TEMPLE IMAGES ON THE COINAGE OF SOUTHERN IBERIA

From the early first century B.C. into the first century A.D. several cities on the south coast of the Iberian peninsula, the Republican province of Hispania Ulterior, struck coinage at local mints. Exactly why these cities began to issue coinage is not clear. Though the reasons may not have been dissimilar to those that prompted the start-up of mints in the Iberian and Celtiberian towns of Hispania Citerior (1). It would seem equally likely that the towns of the south coast which had been part of the Punic trading network and had probably used the silver coinage from the Punic mints at Gades (Cádiz) and Carthago Nova (Cartagena) issued since the late third century B.C. (2), now struck their own coinage to facilitate continued trade among themselves. This might explain why some of these new mints first produced coins with Punic inscriptions (3). Among the reverse types used by the minters at Carthago Nova, Gades, Abdera, and Malaca (Malaga) was the image of a tetrastyle temple. In attempting to reconstruct the architecture of the southern Spanish coast during the Republic, these coin images have often been cited as evidence for the existence of specific temples and associated cults within the cities issuing the coins, and moreover, the temple images have often been employed as a means of recon-

(1) It has been argued that the towns of Hispania Ulterior were encouraged to begin minting their own coinage following Roman standards to ease the collecting of tribute by the Roman administrators and as a means of providing local pay for the resident Italian troops. J. S. Richardson, Hispaniae: Spain and the Development Roman Imperialism 218-82 BC, Cambridge, 1986; F. Beltrán, Sobre la función de la moneda ibérica e hispano-romana, in Estudios en homenaje al Dr. A. Beltrán Martínez, Zaragoza, 1986, p. 889.

(2) A. M. de Guadán, La moneda ibérica: catálogo de numismatica ibérica e ibéreo-romana, Madrid, 1980, nos. 57-73 and 144-160.

(3) A. M. de Guadán, La moneda ibérica, supra n. 2, Malaca (Málaga), no. 107, Sexi no. 116, Abdera no. 119, Salacia no. 125.
Structuring buildings otherwise lost in the archaeological record (4). The most systematic study of such imagery has been done in two articles by A. Beltrán Martínez and his student F. de Asis Escudero y Escudero (5). Both Beltrán Martínez and de Asis Escudero y Escudero built on the work of such earlier pioneers in the study of architectural rendering as reverse coin types as K. Regling, E. Babelon, D. Brown, and B. Trell.

Several cities on the Iberian peninsula during the late Republic and early Empire issued coins with a temple as the reverse type (6). However, the temple images used by the mints of Gades, Malaca, and Carthago Nova can be shown to be stylistically related. Therefore, the use of the image in these three cases can be argued to have had a particular purpose quite distinct from the temple images on other issues on the Iberian peninsula or elsewhere in the Roman world. They were not intended to visually portray existing buildings. This paper will examine these images in detail to show how they were created and will offer some suggestions as to their purposes.

**Gades (Fig. 1):**

Gades was one of the oldest settlements on the Iberian peninsula. It had been founded by the Phoenicians in the eighth century B.C., and it was the center of the older Punic culture, though it had been supplanted politically by Cartago Nova (Cartagena), founded by the Carthaginians just before the Second Punic War (7).


Sometime at the end of the first century B.C. the mint at Gades struck a series of sestertii some of which had as a reverse type a tetrastyle temple. The date for the issues is uncertain. The head on the obverse is of Augustus usually accompanied by AUGUSTUS above and the DIVI F epithet below (8). A. de Guadán has placed the issue as part of a larger series of sestertii struck by the mint some of which used the head of Agrippa as an obverse type and those of his two sons as reverse types (9). This might suggest that the coin type was an element in the Augustan dynastic propaganda (10).

The Gades image is a tetrastyle temple with a clipeus placed in the pediment. The die cutter for the Gades image was particularly careful. All published versions of the coin share certain features in common. The structure sits without a podium or foundation. The columns themselves are, however, marked as having bases of two tori. They also have capitals, though it is impossible to say of what type. The pediment is high to accommodate the clipeus. Along the diagonals of the gable are clearly marked fictile ornamentations. The colonnaded facade screens a door, the panels for which can be seen between the columns. This marking is easiest to read between the center columns, but markings between the two side pairings of columns would indicate that doors and panels are to be read in those positions also.

(9) A. M. de Guadán, La moneda ibérica, supra n. 2, nos. 88-89.
In his analysis of the coins, A. Beltrán concluded that the temple was that of the famous temple to Heracles located outside of Gades (11). Nothing about the image actually supports such an identification. The temple no longer exists, and all conjectures about its ancient form are based almost exclusively on interpretations of the literary sources (12). Silius Italicus (Pun. 3.32) describes in some detail the doors of the sanctuary which were decorated with scenes from the labors of Heracles, and this alone might possibly be related to the emphasis on the door panels so carefully delineated by the die cutter.

Why the city of Gades should have chosen to connect the sanctuary of Heracles with Augustus is a little harder to determine. The temple image is itself enclosed by a wreath which A. de Asis Escudero y Escudero has described as a laurel crown following the lead of Vives y Escudero. The laurel crown is not an uncommon element in Augustan iconography (13) and was employed on several issues of coinage on the peninsula. Its usage here to encircle the temple façade could have been to make closer the association between sanctuary and Princeps which was also first iterated on the obverse with the DIVI F. Gades had supported Caesar in the Civil War, and Caesar had repaid the loyalty by returning the money and ornaments taken from the sanctuary by Varro (BC 2.21). Moreover, it was in the sanctuary at Gades that Caesar had seen the statue of Alexander which caused him such dismay (Suetonius, Caesar, 7). The obverse and reverse images could then celebrate Gades's particular relationship to Caesar. No doubt Gades hoped that the relationship would continue with Augustus.

Malaca (Fig. 2):

In his major catalogue and study of ancient Spanish coinage, A. Vives y Escudero noted in passing that the Gades and Malaca temple images were similar (14). Beltrán Martínez has pointed out

that Vives y Escudero did not see any special qualities to the types used on the Iberian coins minted under Roman control, and rather thought them to be imitations of Roman types with little or no local significance (15). Vives y Escudero further noted in his analysis of the coinage of Malaca that the coin temple resembled that of the issue of M. Volteius of 78 B.C. (Fig. 3) which portrayed the Capitolium in Rome (16). The coin image from Malaca also shows a tetrastyle temple without a pronounced podium. There is a slight swelling to the bottoms of the columns, perhaps intended to suggest bases, and a slight swelling to the tops to indicate capitals. The pediment is again decorated with a clipeus, though the diagonals for the gable are shown both with and without indications of fictile ornaments. There does seem to be an acroterium ornament, a small ball, at the apex of the pediment.

Fig. 2. Malaca, courtesy of The American Numismatic Society

The Malaca coins are quadrantes rather than sestertii, so smaller coins (17). The obverse carries a profile bearded head wearing a pilos cap. Vives y Escudero identified the figure as Vulcan, an identification kept by Guadán who merely changed the name to its Greek form, Hephaistos (18). The legend is in Phoenician and reads SMS.

Fig. 3. Rome, Capitoline Temple, issue of M. Volteius, courtesy of The American Numismatic Society

(15) A. BELTRÁN MARTÍNEZ, 1953, supra n. 5, p. 40.
(16) A. VIVES Y ESCUDERO, supra n. 8, vol. 3, p. 28.
(17) Ibidem, p. 30, nos. 15, 16.
(18) A. M. DE GUADÁN, La moneda ibérica, supra n. 2 p. 32, no. 111.
Beltrán Martínez has denied the identification of the head as that of Vulcan. He has suggested that the coin should be treated with others from Malaca which show as reverse types in association with the pilos capped obverse figure, a frontal head with a pointed crown or a star with eight or twelve rays. The star suggests a solar connection. The frontal head has been identified as Ashtarte (19), and Beltrán Martínez wants to identify the pilos capped figure as the Phoenician god Chusor-Phtha. F. de Asís Escudero y Escudero read the SMS as Semes the Punic sun god (20), while J. M. Solá Solé has interpreted the figure as Baal-Hammon (21).

**The relationship:**

There are clear stylistic associations between the Gades and the Malaca types. The temples are both tetrastyle; they lack podia; the pediments are decorated with a cîpeus. Missing from the Malaca image is the emphasis on the doors and the regular representation of the fictile ornamentation. The difference in the flan size—the Gades coin is substantially larger—could account for some of the differences such as the missing fictile decoration, but probably does not explain the difference in the treatment of the doors which may reflect a specific feature of the temple at Gades.

Unlike the Gades coin, there is no internal means for dating the Malaca coins. They probably predate the rise of Augustus since they do not include his image as the obverse type, and must therefore be considered to be earlier than the Gades issue (22).

The Gades image is too closely similar to the image on a coin of Volteius minted in Rome in 78 B.C. (Fig. 3) to be accidental. The use of images of temples as a reverse type on Roman coinage can be traced to the issues of M. Volteius. He employed a view of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus with an obverse of the head of Jupiter

(20) F. de Asís Escudero y Escudero, *supra* n.5, p. 172.
(22) It has been suggested that the fully frontal face found as an obverse on some coins copies the denarius of L. Mussidus Longus of 42 B.C., see F. de Asís Escudero y Escudero, *supra* n.5, p. 171 n.1.
for one of five series of denarii minted in Rome (23). The temple shown is tetrastyle, situated atop a podium with an ornament, perhaps a thunderbolt (?) in the pediment. Martin Price and Bluma Trell have argued that this earliest representation shows an abbreviated façade in which the number of columns has been reduced to four in order to allow the doors behind to be displayed (24). The fictile ornamentation along the roof line must have been equally important as it receives attention on the image. There exists no definitive information about the appearance of the temple other than Livy’s description of the building process (1.56) and the coin representation, which M. Crawford maintains was struck after the destruction of the first temple but prior to the erection of Sulla’s temple (25). Therefore, the coin temple must have been intended to suggest the temple built by Tarquinius Superbus in 509 B.C.

The two Spanish temples share with the Volteius image low flat podiums and high pediments with central decoration. The Gades image also has radiating curved lines along the roof that represent the fictile decoration and the shared format of the three door openings viewed through a screen of columns. They are clearly and similarly marked by rectangular panels, two per door.

A. Beltrán and Garcia y Bellido argued that the coin image at Gades did represent the temple of Heracles at that city in one of its later rebuildings. They did not see the association with the Roman coin, though Vives y Escudero did note a possible similarity and also thought that the Malaca issue was related. F. de Asis Escudero y Escudero has argued that the visual links among the three coins cannot be ignored, and at a minimum require that we dismiss the notion that an actual building stands behind either the Gades or the Malaca images (26).

It is possible that the die cutters for the mints at Gades and Malaca had the Roman coin available to serve as a model, but that would not explain why they would have selected the image of the


(24) M. Price and B. Trell, *supra* n. 4, p. 65.


(26) F. de Asis Escudero y Escudero, *supra* n. 5, p. 172.
Capitolium in Rome, and there is little reason to accept the view that both Malaca and Gades possessed temples which resembled the image of the Capitolium. There was a possible second source of inspiration. The Sardinian city of Carallis issued a coin (Fig. 4) during the second half of the first century B.C. with a temple image borrowed from the Capitolium temple type. The Carallis temple is also a tetrastyle form raised on a podium. The high pediment is decorated with an ornament, and there is fictile ornamentation along the roof line. Again, the tripartite doors are emphasized. The sanctuary represented on the Carallis coin is clearly stated to be that of Venus, for it carries the legend *VENERIS* (27). Again, the Capitolium coin must have provided the model.

It is impossible to know if the sanctuary of Venus at Carallis really resembled the image on the coin, but it is safe to say that the sanctuary of Heracles at Gades did not. The sanctuary of Heracles was an ancient Semitic sanctuary originally dedicated to Melqart. There was no reason for it to have remotely resembled an Italic tetrastyle temple, even if it had been rebuilt after the Roman conquest. If anything, the temple must have resembled the lost temple of Solomon (28). Guadán has separated the image on the Gades coin from any actual structure. But it remains a puzzle as to why a die cutter at the mint of Gades should have selected the image from the Roman or Sardinian coin as the model.

In 43 B.C. another series of coins were struck in Rome again with the reverse type of the Capitoline temple. But this time the temple

(27) Price and Trell, supra n. 4, p. 66.

(28) See Harrison's (supra n. 7) reconstruction, p. 123, fig. 78.
is hexastyle (29). This is the issue that immediately preceded the Gades coin, and if the intent of the mint master at Gades had been to reference Rome or the idea of a Capitoline temple, then it would seem reasonable to expect that this more recent version of the temple, which no doubt reflected the Sullan temple dedicated in 69 B.C., would have been chosen. Perhaps then the association of the Gades coin is really with that of Carallis. And it might be equally the case that the Malaca coin is also related to the Carallis image.

R. Martini has suggested that the legend VENERIS on the Carallis coin might actually be a reference to the Punic goddess Tanit (30). Sardinia was a Phoenician outpost in the west. If such is true, then the Carallis, the Gades, and the Malaca coinage all share in common the fact that the cults they most likely refer to in the temple images are old and important Punic cults in the cities. It may be that the Gades coin was intended to signify the sanctuary of Heracles even if it did not represent it. The choice could have been to copy the coin which represented another old Punic sanctuary, allowing the image to work on an emblematic level. Certainly, if the doors were as notable a feature as the reference of Silius Italicus implies, then the image of the temple captures that aspect. What is more, the image is left indistinct as to the details, quite different from the second image of the Capitoline temple.

Abdera (Fig. 5, 6):

Vives y Escudero maintained that the Gades and Malaca images were similar to those on a series of coins from another Punic city on the south coast, Abdera. Guadán places its first issue of coinage in the years between 133 and 105 B.C. (31). The earliest coins have an obverse with a Heracles head and a reverse of two fish, perhaps

(29) Ryder, supra n.23, p. 42.
suggesting the major industry of the town (32). It is not known how long these first series were minted, but at some point in the mid-first century B.C. a new obverse was introduced for a series of asses, a tetrastyle temple (Fig. 5) (33). The image shows the four columns set atop a clearly marked horizontal base. The column bases are delineated though not well enough to identify what type of base. And likewise, the capitals have a flare, perhaps to indicate that they are Ionic (34). The pediment is low and wide with a central tondo ornament. D. Woods, in his study of these coins, thought that this first temple image was a representation of a Tuscan temple type,


(33) L. Villaronga, Numismática antiqua de Hispania, Barcelona, 1979, p.162-163.

(34) A. Beltrán Martínez, 1953, supra n. 5, p. 51.
though such seems unlikely if the treatment of the capitals was intended to suggest the Ionic order (35). Between the center two columns are placed two crossing lines forming a quadrant pattern, and in each quadrant is a dot. This must be the sanctuary door. The reverse type retains the two fish, but now the ethnic for Abdera is added, placed between the fish in Punic script (36). There are several variations of the two types. The temple is sometimes shown with more slender columns, with the clipeus ornament outlined by a semi-circle, and with more or fewer roof decorations. The fish and inscription switch directions and move from right to left or left to right.

As with the Gades and Malaca coin images, there is a question as to whether this temple image in someway captures the real façade of a temple in the city. There are two internal features about this coinage which suggest that no real façade lies behind the coin type. One of the issues in the series shows a temple façade of five columns. It is generally accepted that die cutters wishing to represent existing buildings might abbreviate features to fit the structure onto the flan, but they would not purposely add elements which did not exist (37). A five column temple has no precedent in either Greek or Roman architecture nor in Iberian architecture. The five column façade is a mistake of the die cutter (38). The die cutter would have had no reason to change the accepted abbreviated image if he knew the standing monument. He would have recognized the central line as defining the doors. The fact that he did not must be because he, and the mint master, misunderstood the model which was strictly the image of a generic temple.

That this temple did not ever exist seems even more clearly evidenced when the Tiberian issues are considered. The tuna fish with the Punic ethnic are replaced by a bust of the emperor with the legend TI CASEAR DIVI AVG F AVGVSTVS. The reverse type continues to be a tetrastyle temple, but the two central columns that flank the door are replaced by two large fish arranged so that the head of one is opposite the tail of the other (Fig. 6). The name of the city is now inscribed in Latin letters across the temple

(35) D. Woods, supra n. 32, p. 284.
(36) D. Woods, supra n. 32, p. 389.
(38) A. Beltrán Martínez, 1953, supra n. 5, p. 51.
façade. On two issues, the Punic form of the name is retained; on the third it disappears. Beltrán suggested that the change in the façade captured a renovated temple front (39). Guadán has argued that such fish belong to the iconography of Heracles, and they are appropriate for a temple façade dedicated to the hero (40). F. Asis Escudero y Escudero has been a little less willing to accept the reality of the fish columns (41). Certainly, there is no archaeological evidence to support such a reading. And there are no known temples in the Roman world which make use of such imagery so early. The façade, like that of the temple of Gades, is clearly based on Greco-Roman models. The tuna fish, like the doors on the Gades coin, may have been intended to refer to a specific feature of a local shrine to a Punic god, perhaps Heracles-Melqart again, but the façade shown on the coins cannot be an accurate image of the temple. If anything, the fish columns must be reflective of an older pre-Roman cult, and if they did have a basis in reality, they must have been a feature on an earlier temple not one rebuilt after Augustus. There is no evidence on the peninsula for the making of such a statement of non-Romanness in monumental architecture after Augustus comes to power.

If not an image which represents the reality of a standing monument, then what is the meaning of the Abdera temple coin type? Unlike the Gades and Malaca coins, there is no apparent prototype for the temple, certainly not in its final form. It seems perverse not to accept that it signifies the existence at Abdera of a cult sanctuary, and considering that the first issues are Punic, the cult must also be. Woods has seen in the modification of the reverse type a reaction to the Romanization process. While the obverse type was changed to conform to Roman practice with the head of the emperor, the reverse was still allowed as a field for local expressions. The two fish, which in the earlier coinage had been associated with the city's name, and hence with the city itself, are now moved to make room for the portrait of Tiberius, but are still retained, now grafted onto the symbol of the city's main sanctuary. Such a reading would seem to be supported by the survival of the city's name in Punic form placed in the pediment of the temple (42).

(41) F. de Asis Escudero y Escudero, supra n. 5, p. 159.
(42) D. Woods, supra n. 32, p. 384.
This symbolic use of the reverse is not out-of-place with what is known of symbolic use of images in the Semitic world. B. Treil has stressed this symbolic rather than specific role for imagery when treating Semitic forms (43), and the Abdera coins could then be seen as a last manifestation of a failing local Semitic sensibility falling before the cultural force of peaceful Romanization.

**Ilici** (Fig. 7):

Fig. 7. Ilici, courtesy of The American Numismatic Society

Certainly lying within the orbit of Punic settlement was the site of Ilici which may have begun to mint coins about 28-27 B.C. with the foundation of the colony, Colonia Iulia Ilici Augusta (44). Under Augustus the city minted a semis. The reverse type for one of these issues is a tetrastyle temple with a large architrave inscribed IVNONI and with the legend of the duumvir quinquenales Q PAPIR(ius) CAR(bo) Q TERE(ntius) MONT(anus) II VIR Q V. The obverse is the head of Augustus with either the legend AVGVSTVS DIVI F or CAESARI DIVI AVGVSTO IMP. The date for the striking of these coins has been ascribed to 28-27 B.C. or to 14-13 B.C. or to 13-12 B.C. (45).

A. Beltrán Martínez has stated that the coin image does represent a real temple which stood on site, a view earlier expressed by


P. Beltrán in his study of the Ilici coinage (46). A. Beltrán goes so far as to read the capitals portrayed on the coin image as Corinthian. There is documentary support for the existence of a temple dedicated to Juno at Ilici, an inscription found in the eighteenth century at nearby La Albufereta (47):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{P FABRICIO IVSTO} \\
\text{P FABRICIO RESP(E)CT(O)} \\
\text{II VIR TEMP IVNONIS} \\
\text{EX DECRETO ORDIN} \\
\text{D S R P RESTITVIT}
\end{align*}
\]

The inscription is generally accepted as Imperial in date. It does no more than indicate the existence of the temple in the vicinity of Ilici, but no architectural members have been found.

The temple image on the coins is consistent. Such minor differences as do exist can be attributed to the individual features of distinct dies, but the main features of the edifice do not vary. The temple is tetrastyle with widely spaced columns standing on bases and atop a podium defined by two or three horizontal lines, perhaps to indicate stairs. Between the pairs of columns are placed the abbreviations for the colonia C-I-IL-A. There is some widening of the columns at the capital, which led A. Beltrán to suggest that they are representations of Corinthian, and F. de Asis Escudero y Escudero has argued that some of the representations seem to show attic column bases (48). The columns support a wide entablature, the most notable feature of the façade, which carries the dedication IVNONI. Above that is a small pediment with a clipeus. This reverse type is always paired with an obverse of Augustus, and Grant has argued that it is a short lived series, perhaps no more than a year.

Can this temple with its neon sign announcing the cult really be accepted as a valid version of a standing monument? Not too likely. Some remains of a classical structure have been found in stratum D at Ilici, which date to the period between ca. 42 B.C. and the mid-first century A.D. These consist of two attic bases, a frag-

(47) CIL II, 3557.
(48) F. de Asis Escudero y Escudero, supra n. 5, p. 160.
ment of the column shaft, and some of a cornice; though there is no clear evidence that they belong to the temple of Juno (49).

As with the images on the coinages of Gades, Malaca, and Abdera, this too is a symbolic image as seems to be made clear from the unusual treatment of the entablature. Such a symbolic rendering may have suited this particular cult. A. Beltrán thought that the image commemorated the building of the temple during the period of the magistrate of the quinquennales who struck the coins. However, F. de Asis Escudero y Escudero has argued that the Juno referred to on the architrave is not the Roman goddess but is rather the Punic goddess Tanit in her Roman guise (50). Pliny (HN 4.36.120) makes reference to the fact that along the coast of Hispania there are Romanized cities which worship native deities under Roman guise. F. de Asis Escudero y Escudero believes that the numerous references in the Greek and Latin sources to places sacred to Hera or Juno indicate the spread of the cult of Tanit along the Iberian coast, particularly in the stretch between Cádiz (Gades) and Gibraltar, the ancient heartland of the Phoenician colonization (51). The transformation of Tanit into the Romanized forms of Juno and Caelestis is well documented for both Iberia and North Africa (52). At least through the mid-first century B.C., Ilici seems to have retained a strong sense of its Punic heritage as evidenced from the finds of Iberian painted pottery in stratum E which are painted with an image that may be the goddess Tanit herself (53).

It is the entablature which is the most interesting feature on the Ilici coin. This particular treatment can be paralleled by an aureus of Augustus struck at the mint in Rome (Fig. 8). This image is of a temple-like structure of two stories ornamented with three sculptures on the roof and surrounded by a low colonnade. Along the architrave of the roof line is an inscription, an oversized legend IMP

(49) R. Ramos, La ciudad romana de Ilici, Alicante, 1975, p. 164-165 with reconstruction of the temple on plate LXXX.
(50) F. de Asis Escudero y Escudero, supra n. 5, p. 161.
(53) F. de Asis Escudero y Escudero, supra n. 5, p. 162-163; R. Ramos, supra n. 49, pl. XLVIII.
CAESAR (54). Grueber identified the structure as a temple and dated the issue to 29-27 B.C. (55). Price and Trell accept the date but explain the image as a representation of the Roman Curia as begun by Julius Caesar and finished by Augustus (56). They also note a second analogous coin image on an issue struck by Juba II at Caesarea in North Africa (Fig. 9) and dating some thirty years later (A.D. 6). The unusual design of the building is the same, but the legend has been changed to read AVGVSTVS. Both images could represent the reality of standing structures, but it seems more likely that Juba borrowed the image type not the building form.

If the dates are correct for the Augustan issue with IMP CAESAR, then it would be the likely prototype for the Ilici coin and the coin of Juba II, but there is a still earlier possible prototype for the Augustan issue. A coin struck in North Africa probably during the Triumvirate (43-33 B.C.) features on the obverse the head of Octavian with a beard and on the reverse a tetrastyle temple raised on a low podium with a star ornament in the pediment. Across the wide

(54) E. A. Sydenham and H. Mattingly, *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, London, 1923, p. 63, no. 35; they do not supply a date for the issue.
(56) M. Price and B. Trell, *supra* n. 4, p. 73-74.
architrave is the legend DIVO IVL. The cult statue of the temple has been moved to the front, so that it is clearly visible.

This early coin shows that the image of a distinctive temple type with an abnormally large inscribed architrave first appears during the years of the Triumvirate, and perhaps the concept of the inscribed architrave is borrowed from contemporary coin representations of arches with similarly treated architraves. D. Brown, discussing the early North African issue with the DIVO IVL, has noted that the date of the issue must pre-date the actual dedication of the temple to divine Julius in Rome, since this was not dedicated until 29 B.C. He maintained that the iconographical feature of the slightly raised podium without obvious access could be interpreted to mean that the building shown was only putative and had no basis in reality. P. Zanker has interpreted the star in the pediment as *sides Iulium*, which was one of the elements in Octavian's early iconographic program.

It would seem that the first appearance of these temple-like structures with large inscribed architraves occurs in North Africa, the old Punic, Semitic region of the western Mediterranean, and they are all used symbolically. This last point is clearest with the first coin which represents a non-existent temple. It would seem, however, that all these images reproduce fantastic buildings with their large architraves rather than the reality of any standing structure. The coin images share in common the tetrastyle façade — even the curia of Price and Trell has a tetrastyle colonnade — the low podium, and the large inscribed architrave.

The Ilici coin, then, is part of a larger group of architectural renderings which share certain specific features. The similarities are too distinct and one is too unusual to argue for independent invention by the individual die cutters. Rather, we should assume that the image format, first employed by Augustus to represent his planned temple to Divine Julius, was used with some modifications, in

(60) P. ZANKER, *supra* n. 13, p. 34-35.
other contexts to represent either planned structures (61) or to symbolically stand-in for existing buildings. The former notion has some possibility when it remembered that the Curia, begun by Caesar, was not finished until 29 B.C. when Augustus inaugurated it. If Price and Trell are correct in identifying the image as that of the Curia, then perhaps it represents the structure prior to its completion. A similar situation could indeed be the case at Ilici where the building of the sanctuary of Juno, perhaps in reality Tanit, was inaugurated but not necessarily finished when the coin was issued. Certainly, a symbolic representation of the temple is not out of place in this old Semitic region. The head on the obverse of the Ilici coins carries the epithet AVGVSTVS which determines a date after 27 B.C. for the striking. So the die cutter for the mint at Ilici could well have known either the North African coin type or the Roman Curia type.

**Carthago Nova (Fig. 10):**

There was a Punic mint at Carthago Nova by 230 B.C. (62). According to Robinson, the mint struck coins for the Barcids in at least four series. None of these have architectural representations as the obverse or reverse types. The city has a long history and was refounded as a colony in 42 B.C., the Colonia Urbs Iulia Nova Carthago (63). Interestingly, during the long interval between the fall of the Carthaginian Empire and the foundation of the colony, Carthago Nova did not strike coinage (64).

The Roman issues at Carthago Nova perhaps began in A.D. 18 under the duumviri M. Postumius Albinus and P. Turullius with semis and quadrantes (65). The semis has an obverse type of a te-


(65) O. Gil Farrés, supra n. 44, p. 440.
trastyle temple and a reverse type of a quadriga. Along the architrave of the temple is inscribed AVGVSTO. As in the image of the temple of Ilici, the columns are placed on a low stylobate of four horizontal lines, and the central door is carefully delineated with the panels indicated, and in the pediment is a clipeus.

The reverse type has variations. The quadriga moves to the left or to the right. The horses are sometimes shown jumping and other times at a canter. Based on reverse variations, Alvarez Burgos has catalogued four distinct series, but they share the same obverse temple (66). A. Beltrán Martínez has noted some modifications in the ethnie which appears across the front of the temple. It can read VR I N K, V I N K, or V N K. The temple, however, remains unaltered (67).

O. Gil Farrés has suggested that the series commemorated the deification of Augustus (68). His dating would place the striking of coin after the ascension of Tiberius. A. Beltrán Martínez has argued that the series was struck to commemorate the dedication of a temple to Augustus reproduced in the image. He maintains that the columns on the temple are capped with Corinthian capitals, and such capitals have been found on site (69).

(66) F. Alvarez Burgos, supra, n. 44, p. 181.
(67) A. Beltrán Martínez, Acerca de los nombres de Cartagena en la edad antigua, in Archivo de Prehistoria Levantina, 2, 1945, p. 299-325.
(68) O. Gil Farrés, supra, n. 44, p. 440.
(69) A. Beltrán (1980), supra, n. 5, p. 136; Id. (1953), supra, n. 5, p. 58.
Unlike the other coin images discussed, the Carthago Nova temple cannot be related to coin image prototypes. And therefore, it might be the most likely candidate to represent in some degree of reality a standing structure. The fact that the image remains unaltered while the quadriga type and the ethnic go through various transformations might support such a view. If indeed it is intended to reference the new temple to the deified Augustus, such fidelity might make sense, considering that such a temple would have been among the earliest on the peninsula and a source of local pride.

Yet a comparison of the Carthago Nova image with the others from the old Punic area reveals a strong commonality in the treatment of the architecture. All the temples are tetrastyle; all sit on low podia, all have a clipeus ornament in the pediment; most have the door singled out as a major feature. If the temple represented on the Carthago Nova coin is that of Augustus, then it could not have been struck until after A.D. 15 when Tiberius first allowed a temple to the deified Augustus to be built on Iberian soil at Tarraco. Therefore, the Carthago Nova coin image must be the latest in the series being considered here. It seems more likely, that again this is a symbolic representation, like the images from Gades, Malaca, Ilici, and Abdera. In fact, the die cutter borrowed specific compositional elements which have become standard for such representations in southern Spain, and while it may be true that a temple to the deified Augustus did stand in Carthago Nova and may be referenced on the coin, it bore no specific resemblance to the image produced on the coin.

Conclusions

There is no doubt that among the many images of buildings which served as reverse types on the coinage of the Roman world some reproduced with a degree of accuracy existing structures, and moreover, from these coin representations, it is sometimes possible to reconstruct quite valid interpretations of lost edifices. The coin representations studied here, however, suggest another possibility, that the imagery of buildings could have a strictly symbolic usage and be independent of any actual structural reality.

The coin temples of Gades, Malaca, Abdera, Ilici, and Carthago Nova ultimately share too many stylistic similarities to be acciden-
tal. In the case of the coins of Gades, Malaca, and Ilici there appear to be prototypes from elsewhere that where employed and modified to suit the local needs. The images at Carthago Nova and Abdera were probably invented by the die cutters, but these die cutters used a vocabulary of forms that also appear on the Gades, Ilici, and Malaca issues.

Symbolic, generic imagery had its place in the old Semitic world of southern Spain. The temple forms served to reference the cults and concepts with local meaning without being tied to specific structures. It was the cult or the linkage being referenced by the image of the temple rather than the building itself, and thus the image had meaning even were the building to be destroyed.

The temple images from the coinage of southern Iberia are among the first such images to appear in the Roman world, and the popularity of the type is testified to by issues from five distinct mints over perhaps a period of half a century.