

The University of Memphis

Interlibrary Loan

ILLiad TN: 58634



Borrower: TXM

Lending String: *TMA,TWS,TMK,TJC,TKN

Patron: Clark, Victor

Journal Title: Phoenix.

Volume: 19 **Issue:**

Month/Year: 1965**Pages:** 51-60

Article Author:

Article Title: Frederick H. Armstrong; The
Ihnasyah Hoard Re-Examined

Imprint: Toronto, University of Toronto Press [et

ILL Number: 28355560



Call #:

Location:

ARIEL

Charge

Maxcost: Free

Shipping Address:

Middle Tenn. St. Univ. Lib

ILL

Box 13

Murfreesboro, TN 37132

Fax:

Ariel: 161.45.205.82

THE IHNASYAH HOARD RE-EXAMINED

FREDERICK H. ARMSTRONG

PRIOR TO THE OPENING of the Royal Ontario Museum in 1912 the late Dr. C. T. Currelly, the first Director of Archaeology, had travelled extensively in Europe and the Near East gathering the nucleus of the present collections.¹ Among his acquisitions was a large hoard, or part of a hoard, of Roman copper coins of the Constantinian Dynasty dating from between the years 324 and 346, which he purchased at Ihnasyah in Egypt.² These coins were examined by the late Professor J. G. Milne and his findings published in 1914 in the *Journal International d'Archéologie Numismatique*.³ In his article he discussed a total of 6476 coins, which is slightly less than the 6527 coins included in the hoard as it was arranged for display by Dr. Currelly not long after the Museum opened. The discrepancy is almost exactly accounted for by the ten fragments and the 36 coins from other periods which are included in the hoard. Although the coins were purchased in three lots, both these authorities felt that they formed part of the same find and constituted all or part of a hoard—a contention which is supported by their close dating and the fact that all have the same general patination. The Museum also possesses some further coins dating from the 324–346 period which Dr. Currelly did not include in the hoard when he placed it on display. These coins, which frequently have a very different patination, are not examined either in this paper or in the article by Milne.

At that time the field of late Roman numismatics was badly neglected; the system of classification used by Milne has since been considerably revised, the dating made more precise, and the variations in the details of the types used at the different mints examined extensively. The results of these studies are now available in a new conspectus prepared by P. V. Hill, J. P. C. Kent, and R. A. G. Carson of the British Museum, in which they reclassify the copper coinage from 324 to 498.⁴ With the

¹I should like to thank F. M. Heichelheim, of University College, University of Toronto, who has been kind enough to examine the manuscript and to check a number of coins; C. H. Clough, of the University of Birmingham, who also read the manuscript; J. W. Graham and Mrs. N. Leipen, of the Royal Ontario Museum, who made it possible for me to examine the coins and offered many helpful suggestions; and R. A. G. Carson, of the British Museum, who examined the list of possible new varieties.

²J. G. Milne, "A Hoard of Constantinian Coins from Egypt," *Journal International d'Archéologie Numismatique* 6 (1914) 1.

³*Ibid.* 1–27.

⁴P. V. Hill, J. P. C. Kent, and R. A. G. Carson, *Late Roman Bronze Coinage, A.D. 324–498* (London 1960).

appearance of this work in 1960 a re-examination of the Ihnasyah Hoard became a worthwhile project, both to see if any further minor varieties could be added to those listed by the British Museum, and also to see what information the hoard provided on the mint operations of the period and the economic and political life of the eastern part of the empire.

Unfortunately the early records of the Museum for the years prior to 1912 are not always very detailed, and we do not have full information on how the hoard was acquired. Milne was advised that it was purchased in 1905, but the Currelly memoirs (published in 1956) describe the Ihnasyah operations as follows:

In the winter of 1903 I went from Naples to Palermo, and then across the island of Sicily and on to Crete where I spent my time in making drawings of the objects that we had found. From Crete I went to Ehnassieh [Ihnasyah] in the Fayoum region of Egypt. There I found numbers of natives digging over the great mound to get the old mud brick dust which was rich in saltpetre and therefore valuable as a fertilizer. Our men had arrived, and I started to build a line of huts. While this was being done, I went to where the peasants were digging the brick dust and old ashes, and the ancient town rubbish. I asked them if they had ever found any antiquities. They said no, and I sat down to watch them. Shortly part of a model of a shield turned up. I said: "That's an antiquity; I'll give you half a piastre (about two and a half cents) for it." The excitement was intense, as wages were only ten cents a day. Soon a few Roman lamps turned up, and within two or three days I had them eagerly watching for any kind of an object whatever. I gave a standard price of half a piastre for each object, and soon every night a number of things were brought in. From local people I succeeded in buying thirty thousand Roman coins and a large number of Roman objects.⁵

The thirty thousand coins referred to here probably included the hoard and much of the Museum's large collection of Roman Imperial issues for Egypt predating the coinage reform of Diocletian in 296.

Ihnasyah is today only a series of rubbish mounds, some 369 acres in extent, which is locally known as "Umm el-Kimān" or "Mother of Dust-Heaps"; there is little trace of its past prosperity with the exception of some Byzantine columns which mark the last phase of its occupation. The site was first settled in pre-dynastic times, and was known in antiquity as Neni-nesu. It was the centre of worship of the ram god Herishef, and twice—under the Akhtoyes of Dynasties IX and X, and again under Sheshonk I in Dynasty XXII—was briefly the capital of Egypt. The Greeks later equated Herishef (whom they called Arsaphes) with Herakles, and as a result they renamed the city Herakleopolis, to which the Romans in their turn added Magna.⁶

By the new British Museum classification the coinage from 324 to 346

⁵C. T. Currelly, *I Brought the Ages Home* (Toronto 1956) 68.

⁶Herman Kees, *Ancient Egypt* (Chicago 1961) 214-218; and James Baikie, *Egyptian Antiquities in the Nile Valley* (London 1932) 211-214.

is divided into fo
into two sections
period has its ow
from about 20 m
in 335. The acc
operating at the
the hoard for ea
comparative pur
period 324-346,
issued by Const
period of their jo
small copper pie
under Domitian
an ibis for the re
size as the copp
346 might indica
the fourth centu
debased Alexand
by Philip I (244
Both are in poor
hoard, as is cert
of the Bahri Ma
1354-1361), wit
silver coin in th
reduction in the
of these larger c
indicate that th
ratio of two old

The hoard pr
reform which to
were used at Al
are not represe
the western pa
from the easter
bears what mu
to the recoinag

⁷Milne's attribu
except that he tak

⁸G. C. Miles, o
to identify this co
of the coin of Dor

⁹R. A. G. Cars
mint marks may

¹⁰Hill *et al.* (see

a re-examination of the Ihnasyah Hoard
th to see if any further minor varieties
y the British Museum, and also to see
vided on the mint operations of the
olitical life of the eastern part of the

s of the Museum for the years prior to
l, and we do not have full information
Milne was advised that it was purchased
airs (published in 1956) describe the

les to Palermo, and then across the island of
time in making drawings of the objects that
hnassieh [Ihnasyah] in the Fayoum region of
s digging over the great mound to get the old
tre and therefore valuable as a fertilizer. Our
a line of huts. While this was being done, I
the brick dust and old ashes, and the ancient
ver found any antiquities. They said no, and
odel of a shield turned up. I said: "That's
and a half cents) for it." The excite-
y. Soon a few Roman lamps turned
watching for any kind of an object
each object, and soon every night
ople I succeeded in buying thirty
man objects.

probably the hoard
of Rome issues for
letian
n mon
el-K
pros
e las
me
sh
I
again under
f Egypt. The
aphes) with
olis, to which

324 to 346

Baikie, Egyptian

is divided into four main periods, with a sub-division of the third period into two sections at the death of Constantine the Great in 337. Each period has its own types, but the major change was the reduction in size from about 20 mm. to 15 mm. which took place at the end of Period II in 335. The accompanying table shows a complete list of the mints operating at the time, with the number of coins struck by them found in the hoard for each period. Milne's totals for each mint are shown for comparative purposes.⁷ Of the total of 6527 coins only 35 predate the period 324-346, and only one is later. Of these 35, all but three were issued by Constantine the Great or his colleague Licinius during the period of their joint reign (306-323). Of the three earlier coins, one is a small copper piece probably issued by the Alexandrian provincial mint under Domitian (81-96). It has the emperor's head on the obverse, and an ibis for the reverse type. The fact that it is approximately of the same size as the copper coinage of Constantine and his sons between 335 and 346 might indicate that it had been found and returned to circulation in the fourth century and thus drifted into the hoard. The other two are debased Alexandrian provincial tetradrachms of the third century, issued by Philip I (244-249) and Claudius II Gothicus (268-270) respectively. Both are in poor condition and are probably accidental inclusions in the hoard, as is certainly the one coin which postdates 346, a silver dirhem of the Bahri Mamluk ruler Al-Nasir al-Din Hasan (1347-1351 and 1354-1361), with both the mint and year obliterated. This is the only silver coin in the hoard.⁸ A large percentage of the coins predates the reduction in the weight of the coinage in 335. The comparative frequency of these larger coins ten years after they had ceased to be minted would indicate that they were probably continuing to circulate, possibly at a ratio of two old to three new copper coins.

The hoard probably dates from immediately before the major coinage reform which took place in or shortly after 346. The mint marks which were used at Alexandria and Antioch in the last months before the reform are not represented, but there are, rather surprisingly, two coins from the western part of the empire which may be of a later date than any from the eastern half.⁹ One of these was struck at Arelate in Gaul and bears what must have been the last mint mark used by that city prior to the recoinage.¹⁰ The other was minted at Rome and shows what was

⁷Milne's attribution of the mint marks is the same as that of the British Museum except that he takes "T" to stand for Tarraco, not Ticinum.

⁸G. C. Miles, of the American Numismatic Society in New York, was good enough to identify this coin; Joan Fagerlie, of the same institution, confirmed the identification of the coin of Domitian.

⁹R. A. G. Carson advises that there is a possibility that the order of some of the mint marks may be changed as further evidence comes to light.

¹⁰Hill *et al.* (see n. 4) Nos. 461-463.

TABLE I. Mints of the Ihnasyah Hoard

Mint (east to west)	Mint mark	Period								Total
		I pre-324	II 324-330	IIIa 330-335	IIIb 335-337	IIIa or b 337-341	IV 341-346	Present 1963	Milne 1914	
London (closed 325/6)	LON	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Treveri (Treves)	TR	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	
Lugdunum (Lyons)	LG	—	—	3	1	—	—	2	6	
Arelate (Arles)	CONST & AR	3	—	2	3	5	—	12	25	
Ticinum (closed 327)	T	5	9	—	—	—	—	—	14	
Rome	R	5	11	—	8	47	5	39	182	
Aquileia (reopened 334)	AQ	5	—	67	8	8	—	5	21	
Siscia	SIS	—	6	2	1	5	1	—	19	
Sirmium (closed 325/6)	SIRM	—	—	4	3	—	—	—	42	
Thessalonica	TS	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Heraclea	H	—	11	30	8	32	9	34	124	
Constantinople (reopened 326)	CONS	3	7	26	20	19	—	7	82	
Nicomedia	N	—	6	97	110	135	—	15	363	
Cyzicus	K	—	26	93	49	78	16	25	287	
Antioch	AN	—	35	104	78	145	34	75	471	
Alexandria (reopened 326)	AL	—	41	186	102	401	31	169	930	
Total (identifiable mints)		—	26	173	96	292	38	450	1075	
Unknown or uncertain mints		21	178	788	479	1168	134	833	3601	
Total with identifiable types		11	100	632	—	86	902	492	2223	
Illegible [Period I or II, 174; Period III or IV, 515; fragments, 10]		32	278	1420	479	1254	1036	1325	5824	
Pre-296 or post-346		—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Grand Total [Milne's does not include 36 pre-324 or post-346 and 10 fragments]		—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	

probably the early 346.¹¹ It is official or soldier which arose out of the followers of St. Alexandria in the hoard, which the east

For the east to be significant staff that the divided were not only, according to all types.¹² Out of the mint is certain but four of these the reverse is evident down, as on the 1901 of the second permit conclusion this approximation appears to apply were divided in by letters (A, L) workshop.¹³ In the line taken on the back of the and the back of the obverse head. The two anvils operated by the die position from one position thus used to distinguish. In this case the the distinguishing a simpler system of letter and date period of time, fit in with the late

¹¹*Ibid.*, No. 649.

¹²See note 4.

¹³This distribution is discernible, but with position cannot be

probably the last mint mark, used during the late months of 345 and early 346.¹¹ It may be that these coins were brought to Egypt by some official or soldier who was transferred from the west because of the troubles which arose out of the quarrels between the Arian Christians and the followers of St. Athanasius after he was restored to the patriarchate of Alexandria in 345. These same riots may be the reason for the burial of the hoard, which may have belonged either to a merchant or a banker.

For the eastern mints, where there are enough coins for the evidence to be significant, the hoard confirms the deduction of the British Museum staff that the various *officinae* or workshops into which the mint was divided were not individually limited to striking certain types of coins only, according to a rational distribution, but that all workshops struck all types.¹² Out of the 3580 coins dating from the period 324 to 346 where the mint is certain, the die position is discernible in 3556 specimens. All but four of these have a fixed die position, so that when the coin is rotated the reverse is either right side up, as on modern Canadian coins, or upside down, as on modern American. There are 1651 coins of the first type, and 1901 of the second. For the western mints there are not enough coins to permit conclusions with any degree of certainty, but for the eastern mints this approximately equal division into two set types of die position appears to apply for each mint individually. Further the mints, as noted, were divided into *officinae*, which were always distinguished on the coins by letters (A, B, Γ, Δ etc.); both types of die position appear in each workshop.¹³ In many cases the obverse is not exactly vertical and here the line taken for setting the dies appears to have been drawn through the back of the head and the front of the bust, or the front of the head and the back of the bust, rather than through the vertical middle of the obverse head. The use of two die positions might indicate that there were two anvils operating in each *officina* and their products were distinguished by the die positions. Alternatively, the reverse might have been changed from one position to the other daily or weekly, and the differentiation thus used to distinguish the number of coins produced within a set period. In this case there would only need to be one anvil to each workshop and the distinguishing letter would stand for both. This would certainly be a simpler system than having each anvil distinguished by a combination of letter and die position. Alternatively, if the die position indicates a period of time, there could be several anvils in each *officina*; this would fit in with the large number of dies which were used—so many that even

¹¹*Ibid.*, No. 649.

¹²See note 4.

¹³This distribution also appears to be applicable to the coins where the mint is not discernible, but with these there is a much higher percentage of coins on which the die position cannot be determined.

30	8	32	9	34	124	196
26	20	19	—	7	82	220
97	110	135	—	15	363	698
93	49	78	16	25	287	539
104	78	145	34	75	471	845
186	102	401	31	169	930	1611
173	96	292	38	450	1075	1592
788	479	1168	134	833	3601	6141
632	—	86	902	492	2223	—
1420	479	1254	1036	1325	5824	6141
32	—	—	—	—	699	335
278	—	—	—	—	4	—
6527	—	—	—	—	—	6476

Unknown or uncertain mints
Total with identifiable types
Illegible [Period I or II, 174; Period III or IV, 515; fragments, 10]
Pre-296 or post-346
Grand Total [Milne's does not include 36 pre-324 or post-346 and 10 fragments]

with the fairly large number of coins from some mints any attempt at establishing die linkage is impossible.

The Roman use of coins for propaganda purposes is well known, and the types which appear in the hoard are typical. All the coins bear a head on the obverse; usually Constantine (draped after his death), or one of his sons, but occasionally some other member of the Imperial Family. Personifications of Rome and Constantinople were also used, and in these cases the reverse type was usually a picture of the wolf and twins in the former case (1), and of Victory standing on a prow in the latter (2). Sometimes, however, these civic commemorative coins have the usual type of reverse which was used for the emperors. The memorial coins for Constantine also have special reverses symbolizing his deification. During Period IIIb (337-341) they show a *quadriga* ascending to heaven bearing the emperor (3), and in Period IV (341-346) they depict the figure of Pietas and the legend *VN MR* (4). Although nearly all the different reverse types listed by the British Museum are represented in the hoard, except for the four already mentioned, almost all those which occur frequently are ones which were used with obverses depicting several different members of the Imperial Family. In Period I (324-330), of the 278 coins which have an identifiable type, 240 are of the *PROVIDENTIA AVGG* or *CAESS* class (5). For Period II (330-335) there are only three types: 1035 coins with a soldier standing on each side of two standards and the legend *GLORIA EXERCITVS* (6); 202 of the Constantinople/Victory variety; and 183 with the Rome/wolf-and-twins type. Coins of the third period (335-341) total 2769, of which 2078 are of the *GLORIA EXERCITVS* type—but with only one standard, due to the reduction in the size—and 330 are of the *quadriga* variety commemorating Constantine. These last were of course only issued in Period IIIb after his death. In Period IV (341-346) different types for the reverse were used in the eastern and western areas of the empire, and as would be expected the eastern types dominate. Of the 1325 coins dating from this period, 847 have the reverse legend *VOTXXMVLTXXX* in a wreath (7), and 338 are of the Pietas commemorative variety.

The distribution of the obverse types shows that coins bearing the heads of different members of the Imperial Family were struck during all four periods without regard to mints; naturally the percentage assigned to the various members of the dynasty changed from time to time. Dealing only with the five eastern mints (Constantinople to Alexandria in the table), where there are enough specimens to indicate policy, we find, as we should expect, that during the first three periods while Constantine was still alive the coins bearing his head predominate. In Period I—leaving out Constantinople which is only represented by a single piece—there are 98 coins with the emperor's head. His sons

Crispus, Co
respectively
probably ex
murdered in
are still the
number acc
and Consta
Alexandria
mately the
surviving so
Constans is

The coins
Constantine
addition a
Constantine
distribution
east were u
now his he
IIIb (337-
95 for Con
the mints
Constans, l
only 28 for
final period
of Constan
larger num
there are 1
that Cons
centres. Th
occurs in I
(died 329)
(8). The l
struck coin
of Period
is very cru

As Miln
mints, not
province c
most com
with Alex
western m
per cent
than twen

from some mints any attempt at

unda purposes is well known, and typical. All the coins bear a head (draped after his death), or one of member of the Imperial Family. Constantinople were also used, and in y a picture of the wolf and twins standing on a prow in the latter commemorative coins have the for the emperors. The memorial reverses symbolizing his deifica- y show a *quadriga* ascending to Period IV (341-346) they depict MR (4). Although nearly all the tish Museum are represented in entioned, almost all those which d with obverses depicting several ily. In Period I (324-330), of e type, 240 are of the PROVI- Period II (330-335) there are standing on each side of two RCITVS (6); 202 of the Con- th the Rome/wolf-and-twins total of which 2078 are w one standard, due o *quadriga* variety com- o y issued in Period p for the reverse ire, and as would coins dating from MVLTXXX in a variety. e coins bearing the were struck during lly the percentage nged from time to (Constantinople to ecimens to indicate e first three periods s head predominate. y only represented by or's head. His sons

Crispus, Constantine II, and Constantius II, appear on 14, 31, and 18 respectively. The smaller number for Crispus, who was the eldest, is probably explained by the fact that his coinage would cease after he was murdered in 326. For the next period (330-335), the coins of Constantine are still the most numerous (256), and those of his sons decrease in number according to their age: Constantine II, 197; Constantius II, 126; and Constans, the youngest, 34. Looking at the mints individually, Alexandria presents a different picture from the rest, for there is approximately the same number of coins for Constantine as for his two eldest surviving sons from that mint (30:33:29). Of the 34 coins with the head of Constans issued at this time, over half are from Constantinople.

The coins of the following period, IIIa, show Constantine in 150 cases, Constantine II in 72, Constantius II in 69, and Constans in 43. In addition a cousin, Delmatius, is represented on 20. With the death of Constantine I and the murder of Delmatius in 337 there is a different distribution for the last two divisions of the hoard. All the mints in the east were under the jurisdiction of Constantius II during this time, and now his head might be expected to predominate on the coins. In Period IIIb (337-341), he appears on 405 coins, to 215 of Constans, and only 95 for Constantine II who was murdered in 340. Except for Antioch all the mints struck an almost equal number of coins for Constantius and Constans, but from the capital of Syria there are 238 for the former, and only 28 for the latter. This distribution occurs again at Antioch in the final period up to 346, there being 123 coins of Constantius and only 15 of Constans; but at the same time at the other mints there are generally larger numbers issued for Constans, so that in the overall eastern total there are 163 for Constans to 167 for Constantius. This may well indicate that Constantius' control was stronger at Antioch than at the other centres. The only case of an empress appearing on any number of coins occurs in Period IIIb where Constantine the Great's mother, St. Helena (died 329), is depicted on 35 coins of Constantinople, and one of Treves (8). The hoard contains one obvious contemporary forgery. This is a struck coin of the GLORIA EXERCITVS type with the two standards of Period II, but it is considerably reduced in size and the workmanship is very crude.

As Milne pointed out, the frequency of the coins from the non-Egyptian mints, not surprisingly, is directly proportional to their proximity to the province on the trade routes, and the coins of Antioch are, of course, the most common. For the west, Rome, which had direct trade connections with Alexandria, is the best represented mint, and the coins of the other western mints probably came to Egypt via that route. Only about thirty per cent of the identifiable coins come from Alexandria, while no less than twenty-six per cent come from Antioch. This is readily explained

not only by the close trade connections, but also by the fact that the Alexandria mint was closed until 326 and then only had two *officinae* operating until 335, when the number was increased to four; while at the same time Antioch had ten *officinae* before 339 and fifteen after.¹⁴ The opening of the additional facilities at Alexandria soon changed the proportion of coins from the two mints drastically and for the half decade from 341 to 346 there are 450 Alexandrian coins to only 169 from Antioch. Obviously the mint at Alexandria was catching up with the local demand and making the importation of coinage from other mints unnecessary. It is to be regretted that such a large proportion of the total coinage from 324 to 346 (2922 out of 3601) cannot be identified completely; but although Milne assigned a far larger number to specific mints I feel it is safer not to classify coins so completely when the attribution is in any way uncertain. In spite of the many uncertain coins, however, the hoard does provide a fair picture of the subsidiary Egyptian coinage in the period immediately before the mid-century reform, and also adds some twenty-five new minor varieties to the number already noted by the British Museum.¹⁵

APPENDIX

LIST OF NEW VARIETIES

The following is a list of new varieties and other new information provided by the hoard. Details of classification and numbers are according to P. V. Hill, J. P. C. Kent, and R. A. G. Carson, *Late Roman Brome Coinage* (London 1960). Where the coin is a new variety it is classified by the number of the coin it would follow in their tables plus an "a."

1. LUGDUNUM—Period IV—Cn:3d:(N?)—VICTORIAEDd—PLG—has as part of the mint mark C over the PLG—variety not listed.

2. ARELATE—Period IV—Cs:3b:N—VICTORIAEDd—?ARL (top only visible)—has monogram FV above, which is not listed. (not E V No. 271).

3. TICINUM—Period I—(No. 477a)—Cr:10a:J—DOMINOR.NOS-TROR.CAESS.—VOT X—TT—head J is not listed with this mark although it appears with the ones before and after (Nos. 468 and 482).

4. ROME—Period II—(No. 532)—CII:9c:J—GLORIAEXERCITUS—RFT—only RFS listed with this number.

¹⁴Hill *et al.* (see n. 4) 30-31.

¹⁵This hoard, together with two other Roman Imperial hoards, is now being arranged for display at the Royal Ontario Museum.

5. ROME—Period II—(

6. HERACLEA—Period EXERCITUS—SMHB—no

7. HERACLEA—Period EXERCITUS—SMHA—H appears to be K. It is defin

8. HERACLEA—Period EXERCITUS—SMH€—N for Cn earlier.

9. HERACLEA—Period LTXXX—SMHB—E¹ only

10. CONSTANTINOPOLI GLORIAEXERCITUS—C 1005-1009) does not inclu here are the same as in his

11. CONSTANTINOPOLI

No.

No.

No.

12. CONSTANTINOPOLI GLORIAEXERCITUS—

listed for Delmatius, altho

13. CONSTANTINOPOLI GLORIA EXERCITUS— after ITUS. (3 coins)

14. CONSTANTINOPOLI PAXPUBLICA—CONS

15. CONSTANTINOPOLI GLORIAEXERCITUS—

16. NICOMEDIA—FRIAEXERCITUS—SMI NSAVG." (2 coins)

17. CYZICUS—Period SMKA—No mint mark

18. CYZICUS—Period LTXXX—SMKA, € &

19. CYZICUS—Period LTXXX—SMKS—No l

20. ANTIOCH—Period EXERCITUS—SMANZ stantius it is logical to a

ections, but also by the fact that the
326 and then only had two *officinae*
number was increased to four; while at
officinae before 339 and fifteen after.¹⁴
ilities at Alexandria soon changed the
ints drastically and for the half decade
andrian coins to only 169 from Antioch.
was catching up with the local demand
oinage from other mints unnecessary.
ge proportion of the total coinage from
t be identified completely; but although
r to specific mints I feel it is safer not
en the attribution is in any way un-
ertain coins, however, the hoard does
diary Egyptian coinage in the period
y reform, and also adds some twenty-
umber already noted by the British

ETIES

s and other new information
on a...bers are according
G. C...te Roman Bronze
s a...y it is classified
w...les plus an "a."
N...RIAEDd—PLG
he...ety not listed.
DDd—?ARL (top
ot listed. (not E
DOMINOR.NOS-
d with this mark
Nos. 468 and 482).
RIAEXERCITUS

s now being arranged

5. ROME—Period II—(No. 569)—RFT appears P, Q only listed.
6. HERACLEA—Period IIIb—(No. 947a)—CII:16:N¹—GLORIA-EXERCITUS—SMHB—no head N¹ listed.
7. HERACLEA—Period IIIb—(No. 948a)—Cs:1e:K—GLORIA-EXERCITUS—SMHA—Head is not sufficiently clear to be certain but appears to be K. It is definitely not Q.
8. HERACLEA—Period IIIb—(No. 950a)—Cn:1g:Kl—GLORIA-EXERCITUS—SMH€—No Kl listed for this period although it is used for Cn earlier.
9. HERACLEA—Period IV—(No. 958a)—Cs:7b:E²—VOTXXMUL-TXXX—SMHB—E¹ only listed.
10. CONSTANTINOPLE—Period II—(No. 1007a)—Cn:11a:Kl—GLORIAEXERCITUS—CONSI—No dot after CONS series (Nos. 1005–1009) does not include a listing for Constans; type, legend, etc. here are the same as in his later series.
11. CONSTANTINOPLE—Following *officinae* added to the list—
No. 1020—Cn:11a:Kl—H
No. 1041—CI:22b:I —A
No. 1025—CI:2a:N —T
12. CONSTANTINOPLE—Period IIIa—(No. 1032a)—D:8f:K—GLORIAEXERCITUS—CONSI—Has dot after ITUS which is not listed for Delmatius, although it exists for the others with this mint mark.
13. CONSTANTINOPLE—Period IIIa—(No. 1032b)—D:8g:K—GLORIA EXERCITUS—CONSI—Legend 8g not listed—coin has dot after ITUS. (3 coins)
14. CONSTANTINOPLE—Period IIIb—(No. 1046a)—D:8g:K—PAXPUBLICA—CONS€—No dot after BLICA.
15. CONSTANTINOPLE—Period IIIb—(No. 1051a)—CII:7a:B—GLORIAEXERCITUS—CONSA—Dot after ITUS. (3 coins)
16. NICOMEDIA—Period IIIb—(No. 1138a)—Cn:(li):E¹—GLORIAEXERCITUS—SMNB and €—Legend unlisted "CONSTANSAVG." (2 coins)
17. CYZICUS—Period III—Cn:7c:A—GLORIAEXERCITUS—SMKA—No mint mark listed with dot before it for this period. (2 coins)
18. CYZICUS—Period IV—(No. 1307a)—Cs:7b:E¹—VOTXXMV-LTXXX—SMKA, € & Ø—No E¹ listed. (3 coins).
19. CYZICUS—Period IV—(No. 1308a)—Cn:7c:A—VOTXXMV-LTXXX—SMKS—No head A listed.
20. ANTIOCH—Period IIIb—(No. 1390a)—Cn:7c:E¹—GLORIA-EXERCITUS—SMANZ—No E¹ listed but as type was used by Constantius it is logical to assume that Constans used it also.

21. ALEXANDRIA—Period IV—(No. 1481a)—Cn:7d:D—VOTXX.
⁺
 MVLTXXX—SMALB—No head D listed for Constans, though Constantius used it shortly before.

22. ALEXANDRIA—Period IV—(No. 1480a)—Cs:7b:E²—VOTXX.
⁺
 MVLTXXX—SMALΔ—No Constantius listed with this mark.

TERTULLIAN IN HIS *Apolog* the news from Palestine con- rejected this claim, but Tiber against accusers of Christian deification by decree of the s but with the added informati Christians from the city and death to their accusers.² This have inspired a couple of pag Jerome cites his source; it is

Few would take seriously But there is a great tendency evidence than is really there. l of Christians in the period fro to the limitations of the evid

At present it seems to be v first two centuries any specia offence, though that view doe now to be clear that the norm by exercise of the power of perium.⁴ This did not requir

This paper was originally presen annual meeting in 1963.

¹Tert. *Apol.* 5.1–2. On the histo 1934) 319–326. The account has re (1957) 58–93, but not apparently E. Kornemann, *Tiberius* (Stuttgar

uncertain interpretation of late evi ²Eusebii Pamphili *Chronici Cano* Eusebius (*HE* 2.2) quotes Tertulli responsible for this addition.

³See especially H. Last, *RLAC* 2 J. Moreau, *La persécution du Chri*. J. Beaujeu, *L'incendie de Rome en 64 Historia* 12 (1963) 185–208.

⁴H. Last, *RLAC* 2.1221–1225; A. in the *New Testament* (Oxford 1963) A. H. M. Jones, *Studies in Roman ability of the Roman law to deal Stellionatus* (*Digest* 47.20.3).