

**Zeitschrift:** Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau = Revue suisse de numismatique = Rivista svizzera di numismatica  
**Herausgeber:** Schweizerische Numismatische Gesellschaft  
**Band:** 65 (1986)

**Seite**

### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

**Download PDF:** 30.09.2025

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

Apollo Citharoedus type<sup>16</sup> and lightened the weight-standards of the aureus and denarius<sup>17</sup>; that Galba coined in Spain after rising against Nero<sup>18</sup>; that the coins of the immediately previous rivals to empire were not recalled by Vitellius<sup>19</sup>; that Vespasian coined at Antioch<sup>20</sup>; and that Trajan called in and demonetized old and worn coin<sup>21</sup>. An important harvest of facts, certainly, but one which throws very little light on the organizational aspects of the coinage. Some help on this comes, indeed, from the inscriptions of Trajan's time<sup>22</sup> which detail the operational personnel of the mint of Rome during his principate and specify the workers of varying kinds under its technical supervisor. But we still do not know who chose the types, mint by mint, or who decided the quantities in which they should be struck, metal by metal or denomination by denomination, or who defined the acceptable interval of time after which a notably topical type must appear.

At this point speculation has to begin. We have to assume that the magistrates in charge of the *aerarium*, whoever they were at any given period<sup>23</sup>, being in any case aware of certain more or less predictably fixed items of annual imperial expenditure such as payment of the armed forces and the civil service<sup>24</sup>, would have necessarily maintained liaison with the imperial nominee in charge of the *fiscus* – that branch of treasury which lay outside the scope of the state's magistrates. For if a *princeps* wished to undertake a project which fell outside the responsibility of the *aerarium* (e.g. a special *donativum* or *congiarium*, or a very costly personal construction like Nero's *domus aurea*)<sup>25</sup>, it was the state's mint-workmen and mint-premises which had to coin the necessary money even if the cost was not debited to the public *aerarium* but to the emperor's personal account. In other words, the state-officials in charge of the *aerarium* and the mint had to regard not only the more or less regularly recurrent figures of a regularly periodic public budget, but also special claims upon that budget<sup>26</sup>, and, in addition, what may be called the personal budget of the *princeps*. Only so would they know, in any given year, how much money should be coined to supplement stocks withdrawn from the *aerarium*, and in what metals and what denominations.

This, in any given year, could scarcely be a matter of instant decision. Financial magistrates beginning a year's office in January could not at once be certain of their working figures, and very possibly not for a month or two. And then there was the question of types – by whomsoever discussed and decided. It was a question, indeed,

<sup>16</sup> Suet. Nero 25.2.

<sup>17</sup> Pliny, NH 33.3.

<sup>18</sup> Plut. Galba 20.2.

<sup>19</sup> Dio Cass. 64.6.1.

<sup>20</sup> Tac. Hist. 2.82.

<sup>21</sup> Dio Cass. 68.15.

<sup>22</sup> CIL vi. 42-4, 239, 791.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Tac. Ann. 13.29; by Trajan's time the effective head of the mint of Rome was an equestrian *procurator monetæ* (CIL vi. 1607, 1625).

<sup>24</sup> Cf. the speculative reconstruction of the Augustan financial budget given by Tenney Frank, *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* i, 1934, pp. 4 ff.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. M.T. Griffin, *Nero: the End of a Dynasty*, 1984, pp. 133 ff.

<sup>26</sup> For example, the very heavy cost of the reception of Tiridates in Rome in A.D. 66, charged (according to Dio Cass. 63.1.2.) to the *aerarium*.