The Tomares hoard (Seville): An approach based on an archaeological sample

El tesoro monetario de Tomares (Sevilla): Una aproximación a partir de una muestra arqueológica

Abstract
This article presents a small sample, comprising 102 coins of the Tomares hoard, found during the excavation of El Olivar de El Zaudín, following its accidental discovery. These coins were retrieved during the excavation that followed the find, after the rest of the hoard had been removed. Although the study of the hoard is ongoing and several publications have already come out, this small assemblage is a coherent repertoire whose publication is fully justified. This coherence, in addition to its random nature allows us to undertake a preliminary approach to this enormous assemblage and compare it with other hoards of similar chronology.
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1. Introduction

On 27 April 2016, 19 amphorae full of nummi dat-
ed to the Tetrarchy were accidentally found at the park Olivar de Zaudín, Tomares (Seville). The so-
called Tomares hoard is one of the largest known in its category. Despite the logistical problems that this sort of discovery entails, a monograph, promoted by the excavators of the site has already been published (Vázquez Paz and Garrido, 2017), as well as several notes and general papers about the find (see Chaves et al., 2022). However, no repertoire of coins has yet been published, as it was decided, correctly in our opinion, that the partial and hasty publication of the coins makes no sense unless a clear research objective is addressed. There is, however, a small assemblage of approximately one hundred coins found in the site during the excavation that followed the discovery of the hoard (Vázquez Paz and Garrido, 2017: 301-338). The coins must have been scattered around the site after the amphorae broke, and during their swift removal to the museum, on the same day of their discovery. This circumstance, in addition to the random nature of the sample (102 coins), offers a coherent repertoire that can be approached with some guarantees. Although, as is obvious, our conclusions must be taken with caution, the delay, which were outside our control, in the publication of this paper, which was conceived as a first approximation to the Tomares hoard, allows us now to compare the composition of the assemblage with the new data that the study of the hoard at large has provided in the meantime (Scrivano et al., 2022; Pliego and García Vargas, forthcoming; Chaves, Pliego and García Vargas, forthcoming).

2. Circumstances of the find

The discovery of the Tomares hoard was report-
ed on by newspapers, newsletters, and other publica-
tions around the world. A mechanical digger, while opening a ditch at the park Olivar de Zaudín (Tomares, Seville, district of Aljarafe), bumped into the amphorae breaking ten of the total of nineteen, while nine remained whole and sealed. That same day, the whole hoard was deposited in Seville’s Archaeological Museum. Soon afterwards, the Regional Ministry of Culture planned the arch-
eological excavation of the site (figure 1).

The main aim of the archaeological sounding was to contextualise the amphorae and establish ing the stratigraphic sequence. The excavation began with the emptying of the negative unit formed by the removal of the amphorae, which had filled up with the soil that surrounded them. However, the original ditch in which the amphorae had been buried had been affected by the mechanical digger on the following day, during the construction of the foundations for a sewer, and this partially cut the se-
quence and removed the soil that had fallen inside the ditch (UE 0). This soil was sieved, resulting in the discovery of the 102 coins here presented, which must have come out of some of the broken ampho-
rae. Only two minimi that were unrelated to the hoard were found in the levels of use and abandon-
ment that surrounded the ditch (Pliego, 2020: 131, n. 30). The sieve also yielded a few amphora frag-
ments, no doubt from the containers in which the hoard was buried.

Once the limits of the ditch had been outlined, a 4 × 4 m trench was excavated to the bottom of the cultural sequence; it was not necessary to remove any of the features identified (figure 2). The stratigraphic sequence was simple but was severely affected by modern and ancient ditches. This notwithstanding, the remains of at least one brick construction dated to the 3rd century AD could be clearly defined; the foundations combined several techniques, and there was a pavement of opus signinum, not too thick and substantially damaged by later ditches. In any case, it was possible to establish that, despite the news published in the days that followed the discovery, the hoard was hidden in the courtyard or portico of a warehouse associated with a much larger private fundus, something later confirmed by the intensive survey undertaken in the area, as we shall see presently.

The various construction techniques found could correspond to two buildings built next to one an-
other or, more likely, two construction phases in the same building. Unfortunately, the damages done to the sequence of the original ditch make it uncertain
whether the pavement of signinum was laid on top of it to hide the amphorae, or whether it was cut to bury them. On the other hand, the ceramics found during the excavation date the building to the 3rd century AD, although there is evidence for occupation in the area in the 1st and 2nd centuries AD. The site was at its most active in the 4th century AD, before being abandoned in the 5th. The building materials of the building were thoroughly robbed out down to the foundations during the 5th century AD.

In addition to the excavation of this trench, an intensive survey covering 7 ha was undertaken. The walking survey confirmed the data yielded by the trench, defining a site largely characterised by the presence of ceramic material dated to the 3rd-5th century. A few pieces of pottery dated to the 1st-2nd century were also found to the north of the trench. GPR survey confirmed the presence of further structures and cultural layers in the northern sector of the site.

Both the GPR and the excavation determined the existence of built features at different elevations. The fact that the largest and most regular features are located at a deeper level suggests that these may be better preserved and, most importantly, that they are earlier in date, perhaps from the early imperial period to which the few earlier pottery sherds noted above can be dated.

Therefore, the joint results of these techniques indicates that the site found at the park Olivar del Zaudín was a settlement occupied in all certainty between the 3rd and 5th centuries, although earlier phases cannot be ruled out. At any rate, this earlier settlement would be substantially smaller than the later one. The results indicate the presence of a built complex, most likely private in nature, with various scattered buildings, perhaps related to agricultural activities and, likely, also a residential complex to the south/southeast of the archaeological trench.

The fact that the farm buildings remained in use for several decades after the occultation of the hoard, the flimsy nature of the pavement of opus signinum and the fact that the hoard was not found when the building materials were robbed in the 5th century, suggest that the pavement was laid out after
the hoard was buried, as the traces of a cut in the pavement to hide the hoard would have been hard to miss.

3. Composition of the sample

As noted, the coins form a random sample that remained at the site once the hoard was removed to the museum. The results of their examination are, therefore, non-representative of the whole, as they barely amount to approximately 0.2% of the total. With current data, based on the contents of the two half-opened amphorae (2798 and 2799 coins, respectively) it is estimated that the whole hoard includes around 53,200 coins.

The most recent of these coins is a piece by Maxentius struck at Ostia’s mint between 309 and 312 (cat. 87). All the co-regent emperors are represented, except for Licinius, who is, however, present in the rest of the hoard (Chaves, 2017: 243). Most of the pieces correspond to the first Tetrarchy, and Maximian’s (30) and Constantius’s (20) coins constitute nearly 50% of the sample. There is a significant number of coins issued on Diocletian’s name, (these pieces were struck in most mints), and that of his eastern co-regent Galerius (with 19 each), amounting to 37.26%. Next in number are Constantine’s (7, 6.86%), Severus and Maximinus, with three each (2.94%) and Maxentius, with only one (figure 3).

Figure 4 illustrates the predominance of first Tetrarchy coins; 71.57% of the coins correspond to this period, while 10.78% are dated to the second, 5.88% to the period before the death of Severus, and slightly more to the period following the spring of 307 (11.76%), especially coins struck on Constantine’s name, along with isolated examples by Maxentius and from Maximian’s second period. The most widely represented western mint is Treveri (33.3%), which alongside the other western mints account for over half the coins in the sample (52.94%) (figure 5). This includes six examples from Londinium with no mint mark (5.88%) and 14 from Lugdunum (13.73%). Nearly half the assemblage (45.10%) is constituted by central mints, namely Ticinum (18; 17.65%), Carthage (11; 10.78%) and
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| **2nd Tetrarchy** | **Constantinus** |                  |        |       |       |          |        |
|                  |                  |                  |        |       |       |          |        |
|                  |                  |                  |        |       |       |          |        |
|                  |                  |                  |        |       |       |          |        |
|                  |                  |                  |        |       |       |          |        |
|                  |                  |                  |        |       |       |          |        |
|                  |                  |                  |        |       |       |          |        |
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| **3rd Tetrarchy** | **Severus** |                  |        |       |       |          |        |
|                  |              |                  |        |       |       |          |        |
|                  |              |                  |        |       |       |          |        |
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| **Total**      |        |                  |        |       |       |          |        |
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and their associated chronologies. As such, 55.88% of the pieces feature the Genio, including three specimens with the abbreviated legend \textit{Genio Pop Rom}, two of which come from Lugdunum; 49 of these coins are dated to the first Tetrarchy (48.04%). On the other hand, all the mints represented contribute with at least one Genio type, except for Ostia and, obviously, Carthage. However, the prominent presence of Ticinum’s mint alongside the less numerous coins from Rome and Aquileia make the Moneta (10; 9.80%). From the Balkans area, there is one piece from Siscia (1.96%). Eastern mints are represented by two coins only from Antioch (less than 2%).

The abundance of the type \textit{Genio Populi Romani} in the hoard is explained by the pre-eminence of Treveri’s mint. Figure 7 illustrates the distribution of reverse typologies in the various mints, with a clear peak in Treveri’s Genio and another one in Ticinum’s Moneta type. Figure 8 compares the typological data and their associated chronologies. As such, 55.88% of the pieces feature the Genio, including three specimens with the abbreviated legend \textit{Genio Pop Rom}, two of which come from Lugdunum; 49 of these coins are dated to the first Tetrarchy (48.04%). On the other hand, all the mints represented contribute with at least one Genio type, except for Ostia and, obviously, Carthage. However, the prominent presence of Ticinum’s mint alongside the less numerous coins from Rome and Aquileia make the Moneta
The weight of the coins dated to the first Tetrarchy, it is concluded that most of the pieces predate the first reduction, which must have occurred in spring 307 (RIC VI: 39). In fact, only a few of the coins from Treveri, Lugdunum, Ticinum and Ostia show signs of this reduction, barely five specimens overall (figure 9). The significant 5.65 g of Maxentius’s reduced type (20.59%) the second most common. Ticinum is followed in numbers by Carthage, with its own Saluis Avg type (8.82%) and that of Quies (6.86%), related to the seniores, Diocletian and Maximian.

Although we are aware of the risks of statistical analysis with such a small sample, metrological figures agree with those from the period. Considering the weight of the coins dated to the first Tetrarchy, it is concluded that most of the pieces predate the first reduction, which must have occurred in spring 307 (RIC VI: 39). In fact, only a few of the coins from Treveri, Lugdunum, Ticinum and Ostia show signs of this reduction, barely five specimens overall (figure 9). The significant 5.65 g of Maxentius’s reduced
piece illustrates the reduction to 1/96 of a pound (see Drost 2013).

As noted in the opening lines, it is premature to reach any conclusions concerning the rest of the repertoire. First, the distribution of this small sample by emperor is similar to that yielded by the total assemblage, with one exception: the presence of coins of Maximian is higher (30% vs 22.7%), and that of coins of Constantine is slightly lower (5.88% vs 8.63%) (figure 9).

However, the relative parity of both assemblages in the distribution by emperor is not found in the distribution by mint, in which the differences are more significant, especially concerning western mints. Coins from Treveri account for 33% of the coins found during the excavation, and only for 6.65% of the overall assemblage (figure 10). Although the difference is less significant, the mint of Ticinum is widely represented in the small assemblage, and this is peculiar, since the most common mint in the general assemblage is Carthage. For the remaining mints, the proportions are similar, especially Siscia and the rest of Balkan and eastern mints, which have been recently studied in detail (Chaves, Pliego and García Vargas, forthcoming).

Far from taking this as objective and reliable data to extrapolate the contents of the whole hoard, this comparison raises a cautionary flag and emphasises the circumspection with which partial studies must be approached when dealing with a hoard with these characteristics.

4. The Tomares hoard in the context of known hoards from the Tetrarchy period

In all likelihood, the Tomares hoard is almost entirely constituted by nummi struck after Diocletian’s monetary reform of 294. Because of its volume, it can only be compared with the major hoards from the same period, the largest of which is that found in Misrata (Libya), which comprises over 108,000 nummi. In terms of date and composition, however, the Tomares hoard resembles the also Libyan hoard of Mangub B (ca. 311) and others like Čentur’s (Slovenia) (ca. 310–312) and L’Isle Jourdain (Gers,
France) (ca. 311). With the exception of that from Mangub, all these hoards are currently under study, which poses a great limitation for comparative analyses. We can, at any rate, put the hoard in the context of the period’s monetary picture, and take into consideration better known hoards not only in the Iberian Peninsula (see Chaves, 2017) but also in other territories in the Roman Empire (see Appendix 1).

Our knowledge about the repertoire of Tetrarchy hoards known in the Iberian Peninsula is scarce and fragmentary. These include a hoard found near Seville, of which only its distribution by emperors is known, including Diocletian (42 coins) and Maximian (35) (Balil, 1957: 142, no. 113). Although Martínez Mira (1995-1997: 147) dates this hoard between 284/296 and 305, this seems to respond to the end date of these emperors’ rule (they abdicated in May 305), rather than the chronology of the pieces. Less evidence is available for the hoard of Linares, although it is argued that it is more or less contemporary to that from Seville (see Balil, 1957: 143 and Martínez Mira, 1995-1997: 146). Another hoard is so little known (including its find spot) that it is commonly referred to as “southern Spanish hoard”; it allegedly comprised ca. 1,000 pieces from Claudius II and Diocletian (pre-reform), including a substantial number of Probus (c. 200) (Guadán, 1964 and Martínez Mira, 1995-1997: 146). The important proportion of different types of *antoniniani* and *aureliani* from Gallienus’s — indeed from Valerian’s in some cases — period onwards, is a characteristic shared by these hoards. Probably, the hoards from Seville and Linares, as well as the “southern Spanish hoard”, presented a similar composition with pre-reform silver and bronze coins. A similar pre-eminence of *antoniniani* and *aureliani* that survived until Diocletian’s reign (but prior to the reform), can also be found in the Portuguese hoards (Martínez Mira, 1995-1997; Cepeda, 2004; Ruivo 2008-2013).

In addition to those above mentioned, hoards of pre- and post-reform silver and bronze coins have also been recorded in the Iberian Peninsula. The Spanish hoard found in Santo Tomé (Ubeda, Jaen) seems to respond to this pattern, although the Tetrarchy coins appear to postdate the reform, for the small group of known coins — 166 out of a...
total of ca. 4,000 — include at least 21 pieces issued by Constantius Chlorus, even if we do not know if he is referred as Augustus in any of them (Mateu y Llopis, 1958; Martínez Mira, 1995-1997: 147). Although it would not be strange for the hoard to include antoniniani and aureliani from before Diocletian, nothing is known about later pieces, even if it has to be taken into account that post-reform hoards with silver coins — antoniniani, aureliani and argentei — and post-reform nummi, is documented in other western hoards dated to the Tetrarchy, although in some of these mixed hoards (Drost and Gautier, 2009; Guihard, 2020). In some of these mixed hoards, however, silver coins appear in very small numbers, such as the hoard of Larre (Morbihan) — whose 929 coins include two denarii (Hadrian and Didius Julianus) and 9 argentei from the Tetrarchy (Drost, 2007-2008) — or Wold Newton (East Yorkshire), which contains a radiate (Bland, 2018: 102). It is uncertain whether the Spanish hoard of Sacona (Rigoitia, Vizcaya) belongs to this group because although most of its known coins are Tetrarchy nummi — 148 nummi out of 185, out of a total of 447 coins — the assemblage also includes nine antoniniani dated between Valerian and Carus, and one pre-reform argenteus issued by Maximian. The same uncertainty is present in another Spanish hoard found in Lugo, mainly because this remains largely unknown (Vázquez Seijas 1939, 32).

Hoards exclusively made up of post-reform nummi are rarer. They are most common in Britain, among which the ones found in Market Stainton (Lincolnshire), Bridgen (South Wales) and Brookland (Weybridges) must be highlighted; also important are the German hoard of Emmersweiler; the Gallic hoards of Ghlin (Mons, Belgium), Gruissan (Aude), Lignières (Cher) and Margaux (Gironde); the Italian hoard of Santa Teresa de Gallura; and the African hoards of Cirta (Constantina), Henchir Thina (Mois Baths), Constantine II, and one held in the Bardo Museum, all in Algeria, as well as the Lybian hoard of Mangub A. In the east, the Lebanese hoards, as well as the Syrian hoards from Aleppo and Homs, are also of note. Other assemblages from the Iberian Peninsula are more problematic, owing to the lack of available information. As such, the hoards of Cadramon (Valedouro, Lugo) and Higuera de Arjona (Jaen) are not very informative, although it seems that the latter could be regarded as a hoard entirely constituted by nummi. Slightly better known is the hoard from Mozinho (Oldróes, Penafiel), 78% of whose coins are known. Although it seems that the hoard of Foxó (Tameza, Asturias) was completely made up by nummi, this must be handled with caution, as barely 15% of the coins that constituted the hoard are known.

We have compared the preliminary results of the Tomares Hoard (el 10.72%) with the Iberian hoards, including the peculiar, and later (ca. 318) hoard of Granada. Concerning the distribution by emperors (figure 10), it can be observed that Maximinian pieces predominate among first Tetrarchy pieces earlier than 312: the peak in the Tomares hoard and that in the hoard of Foxó can be regarded as exceptional (in the latter hoard, this may be due to the fact that we only 17% of the pieces that constitute the whole assemblage are known). The larger number of pieces dated to Constantine in Sacona and to Maxentius and Licinius in Granada is explained by the wider chronological bracket covered by these hoards, which in both cases reaches the year 317.

Concerning mints (figure 11), the picture is much more homogeneous. The hoards found in the Iberian Peninsula suggest a certain tendency to regional money circulation, that is, coins minted nearby are more abundant, which is unsurprising. This is especially clear when the relative abundance of eastern and western coins is considered (Chaves, Pliego and García-Vargas). The most widely represented mints in the Iberian Peninsula are those from Gaul and Italy, especially Treveri and Rome and, to a lesser extent, Lugdunum and Ticinum. It is likely that Treveri is overrepresented in our sample, and the study of the rest of the hoard will probably correct this. Also of note is the presence in the Iberian Peninsula of a substantial number of coins minted in Carthage (see Ermatinger, 1990: 113), as previously pointed out by Chaves (2017: 244). The large number of Italian coins (especially Rome and Ostia) in the hoard of Granada is explained by the presence of coins dated to the reigns of Maxentius and Licinius.
5. Conclusions

This approach to the numismatic material in the Tomares hoard has attested that all the pieces postdate Diocletian’s reform, and that no coins from Constantine postdating 313, as in other hoards. There is a clear predominance of first Tetrarchy coins, especially from Maximian, while the proportion of coins issued under Constantius Chlorus is like that of coins issued by eastern emperors. However, the presence of coins issued by Constantine and Maxentius, as well as a previously known coin by Licinius, demonstrates that the hoard was not hid earlier than ca. AD 310–311. Unsurprisingly, western mints — including Treveri, Ticinum and Lugdunum, but also Carthage — are significantly represented mint is Rome. As noted, the mint of Carthage is significantly represented in virtually all hoards.

For obvious reasons, this regionalism is most clearly attested in hoards found in strategic points and near the mints. Of the above listed assemblages, we have selected the most representative in this regard. Figure 12 shows that mints near Treveri, Londinium and Lugdunum predominate in the hoards found in Britain or Gaul, and something similar happens with the hoards of Lebanon and Aleppo and the mints in Antioch and Alexandria. It is, however, of note that the Slovenian hoard of Čentur (D) is dominated by Italian mints, especially Aquileia but also Ticinum and Rome. Likewise, in the Lybian hoard of Mangub A and the Tunisian hoard of Cirta Italian coins predominate, although in this case the most widely represented mint is Rome. As noted, the mint of Carthage is significantly represented in virtually all hoards.
more widely represented than the most distant eastern ones. As a result, the most common typologies are the Genio and the Moneta. The metrological data agrees with known broader patterns, with a first reduction in weight approximate in mid AD 306 (coins drop from 9.61 g to 9.40 g on average), and a sharp second reduction after the spring of AD 307, when the few pieces attested drop to just over 7 g.

Although it has been repeatedly stated that the sample is too small to bring conclusions too far, the results and their contextualisation with those of the hoard overall, give value to the study of this first assemblage, which is in line with what is known about other hoards in the Iberian Peninsula and the rest of the empire is informative concerning composition and chronology. Only the results of the study of the whole assemblage will be able to tell us how accurate this first approximation is.
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Appendix 1: Hoards mentioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoard</th>
<th>Nº exs. Known/Total</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Bibliography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linares (Jaén)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>Gallienus to Diocletian</td>
<td>Ball, 1957: 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevilla</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>Probably pre-reform</td>
<td>Ball, 1957: 142: nº 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Southern Spanish hoard”</td>
<td>1,000?</td>
<td>Claudia II; Probus; pre-reform Diocletian</td>
<td>Guadán, 1964: 146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoard</th>
<th>Nº exs. Known/Total</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Bibliography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santo Tomé (Ubeda, Jaén)</td>
<td>166/ca. 4,000</td>
<td>Pre and post-reform</td>
<td>Mateu y Llopis, 1958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoard</th>
<th>Nº exs. Known/Total</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Bibliography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larré (Morbihan)</td>
<td>2 denarii, 9 argentei/929</td>
<td>ca. 300</td>
<td>Drost, 2007-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugo?</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Tetrarchy</td>
<td>Vázquez Seijas, 1939: 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misrata (Libya)</td>
<td>‘pochi Antoniniani’/108,000</td>
<td>ca. 333.</td>
<td>Garraño, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santo Tomé (Ubeda, Jaén)</td>
<td>158/447</td>
<td>ca. 316-317</td>
<td>Ocharán, 1990; Cepeda unpublished; Cepeda, 2004:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoard</th>
<th>Nº exs. Known/Total</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Bibliography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aleppo</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>ca. 308/309</td>
<td>Bastien, 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>ca. 307</td>
<td>Naceur-Loum, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgen (South Wales) must be highlighted</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>ca. 310</td>
<td>Besly and Webster, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookland (Weybridges)</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>ca. 305</td>
<td>Hill, 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadràmon (Valedouro, Lugo)</td>
<td>11/unknown</td>
<td>ca. 294 - 313</td>
<td>Arias, 1979; Cepeda, 2004: 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calle Sierpes (Granada)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>ca. 316</td>
<td>Padilla and Marín, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čentur’s (Slovenia)</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>ca. 310-312</td>
<td>Calleguer, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirta (Constantina)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>ca. 310-311</td>
<td>Salama and Callu, 1990: nº 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine II</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>ca. 311</td>
<td>Salama, 1960-1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmersweiler</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>ca. 298</td>
<td>Kienast, 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxó (Tameza, Asturias)</td>
<td>173/”thousand”</td>
<td>ca. 307</td>
<td>Diego Santos, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghlin (Mons, Belgium)</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>ca. 313</td>
<td>Faider-Feytmans, 1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruissan (Aude)</td>
<td>3,978</td>
<td>ca. 313</td>
<td>Boucaras, 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henchir Thina (Mois Baths)</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>ca. 312</td>
<td>Fendri, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higuera de Arjona (Jaén)</td>
<td>ca. 300</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gil, 2001; Chaves, 2017: 247 and nº 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homs</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>ca. 308/309</td>
<td>Bastien, 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’Isle Jourdain (Gers, France)</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>ca. 311</td>
<td>In study : F. Dieulafait, M.-L. Le Brazidec, J.-M. Doyen, V. Drost, V. Geneviève and G. Malingue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanonese hoards</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>ca. 307</td>
<td>Bastien, 1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lignières (Cher)</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>ca. 310</td>
<td>Bastien and Cothenet, 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangub A</td>
<td>2,208</td>
<td>ca. 311</td>
<td>Salama and Callu, 1990: nº 3A; Di Vita, Polosa and Salama, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangub B (Libye)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>ca. 311</td>
<td>Salama and Callu, 1990: nº 3B; Di Vita, Polosa and Salama, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaux (Gironde)</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>ca. 311</td>
<td>Cabarro and Nony, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Stainton (Lincolnshire)</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>ca. 305</td>
<td>Mossop, 1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozinho (Oldrões, Penafiel)</td>
<td>236 known out of a total of ca. 300</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pereira, 1974; Lira, 1984-1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Teresa de Gallura</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>ca. 313</td>
<td>Guido, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomares</td>
<td>53,200</td>
<td>ca. 310-311</td>
<td>Chaves, 2017; Chaves et al., 2022; Scrivano et al., 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 We want to thank J.J. Cepeda for providing us with the composition of this still unpublished hoard.
Bibliography related to the mentioned hoards
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Key of busts

1 = Right, head laureate
2 = Right, head laureate (small head)
3 = Right, head laureate (large head)
4 = Right, head laureate, H under bust
5 = Right, bust laureate, draped, cuirassed
6 = Right, bust laureate, draped, cuirassed, seen from behind
7 = Right, bust laureate, cuirassed
8 = Right, bust laureate, cuirassed (small head on tall neck)
9 = Right, bust laureate, cuirassed (large head on short neck)
10 = Right, bust laureate, wearing imperial mantle, holding olive branch in right hand and mappa in left hand
11 = Left, head laureate
12 = Left, bust laureate, holding club over right shoulder and lion’s skin on left shoulder
13 = Left, bust laureate, cuirassed
14 = Left, bust laureate, cuirassed, holding sceptre over right shoulder

Londinium

Without mint-mark (296-297)

(300-305)

MAXIMIANVS NOB CAES
1 Bust 12. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 15. 10.25-7 (MAS DJ2016/07-00100).

IMP C MAXIMIANVS P F AVG
2 Bust 13. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 17. 8.53-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00003).

303-305

IMP MAXIMIANVS P F AVG
3 Bust 11. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 23b. 10.54-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00054).

303-305

MAXIMIANVS NOBIL C
4 Bust 11. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 33. 10.45-7 (MAS DJ2016/07-00063).

MAXIMIANVS NOB CAES
5 Bust 11. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 35. 11.85-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00017).

305-306

SEVERVS NOBILI SIMVS CAES
6 Bust 8. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 59a. 9.38-7 (MAS DJ2016/07-00016).

Treveri

(294)

IMP C DIOCLETIANVS P F AVG
7 Bust 1. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 137a. 9.5-12 (MAS DJ2016/07-00065).

IMP C MAXIMIANVS P F AVG
8 Bust 1. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 137b. 9.69-12 (MAS DJ2016/07-00046).

CONSTANTIVS NOB CAES
9 Bust 1. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 146a. 10.31-12 (MAS DJ2016/07-00070).

A/Γ/–/TR – C/Γ/–/TR (295)

A/Γ/–/TR

IMP MAXIMIANVS P AVG
10 Bust 1. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 152b. 8.17-7 (MAS DJ2016/07-00087).

CONSTANTIVS NOB CAES
11 Bust 1. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 158a. 10.51-12 (MAS DJ2016/07-00072).

B/Γ/–/TR

IMP MAXIMIANVS P AVG
12 Bust 1. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 152b. 9.28-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00064).

A/Γ/–/TR – C/Γ/–/TR (296-297)

A/Γ/–/TR

IMP DIOCLETIANVS P F AVG
13 Bust 26. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 176a. 10.32-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00071).

IMP MAXIMIANVS P AVG
14 Bust 1. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 170b. 9.18-12 (MAS DJ2016/07-00005).

CONSTANTIVS NOB CAES
15 Bust 1. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 213a. 8.02-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00043).

MAXIMIANVS NOB CAES
16 Bust 11. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 213b. 9.81-12 (MAS DJ2016/07-00083).

B/Γ/–/TR

IMP DIOCLETIANVS AVG
17 Bust 1. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 305a. 9.12-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00039).

CONSTANTIVS NOBIL CAES
18 Bust 1. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 343a. 8.64-12 (MAS DJ2016/07-00097).

-/*//ATR – -/*//BTR (300-301)

MAXIMIANVS NOB CAES
22 Bust 11. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 358b. 8.92-7 (MAS DJ2016/07-00008).

B/Γ/–/TR

IMP DIOCLETIANVS AVG
23 Bust 1. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 305a. 9.12-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00039).

CONSTANTIVS NOBIL CAES
24 Bust 1. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 343a. 8.64-12 (MAS DJ2016/07-00097).

-/*//ATR – -/*//BTR (300-301)

MAXIMIANVS NOB CAES
25 Bust 11. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 454b. 11.48-7 (MAS DJ2016/07-00011).
The Tomares hoard (Seville): An approach based on an archaeological sample

S/F // ITR – S/F // ITR (302-303)
S/F // ITR
IMP MAXIMIANVS P F AVG
26 Bust 11. MONETA S AVGG ET CAESS NN, RIC VI 544b. 9.07-12 (MAS DJ2016/07-00034).
S/F // ITR
IMP MAXIMIANVS P F AVG
27 Bust 11. GENIO POP-VLI ROMANI, RIC VI 515b. 11.42-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00024).
CONSTANTIVS NOB C
28 Bust 11. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 530a. 11.68-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00086).
S/F // PTR (303-307)
303-305
IMP DIOCLETIANVS AVG
Bust 11. GENIO POP-VLI ROMANI, RIC VI 582a. 9.86-7 (MAS DJ2016/07-00092).
D N DIOCLETIANO BAEATISSIMO SEN AVG
Bust 23. PROVIDENTIA DEORVM QVIES AVGG, RIC VI 673a. 10.62-1 (MAS DJ2016/07-00028).
D N MAXIMIANO FELICISSIMO SEN AVG
Bust 23. PROVIDENTIA DEORVM QVIES AVGG, RIC VI 676b. 9.64-7 (MAS DJ2016/07-00019).
S/A // PTR (307)
FL VAL CONSTANTINVS NOB C
40 Bust 11. GENIO POP ROM, RIC VI 719b. 8.04-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00081).

Lugdunum
-/-/LA – -/-/LB (295 - 296)
-/-/LB
CONSTANTIVS NOB C
41 Bust 1. GENIO POPVLI ROMANI, RIC VI 6. 11.11-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00028).
A/-/PL – B/-/PL (296 - 297)
A/-/PL
MAXIMIANVS NOB CAES
42 Bust 1. GENIO POP-VLI ROMANI, RIC VI 53b. 9.27-1 (MAS DJ2016/07-00019).
A/-/LP – B/-/LP (297)
B/-/LP
IMP C MAXIMIANVS AVG
43 Bust 11. GENIO POP-VLI ROMANI, RIC VI 32b. 11.09-12 (MAS DJ2016/07-00069).

Ticinum
*/-//PT – */-//ST (296 - 297)
*/-//PT
IMP C MAXIMIANVS P F AVG
55 Bust 11. GENIO POP-VLI ROMANI, RIC VI 31b. 10.65-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00015).
*/-//ST
CONSTANTIVS NOB CAES
56 Bust 11. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 32a. 7.86-12 (MAS DJ2016/07-00095).

S/F // PTR (303-305)
303-305
IMP DIOCLETIANVS AVG
Bust 11. GENIO POP-VLI ROMANI, RIC VI 582a. 9.86-7 (MAS DJ2016/07-00092).
D N DIOCLETIANO BAEATISSIMO SEN AVG
Bust 23. PROVIDENTIA DEORVM QVIES AVGG, RIC VI 673a. 10.62-1 (MAS DJ2016/07-00028).
D N MAXIMIANO FELICISSIMO SEN AVG
Bust 23. PROVIDENTIA DEORVM QVIES AVGG, RIC VI 676b. 9.64-7 (MAS DJ2016/07-00019).
S/A // PTR (307)
FL VAL CONSTANTINVS NOB C
40 Bust 11. GENIO POP ROM, RIC VI 719b. 8.04-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00081).

Ticinum
*/-//PT – */-//ST (296 - 297)
*/-//PT
IMP C MAXIMIANVS P F AVG
55 Bust 11. GENIO POP-VLI ROMANI, RIC VI 31b. 10.65-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00015).
*/-//ST
CONSTANTIVS NOB CAES
56 Bust 11. GENIO POPV-LI ROMANI, RIC VI 32a. 7.86-12 (MAS DJ2016/07-00095).

S/F // PTR (303-305)
303-305
IMP DIOCLETIANVS AVG
Bust 11. GENIO POP-VLI ROMANI, RIC VI 582a. 9.86-7 (MAS DJ2016/07-00092).
D N DIOCLETIANO BAEATISSIMO SEN AVG
Bust 23. PROVIDENTIA DEORVM QVIES AVGG, RIC VI 673a. 10.62-1 (MAS DJ2016/07-00028).
D N MAXIMIANO FELICISSIMO SEN AVG
Bust 23. PROVIDENTIA DEORVM QVIES AVGG, RIC VI 676b. 9.64-7 (MAS DJ2016/07-00019).
S/A // PTR (307)
FL VAL CONSTANTINVS NOB C
40 Bust 11. GENIO POP ROM, RIC VI 719b. 8.04-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00081).
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CONSTANTIVS NOB CAES
60 Bust 1. SACRA MONET AVGG ET CAESS NOSTR, RIC VI 46a. 10.3-12 (MAS DJ2016/07-00074).
-/*//ST
IMP C MAXIMIANVS P F AVG
61 Bust 1. SACRA MONET AVGG ET CAESS NOSTR, RIC VI 45b. 8.63-1 (MAS DJ2016/07-00038).
MAXIMIANVS NOB CAES
62 Bust 1. SACRA MONET AVGG-ET CAESS NOSTR, RIC VI 44b. 10.67-12 (MAS DJ2016/07-00051).
-/*//TT
IMP C MAXIMIANVS P F AVG
63 Bust 1. SACRA MONET AVGG ET CAESS NOSTR, RIC VI 45b. 11.07-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00101).
64 Bust 1. SACRA MONET AVGG ET CAESS NOSTR, RIC VI 45b. 11.2-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00047). […][T+]
-/*//PT – *///TT (304-035)
-/*//ST
CONSTANTIVS NOB CAES
Bust 1. SACRA MONET AVGG ET CAESS NOSTR, RIC VI 48a.
-/*//PT – *///TT (305)
-/*//PT
IMP C CONSTANTIVS P F AVG
66 Bust 1. FI\[ES MILITVM, RIC VI 55a. 8.94-12 (MAS DJ2016/07-00049).
-/*//ST
IMP C MAXIMIANVS P F AVG
67 Bust 1. FI\[ES MI\[LITVM, RIC VI 55b. 9.27-12 (MAS DJ2016/07-00066).
-/*//PT (306)
D N MAXIMIANO FELICISSIMO SEN AVG
68 Bust 23. PROVIDENTIA DEORVM QVIES AVGG, RIC VI 62b. 10.74-1 (MAS DJ2016/07-00025).
A-///PT – A/-//TT (306)
A/-///TT
CONSTANTIVS NOB CAES
69 Bust 10. VIRTVS AVGG CC ET CAES NN, RIC VI 70b, var. 10.14-1 (MAS DJ2016/07-00009). Unknown bust for this issue.
-/*//PT – *///TT (306)
-/*//ST
CONSTANTIVS NOB CAES
70 Bust 10. VIRTVS AV-GG ET CAESS NN, RIC VI 76. 10.19-1 (MAS DJ2016/07-00068).
-/*//PT – *///TT (307)
-/*//TT
IMP C MAXIMIANVS P F AVG
71 Bust 1. CONSERV VRB SVAE, RIC VI 92. 6.82-12 (MAS DJ2016/07-00080).

Aquileia
-/*//AQ (294)
IMP C MAXIMIANVS P F AVG
72 Bust 1. GENIO POP-VLI ROMANI, RIC VI 18b. 10.17-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00076).
-/*//AQ (301)
MAXIMIANVS NOB CAES
73 Bust 1. SACRA MONET AVGG ET CAESS NOSTR, RIC VI 32b. 7.98-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00029).

Ruth Pliego, Jacobo Vázquez Paz and Pablo Garrido
Ostia

-/-//MOSTS (309-312)
IMP C MAXENTIVS P F AVG

Carthago

I or H/-//PKP – I or H/-//PKQ (297-298)
I/-//PKQ
MAXIMIANVS NOB CAES
88 Bust 1. FELIX A-DV-ENT AVGG NN, RIC VI 24b. 9.39-12 (MAS DJ2016/07-00059).
-H or l/- H or l/-//PKA – - H or l/- H or l/-//PKΔ (298)
H/-//PKB
IMP MAXIMIANVS P F AVG
89 Bust 1. FELIX AD-V-ENT AVGG NN, RIC VI 25b. 11.29-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00066).

Siscia

-/-//A – -/-//Δ (298-303)
-/-//B
IMP MAXIMIANVS P F AVG
90 Bust 2. SALVIS AVGG ET CAESS FEL KAR T, RIC VI 29b. 9.98+1 (MAS DJ2016/07-00010).
-/-//A – -/-//Δ (299-303)
-/-//A
IMP DIOCLETIANVS P F AVG
91 Bust 3. SALVIS AVGG ET CAESS FEL KAR T, RIC VI 31a. 9.41-5 (MAS DJ2016/07-00099).

Antiochia

K(I on V)/ANT – K(I on V)/ANT
K(I on V)/ANT
FL VAL CONSTANTIVS NOB CAES
92 Bust 1. SALVIS AVGG ET CAESS FEL KAR T, RIC VI 34b. 8.18-12 (MAS DJ2016/07-00092).
-H or l/-//A – H or l/-//IT (305-306)
H/-//A
IMP CONSTANTIVS P F AVG
93 Bust 1. SALVIS AVGG ET CAESS FEL KAR T, RIC VI 39a. 9.58+1 (MAS DJ2016/07-00033).
94 7.59-12 (MAS DJ2016/07-00034).

H/-//IT
FL VAL SEVERVS NOB CAES
95 Bust 1. SALVIS AVGG ET CAESS FEL KAR T, RIC VI 40a. 8.82-6 (MAS DJ2016/07-00050).
The Tomares hoard (Seville): An approach based on an archaeological sample