

Mediterranean symbols for a Hispano-Roman city: Artemis/Diana, Pallas-Athena/Minerva and Pegasus on the coinage of *Emporiae*

*Símbolos mediterráneos de una ciudad hispanorromana: Artemisa/Diana,
Pallas-Atenea/Minerva y Pegaso en las monedas de Emporiae*

Helena Gozalbes García
Universidad de Granada
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5949-3634>
helenagg@ugr.es

Recibido: 16/03/2024; Revisado: 07/11/2024; Aceptado: 28/11/2024

Abstract

This study analyses the dissemination of icons used on the coins minted by the provincial mint of *Emporiae*. To this end, the study delves into aspects that have received little attention in the literature. The first section explores the different phases that took place in the territory where the Hispano-Roman city was to emerge. The second section examines the main aspects that shaped the projection process of these monetary icons, taking into consideration important aspects such as the absence of the imperial portrait, the closest parallels of these images, and the epigraphic elements used in their dissemination. A detailed analysis of all the above allows us to conclude that the particular iconological-monumental selections made by *Emporiae* had the sole objective of showcasing the city's complex nature, as it succeeded in integrating the different Hispanic, Roman, and Mediterranean identities of the various populations that were involved in the establishment of *Emporiae* as a *municipium* in *Hispania Tarraconensis*.

Keywords: Numismatics, Iconology, Cultural Identity, Ampurias, Hispano-Roman *Municipium*.

Resumen

Este estudio analiza el fenómeno de difusión de los iconos adoptados en las monedas acuñadas por la ceca provincial de *Emporiae*. Para ello, esta aportación profundiza en aspectos que han recibido poca atención en la investigación. El primer apartado explora las diferentes fases que tuvieron lugar en el territorio donde surgiría la ciudad hispano-romana. La segunda parte examina los principales aspectos que configuraron el proceso de proyección de estos iconos monetarios, tomando en consideración aspectos importantes como la ausencia del retrato imperial, los paralelos más estrechos

de estas imágenes y los elementos epigráficos utilizados en su difusión. El análisis detallado de todo ello permite concluir que la particular selección iconológica-monumental elegida por *Emporiae* tuvo como único objetivo mostrar el carácter complejo de la ciudad, ya que logró integrar las diferentes identidades hispánicas, romanas y mediterráneas de las distintas poblaciones que participaron en el proceso de promoción de *Emporiae* como un *municipium* de la *Hispania Tarraconensis*.

Palabras clave: Numismática, Iconología, identidad cultural, Ampurias, *municipium* hispanorromano.

1. INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY¹

The Hispano-Roman mint of *Emporiae* (present-day L'Escala, Girona, Spain) was located in the western region of the Mediterranean and was one of the most prolific provincial issuing centres in these territories (RIPOLLÈS *et al.*, 1993). In keeping with the most developed production dynamics in these areas (BURNETT, 2011: 2), all the coins minted there were made in bronze and featured inscriptions in Latin. However, unlike almost all the coins produced in the Western Mediterranean, none of the series issued by *Emporiae* included elements connected to the emperor or any of his family members (KEMMERS, 2019: 34) or his family (HORSTER, 2013: 243-261). The absence of these elements hinders their chronological interpretation, with some authors suggesting that they began to be produced in the Augustan period (27 BC-14 AD) (BURNETT *et al.*, 2006: 106; AMELA, 2016: 96; RIPOLLÈS, 2010: 165; 2012; VILLARONGA, 1994: 151-157; 2004b: 248). However, we now know that some of the pieces produced by this city were found in archaeological contexts dating back, according to some specialists, to the first and second third of the 1st century BC, meaning that these pieces were probably minted at least a few years before the battle of *Actium* (41 BC) (COLLANTES, 1997: 156; GARCÍA-BELLIDO & BLÁZQUEZ CERRATO, 2001: 138). The period in which the mint ceased operations has also given rise to a variety of interpretations that, so far, have not been confirmed through material records. Specifically, some historians claim that it occurred some time before the death of Augustus (GARCÍA-BELLIDO & BLÁZQUEZ CERRATO 2001: 150), while others believe that it took place a few years after (AMELA, 2016: 97; BURNETT *et al.*, 2006: 106; RIPOLLÈS 2010: 166).

However, whether they were produced at one time or another, the large number of countermarks engraved on some of the specimens² proves that some of these coins may have remained in use for a particularly long time (Fig.1). The persisting use of these pieces has also been confirmed by the data provided by some of the monetary finds documented at the site; discoveries which demonstrate that these coins could have continued to be used even when some areas of the city had been abandoned (CAMPO & RUIZ DE ARBULO, 1986-1989; CAMPO

¹ This work is result of the Research Project «La divulgación del icono del Pegaso en las acuñaciones griegas, ibéricas y provinciales de Emporion, untikesken y Emporiae», directed by Prof. Á. Padilla Arroba and supported by an «Ayuda Puente para Doctoras» of the Vicerrectorado de Investigación y Transferencia de la Universidad de Granada (2021).

² RPC I, 235.1, 235.8, 238.37, 241.4, 241.11, 241.68-71, 242.6, 246.13-14, 247.25, 249.15, 250.25, 252.34, 252.73, 253.6, 253.8, 254.23-24, 257.58-62, 257.397-402, 397.404 and 257.406.

et al., 2015; CASTANYER *et al.*, 1993). This phenomenon of continuous circulation is particularly important, as it may have contributed to prolonging—in some people’s memories—the immaterial connection between the city and the visual elements that the city had and had not selected years before. These dynamics, which hold considerable importance, will be explored in further detail across several sections of this study.

In this regard, one of the most consequential aspects that we consider pertinent to discuss in this introductory section concerns the icons, as, interestingly, all of them were associated with images already adopted in the coinage previously produced in this territory (AMELA, 2016: 100; BURNETT *et al.*, 2006: 106; GARCÍA-BELLIDO & BLÁZQUEZ CERRATO, 2001: 128; JIMÉNEZ DíEZ, 2008: 133). That is why some researchers have concluded that the selection of these representations was the result of a process of mere typological conservation. However, although it is clear that we are looking at an iconology selection policy influenced by the preceding local/regional emblem, several elements are particularly striking. This is especially true considering the importance that this mint may have had due to its tradition, its aforementioned high volume of production, and its location near the border separating the Iberian Peninsula from the Mediterranean mainland.



Figure 1: Latin coins minted by *Emporiae* and countermarked.
 a: Bronze base unit (RPC I, 243a) (MAN Madrid 1993/67/4369).
 b: Bronze base unit (RPC I, 241) (MAN Madrid 1993/67/4360).
 c: Bronze base unit (RPC I, 257a) (MAN Madrid 1993/67/4472).
 d: Bronze base unit (RPC I, 257a) (MAN Madrid 1973/24/6703).

It is therefore of interest to us to assess in greater detail the potential aspects that may have characterised the socio-cultural phenomena associated with the coins put into use by *Emporiae*. To this end, this study focuses on certain theoretical approaches that are most committed to current social issues, such as, without doubt, the argumentative reinterpretations linked to the New Social History and the multicultural and decolonial turn in history. Specifically, an essential aspect of our research was to consider the multiple analyses that seek to reflect on the importance that the understanding of the Mediterranean space has had and continues to have as a socio-cultural construct, while highlighting the work published by researchers such as M. Dietler (2005), R. Hingley (2005), A. Jiménez Díez (2008), D. Mattingly (2004) and P. Van Dommelen (2011). To this end, we took a methodological approach that reinforces inter-multi-disciplinarity by combining techniques specific to archaeology, numismatics, epigraphy, and iconography in a common synergy that allowed us to reflect on the social value that some monetary icons had and their importance in the different contexts in which they were defined, promoted, transformed, and/or abandoned.



Figure 2: production of Latin coins minted by *Emporiae*.
 a: bronze base unit (*RPC I*, 257b) (MAN Madrid 1993/67/4432).
 b: bronze quarter (*RPC I*, 239a) (MAN Madrid 1993/67/4475).

2. RESULTS AND DISSEMINATION

2.1. The Hispano-Roman *municipium* of *Emporiae*

The first occupation phase of the territory of Empúries in Antiquity took place around 600 BC and was characterised by the progressive establishment of population of Phocaeen-Massaliote origin in an area where there may have been a pre-existing indigenous settlement (AQUILUÉ, 2017: 106). This emerging colonial centre, which Strabo called *Palaiopolis*, was located on an isthmus (AQUILUÉ, 2002: 95) and was the result of frequent contact between the inhabitants of this area

and navigators from further east in the Mediterranean (AQUILUÉ, 2012a: 1; MAR & RUIZ DE ARBULO, 1993: 119-120). In fact, we now know that this settlement was not founded as an entirely urban centre, but as one of the various commercial centres or emporiums (*ἐμπόριον*) that had been established by these sailors for centuries. Although wordcount limitations prevent us from delving deeper into this question, we believe it is of interest to point out that recently published studies are paying special attention to the different defining characteristics of these centres, confirming both the socio-cultural complexity implied by the establishment of many of them, and the extent to which their origins may have influenced their subsequent historical evolution (GAILEDRAT *et al.*, 2018). This socio-cultural and economic dynamism seems to be confirmed in the specific case of the centre founded in the territory of Empúries, as this nucleus may have been one of the few *emporía* that began to mint some coins after their establishment. In particular, we are referring to the manufacture of very small-sized potential imitations of Massaliote series (CAMPO, 1992a: 197-198; 1996: 9; 1997: 22; 2000: 89; 2002b; RIPOLLÉS, 2005a: 187; 2005b: 35; 2013; VILLARONGA, 1994: 3), which featured Greek inscriptions and a wide variety of typologies.

The little space available on this isthmus and the great demographic growth experienced by the emporium – which was also the result of the forced migration of Phocaeans after the Persian conquest of their metropolis and the increasing influence of *Massalia* after the Battle of Alalia (537 BC) – meant that part of the population was forced to move to the mainland shortly afterwards (AQUILUÉ, 2012b: 27; CASTANYER *et al.*, 2009-2011: 63; PLANA-MALLART, 2012). As a result, the city known in modern historiography as *Neapolis* was founded, giving rise to a city called *Emporion* (*Ἐμπόριον*); a Greek name reflecting its fundamentally commercial past that was passed on over the centuries, eventually adopting the present-day toponym of Empúries.

As Strabo (III, 8-9) and Livy (34, 9) appear to suggest, initially the settlers and the natives may have occupied this place separately; but archaeological findings have demonstrated that, by the 3rd century BC, the profound intermingling of these populations gave rise to a first unified community (PLANA-MALLART, 2012). This process may have had some important precedents related to both coexistence and even symbiosis, as some of the most recently published studies successfully demonstrate (AQUILUÉ *et al.*, 2010; CASTANYER *et al.*, 2016; CASTANYER *et al.* 2020; DELGADO *et al.* 2020). Shortly before that, in the 4th century BC, *Emporion* could have had the fully articulated physiognomy of a *polis*, and thus began to increase its coin production (MAR & RUIZ DE ARBULO, 1993). From this point onwards, this production was associated solely with a distinct and original minting phenomenon, the development of which continued until the late 2nd century BCE (CAMPO, 1992a: 204; 1997: 49; VILLARONGA, 1994: 26) or the early years of the following century (CAMPO, 2002a: 78 and 93; 2012: 27).

From the 4th century BC onwards, the coins issued by this mint began to be associated with a metrology based on the drachma, the weights of which gradually decreased (CAMPO, 1997) until they resembled the sizes of the Roman denarii (AMELA, 2019). Greek legends continued to be used on these coins together with

very specific types. As such, shortly afterwards, *Emporion* gave great prominence to a female head³ surrounded by dolphins⁴ and to a winged horse⁵. The wide dissemination of these two icons leads us to hypothesise that the inhabitants of the city began to take an interest in using coins as a means of self-affirming their collective identity, so that these types began to make a twofold allusion, both religious and emblematic. It is also important to note that this iconology was markedly different from that of the coinage minted from the 3rd century BC onwards in the neighbouring area, where a typological programme based on the head of a male figure and that of a horseman became widespread. This widespread homogenisation of monetary iconology around these images is significant, as it determined the very identification phenomena that were developed in some Western Mediterranean regions. In fact, these data suggest that it was precisely at this time that practices allowing for the projection of community identity through visual propaganda began to become widespread. This phenomenon developed progressively, and we cannot rule out the possibility that the very coins minted by *Emporion* played a decisive role in this process. As previously mentioned, such sociocultural dynamics had already been underway in this city for several years. This was how a context was consolidated in which the potential users of Emporitan coins were able to fully absorb the emblematic symbolism that their inhabitants decided to disseminate through their coins.

A new phase of occupation of the territory of Empúries began shortly afterwards, which was characterised by the intense introduction of new cultural elements and their progressive intermingling with the already hybrid local population. Against this backdrop, the gradual construction of a new city began just behind the Greek-Indigenous nucleus. This incipient urban reality, called *Emporiae*, was initially organised as a Roman *civitas foederata* (AQUILUÉ, 2002: 98; 2012: 3a; AQUILUÉ, *et al.*, 2006: 19-31; MAR & RUIZ DE ARBULO, 1993: 155-186) situated on the site of an ancient Iberian settlement, which could have begun to be inhabited separate from *Emporion* (RIPOLL, 1985: 71). Archaeologists excavating this site for several decades link this potential Iberian settlement with a Roman military installation which, according to these specialists, may have been established in the second quarter of the 2nd century BC (CASTANYER *et al.*, 2016). It is quite possible that the name of the people who resided in those lands gave rise to the demonym *untikesken* mentioned on its coins (AMELA, 2017: 59; AQUILUÉ, 2012a: 4; BARRANDON, 2011: 249 and 375; CAMPO, 2002a: 77; 2009: 13; 2010: 17; DOMÍNGUEZ ARRANZ, 1997: 125; GARCÍA-BELLIDO & BLÁZQUEZ CERRATO, 2001: 387; MAR & RUIZ DE ARBULO, 1993: 306; RIPOLL, 1985: 71), which were minted in bronze with Iberian inscriptions and have been dated to between the 2nd and 1st centuries BC. (AMELA, 2017: 64-70; AQUILUÉ, 2012a: 4; BARRANDON, 2011: 375; CAMPO, 2000: 64-65; 2002a: 79, 81 and 93; 2009: 13; 2010: 26; 2012: 24; DOMÍNGUEZ ARRANZ, 1997: 126; GARCÍA-BELLIDO & BLÁZQUEZ CERRATO, 2001: 387; MAR & RUIZ DE ARBULO, 1993: 194-195; RIPOLLÈS, 2005a: 80; 2005b: 160; 2010: 165; 2012: 132; VILLARONGA, 1994: 141; VILLARONGA & BENAGES,

3 ACIP 156-237; MIB 1/192-252.

4 ACIP 160-178, 186-202 and 209-237; MIB 1/196-206, 211-216, 225-242 and 244-252.

5 ACIP 160-180, 182-183, 186-205 and 209-237; MIB 1/196-207, 209, 211-221 and 225-252.

2011: 176). Several specialists are of the opinion that the closure of the *Emporion* mint coincided with the moment when *untikesken* began to issue coins (BURNETT *et al.*, 2006: 106; COLLANTES, 1997: 156; DOMÍNGUEZ ARRANZ, 1997: 125; VILLARONGA & BENAGES, 2011: 175). However, this hypothesis is difficult to verify, given that the excavation work carried out at the site shows that the definitive union between the two centres did not take place until decades later.

For these reasons, we cannot not rule out the hypothesis put forward by L. Amela (2019), being that the last phase of coin production in *Emporion* must have been simultaneous with the production of the first coins in *untikesken*. Specifically, this author highlights the fact that, in the final stages of operation at the *Emporion* mint, it began to produce light drachms with a metrology like that of the Roman denarius, i.e. the metrological system to which the *untikesken* bronzes were linked. It would therefore be quite plausible to assume that these changes were a consequence of the opening of the nearby Ibero-Roman mint, whose bronzes could begin to play the fractional role that the small specimens struck by *Emporion* had played years before and whose production also ceased at that time. Such a relationship – based on the bipolarity that both centres may have had as part of that particular *dipolis*, as ascertained by archaeological records – was also apparent in their typological selections. In fact, in contrast to what has been confirmed in the other indigenous mints in these territories, the most common reverse type used on the larger pieces produced by *untikesken* was the winged horse icon⁶. However, this city selected an obverse type that was completely different from that of *Emporion*, i.e. the image of a goddess with military attributes (VILLARONGA, 2004a).

Over time, part of the Ibero-Roman population living there and in the surrounding area was assimilated into the new Hispano-Roman city of *Emporiae*, whose oldest archaeological remains have been dated to the early years of the 1st century BC (AQUILUÉ, 2012a; GARCÍA-BELLIDO & BLÁZQUEZ CERRATO, 2001; MAR & RUIZ DE ARBULO, 1993; RUIZ DE ARBULO, 1998). Thus, on the occasion of the Roman-provincial administrative integration that began to take place in the second half of that century, *Emporiae* was granted municipal *status* (AQUILUÉ, 2012a; 2017; BARRANDON, 2011; DOMÍNGUEZ ARRANZ, 1997; GARCÍA-BELLIDO & BLÁZQUEZ CERRATO, 2001; RIPOLLÉS, 2010; VILLARONGA, 1994; VILLARONGA & BENAGES, 2011). It was at this time that a major urban redevelopment took place, as well as the definitive material and immaterial union between the Greek-Indigenous and the Ibero-Roman communities.

2.2. The absence of political portraits on the Latin coins of *Emporiae*

The iconological policy of *Emporiae* differed only in part from the strategies followed by *Emporion* and *untikesken*, as the city authorities selected three different

⁶ ACIP 993, 999, 1006-1007, 1009-1011, 1022, 1025, 1028-1034, 1036, 1042-1052 and 1055-1060; MIB 57/01, 06, 14-16, 19, 30, 32-35, 38-40, 43, 49-55, 58-60 and 67-68.

icons, two for the obverse and one for the reverse. This distribution is particularly striking, as we are also aware that this mint struck at least 22 series of base units⁷ and three series of quarters,⁸ most of which had a particularly high number of variants.⁹ The great number of issues and diversity of minted values could have facilitated the incorporation of a much more varied typological programme, similar to the original typological selection strategy previously adopted by the *untikesken* mint. However, in contrast to what is observed regarding this indigenous mint, the city authorities decided to maintain an almost totally fixed typological policy which they did not even alternate, even though they understood coins have two distinct representation spaces, i.e. the obverse and the reverse.

Nonetheless, as we have noted, although the selections in *Emporiae* showed a degree of innovation in terms of diversity, the icons chosen were directly related to those adopted in coinage produced decades earlier in this area. This strategy was particularly original as it cannot be directly related to the typological elements most frequently used in the provincial coinage produced in those years. The new icons included the political portrait, which, at the beginning of the Principate period, began to be used almost exclusively on the obverse of coins produced in most of the provinces of the Roman Empire (BURNETT, 2011: 1-30), especially in those located in the Western Mediterranean areas. The absence of this image on the *Emporiae* bronzes is quite striking, particularly considering the ideas detailed in the previous paragraph, as it is evident that the city's high production volume could have facilitated the dissemination of a highly varied iconological programme in which, after *Actium*, some of the different elements associated with imperial propaganda could have been present.

One might therefore wonder whether the absence of the political portrait was due to a previous lack of knowledge about its provincial dissemination. Perhaps the answer to this question can be found in the possibility that other nearby mints, such as those of *Tarraco*¹⁰ (Tarragona, Spain) and *Ilerda*¹¹ (Lleida, Spain), would have begun to select this image as early as the time of Augustus. In fact, *Emporiae* was the only issuing centre in the province of *Citerior* that did not mint any coins bearing the political portrait and the only Hispanic mint – apart from the rather dubious and productive mint of *Sexi*¹² (Almuñécar, Granada, Spain) – whose coins made no reference to any member of the imperial family. In light of these circumstances, we would conclude that if *Emporiae*'s decision not to adopt the political portrait was initially unconscious, it was no longer so after a while, as archaeological evidence may prove.

Indeed, well known reports on the coin finds that have taken place at the Empúries archaeological site lead us to believe that, during the period in which the provincial workshop of *Emporiae* was operational, the inhabitants of the area

7 *RPC* I, 234-38, 240-43 and 245-257.

8 *RPC* I, 239, 244 and 258.

9 *RPC* I, 234a-b, 235a-b, 237a-c, 238a-b, 239a-b, 240a-b, 241a-d, 242a-d, 243a-d, 245a-c, 246a-b, 247a-b, 249a-b, 250a-b, 251a-c, 252a-f, 253a-d, 254a-c, 256a-e and 257a-c.

10 *RPC* I, 210 and 215.

11 *RPC* I, 259-260.

12 *RPC* I, 123A

were already familiar with the provincial tradition of disseminating the political portrait. Moreover, we are aware of the arrival of certain pieces from local factories in the city, in which these representations were used. This is supported by the well-known Augustan findings made at the site,¹³ including two *quadrantes* issued by *Colonia Patricia*¹⁴ (Córdoba, Spain) (RIPOLLÈS, 1982: 183), one *semis* from *Carthago Nova*¹⁵ (Cartagena, Murcia, Spain) (LLORENS, 1994: 111 and 309), one *as* coined by *Pax Iulia*¹⁶ (Beja, Portugal) (RIPOLLÈS, 1982: 183), one *as* from *Tarraco*¹⁷ (Tarragona, Spain) (RIPOLLÈS, 1982: 183), another five from *Ilerda*¹⁸ (RIPOLLÈS, 1982: 183 and 189), another two produced in *Caesaraugusta*¹⁹ (Zaragoza, Spain) (GÓMEZ BARREIRO, 2017: 350), another from *Turiaso*²⁰ (Tarazona, Zaragoza, Spain) (RIPOLLÈS, 1982: 95), another one from *Calagurris*²¹ (Calahorra, Spain), another one from *Segobriga*²² (Saelices, Cuenca, Spain) (RIPOLLÈS, 1982: 92 and 189) and another 24 from *Nemausus*²³ (Nîmes, France) (16 intact and 12 broken ones) (CAMPO & RUIZ DE ARBULO, 1986-1989: 154 and 160; CAMPO *et al.*, 2015: 134; KEAY, 1984: 489; RIPOLLÈS, 1982).

We could also add data on other discoveries of provincial coins bearing political portraits, such as two broken *as* coins minted in *Narbo*²⁴ (Narbonne, France) (CAMPO *et al.*, 2015: 119) and *Lugdunum*²⁵ (Lyon, France); two Tiberian *asses* struck by *Saguntum*²⁶ (Sagunto, Valencia, Spain) (GOZALBES & RIPOLLÈS, 2002), another contemporary *as* minted by *Calagurris*²⁷ (RIPOLLÈS, 1982: 189), and a *sestertius*²⁸ and an *as*²⁹ also produced at the same time, in this case by *Tarraco*

13 We are awaiting the publication of the details of some of finds, including the monetary set dated to the Flavian period (17 pieces) and found in 1925 (GNC 19133-CJT) (<https://www.museunacional.cat/ca/colleccio/conjunt-monetari-demporion-depoca-flavia/diverses-autoritats/019133-cjt>).

14 *RPC I*, 131 (2 pieces); GNC 19135 and GNC 19509.

15 *RPC I*, 171; GNC 19442 (6,11g, 7h).

16 *RPC I*, 52; GNC 19134.

17 *RPC I*, 210; GNC 19295.

18 *RPC I*, 260 (5 pieces); GNC 19323, GNC 19378 and Museu d'Arqueologia de Catalunya (3 pieces).

19 *RPC I*, 309 and 322; GNC 19247 (10, 44g) (CAMPO & RUIZ DE ARBULO, 1986-1989: 154; GÓMEZ BARREIRO, 2018: 350) and GNC 14571 (GÓMEZ BARREIRO, 2018: 350).

20 *RPC I*, 417; piece that belong to the "Víctor Catalá" collection.

21 *RPC I*, 447; Museu d'Arqueologia de Catalunya (we do not know the inventory number).

22 *RPC I*, 472; Museu d'Arqueologia de Catalunya (we do not know the inventory number).

23 *RPC I*, 522-5 (28 pieces); GNC 19335 (8,52g, 6h), GNC 19720 (13,44g, 10h) (CAMPO & RUIZ DE ARBULO, 1986-1989: 154 and 156), 01-CR-I30-1004-9319 (13,44g, 1h, 26mm), 03-CR-I30-20001-1 (7,21g, 11h, 25mm) (CAMPO *et al.* 2015: 134), CR-4007 (13,1mm, 5h) (KEAY, 1984: 489) and another 23 only mentioned, of which one has been published as a controlled find (CAMPO & RUIZ DE ARBULO 1986-1989: 158) and the rest as pieces that belong to the "Víctor Catalá" collection (6 pieces) (3 split pieces) (Ripollès, 1982: 95) and to the Museu d'Arqueologia de Catalunya collection (16 pieces) (9 split pieces) (RIPOLLÈS, 1982: 190).

24 *RPC I*, 518; 04-CR-I30-18016-3.

25 *RPC I*, 514-517; GNC 14484-N (20,97g, 10h, 35mm) (<https://www.museunacional.cat/ca/colleccio/partit/august/014484-n>).

26 *RPC I*, 202; GNC 19533 and Museu d'Arqueologia de Catalunya (we do not know the inventory number).

27 *RPC I*, 450; Museu d'Arqueologia de Catalunya (we do not know the inventory number).

28 *RPC I*, 219; GNC 14599-N (20,97g, 10h, 35mm) (<https://www.museunacional.cat/ca/colleccio/sesterci/tiberi/014599-n>).

29 *RPC I*, 228; Gabinet Numismàtic de Catalunya (we do not know the inventory number).

(RIPOLLÈS, 1982: 183); another *as* issued by *Carthago-Nova*³⁰ during Caligula's reign (CAMPO & RUIZ DE ARBULO, 1986-1989: 156); another *as* of an uncertain date put into circulation by *Bilbilis* (Calatayud, Zaragoza, Spain) (RIPOLLÈS, 1982: 92) and at least one other piece with as yet unpublished details minted by *Calagurris* (RIPOLLÈS, 1982: 190).

It is true that some of these coins appeared at different erosion levels dated decades after they were put into circulation (CAMPO & RUIZ DE ARBULO, 1986-1989: 152-163; CAMPO *et al.*, 2015: 93-143) and that the date of deposit is unknown for the rest of the finds, making it impossible to determine the exact moment at which these bronzes began to be used in *Emporiae*. Nevertheless, the large number of coins uncovered, the absence of any signs of reuse (countermarks and evidence of breaking) on a large number of them, and the proximity between the city and some of the mints which had issued them could lead us to believe that at least some of these bronzes may have arrived in the area during the years when the *Emporiae* workshop was still in operation.



Figure 3: Coins countermarked.

- a: Bronze base unit mint in *Caesaraugusta* (RPC I, 320) (MAN Madrid 1993/67/8140).
- b: Bronze base unit mint in *Emporiae* (RPC I, 257a) (MAN Madrid 1993/67/4463).
- c: Bronze base unit in *Caesaraugusta* (RPC I, 327) (MAN Madrid 1993/67/8173).

³⁰ RPC I, 186; GNC 19622.

In addition, the discovery of these coins leads us to believe that the arrival of provincial coins of non-local manufacture was common in the region. This means that we cannot rule out the possibility that other bronzes of similar characteristics were used in *Emporiae* and that they either have not yet been discovered, or their provenance is unknown, or they left *Emporiae* to be re-struck or be used in other areas or were ultimately melted down for recycling by this city or another issuing center. Such specimens could include coins on which the countermarks typical of this city were stamped³¹ (RIPOLLÈS, 2010: 167). As such, we believe it necessary to disregard the pieces that received the distinctive mirror inscription DD³² (or any of its variants: D'D, D.D, or D:D), as this is replicated in specimens from *Emporiae*³³ (Fig. 3b), *Emerita Augusta*³⁴ (Mérida, Badajoz, Spain), *Colonia Patricia*,³⁵ *Carthago-Nova*,³⁶ *Tarraco*,³⁷ and especially from *Ebora*³⁸ (Evora, Portugal), *Iulia Traducta*³⁹ (Algeciras, Cádiz, Spain), and *Saguntum*.⁴⁰ The widespread repetition of this countermark suggests that it must have been used by different mints; a hypothesis that could be further justified when considering the meaning of this inscription (most probably *decreto decurionum*). This is why we chose not to include an analysis of coins with the DD countermark in our study, as it is currently impossible to identify the specific specimens that were re-stamped within *Emporiae* itself.

We also believe it appropriate to exclude the coin minted by *Caesaraugusta*⁴¹ in the Augustan period from our sample, which, according to the authors of the Roman Provincial Coinage Online catalogue,⁴² may have been countermarked with the figurative insignia of a dolphin⁴³ (Fig. 3a). Even though *a priori* this would suggest that this piece was the only known coin not minted by *Emporiae* that featured the typical engraving of Emporitan bronzes,⁴⁴ we were able to closely examine this specimen—currently on deposit at the National Archaeological Museum in Madrid⁴⁵—and we believe there is some evidence that this was not the case. In fact, the countermark in question seems to be more similar to the eagle's head stamp looking to the left⁴⁶ that is so common on coins minted in the inland regions of the province of *Citerior* in general, and in *Caesaraugusta* in particular⁴⁷ (Fig. 3c).

However, although studying these countermarks does not help in confirming

31 *RPC I*, index 3, 12, 46-47 and 63-64.

32 *RPC I*, index 46-47.

33 *RPC I*, 241.68-70, 247.25, 250.25, 253.6, 254.23-24, 257.58-62, 257.397-400, 257.404 and 257.406.

34 *RPC I*, 6.13.

35 *RPC I*, 129.386.

36 *RPC I*, 129.386 and 179.69.

37 *RPC I*, 228.17.

38 *RPC I*, 51.13, 51.21, 51.33, 51.36, 51.79, 51.82, 51.90, 51.93, 51.106 and 51.108-110.

39 *RPC I*, 107.58, 108.421, 108.434, 108.436 and 108.440.

40 *RPC I*, 202.19, 202.21, 202.94 and 202.109.

41 *RPC I*, 320

42 *RPC I*, 320.58.

43 *RPC I*, index 3.

44 *RPC I*, 241.68-70, 254.23-24, 257.69, 247.62, 247.400 and 247.406.

45 Inventory number 1993/67/8140.

46 *RPC I* index 4.

47 *RPC I*, 309.32, 314.40-41, 317.14, 322.50, 322.61 and 327.7

our conclusions, we believe that available data on production and finds enable us to form a hypothesis: that the icons of exclusively local/regional character were so highly valued by the inhabitants of *Emporiae* that the authorities decided to incorporate them on both sides of their coins, even though they had to consciously dispense with propagandistic elements such as those alluding to the power of the Empire. This dynamic could also have caught the attention of those who, while not living in the city, may have been familiar with the original monetary icons of *Emporiae*, since, as has already been pointed out, the identity dynamics connected with the monetary iconology were already well known.

2.3. Artemis/Diana on coins minted by *Emporiae*

The obverse types adopted on the coins minted by *Emporiae* featured two female divinities, both represented by the figure of their heads (Fig. 4). The most widespread of these two icons had strong military overtones and was adopted on almost all the series, whether they were base units or quarters. There was an exception, however, as this mint also produced a single base unit issue depicting a female deity accompanied by what appears to be a bow and quiver with arrows.⁴⁸ The latter object was neither new nor unusual in the region's coinage, as its image may have appeared on some of the lighter drachms, and therefore those of a later chronology, produced by *Emporion*⁴⁹ (Fig. 5). In fact, several historians such as L. Amela (2019), M. J. Pena (2016), L. Villaronga, and J. Benages (2011) have concluded that the obverse of these Greek coins featured the image of a deity accompanied by two dolphins and a quiver of arrows.

The presence of this quiver on all these coins, a symbol that complemented the bow in the Latin series, has led some authors to identify the deity depicted on these specimens as the huntress goddess Artemis/Diana. This same interpretation, which has also been put forward for some coins with partly similar iconography manufactured by *Massalia* (PENA, 2016), could relate to the ideas advanced by other historians regarding the obverse images used on the other Emporitian drachms, on which, as previously mentioned, the head of a female deity was depicted, generally accompanied by several dolphins.

⁴⁸ RPC I, 234.

⁴⁹ ACIP 233-237; MIB 1/248-252.



Figure 4: Bronze base unit minted in *Emporiae* (RPC I, 254a) (MAN Madrid 1993/67/4358)

The presence of these marine animals has led some authors to identify the goddess represented on these drachms with certain nymphs (GARCÍA-BELLIDO, 1991: 47-78; OLMOS, 1992: 107), such as Persephone/Arethusa (ARÉVALO, 2002-2003: 243; CAMPO, 1992a: 198-200; 1997: 24-25; VILLARONGA, 1994: 17-29; 2001: 31 and 37), but we believe that the proposal put forward some time ago by M. J. Pena (1973: 109-134; 2006, 10-11), assumed shortly afterwards by other researchers (AMELA, 2016: 99; BURNETT *et al.*, 2006: 107; COLLANTES, 1997: 157; GARCÍA-BELLIDO, 1992: 244; 1998: 77; GARCÍA-BELLIDO & BLÁZQUEZ CERRATO, 2001: 128; RIPOLLÈS, 2012: 133; RUIZ DE ARBULO, 2002-2003: 170), is more reasonable. According to this author, the deity represented on these coins was also Artemis/Diana. In line with this, it should be noted that Strabo (III, 4, 8) mentioned in his work that one of the main cults of *Emporion* was precisely that of the goddess Artemis Ephesia; a deity with strong links to the cities of *Phocaea* (Eskifoça, Turkey) and *Massalia* (Marseille, France) (AQUILUÉ, 2002: 100; CAMPO, 1992b: 121; PENA, 2006: 11-14; SELTMAN, 1952: 34-35; ROSE & ROBERSON, 1979: 127; TRÉZINY, 1997: 193). Therefore, it should come as no surprise that some researchers have raised the possibility that an important sanctuary dedicated to this divinity may have been erected in *Emporion* itself (PENA, 2000: 59-68; PUCCIO, 2010: 218), the remains of which have either not yet been found (PENA, 2006: 11) or have not been unquestionably identified as such.

We also believe that the presence of the dolphin figures next to the representation of Artemis/Diana on the *Emporion* coins could align with the artistic repertoire of the period. Nonetheless, we are aware that some iconographic works on non-monetary materials associated with this goddess depicted her holding in each hand an animal of distinctly wild character (AGHION *et al.*, 2008: 150; GRIMAL, 2001: 54; MARCH, 2002: 64-65; ROSE & ROBERSON, 1979: 126) – or at least of an untameable nature, according to the perceptions of that time –. A highly significant example of this is the iconography of a gem – currently on deposit at the National Archaeological Museum of Athens – possibly depicting this divinity flanked by two dolphins.⁵⁰

⁵⁰ LIMC II Artemis 5.



Figure 5: Silver base unit minted in Ἐμπορίον(-Emporion) (ACIP 163; MIB 1/199a) (MAN Madrid 1993/67/12) (<https://monedaiberica.org/v3/type/14832>).

Based on this data, we would argue that the presence of these animals on the coins of *Emporion* alluded to that iconographic practice, highlighting, in this case, the maritime importance of this Mediterranean *polis*. Such an approach may have projected a narrative that aligned with the unique identity of a city marked by its port and border character, as is the case under study. Should this interpretation be accepted, it could allow us to recognize the development of a particularly exceptional intangible phenomenon, in the sense that it somewhat distanced the Emporitan religious-identity discourse from others, such as that of *Massalia*.

It is important to note that the authorities of *Massalia* chose to associate the monetary image of the goddess Artemis/Diana with a non-maritime wild animal, in this case, a lion. However, although the magistrates of *Massalia* opted not to link this goddess's coinage image with a symbolic coastal narrative, the Emporitan programme was nevertheless quite consistent with the religious traditions of the period, as we have evidence that Artemis/Diana was a goddess to whom a nautical protective function—especially the protection of sailors and ports—was attributed in certain territories (GUETTEL COLE, 2000: 473). Indeed, one of her roles was to defend transitional spaces, and it would therefore be more than likely that this deity was worshipped in maritime cities as a divinity protecting coastal areas, i.e. the transition zones between the sea and land. This is why she was even associated with dolphin-shaped goddesses such as the Nabataean Atargatis (KAMPEN, 2003: 214-218). These latter ideas could also be linked to the well-known lunar attributes of the divinity (LiDONNICI, 1992: 407), as the silhouette of dolphins could have reminded the users of the *Emporion* coins of a crescent moon, another of the main symbols generally associated with Artemis/Diana.

Moreover, since *Emporion* was founded by the Greeks, which was also evident in its very name, the image of the dolphin could also be connected with Mediterranean peoples' understanding of the processes of colonial expansion. This hypothesis—already put forward by R. M. Motta (2016) regarding the coins of Syracuse (Italy) depicting the image of Arethusa—is based on the existence of

a god, *Apollo Delphinus*, who had a fundamentally commercial and/or colonial symbolism. If this were the case, such symbolism would have a particularly representative significance in the case of Artemis/Diana, since, according to tradition, she was the twin sister of Apollo himself. Nevertheless, we do not wish to overlook the reasons that led the authorities of *Emporion* to incorporate the figure of the quiver, as we find it quite plausible to consider that, in this instance, the change was indeed influenced by the coinage of *Massalia*. It is also worth noting that the metrology of known specimens suggests that this object's depiction appeared in Massaliote series several decades before it was introduced in those of *Emporion*.

If we were to accept these arguments, we would also have to assume that the subsequent iconographic innovation was brought about by the coins of *Emporiae*, on which the goddess was no longer represented alongside the dolphins that used to evoke the maritime and colonial character of the territory, resulting in the transformation of her iconography. As a consequence of this new development, the Emporitan icon of Artemis/Diana was directly linked to a new figurative imagery—the Roman provincial one—whose heterogeneity was particularly marked, as we are aware that it was constructed through an open dialogue of influences (NOELKE *et al.* 2003), contributions, and constantly renewed socio-cultural processes in which both the people who made the artifact and those who commissioned it were involved. However, although the disappearance of the dolphin figures was the consequence of an obvious aesthetic evolution, it is no less striking, especially considering that the types of maritime exaltation were icons frequently used on the provincial coins minted in some of the areas closest to *Emporiae* itself; so much so, that these images became the monetary emblems of two of the six mints located in the eastern part of the Iberian Peninsula, namely, *Saguntum* and *Ilercavonia-Dertosa* (Tortosa, Tarragona, Spain), whose monetary selection dynamics are not mentioned here by chance, as we are aware that at least three specimens were put into use by both mints and circulated at the Empúries site. It should be noted that we ignore the context in which any of these coins were recovered and, therefore, we do not know when they may have begun to be used by the inhabitants of *Emporiae*.⁵¹ Nonetheless, these materials are important, as they allow us to assess the possibility that at least some Emporitans were aware that both *Saguntum*⁵² and *Ilercavonia-Dertosa*⁵³ had selected maritime icons as their monetary emblems. Two of these three pieces have been detailed in the previous section, noting that they were put into use in the time of Tiberius.⁵⁴ Both were manufactured by *Saguntum* and bear the image of a vessel as the reverse type. The third piece was an *as* with maritime types on the obverse and reverse minted by *Ilercavonia (-Dertosa)* in the time of Augustus.⁵⁵

51 *RPC I*, 147-148 and 155.

52 *RPC I*, 199A-D, 200-204 and 485.

53 *RPC I*, 205-209.

54 *RPC I*, 202; GNC 19533.

55 *RPC I*, 205; GNC 19133-N (1,84 g, 2h, 11mm) (<https://www.museunacional.cat/ca/colleccio/retallat/august/019133-n>).

In light of the above, we believe that it would be wrong to minimise the value that the disappearance of the icon of the dolphins from the coins minted in the territory of Empúries may have had. In our opinion, this disappearance reflected the interest of the city's authorities in connecting the goddess Artemis/Diana with more widespread iconographic patterns, even if they had to dispense with a narrative of territorial-maritime exaltation which, interestingly enough, they later disseminated by using their local countermarks. This phenomenon bears comparison with what happened in other cities traditionally associated with the cult of this goddess. One of these was Ephesus (Selçuk, Turkey), on whose provincial coins the recurring depiction of Artemis/Diana, in conjunction with a bee, began to be associated with one of the most widespread Mediterranean symbols of hunting, i.e. that of a deer⁵⁶ (HEUCHERT, 2005: 49; FRAYER-GRIGGS, 2013: 463-469).

In any case, however, the coinage of *Emporiae* with the representation of Artemis/Diana was also special because of its epigraphic elements. Although it is undeniable that most of the users of these coins must have been illiterate and, consequently, one might assume that many of them were incapable of interpreting the information contained in those inscriptions, we also believe that a considerable number of them were able to recognise at least the letters of the name of *Emporiae*, firstly because of the personal connection they had with the city and, secondly, because, although its name was written in Latin, the letters were very similar to those engraved on the coins minted by *Emporion*.



Figure 6: Obverse of bronze base unit minted in *Emporiae* (RPC I, 254).
(MAN Madrid 1993/67/4359).

⁵⁶ RPC I, 2575-2585, 2587, 2589, 2591, 2593-2609 and 2610-2612.

In line with the above, we also believe that it is necessary to appreciate the importance that monetary epigraphy itself may have had as an element directly related to the city's elites, since the limited reading skills of the population allowed them to use this resource as a means of self-affirming their own power and prestige. In fact, these individuals did not only select the written messages to be conveyed but were also the ones who were able to reveal their meaning, thus practising a kind of evergetism which, in this case, allowed them to consolidate the civic identity of the centre and reinforce the integration of its inhabitants over whom they had been exercising their power. To this end, they made use not only of words but also of images, using icons that were easily recognisable both outside and, above all, inside the issuing centre itself.

The latter hypotheses are supported by the fact that the coins bearing the image of Artemis/Diana were the only series produced by *Emporiae* in which the municipal *status* of the city was mentioned (Fig. 6) (AMELA, 2016: 97-99; BURNETT *et al.*, 2006: 106; COLLANTES, 1997: 157; RIPOLLÉS, 2010: 165; 2012: 133; VILLARONGA, 1977: 6) and whose obverse bore the name of the issuing city. By contrast, in the other the issues the toponym was displayed on the other side of the coin. Although this divergence could easily go unnoticed, we believe that it was not accidental, as it could have been the intention of the authorities of the *municipium* to directly link the image of this goddess with the Latinised name of the city. This interpretation is also supported by the fact that, in this issue, the name of the centre could have been written either in the nominative—*emporia(e)*—or in the genitive case—*empori(t)a(num)*—in reference to the *municipium* itself—*munici(pium) empori(t)a(num)*—, while in the other series this may have been specified in a different way.

The presence of that precise lettering—*munici(pium)*—has led certain specialists to conclude that these bronzes were associated with foundational exaltation (AMELA, 2016: 99; COLLANTES, 1997: 157), a hypothesis that we share, not merely because of the presence of that inscription, but also because of other relevant data. In fact, the choice of the image of Artemis/Diana together with her main attributes according to Mediterranean iconology could be evidence of the close relationship that these bronzes had with a narrative of civic exaltation. As we have argued in this study, this would suggest that the figure of that deity may have been one of the two main types found on the numerous coins minted by *Emporion*.

Consequently, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that we are looking at a divinity strongly rooted among the local population, especially among those who had resided in the ancient Greek-Indigenous settlement and those directly connected with families who had emigrated, originally from places such as *Phocaea* or, more likely, from nearby *Massalia*. For this reason, while we do not dispute the religious and cultural factors, which we believe to be both evident and significant, we do not rule out the possibility that the choice of Artemis/Diana as a monetary icon was also motivated by other, less easily interpretable factors. These factors may be socio-political in nature, as this choice may have been linked to the prestige and, above all, the influence that certain aristocratic families from the ancient Greek-Indigenous city may have exerted in the process of re-founding

the *municipium* of *Emporiae*.

Our arguments herein allow us to conclude that, although the representation of Artemis/Diana on the coins of *Emporiae* was not as widespread as the other iconologies of this mint, the type was indeed characterised by certain features that brought its symbolism closer to a civic-representative narrative that was key to understanding the very idiosyncrasy of this Mediterranean city.

2.4. Pallas-Athena/Minerva on the coins minted by *Emporiae*

The rest of the issues minted by *Emporiae* featured on the obverse the image of a female deity adorned with a large helmet with a plume and visor. The presence of this helmet has led most authors to identify this icon with the goddess Pallas-Athena/Minerva (Fig. 7 and 8b) (AMELA, 2016: 98; BURNETT *et al.*, 2006: 107-109; COLLANTES, 1997: 157; GOMIS, 1997: 53; GRANT, 1946: 154; RIPOLLÈS, 1997a: 32; 1997b: 350; 2005b: 361; 2010: 168-170; 2012: 133; RUIZ DE ARBULO, 1998: 552; SANMARTÍ, 1973: 14-15; VILLARONGA, 1994: 151; 2000a: 356-358; 2000c: 170-171; 2004a; 2004b: 247; VILLARONGA & BENAGES, 2011: 188-15). In our opinion, this is a reasonable hypothesis, not only because of the presence of the helmet, but also because it is well known that the cult of this divinity was the main rite of devotion in the city of *Phocaea* (PENA, 2016: 961; TRÉZINY, 1997: 193), i.e. in the metropolis founded by *Massalia*, and that, together with the latter, it may have participated in the later establishment of the colony of *Emporion*.



Figure 7: Obverse of bronze base unit minted in *Emporiae* (RPC I, 257). (Ashmolean Museum).

Although the archaeological evidence for this is not entirely conclusive, Strabo (IV, I, 4) mentioned that an important temple dedicated to Pallas-Athena/Minerva was built in *Massalia* itself (TRÉZINY, 1997: 193). Another important point to consider in this regard is that the mint of *untikesken* itself may have selected the image of a helmeted goddess as the obverse type for all its coins (Fig. 8a). In the opinion of authors such as J. Tremoleda, M. Santos, P. Castanyer, and E. Hernández, this phenomenon could relate to the particular context of the centre (TREMOLÉDA *et al.*, 2022: 25), as it could be quite plausible to consider that the establishment of a military installation in the territory could have influenced the mint's monetary selections.

In any case, however, we deem it evident that the specimens put into use by *untikesken* greatly influenced the iconological-monetary strategy followed decades later by *Emporiae*, as we also have evidence that a certain proportion of them may have continued to be in use during the period in which the municipium's workshop was in operation. Hence, it would not be far-fetched to infer that the inhabitants of the city were in a position to compare the icons on the *untikesken* bronzes with the new Emporitan pieces, as this comparison could have been based on both memory and material handling, in some cases extending as far back as the time of the Flavian emperors (69-96 AD) and, in others, as far back as the 3rd century AD.



Figure 8: production of coins minted in Empúries
 a: bronze base unit minted in *untikesken* (ACIP 1007; MIB 57/15) (MAN Madrid 1993/67/4282) (<https://monedaiberica.org/v3/type/1007>).
 b: bronze base unit minted in *Emporiae* (RPC I, 241b) (MAN Madrid 1993/67/4428).

Several discoveries can be mentioned as evidence of this, especially those made in archaeological packages in which coins struck by one mint and the other could have been chronologically linked. This was the case of some published levels documented in the Neapolis area (CAMPO & RUIZ DE ARBULO, 1986-1989), such as the accumulation of sediments that rendered both the agora well and the cistern of its

stoas useless. In the agora well, two bronzes from *untikesken*⁵⁷ and two units from *Emporiae*⁵⁸ were found in an archaeological package whose latest coin dates from the Claudian period⁵⁹ (41-54 AD). In the cistern, a broken unit⁶⁰ and a quarter⁶¹ from *untikesken*, as well as three units from *Emporiae*,⁶² were found in another archaeological package, whose latest coin dates from the time of Vespasian⁶³ (69-79 AD). This was also the case in the abandonment strata of some *tabernae* in this same area of the Neapolis, including the one located in the northwest corner of the *agora*, where one *untikesken*⁶⁴ bronze and four *Emporiae*⁶⁵ bronzes were found in an archaeological package whose latest coins were manufactured locally, and some of those located in street 2 :one unit⁶⁶ and one quarter⁶⁷ from *untikesken*⁶⁸ and one *Emporiae* unit, which were found in an archaeological package whose latest coin dates to the time of Titus⁶⁹ (79-81 AD); one *untikesken* unit⁷⁰ and another one from *Emporiae*,⁷¹ which were found in an archaeological package whose latest coin dates to the time of Claudius;⁷² and five units⁷³ and a quarter⁷⁴ from *untikesken*, as well as one *Emporiae*⁷⁵ quarter, which were all found in an archaeological package whose latest coin dates to the Flavian period.⁷⁶ We could also mention other documented discoveries in the Neapolis which, in contrast to those described above, are only partially known at the moment. This is the case of the finds from *tabernae* J, including two halves and a broken unit from *untikesken* and another broken unit from *untikesken* found in an archaeological package whose latest coin was the locally minted one (LLEDÓ CARDONA, 2004: 64), as well as the finds from one of the abandonment strata documented in the 1925 excavations, i.e. at least

57 ACIP/ MIB unpublished; GNC 19187 (14,86 g, 6h) and 19188 (18,19g, 9h).

58 RPC I, 252 and 257; GNC 19225 (11,55g, 6h) and 19250 (13,60g, 10h).

59 RIC I, 97 (two pieces) and 100 (two pieces); GNC 19235 (11,36g, 6h), 19248 (11,11g, 6h), 19249 (16,09 g, 6h) and 19252 (13,26 g, 6h).

60 ACIP/ MIB unpublished; GNC 19332 (8,99g, 11h).

61 ACIP 1020; MIB 57/28c; GNC 19130 (5,35g, 7h).

62 RPC I, ¿237?, 257 and unpublished; GNC 19332 (10,29g, 12h), 19330 (10,83g, 6h) and 19326 (13,07g, 6h).

63 RIC II, 561b; GNC 19328 (11,58g, 6h).

64 ACIP/ MIB unpublished; GNC 19733 (6,73g).

65 RPC I, 234, 237, 239 and 257; GNC 19726 (11,35g, 11h), 19758 (10,62g, 7h), 19729 (1,82g, 3h) and 19721 (15,40g, 9h).

66 ACIP/ MIB unpublished; GNC 19650 (24,66g, 1h).

67 ACIP 1005; MIB 47/13b; GNC 19655 (7,89g, 5h).

68 ACIP 1005 and unpublished; MIB 47/13b and unpublished; GNC 19655 (7,89g, 5h) and 19650 (24,66g, 1h).

69 RIC II, 129b; GNC 19643 (11,03g, 6h).

70 ACIP 1016; MIB 57/25; GNC 19680 (11,80g, 3h).

71 RPC I, 257; GNC 19663.

72 RIC I, 100; GNC 19686 (7,56g, 6h).

73 ACIP 1011, 1058 and 1059 (2 pieces); MIB 57/19b, 68a and 68b; GNC 19657 (21,53g, 3h), 19624 (14,90g, 5h), 19636 (13,28g, 6h), 19661 (12,99g 5h) and 19646 (12,34g, 2h).

74 ACIP 1014; MIB 57/21; GNC 19623 (5,56g, 9h).

75 RPC I, 257; GNC 19664 (9,08g, 12h).

76 RIC unpublished; GNC 19620 (10,49g, 6h).

two units from *untikesken*⁷⁷ and another five from *Emporiae*⁷⁸ (all countermarked) found in an archaeological package whose latest coin dates from the time of Claudius⁷⁹ (41-54 AD).

Along with these finds, it is also important to mention those documented in other areas of the city, including those from *insula* 30 that have been recently published (CAMPO *et al.* 2015: 93-143.). This is the case of the coin finds made in the *taberna* located to the south of the entrance to the thermal complex that was built in this neighbourhood; coins that appeared both on the level resulting from the definitive destruction of this establishment and on the surface level that ended up forming on top. In the first, archaeologists located a bronze from *untikesken*⁸⁰ and another from *Emporiae*⁸¹ in a stratum whose latest coin dates from the time of Claudius II⁸² (268-269 AD), and in the second they discovered one *untikesken*⁸³ bronze and another from *Emporiae*⁸⁴ were found in a stratum whose latest coin dates from the time of Gallienus⁸⁵ (263 AD). One last *taberna* remains to be mentioned in which these coins may have been archaeologically related. We are again referring to a level of destruction—in this case, documented in one of the establishments built in the same street as the aforementioned *taberna*—in which a bronze from *untikesken*⁸⁶ and another from *Emporiae*⁸⁷ were found in a stratum whose latest coin was the local manufactured one.

Although our study has aimed to be as thorough as possible in its archaeological methodology, we are aware that this detailed data may constitute only a small sample of all that professionals have been able to document to date. Nevertheless, we believe that this overview is sufficiently representative. There is therefore enough evidence to suggest that the iconologies used on *untikesken* and *Emporiae* coins were effectively linked and therefore represented the same religious concept, this being one of the civic elements that the Ibero-Roman inhabitants preserved as an expression of their participation in the integration process that led to the creation of the *municipium*. It is also important to note

77 ACIP/ MIB unpublished; GNC 19614-N (11,99g, 3h, 26mm) (<https://www.museunacional.cat/ca/colleccio/unitat/untikesken/019614-n>) and 19616-N (10,66g, 8h, 27 mm) (<https://www.museunacional.cat/ca/colleccio/unitat/untikesken/019616-n>).

78 RPC unpublished; GNC 19556-N (7,68g, 12h, 25mm) (<https://www.museunacional.cat/ca/colleccio/as/emporiae/019556-n>), 19566-N (12, 99g, 6h, 28mm) (<https://www.museunacional.cat/ca/colleccio/as/emporiae/019566-n>), 19568 (9,96g, 10h, 28mm) (<https://www.museunacional.cat/ca/colleccio/as/emporiae/019568-n>), 19564-N (12,11g, 6h, 28mm) (<https://www.museunacional.cat/ca/colleccio/as/emporiae/019564-n>) and 19576-N (7,84g, 8h, 28mm) (<https://www.museunacional.cat/ca/colleccio/as/emporiae/019576-n>).

79 RIC unpublished; GNC 19561-N (9,09g, 6h, 29mm) (<https://www.museunacional.cat/ca/colleccio/as/claudi-i/019561-n>).

80 ACIP ¿1004?; MIB ¿57/11?; 03-CR-I30-18004-103 (7,29 g, 6h, 22 mm).

81 RPC I, ¿234?; 03-CR-I30-18004-100 (7,20 g, 27 mm).

82 RIC V.1, 54 or 55; 03-CR-I30-18004-101 (2,26g; 1 h).

83 ACIP 1058-1060; MIB 57/68a, 68b and 68c.

04-CR-I30-18007- 2 (12,44g, 6 h, 27 mm).

84 RPC I, 257; 04-CR-I30-18007-3 (9,23g, 7h, 25mm).

85 RIC V.1, 270; 04-CR-I30-18007-18 (3,26g, 6 h, 20mm).

86 ACIP/ MIB unpublished; 04-CR-I30-24003-1 (7,62g, 12h, 21mm).

87 RPC I, 237c; 04-CR-I30-24003-2 (11,43g, 12h, 26mm).

that the goddess Pallas-Athena/Minerva had unique attributes that enabled her to fulfil her integrative function, as we are aware that this divinity has been associated with diplomatic agreements, peaceful pacts (DEACY, 2016), and civic exaltation from time immemorial.



Figure 9: Latin coins minted by *Emporiae*.
 a: bronze base unit (RPC I, 251b) (MAN Madrid 1993/67/4376).
 b: bronze base unit (RPC I, 257b) (MAN Madrid 1993/67/4440).
 c: bronze base unit (RPC I, 243c) (MAN Madrid 1993/67/4372).
 d: bronze base unit (RPC I, 254a) (MAN Madrid 1993/67/4403).
 e: bronze quarter (RPC I, 244) (MAN Madrid 1993/67/4478).
 f: bronze quarter (RPC I, 239) (MAN Madrid 1993/67/4477).

The most important reason that led *untikesken* to adopt an obverse iconography different from the most widespread in *Emporion's* production may have been of great relevance, as perhaps these innovations were due to the *untikesken's* intentions to express its autonomy with respect to the nearby Greek-Indigenous *polis*. This autonomy, as mentioned above, did not prevent the existence of

significant identity relations between the two, and undoubtedly shaped the main aspects of the subsequent idiosyncrasy of *Emporiae*. Specifically, such civic identity was based on the exaltation of the hunting goddess of *Emporion* as a (re-) foundational symbol, while the military divinity of *untikesken* became one of the monetary emblems of *Emporiae*. In this respect, it seems appropriate to underscore that, even though we are aware that the iconology of a similar military goddess was also selected by other provincial mints in the Western Mediterranean area—the goddess Roma⁸⁸ and the deity Athena-Minerva⁸⁹—none of them featured emblematic symbolism as prominent as that found at *Emporiae*. At this time, the only parallel is found much further afield in the Eastern Mediterranean, specifically in the ancient province of *Achaia*, with the sporadic coinage put into circulation by the city of Athens in the Augustan period, featuring the head of Athena on the obverse.

These ideas could be further developed by considering the compelling reasoning—particularly in the case of the Pallas-Athena/Minerva icon—that the Emporitan iconological-monetary choices were motivated not only by cultural and religious factors, but also by those of a significantly more socio-political nature. This hypothesis, partially suggested in the previous section of our study, warrants revisiting here, as it is also supported by the fact that, in the provincial bronzes minted by *Emporiae*, the representation of Pallas-Athena/Minerva was linked to the names of certain magistrates who oversaw the minting activities of the *municipium*. Thus, from a historical-visual perspective, we may be observing a narrative that, at least in the eyes of part of the population, could have immortalised the connection that these political figures—or some among them—might have had with the *untikesken* past of the newly established Hispano-Roman city.

Indeed, in a similar vein to the *Emporiae* series with the representation of Artemis/Diana, we also believe that the coins produced by *Emporiae* with the icon of Pallas-Athena/Minerva were engraved with epigraphic elements that were not incidental or that, even if they were initially so, ended up acquiring a completely intentional nuance. Continuing the strategy begun with the *untikesken*⁹⁰ bronzes, 18 of the 24 issues of *Emporiae* depicting the head of Pallas-Athena/Minerva mentioned the monetary magistrates alluded to in the previous paragraph.⁹¹ Their names always appeared in detail on the obverse, while the reverse-side very likely reflected the name of the city. It should be noted that, in the latter case, the proposed reading of the inscription could be different from the one we suggested for the bronzes displaying the image of Artemis/Diana. This seems to be suggested by the presence of the letters EMPORIT on some of the variants of 14 of the 24 issues⁹² (Fig. 9a), and by the letters EMPORII appearing on two others⁹³ (Fig. 9b). However, both inscriptions could reference the demonym ‘the

88 *RPC I*, 61, 199B, 199C and 704.

89 *RPC I*, 151, 826, 833 and 835.

90 ACIP 993-1060; MIB 57/01-68,

91 *RPC I*, 236-238, 240, 242-243 and 245-256.

92 *RPC I*, 235-236, 237d, 238, 240b, 241.d, 243.d, 245c, 246b, 249b, 250, 251b, 252c, 253c-d, and 257c.

93 *RPC I*, 253b and 257b.

Emporitans' — *emporit(anii)* or *emporit(tani)i* —, as was the case with most of the drachms produced by *Emporion*.⁹⁴ In addition, the labels on the remaining variants or complete series of *Emporiae* — IM,⁹⁵ EM⁹⁶ (Fig. 9f), EMP⁹⁷ (Fig. 9e), EMPO,⁹⁸ and, above all, EMPOR⁹⁹ (Fig. 9d) and EMPORI¹⁰⁰ (Fig. 9c) — could also be transliterated in the same way and thus translated as demonyms.

In short, we believe that the data analysed could allow us to document that the creation of the *municipium* of *Emporiae* implied a deep and very cohesive civic symbiosis, allowing the veneration of two patron and/or tutelary goddesses to be compatible. On the one hand, a divinity that had been recognised as playing a (re-)foundational role was worshipped as such — Artemis/Diana, traditionally idolised by the Greek-Indigenous inhabitants of the colony of *Emporion* — and, on the other hand, a goddess directly related to citizens and their political representatives was also worshipped as a patron deity — Pallas-Athena/Minerva, so highly revered by the Ibero-Roman inhabitants of *untikesken* that it became an icon/emblem of *Emporiae* itself, as it had already been of *untikesken*.

2.5. Pegasus on coins minted by *Emporiae*

The comparison of these circumstances enables our knowledge of the historical development of this Mediterranean city to be completed and makes us wonder why its magistrates selected these representations without the portrait of the Roman emperor as obverse typologies. The most reasonable explanation for this question is to be found in the type of reverse selected, i.e. that of the winged horse accompanied by a circular figure, since the image of a similar animal had already been adopted on a large number of coins previously produced by *Emporion*¹⁰¹ and *untikesken*¹⁰² — some of which¹⁰³ have been detailed in the previous section —, which indicates that they may have continued to be in use in the years when *Emporiae* produced provincial coins.

Thus, these data suggest that the winged horse had such a strong regional nuance that it could undoubtedly facilitate the cohesion of the population. In fact, the integrating potential of this icon was such that it could even have been selected as an emblem of the territory without the need to resort to other elements.

⁹⁴ ACIP 156-178, 186-202 and 209-237; MIB 1/192-206, 211-216, 225-226 and 228-252.

⁹⁵ RPC I, 239b.

⁹⁶ RPC I, 239a and 258.

⁹⁷ RPC I, 244.

⁹⁸ RPC I, 256b and 256d.

⁹⁹ RPC I, 237a, 241a-b, 242a-b, 245a, 246a, 247-248, 252a, 252d, 253a, 254a, 254c, 255, 256a, 256c, 256e and 257a.

¹⁰⁰ RPC I, 237b-c, 240a, 241c, 242c-d, 243a-c, 245b, 251a, 251c, 252b, 252e-f and 254b.

¹⁰¹ ACIP 160-180, 182-183, 186-205 and 209-237; MIB 1/196-207, 209, 211-221 and 225-252.

¹⁰² ACIP 993, 999, 1006-1007, 1009-1011, 1022, 1025, 1029-1034, 1036, 1042-1052 and 1055-1060; MIB 57/01, 06, 14-16, 19, 30, 32-35, 38-40, 43, 49-55, 58-60 and 67-68.

¹⁰³ We know that at least 7 of the coins of *untikesken* detailed in the previous point had the image of Pegasus accompanied by a crown on their reverses (04-CR-I30-18007- 2 and GNC 19614-N, 19616-N, 19636, 19646, 19657 and 19661).

Here, therefore, lies the importance of the iconological/monumental selections of *Emporiae*: since there was already a unifying element, the authorities decided to complete the programme with the images of the two patron goddesses, thus representing the two components of the local populations that inhabited it in a dual and, at the same time, concrete way. In view of this, it might be interesting to note that the most widespread typological composition, i.e. the one associating the images of the goddess Pallas-Athena/Minerva and that of a winged horse with a circular figure, could have been consistent with a mythological narrative known across the Mediterranean and not particularly related to the territory of Empúries. However, the legend credited this deity with having given the hero Bellerophon a golden bridle so that he could ride the winged horse Pegasus and thus be victorious in his confrontation with the Chimera (Strabo 8, 6, 21). This is, therefore, another aspect that may have facilitated the dissemination of the emblematic narrative associated with these two icons, which could be identified both individually and as a two-sided composition facilitated by the monetary support itself.

This hypothesis is further supported when considering that the iconology on the coins of *Emporiae* linked to Pegasus was unique and unparalleled, since alongside the horse's figure – always depicted full-length, riding, and with wings outstretched – there was a small, circular silhouette whose iconography was very similar to that of crowns or laurel wreaths. Although a similar figure had already been depicted next to the horse on some coins minted by *Emporion*¹⁰⁴ and, above all, *untikesken*,¹⁰⁵ we believe that this type of coinage on *Emporiae* bronzes symbolised something completely different. It should be kept in mind that, on the reverse sides of the Greek-Indigenous and Ibero-Roman coins minted previously in the area, this circular silhouette was not the only small, engraved figure, a difference suggesting that these representations did not have any meaning that would complete the symbolism of the main typology. Instead, the great diversity of figures, their reduced dimensions, their adoption in series that could be of equal value and metrology, their unequal positions in the free spaces of the coin blanks, their placement together or alone, their different meanings, the possibility of their being replaced by letters, and their appearance only on coins where the monetary magistrates were not detailed seem to suggest that all of them were selected in order to distinguish each of the mints (COLLANTES, 1997: 153; LLORENS, 1998: 59).

The chronology of these series provides food for thought as to the reasons that led first *Emporion* and then *untikesken* to adopt these insignia. Indeed, the context in which these innovations were introduced leads us to suggest that their emergence must be linked to the influences that may have been exerted by the coins minted by Rome, which also adopted this type of figure; an influence that, as previously noted, also affected the metrology of the pieces themselves. However, we believe that the initial decision to adopt these figures may have also been shaped by another factor: the first issues manufactured by the Iberian nuclei in

¹⁰⁴ ACIP 217, 222 and 234; MIB 1/231, 235 and 249.

¹⁰⁵ ACIP 999, 1006-1007, 1009-1010, 1022, 1025, 1028, 1033, 1036, 1043 and 1058-1060; MIB 57/06, 14-16, 30, 35, 38, 43a, 49 and 67-68.

the area, since initially these were imitations of the Emporitana series (BARRANDON, 201: 571; CAMPO, 1997: 41-42; 2010: 20-25; 2012: 19-20; 2017: 20; COLLANTES, 1997: 154-156; GARCÍA-BELLIDO, 1998: 79; GARCÍA-BELLIDO & BLÁZQUEZ CERRATO, 2001: 202; VILLARONGA, 2000b; 2000c: 148-166). For this reason, it might be more difficult to determine the causes prompting *untikesken* authorities to continue adopting these types of production markings, as it is rather difficult to link this strategy to a potential process of monetary imitation. This is because, firstly, during the years in which this mint was in operation, those episodes of potential fraudulent manufacture hardly affected the coinage put into circulation in these territories; and, secondly, because the marks selected by the magistrates of *untikesken* were also used on a number of fractional coins, i.e. coins whose low value rendered their copies almost totally incomprehensible. These two facts suggest that the selection of the *untikesken* insignia was not driven by the same financial factors that had determined the typological policy agreed upon decades earlier by the *Emporion* authorities.

When taken in conjunction with some other data, the most compelling explanation for the strategy used by *untikesken* is related to the interest that its authorities may have had in continuing a specific monetary strategy based on maintaining the visual practice that had been established in this region some time earlier. However, this mimetic process introduced a highly relevant specific variable, since we are not looking at the exact copy and/or imitation of a single iconological programme, but rather at the remodelling of a schema of visual elements characterised by the selection of main types and small secondary figures. These circumstances may have facilitated an initial change: on the one hand, it may be true that the large and small images on both the *untikesken* bronzes and the Emporitana coins were not necessarily linked to a general interconnected narrative. On the other hand, there is no doubt that, over time, having two different images on the reverse of a large number of pieces may have been so representative that it gave way to an incipient symbolism, linking the Empúries monetary emblem to these particular figurative compositions. In fact, although it is very difficult to estimate when this new dynamic began to develop, we believe that *untikesken's* typological selection strategy was so original and different from those of other indigenous nuclei in the Iberian Peninsula, that a representative association was soon established, meaning that these numerous bronzes were easily identifiable by those who had the opportunity to use them.

The above overview leads us to the idea that the dissemination of the winged horse type with the circular figure on the coins of *Emporiae* was the result of a complete iconological evolution that modified the symbolism of the two images depicted. Against this backdrop, the figure of the crown ceased to be a mark of issue or a secondary visual element, while the image of the Pegasus needed to be featured alongside the crown in order to be identified as the monetary emblem of *Emporiae*. Without the crown, the representation of this horse was simply the figure of a mythological animal. With the crown, the image was identified as the emblem of a city which was also associated with the triumphant military goddess Pallas-Athena/Minerva and with a mythological episode that was represented

by all these figures on other materials found in the Western Mediterranean. This is the case of several ceramics found in the Apulia region that date back to the first half of the 4th century BC—one of them found in Bari and another one in Taranto¹⁰⁶ and deposited in the Museo Nazionale Archeologico Taranto-Marta¹⁰⁷—depicting Pallas-Athena/Minerva, Pegasus (ridden by Bellerophon), and a Nike visibly crowning this hero.¹⁰⁸

Other relevant data confirming the narrative-emblematic power that this iconology had in the territory of Empúries could be found in a series of potential parallels. For instance, in the Western Mediterranean we only know of a single specimen bearing the image of a recognisable winged horse, which was neither accompanied by a crown nor a goddess.¹⁰⁹ Once again, we must look for parallels in the province of *Achaia* and, more specifically, in the mint of Corinth, Greece: a centre of Greek cultural tradition where the icon of Pegasus, as well as the image of Pallas-Athena/Minerva, had played an important role in previous monetary production. However, after the integration of the centre into the Roman provincial network, the iconological-monetary programmes of the city changed significantly. So much so that, although the image of the winged horse continued to be used on some coins,¹¹⁰ numerous iconological innovations were introduced from then on, resulting in the near disappearance of the image of Pallas-Athena/Minerva from the repertoire.

3. CONCLUSIONS

The ideas put forward in this study lead us to the conclusion that the iconology of the coins minted by the Hispano-Roman *municipium* of *Emporiae* was not the result of mere random typological copying, as the interpretations published to date seem to suggest. Instead, analysis of the available data shows that the adoption of these images must have been the result of a complete, progressive, and conscious iconological evolution. More specifically, we have observed that the city's monetary image selections were the result of a long, gradual process that ran parallel to the integration dynamics of the various communities taking part in the synoecism process that culminated in the creation of this *municipium*.

The origins of this model can be traced back to the coins minted in the Empúries area at the end of the 3rd century BC. From that time onwards, an ever-evolving behaviour can be observed, in which the dynamics of indigenous and, above all, provincial typological selections became part of particular ideological realities shaped by the temporal and geographical context in which they emerged. The absence of the imperial portrait and its conspicuous replacement by representations of the patron goddesses of the centre—one as a deity of re-

106 LIMC II Athéna 543; LIMC VII Pegasus 192.

107 Inventory Number 52362.

108 LIMC VII Pegasus 187.

109 RPC I, 282.

110 RPC I, 1116, 1121, 1127-81133, 1145, 1147, 1162-1164, 1166 and 1169-73.

foundational exaltation and the other as a goddess of civic-political reminiscence — are evidence of this special iconological-monetary dynamic. Nevertheless, in our opinion, if there is one element that testifies to the complex identity of that city, it was the monetary icon of the Emporitan Pegasus. Not only did it manage to represent the different populations that made up the *municipium*, but this new iconology and its combinations with the images of a crown and Pallas-Athena/Minerva — despite its Eastern origins — also ceased to be so clearly associated with provinces such as *Achaia*, becoming instead the monetary emblem of a Roman city, heir to the westernmost colony that the Greeks had founded in the Mediterranean.

4. REFERENCES

- AGUIÓN, I. *et al.* (2008): *Guía iconográfica de los héroes y dioses de la Antigüedad*, Madrid, Alianza.
- AMELA, L. (2016): Las primeras emisiones de *Emporiae*, *Hécate*, 3: 96-110.
- AMELA, L. (2017): La ceca de *Untikesken*, *Gaceta Numismática*, 193: 59-86.
- AMELA, L. (2019): Las dracmas ligeras de *Emporion*, *Hécate*, 6: 38-55.
- AQUILUÉ, X. (2002): Emporion y el urbanismo griego en la península ibérica, en *Valencia y las primeras ciudades romanas de Hispania*, Ayuntamiento de Valencia, Valencia,: 93-102.
- AQUILUÉ, X. (2012a): Introducción histórica, en *Empúries Municipium Emporiae*, L'Erma, Roma: 1-8.
- AQUILUÉ, X. (2012b): Topografía y evolución urbana, en *Empúries Municipium Emporiae*, L'Erma, Roma: 25-38.
- AQUILUÉ, X. (2017): Emporion/Emporia. Una antigua ciudad portuaria en el extremo occidental del Mediterráneo, en *Phicaria. V. Encuentros Internacionales del Mediterráneo*, Universidad Popular de Mazarrón, Mazarrón: 105-121.
- AQUILUÉ, X *et al.* (2006): Greek *Emporion* and its relationship to Roman Republican *Empúries*, en L. Abad *et al.* (cords.), *Early roman towns in Hispania Tarraconensis*, *Journal of Roman Archaeology*: 19-31.
- AQUILUÉ, X. *et al.* (2010): Contextos d'època d'August procedents del fòrum de la ciutat romana d'Empúries, en V. Revilla; M. Roca (eds.), *Contextos cerámicos y cultura material de época augustea en el Occidente romano*, Universidad de Barcelona, Barcelona: 36-91.
- ARÉVALO, A. (2002-2003): Las imágenes monetales hispánicas como emblemas de Estado, *Cuadernos de Prehistoria y Arqueología Universidad Autónoma de Madrid*, 28-29: 241-258.
- BARRANDON, N. (2011): *De la pacificación à l'intégration des Hispaniques (133-27 a. C.). Les mutations des sociétés indigènes d'Hispanie centrale et septentrionale sous domination romaine*, Bordeaux, Ausonius.
- BURNETT, A. (2011): The Augustan Revolution seen from the mints of the Provinces, *Journal of Roman Studies*, 101: 1-30.
- BURNETT, A. *et al.* (2006): *Roman provincial coinage, vol. I. From the death of Caesar to the death of Vitellius (44 BC-AD 69)*, London-Paris, British Museum- Louvre

Museum.

- CAMPO, M. (1992a): Inicios de la amonedación en la Península Ibérica: los griegos en Emporion y Rhode, en F. Chaves (ed.), *Griegos en Occidente*, Universidad de Sevilla, Sevilla: 195-209.
- CAMPO, M. (1992b): La amonedación griega en el Golfo de León: Massalia, en F. Chaves (ed.), *Griegos en Occidente*, Universidad de Sevilla, Sevilla: 115-128.
- CAMPO, M. (1996): Emporion: moneda i vida quotidiana, en *L'ús de la moneda a les ciutats d'Hispania*, Museu Nacional d'Arte de Catalunya, Barcelona: 7-25.
- CAMPO, M. (1997): La moneda griega y su influencia en el contexto indígena, en C. Alfaro et al. (eds.), *Historia monetaria de Hispania Antigua*, Jesús Vico, Madrid: 19-49.
- CAMPO, M. (2000): Las producciones púnicas y la monetización en el nordeste y levante peninsulares, en M. P. García-Bellido, M. P.; L. Callegarin (cords.), *Los cartagineses y la monetización del Mediterráneo occidental*, CSIC, Madrid: 89-100.
- CAMPO, M. (2002a): La producció d'Untikesken i Kese: funció i circulació a la ciutat i el territori, en *Funció i producció de les seques indígenes. VI Curs d'Història monetària d'Hispania*, Museu Nacional d'Arte de Catalunya, Barcelona: 77-104.
- CAMPO, M. (2002b): Las emisiones de Emporion y su difusión en el entorno ibérico, en *La monetazione dei Focei in Occidente. Atti dell'XI convegno di Centro Internazionale di Studi Numismatici*, Istituto italiano di Numismatica, Napoli/Roma: 139-166.
- CAMPO, M. (2009): Circulació monetària i vies de comunicació als territoris dels indígets, els ceretans i els sordons (c. 195-40 a. C.), en *Us i circulació de la moneda a la Hispania Citerior. XIII Curs d'Història monetària d'Hispania*, Museu Nacional d'Arte de Catalunya, Barcelona: 9-27.
- CAMPO, M. (2010): Les emissions dels ibers: del sud-est de la Gàl·lia a la desembocadura de l'Ebre, en *Els ibers, cultura i moneda*, Museu Nacional d'Art de Catalunya, Barcelona: 26-31.
- CAMPO, M. (2012): La moneda ibérica en el nordeste de la Citerior, en A. Sinner (ed.), *La moneda de los iberos. Ituro y los talleres layetanos*, Museo de l'Estampació de Premià de Mar, Barcelona: 17-27.
- CAMPO, M. (2017): Las emisiones griegas de Emporion y Rhode y su impacto en las sociedades indígenas, en *De la dracma a l'euro. Sistemes i unions monetàries a l'occident d'Europa*, Museu Nacional d'Arte de Catalunya, Barcelona: 15-26.
- CAMPO, M.; RUIZ DE ARBULO, J. (1986-1989): Conjuntos de abandono y circulación monetaria en la Neápolis emporitana, *Empuries* 48-50.1: 152-163.
- CAMPO, M. et al. (2015): Hallazgos monetarios en niveles de abandono de la Ínsula 30 de la ciudad romana de Emporiae (fines del siglo III), *Numisma*, 259: 93-143.
- CASTANYER, P. et al. (1993): L'excavació del Kardo B. Noves aportacions sobre l'abandonament de la ciutat romana d'Empuries, *Cypsela*, X: 159-194.
- CASTANYER, P. et al. (2009-2011): Darreres recerques sobre la gènesi de l'enclavament grec d'Empòrion, *Empúries*, 56: 55-73.
- CASTANYER, P. et al. (2020): El proyecto de investigación sobre las antiguas áreas

- portuarias de Empúries, en *Actualidad de la investigación arqueológica en España* (2018-2019), Ministerio de Cultura y Deporte, Madrid: 239-250.
- COLLANTES, E. (1997): *Historia de las cecas de Hispania antigua*, Madrid, Tarkis.
- DEACY, S. (2016): We call her Pallas, you Know. Naming, taming and the construction of Athena in Greek culture and thought, *Pallas*, 100: 59-72.
- DELGADO HERVÁS, A. et al. (2020): Dualidad étnica o heterogeneidad social? Un análisis de las cerámicas de uso cotidiano de la Neápolis de Emporion, *Zephyrus*, 85: 79-108.
- DIETLER, M. (2005): The Archaeology of Colonization and the Colonization of Archaeology: Theoretical Challenges from an Ancient Mediterranean Colonial Encounter, en G. Stein (ed.), *The Archaeology of Colonial Encounters. Comparative Perspectives*, School for Advanced Research Press, Santa Fe: 33-68.
- DOMÍNGUEZ ARRANZ, A. (1997): Las acuñaciones ibéricas y celtibéricas de la Hispania Citerior, en C. Alfaro et al. (eds.), *Historia monetaria de Hispania Antigua*, Jesús Vico, Madrid: 116-193.
- DOMMELEN, P. van (2011): Postcolonial archaeologies between discourse and practice, *World Archaeology*, 43.1: 1-6.
- FRAYER-GRIGGS, D. (2013): The beasts at Ephesus and the Cult of Artemis, *The Harvard Theological Review*, 106.4: 479-477.
- GAILLEDRAT, E. (2018): The Emporion in context, en *The emporion in the ancient eastern Mediterranean. Trade and colonial encounters from the Archaic to the Hellenistic period*, Presses universitaires de la Méditerranée, Aix-en-Provence: 11-19.
- GARCÍA-BELLIDO, M. P. (1991): Las religiones orientales en la Península Ibérica: documentos numismáticos, I, *Archivo Español de Arqueología*, 64: 37-81.
- GARCÍA-BELLIDO, M. P. (1992): La moneda libro en imágenes de la ciudad, en R. Olmos (ed.), *La sociedad ibérica a través de la imagen*, Ministerio de Cultura, Madrid: 237-249.
- GARCÍA-BELLIDO, M. P. (1998): Dinero y moneda indígena en la Península Ibérica, en *Hispania. El legado de Roma en el año de Trajano*, Ayuntamiento de Zaragoza, Zaragoza: 73-82.
- GARCÍA-BELLIDO, M. P. & BLÁZQUEZ CERRATO, C. (2001): *Diccionario de cecas y pueblos hispánicos*, vol. II, Madrid, CSIC.
- GÓMEZ BARREIRO, M. (2017): *La moneda de Caesaraugusta. Producción y circulación monetaria*, CSIC, Madrid.
- GOMIS, M. (1997): Augusto: el nacimiento de un nuevo lenguaje iconográfico, en *La moneda en temps d'August*, Museu Nacional d'Arte de Catalunya, Barcelona: 39-58.
- GOZALBES, M.; RIPOLLÈS, P. P. (2002): Hallazgos de monedas de Arse-Saguntum, en P. P. Ripollès and M. M. Llorens (eds.), *Arse-Saguntum. Historia monetaria de la ciudad y su territorio*, Fundación Bancaja, Valencia: 534-546.
- GOZALBES GARCÍA, H. (2021): Los iconos de Pegaso y corona en las monedas latinas de *Emporiae*: ¿Un simple fenómeno de copia tipológica, *Hispania Antiqua*, XLV: 90-134.
- GOZALBES GARCÍA, H. (2023): Un icono fundacional para *Emporiae*: Artemisa/Diana

- en las monedas latinas emporitanas, en *Thauma Festschrift para Dirce Marzoli*, Universidad de Alicante, Alicante: 123-139.
- GRANT, M. (1946): *From Imperium to Auctoritas*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- GRIMAL, P. (2001): *Diccionario de Mitología griega y romana*, Barcelona, Paidós.
- GUETTEL COLE, S. (2000): Landscapes of Artemis, *The Classical World*, 93.5: 471-481.
- HEUCHERT, V. (2005): The chronological development of Roman provincial coin iconography, en C. Howgego et al. (eds.), *Coinage and identity in the Roman Provinces*, Oxford University Press, Oxford: 29-54.
- HINGLEY, R. (2005): *Globalizing Roman Culture: Unity, Diversity, and Empire*, Routledge, London.
- JIMÉNEZ DíEZ, A. (2008): La transformación de las acuñaciones hispanas en época de César, en M. P. García-Bellido et al. (eds.), *Del imperium de Pompeyo a la auctoritas de Augusto. Homenaje a Michael Grant*, CSIC, Madrid: 129-140.
- KAMPEN, J. (2003): The cult of Artemis and the Essenes in Syro-Palestine, *Dead Sea Discoveries*, 10.2: 205-220.
- KEAY, S. J. (1984): Les monedes de l'excavació de 1982 a Empúries, en *El forum roma d'Empúries*, Monografies Emporitanes VI, Diputació de Barcelona, Barcelona: 479-492
- KEMMERS, F. (2019): *The functions and use of Roman Coinage*, Brill, Leiden/Boston.
- LIDONNICI, L. (1992): The images of Artemis Ephesia and Greco-Roman Worship: a reconsideration, *The Harvard Theological Review*, 85.4: 389-415.
- LLEDÓ CARDONA, N. (2004): *El uso de la moneda en las ciudades romanas de Hispania en época imperial. El área mediterránea*. Tesis doctoral, Universidad de Valencia, Valencia.
- LLORENS, M. M. (1994): *La ciudad de Carthago Nova: las emisiones romanas*, Universidad de Murcia, Murcia.
- LLORENS, M. M. (1998): La imatge monetària dels pobles ibers de la Citerior, en *La moneda en la societat ibèrica. II Curs d'Història monetària d'Hispania*, Museu Nacional d'Arte de Catalunya, Barcelona: 49-66.
- MAR, R.; RUIZ DE ARBULO, J. (1993): *Ampurias romana. Historia, Arquitectura y Arqueología*, AUSA, Sabadell.
- MARCH, J. (2002): *Diccionario de mitología clásica*, Crítica, Barcelona.
- MATTINGLY, D. (2004): Being Roman: Expressing identity in a provincial setting, *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, 17: 5-21.
- MOTTA, R. M. (2016): Myths coins and semiotics. Arethusa and Persephone in the coins of Syracuse, en *Philosopher Kings and Tragic Heroes*, Parnassos, Iowa: 371-386.
- NOELKE, P. et al. (2003): *Romanisation und Resistenz, Akten des VII. Internationalen Colloquiums über Probleme des Provinzials römischen Kunstschaffens*. Mainz von Zabern. Köln.
- OLMOS, R. (1992): Iconografía y culto a las aguas de época prerromana en los mundos colonial e ibérico, *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma, serie II, Historia Antigua*, V: 103-120.
- PENA, M. J. (1973): Artemis-Diana y algunas cuestiones en relación con su

- iconografía y su culto en Occidente, *Ampurias*, 35: 389-407.
- PENA, M. J. (2000): Les cultes d'Emporion, en *Les cultes des cités phocéennes*, CNRS, Aix-en-Provence: 59-68.
- PENA, M. J. (2006): La iconografía monetaria de Artemis-Diana, de las dracmas griegas a los denarios romanos, en *Moneda, cultes i rutus. X Curs d'Història monetària d'Hispania*, Museu Nacional d'Arte de Catalunya, Barcelona: 9-30.
- PENA, M. J. (2016): El culto a Artemis Efesia en *Massalia* y las costas de Iberia. ¿Una leyenda tardía con trasfondo político? Análisis crítico de las fuentes literarias, *Latomus*, 75: 960-984.
- PLANA MALLART, R. (2012): La présence grecque et ses effets dans le Nord-Est de la péninsule Ibérique (VIIe - début du ive siècle av. n. è.), *Pallas*, 89: 157-178.
- PUCCIO, L. (2010): Les cultes isiaques à Emporion, *Pallas*, 84: 207-227.
- RIPOLL, E. (1985): *Ampurias. Guía itineraria*, Diputación de Barcelona, Barcelona.
- RIPOLLÈS P. P. (1982): *La circulación monetaria en la Tarraconense mediterránea*. Diputación Provincial de Valencia, Valencia.
- RIPOLLÈS, P. P. (1997a): Augusto: las cecas hispanas, en *La moneda en temps d'August*, Nacional d'Arte de Catalunya, Barcelona: 21-38.
- RIPOLLÈS, P. P. (1997b): Las acuñaciones cívicas romanas de la Península Ibérica (44 a. C.-54 d. C.), en C. Alfaro et al. (eds.), *Historia monetaria de Hispania Antigua*, Jesús Vico, Madrid: 335-396.
- RIPOLLÈS, P. P. (2005a): Las acuñaciones antiguas de la Península Ibérica: dependencias e innovaciones, en C. Alfaro et al. (eds.), *Actas del XIII Congreso Internacional de Numismática, vol. I*, Ministerio de Cultura, Madrid: 187-208.
- RIPOLLÈS, P. P. (2005b): *Monedas hispánicas de la Bibliothèque Nationale de France*, Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid.
- RIPOLLÈS, P. P. (2010): *Las acuñaciones provinciales de Hispania*, Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid.
- RIPOLLÈS, P. P. (2012): La Numismática, en X. Aquilué (dir.), *Empúries Municipium Emporiae*, L'Erma, Roma: 131-138.
- RIPOLLÈS, P. P. (2013): Ancient Iberian Coinage, *Documentos Digitales de Arqueología*, 2: 1-55.
- RIPOLLÈS, P. P. et al. (1993): The original number of diez used in the Roman Provincial Coinage of Spain, en *Actes du XIe Congrès International de Numismatique, vol I, Séminaire de Numismatique Marcel Hoc*, Louvain-la-Neuve: 315-324.
- ROSE, H. J. and Roberson, C. M. (1979): Artemis, en *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, Oxford: 127.
- RUIZ DE ARBULO, J. (1998): La evolución urbana de Emporion en época republicana. La complejidad de una tradición, en *De les estructures indígenes a l'organització provincial romana de la Hispania Citerior*, Institut d'Estudis Catalans, Barcelona: 539-554.
- RUIZ DE ARBULO, J. (2002-2003): Santuarios y fortalezas. Cuestiones de indigenismo, helenización y romanización en torno a Emporion y Rhode (s. VI- I a. C.), *Cuadernos de Prehistoria y Arqueología de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid*, 28-29: 161-202.
- SANMARTÍ, E. (1973): El período tardorrepublicano en Emporion, *Acta Numismática*,

3: 11-24.

- SELTMAN, C. T. (1952): The wardrobe of Artemis, *The Numismatic Chronicle*, 12.42: 33-51.
- TREMOLEDA, J. *et al.* (2016): Una nova fortificació d'època republicana a Empúries. Una base militar per la conquesta d'Hispania, *Annals de l'Institut d'Estudis Empordanesos*, 47: 47-74.
- TREMOLEDA, J. *et al.* (2022): Nuevas evidencias de la instalación campamental del siglo II a.C. en la colina de Empúries: las estructuras tardorrepublicanas documentadas en la ínsula 30, *Treballs d'Arqueologia*, 25: 261-318.
- TRÉZINY, H. (1997): Marseille grecque topographie et urbanisme a la lumière des fouilles récentes, *Revue Archéologique*, 9.1: 185-201.
- VILLARONGA, L. (1977): *The aes coinage of Emporion*, British Archaeological Reports Oxford, Oxford.
- VILLARONGA, L. (1994): *Corpus Nummorum Hispaniae ante Augusti Aetate*, Jesús Vico, Madrid.
- VILLARONGA, L. (2000a): Emporiae, en *Monedas hispánicas. Real Academia de la Historia. Catálogo del Gabinete de Antigüedades*, Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid: 356-358.
- VILLARONGA, L. (2000b): *Les monedes de plata d'Empòrion, Rhode i les seves imitacions: de principi del segle III aC fins a l'arribada dels romans el 218 AC*, Institut d'Estudis Catalans/ Societat Catalana d'Estudis Numismàtics, Barcelona.
- VILLARONGA, L. (2000bc): Untikesken, en *Monedas hispánicas. Real Academia de la Historia. Catálogo del Gabinete de Antigüedades*, Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid: 179-171.
- VILLARONGA, L. (2001): Dracmes emporitanes d'arracada singular, *Acta numismàtica*, 31: 31-47.
- VILLARONGA, L. (2004a): Empòrion: bronzes ibèrics d'Untikesken: tipologia del casc de Pal·las, *Acta numismàtica*, 34: 59-78.
- VILLARONGA, L. (2004b): *Numismàtica antiga de la Península Ibèrica*, Institut d'Estudis Catalans, Barcelona.
- VILLARONGA, L.; Benages, J. (2011): *Ancient coinage of the Iberian Peninsula. Les monedes de l'edat antiga a la Península Ibèrica: Greek, Punic, Iberian, Roman*, Institut d'Estudis Catalans, Barcelona. (cited as ACIP).
- VV.AA. (1981-1999): *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, Artemis Verlag Zürich und München, Zürich (cited as LIMC).