

ZEITSCHRIFT

FÜR

NUMISMATIK

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON

H. DRESSEL UND J. MENADIER.

ZWEIUNDDREISSIGSTER BAND.

---

BERLIN

WEIDMANNSCHE BUCHHANDLUNG

1920.

+

## A Denarius of 69 A. D. from Lugdunum.

---

It is with hesitancy that one approaches a subject so much debated as that of the Lugdunum mint<sup>1)</sup>, and particularly when one connects with it a coin which has also been much discussed and about whose mint-place there has been such divergent opinion<sup>2)</sup>.

However, I do venture to assign to the Lugdunum mint the following coin: —



obv.



GALLIA

Buste de la Gaule à droite, avec un collier autour du cou; derrière, une trompette gauloise.

rev.

FIDES

Deux mains jointes, tenant deux épis et une enseigne surmontée d'un sanglier.

---

1) For the Lyon mint see: Lenormant, *Annuaire de la soc. franç. de Num.* V 1877 p. 497; Mowat, *Rev. Num.* 1895 p. 161.

2) For the mint-place of this coin see:

(a) K. F. Hermann, *Eine gallische Unabhängigkeits-Münze aus römischer Kaiserzeit*, Göttingen, 1851, who thinks it was minted by Civilis, the leader of the Batavians, in their insurrection of 69 A. D.

R. Cohen (2. éd.) Galba no. 361, M. le Docteur Haeberlin<sup>1</sup>).

The standard surmounted by the boar, represented on the reverse of this coin, has been interpreted as the *sus gallicus*, the national emblem of ancient Gaul.<sup>1</sup>)

It is not probable, however, that at this time, — when a Gallic nation no longer existed, when the name of Gaul (as given on the obverse of this denarius) had merely a geographical value, when the people were Romanized<sup>2</sup>) and separated from their old memories and traditions by the interval of more than a century, and from each other by differences of language, customs and government, — it is not probable that at this time, the old Gallic standard should be chosen as a symbol by those who represented the Roman authority in the country. Furthermore, since the legions who were the very expression of this authority came, officers and body, from various sections of the empire, it is not likely, that the sign of the territory in which they happened to be temporarily stationed would be found on these quasi-autonomous coins.

On the other hand, during a civil crisis such as arose in the early months of the year 69 A. D., when Otho had been proclaimed emperor by the Senate at Rome, and Vitellius by the legions in Germany, it would not be extraordinary if the sign (that is, the

- 
- (b) de Blacas, *Rev. Num.* 1862 p. 227, disagrees with Hermann and thinks the coin too evidently Gallic for such attribution.  
 (c) Haeberlin, *Berliner Münzblätter* 1908—10 p. 286, favors the view of Hermann rather than that of de Blacas and suggests Trier as the possible mint-place.

1) From the excellent cast furnished me by the courtesy of the owner; the coin is of much better workmanship than appears from the plates of Hermann and de Blacas.

2) de Saussaye, *Numismatique de la Gaule Narbonnaise* p. 139; *Rev. Num.* 1840 p. 240. Eckhel (*D. N.* VI. no. 298) connecting the coin with Galba, thinks it is the banner of Spain. de Witte (*Rev. Num.* 1862 p. 392) following Eckhel and de Saussaye assigns Cohen no. 361 to Gaul and Cohen no. 358 to Spain. Cavedoni, *Rev. Num.* 1862 p. 392, finds this banner to be Spanish. de Saussaye, however, *Rev. Num.* 1840 p. 259, thinks that the boar in northern Spain is also Gallic.

3) See Bernard Henderson, *Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero* p. 397 et seq.

standard) of the legion stationed at the mint-place appeared on such coins<sup>1</sup>).

At this time (69 A. D.) there were two legions which had the boar as a standard; the XX Valeria Victrix and the I Italica<sup>2</sup>). The former was in Britain at the beginning of the civil struggles, but joined the Vitellian forces before the end of the year and may have been the legion which in part accompanied Vitellius himself from Lugdunum to Rome (Tac. Hist. I, 60, II, 57, III, 22). The latter, however, the I Italica, was in January 69 in garrison at Lugdunum, and, furthermore, was the only legion stationed there (Tac. I<sup>3</sup>), 59, 64. It went to Italy later, probably with Fabius Valens, Tac. I, 61).

This combination of circumstances is more than coincidence and seems to fix the coin under discussion as a product of the Lugdunum mint.

The date of the coin can be accurately determined by considering the attitude of Lugdunum in the various struggles of the year 68—69. We know that when Vindex was raising his banner against Nero, Lugdunum remained loyal to the emperor. At that time then, and until the death of Nero, if any silver or gold coins had come from the Lugdunum mint, which was protected by the swords of its legion, they would undoubtedly have borne the sign of that emperor's authority<sup>4</sup>).

The same would not have been the case, however, in January 69,

1) This is the opinion of Prof. Kurt Regling who has kindly given permission to add his authority to the statement.

2) Domaszewski, *Die Fahnen im Römischen Heere*, Wien 1885 p. 54. The author has kindly answered for me some questions connected with the matter in hand. See also Eckhel, *D. N. VIII* p. 494 et seq. for discussion of the legions and coinage.

3) References to Tacitus are to the *Histories*.

4) Nero's death and Galba's election were evidently reported to Galba at Clunia by the same messenger (Suet. Galba 11); and there is no ground for assuming an autonomous coinage at Lugdunum between those two reigns. There was apparently no interregnum even at Rome. Tac. I, 4: „sed patres laeti, usurpata statim libertate licentius ut erga principem novum et absentem.“

when Otho was proclaimed emperor by the Senate at Rome; for Lugdunum and its legion, possibly in part intimidated by the nearness of the Vitellian legions, championed the cause of Vitellius who was the rival candidate chosen by the German armies. During the struggle with Otho, Vitellius made his headquarters at Lugdunum, and it was there that he received his victorious generals, Valens and Caecina, after the battle of Bedriacum (Tac. II, 59, 65).

The mint at Lugdunum had coined copper<sup>1)</sup> as late as the reign of Nero, and some scholars<sup>2)</sup> have thought that it issued gold and silver throughout the reigns of Nero and Galba. In any case, this mint could not have been long in disuse, and it is probable that Vitellius ordered it to be opened and employed to supply money for his troops. It is natural, too, that before his arrival at Lugdunum, and before the I Italica had left the town, the coins should have borne the standard of the legion which protected the mint.

Vitellius proclaimed emperor by the armies	Jan. 1 & 2
Galba assassinated at Rome . . . . .	„ 15
Otho proclaimed at Rome (Tac. I, 47) . . . . .	„ 15
Otho defeated by the Vitellians at Bedriacum . . . . .	April 15
Otho committed suicide in the morning of . . . . .	„ 16
Vitellius proclaimed at Rome (Tac. I, 55) as soon as the news of Otho's death arrived <sup>3)</sup> . . . . .	„ 19
News of battle and of Otho's death reached Vitellius . . . . .	„ 23?
News of election reached Vitellius . . . . .	„ 28?

1) With the inscription ROM. ET AVG. Cohen Nero no. 256.

2) (a) Lenormant, *Annuaire de la soc. franç. de Num.* V 1877 p. 497.

(b) Mowat, *Rev. Num.* 1895 p. 161.

(c) Babelon, *Traité des Monnaies Gr. et Rom.* Part I Vol. I p. 1013.

3) See *Acta Frat. Arval.* „ob diem imperi German. imp. quod XIII K. Mai. statutum est“.

The autonomous issue at Lugdunum would be limited, then, to the period between January 2 and the day when the news of Vitellius' election arrived, — possibly April 28, — after which date the gold and silver would of course have borne the name of Vitellius as emperor. Early in this period and before the *I Italica* started for Italy<sup>1)</sup>, the Lugdunum mint doubtless issued the coin under discussion, bearing the banner of the legion stationed there, and the non-committal and inoffensive legends: "GALLIA—FIDES".

As to the style and fabric of the coins from the Lugdunum mint at this time, we should expect, I think, rather good workmanship, for, as we have seen, the mint could not have been very long in disuse.

The coin we are considering, though it shows a distinctly un-Roman type of face and though unquestionably not from the mint at Rome, is not in any sense barbarous. On the contrary, when we compare it with other autonomous coins, we find that the workmanship displayed in the modelling of the face and hands, in the treatment of hair and drapery and in the lettering is of quite superior quality.

The Gallic trumpet behind the head of Gallia has no significance, I think, beyond symbolizing the idea which the figure personifies. The heads of wheat connected with Fides on the reverse, appear also on *FIDES PVBLICA* coins of Vespasian<sup>2)</sup>. The motto itself is, as I have said, noncommittal, and might have been interpreted as commemorating the loyalty of the legion or of Gaul to the Empire or to Vitellius.

To the same mint and the same period belongs also, I think, the following coin):

1) Tac. I, 64.

2) Cohen Vesp. no. 163, 169.

3) For *Concordia* with caduceus: Coins of the Second Triumvirate. For *Libertas* with wheat: Galba, Cohen no. 106. For the legend *Concordia* see Tac. I, 56: „in senatus ac populi Romani verba iurasse. Si concordia et pax placeat, faciendum, imperatorem“.



obv. LIBERTAS RESTITVTA

Buste diadémé et voilé de la Liberté á droite; dans le champ, un épi.

rev. CONCORDIA

La Concorde assise á gauche tenant une enseigne surmontée d'un sanglier, et un caducée.

R. Cohen Galba no. 358 Vienna<sup>1</sup>).

Its style and workmanship are similar to no. 361, it bears the boar standard, and was in all probability also issued while the I Italica was in garrison<sup>2</sup>).

1) I have to thank Prof. Kubitschek for the cast of this coin.

2) The possibility that these coins with the boar were struck by Vindex as the leader of a national Gallic revolt, by whom the boar would have been chosen as the old Gallic Standard, has, of course, been considered: but I see no proof in favor of such a view and the probabilities seem to be against it:

1. Vindex was using native and not regular troops („Vindex cum inermi provincia“ Tac. I, 16) and would not need money to pay them.
2. These coins, while unlike the products of the mint at Rome, are of good workmanship. They came from a good Roman mint and are not Gallic in the sense of being from a native mint.
3. Vindex besieged Lugdunum until forced to go to the aid of Ventsio, but he never gained admission to the town. He was therefore excluded from the Lugdunum mint, — the only Roman mint in Gaul of whose existence in the latter half of this century we have positive evidence.

From Vienna, the center of the Vindex revolt, we have no Roman coins later than the first years of the reign of Augustus; so that this town, three generations later, could not have furnished a personnel capable of minting money of so good workmanship as the coins in question. The same is the case with Nemausus: its latest Roman coin is early-Augustan (de Saussaye, Num. de la Gaul. Narb. p. 130 & 168).

Of the Narbo mint, Babelon says that there is not a

We should normally expect to find a considerable issue of autonomous coins from Lugdunum, and also an early Vitellian issue from the same mint. However, the consideration of those two questions lies outside the scope of this paper, whose purpose is merely to propose the two coins already mentioned as a point of departure for the classification of other coins produced by the Lugdunum mint during the Vitellian occupation of the town.

---

Roman imperial coin before the middle of the 4<sup>th</sup> century which can with certitude be attributed to it (*Traité des Monn. Gr. et Rom.* Part I Vol. I p. 1018).

For the revolt of Vindex, see Henderson, *Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero*, London 1905 p. 395 et seq.

Lewisburg, Pennsylvania.

Mary B. H a r r i s.

alter De N.C.  
77  
1914. p. 23 (ref. in)