afrique antique 400 av. J.-C.-40 ap. J.-C.* Toulouse. Presses Universitaires du Mirail.
- ALFARO ASÍNS, C. (1993): «La ceca de Gadir y las acuñaciones hispano-cartagineses», *Numismática hispano-púnica. Estado actual de la investigación. VII Jornadas de Arqueología fenicio-púnica*, Ibiza 1992. Edición conmemorativa del 90 aniversario de la fundación de la Sociedad Arqueológica Ebusitana y del inicio de las investigaciones arqueológicas en Ibiza y Formentera, Ibiza. Museo Arqueológico de Ibiza: 27-62.

- ALFARO ASÍNS, C. (1997): *Chapter 8. Los Bárcidas en Iberia y la Segunda Guerra Púnica (237-202 a.C.)*, ALFARO ASÍNS, C. et alii, *Historia monetaria de Hispania Antigua*, Madrid. Jesús Vico, S.A. Editores: 70-79.
- BRUNT, P. A. (1971): *Italian Manpower, 225 BC-AD 14*, Oxford. Clarendon Press.
- BURNETT, A. (1993): «The coinage of Punic Sicily during the Hannibalic War», CALTABIANO, M. C. (ed.), *La Sicilia tra l'Egitto e Roma. La monetazione siracusana dell'età di Ierone II*, Atti del Seminario di Studi Messina 2-4 Dicembre 1993. Messina. Atti Accademia Peloritana dei Pericolanti. Università degli Studi di Messina: 383-399.
- CALLATAY, F. DE (1996): *Les monnaies grecques et l'orientation des axes*. Glaux. Collana di Studi e Ricerche di Numismatica. 12. Milan. Edizioni ennerre
- CHARRIER, L. (1912): *Description des monnaies de la Numidie et de la Maurétanie et leur prix basé sur le degré de rareté*, Macon. Imprimerie Protat Frères.
- CORNELL, T. (1996): *Hannibal's Legacy: The Effects of the Annibalic War on Italy*, CORNELL, T./RANKOV, B./ SABIN, P. (eds.), *The Second Punic War. A Reappraisal*, London. Institute of Classic Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London: 97-113.
- CRAWFORD, M. H. (1969): *Roman Republican Coin Hoards (RRCH)*. London. Royal Numismatic Society. Special Publication no 4.
- CRAWFORD, M. H. (1985): *Coinage and Money under the Republic. Italy and the Mediterranean Economy*, London. Meuthen & CO LTD.
- FARISELLI, A. C. (2002), *I Mercenari di Cartagine*. Biblioteca della Rivista di Stui Punici I, La Spezia. Àgora Edizioni.
- FIELDS, N. (1994): «Apollo: God of War, Protector of Mercenaries», SHEEDY, K. A. (ed.), *Archaeology in the Peloponnese. New Excavations and Research*. The Australian Archeological Institute at Athens. Oxbow Monographs 48. Oxford: 95-113.
- HAMDOUNE, C. (1999): *Les auxilia externa africains des armées romaines. IIIe siècle av. J.-C.-IVe siècle ap. J.-C.* Montpellier, Université Paul-Valéry, Montpellier III.
- HOYOS, D. (2003): *Hannibal's Dynasty. Power and politics in the western Mediterranean 247-183 BC*, Routledge, London & New York.
- JENKINS, G. K./ LEWIS, R. B. (1963): *Carthaginian Gold and Electrum Coins*, London, Royal Numismatic Society. Special Publication, no. 2.
- LAUNEY, M. (1987): *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques*. Tome I, Paris. De Boccard.
- LAZENBY, J. F. (1978): *Hannibal's War. A military history of the Second Punic War*, Warsminster. Aris & Phillips Ltd.
- LE BOHEC, Y. (1996): *Histoire militaire des guerres puniques 246-146 avant J.-C.* Paris. L'art de la guerre. Éditions du Rocher.
- LÓPEZ-SÁNCHEZ, F. (2007): «Los auxiliares de Roma en el Valle del Ebro y su paga en denarios ibéricos (133-90 a.C.)», *Athenaeum* 95/1: 287-320.

- MANFREDI, L.-I. (1995): *Monete Puniche. Repertorio epigrafico e numismatico delle legende puniche*, Bolletino di Numismatica. Monografia 6. Rep. Roma. Ministero Per I Beni Culturali e Ambientali.
- MANGANARO, G. (1981-1982): «Un ripostiglio Siciliano del 214-211 a.C. e la datazione del denarius», *Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte*, 31-32: 37-54.
- MARTÍNEZ-PINNA, J. (1997): «Rhome: el elemento femenino en la fundación de Roma», *Aevum* 71/1: 79-102.
- MARTÍNEZ-PINNA, J. (2002): *La prehistoria mítica de Roma. Introducción a la etnogénesis latina*. Gerión. Anejos VI. Publicaciones UCM (Universidad Complutense de Madrid).
- MOMIGLIANO, A. (1945): «Review on PERRET, J. (1942): *Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome*, Collection d'études anciennes publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Bude, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, *JR S*: 99-104.
- MÜLLER, C. L. (1862): *Numismatique de l'ancienne Afrique. Troisième volume. Les monnaies de la Numidie et de la Mauritanie*. Copenhague. Imprimerie de Bianco Luno
- NIESE, B. (1988): «Die Sagen von der Gründung Roms», *Historische Zeitschrift* 59/3: 481-506.
- PERRET, J. (1942): *Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome. Collection d'études anciennes publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Bude*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres.
- RICHMOND, I. A. (1946): «Review on HEURGON, J. (1942): *Recherches sur l'histoire, la religion et la civilisation de Capoue préromaine. Des origines à la Seconde Guerre Punique*, BEFAR 154, Paris», *JRS* 36: 216-220.
- ROBINSON, E. S. G. (1956): *Punic coins of Spain and their bearing on the Roman Republican series*, CARSON, R. A. G./ SUTHERLAND, C. H. V. (eds), *Essays in Roman Coinage presented to Harold Mattingly*, Oxford.
- RUTTER, N. K. et al, (2001): *Historia Numorum. Italy*. (HNI). London. The British Museum Press.
- SALOMONSON, J. W. (1957): «Telephus und die römische Zwillinge. Zwei Figürliche Darstellungen in Gegenseitiger Beziehung am Panzerschmuck der Leidener Trajanstatue», *Oudheidkundige Mededelingen uit het Rijksmuseum van Oudheiden te Leiden (OMLR)* 38: 15-44.
- SAMBON, A. (1903): *Les monnaies antiques de l'Italie. Tome Premier. Étrurie-Ombrie-Picenum-Samnnium-Campanie (Cumes et Naples)*, Paris, 1903. Bureaux du Musée.
- SCHUR, W. (1921): «Griechische Traditionen von der Gründung Roms», *Klio* 17: 137-152.
- THOMSEN, R. (1961): *Early Roman Coinage. A Study of the Chronology III Synthesis II*, Aarhus. Nationalmuseets Skrifter. Arckæologisk-Historik Række X.

- THOMPSON, M./ MØRKHOLM, O./KRAAY, C. M. (1973): *An Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards (IGCH)*, New York.
- VILLARONGA, L. (1973): *Las monedas hispano-cartaginesas*, Barcelona. Sección numismática del círculo filatélico y numismático.
- VILLARONGA, L. (1983): «Diez años de novedades en la numismática hispano-cartaginesa 1973-1983, *Revista di studi fenici* (RSF), 11 Supplemento: 57-73.
- VILLARONGA, L. (1989): «The Tanger Hoard», *The Numismatic Chronicle*, 149: 149-162.
- VOLK, T. (2006): «The Mazarrón hoard (IGCH 2325) revisited», *Numisma* 250. 56: 205-228.
- WALKER, A. (1984): *Some hoards from Sicily and a Carthaginian issue of the Second Punic War*, HOUGHTON, H. et al, *Festschrift für Leo Mildenberg*, Wetteren: 269-88.
- WUILLEUMIER, P. (1939): *Tarente. Des origines a la conquête romaine*, Paris. Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 148. De Boccard.