

# Some comments on the anonymous silver coinage of the fourth to sixth centuries A.D

Simon Bendall

## Résumé

16 18 17 (x 2) 16 (x 2) 18 (x 2) 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

## Abstract

*Summary. — Anonymous silver coins of the 4th-6th c, partly neglected by major modern reference works, are assembled and completed by some unpublished types from recent hoards dispersed on the market. They are related to similar bronze issues (Populus Romanus etc.) and a provisory dating is proposed. Three series were issued : 1st Roma or Constantinopolis / K on P, 330; 2nd Star / Wreath, 330; 3rd series inspired from the first with either K, R, CV, T or var. on the reverse, whose various issues date to 430?; 530 if., ca 530-580+.*

## Citer ce document / Cite this document :

Bendall Simon. Some comments on the anonymous silver coinage of the fourth to sixth centuries A.D. In: Revue numismatique, 6e série - Tome 158, année 2002 pp. 139-159.

doi : 10.3406/numi.2002.1441

[http://www.persee.fr/doc/numi\\_0484-8942\\_2002\\_num\\_6\\_158\\_1441](http://www.persee.fr/doc/numi_0484-8942_2002_num_6_158_1441)

Document généré le 28/09/2015

SIMON BENDALL\*

## Some comments on the anonymous silver coinage of the fourth to sixth centuries A.D.

(Pl. XI-XII)

*Summary.* — Anonymous silver coins of the 4th-6th c., partly neglected by major modern reference works, are assembled and completed by some unpublished types from recent hoards dispersed on the market. They are related to similar bronze issues (*Populus Romanus* etc.) and a provisory dating is proposed. Three series were issued : 1st *Roma* or *Constantinopolis* / K on P, 330; 2nd Star / Wreath, 330; 3rd series inspired from the first with either K, R, CV, T or var. on the reverse, whose various issues date to 430?; 530 ff., ca 530-580+.

*Résumé.* — Les monnaies anonymes d'argent des IV<sup>e</sup>-VI<sup>e</sup> siècles, négligées par les principaux ouvrages de référence, sont ici rassemblées et complétées de types inédits parus dans des trésors récents dispersés sur le marché. Après rapprochement avec des émissions en bronze analogues (*Populus Romanus* etc.), un regroupement en trois séries et une chronologie provisoire sont proposés : 1<sup>o</sup> *Roma* ou *Constantinopolis* / K ou P, 330; 2<sup>o</sup> Étoile / Couronne de laurier, 330; 3<sup>e</sup> série inspirée de la 1<sup>re</sup> avec K, R, CV, T ou var. au revers, aux types émis en 430 ? ; 530 et s., 530-580.

This interesting and enigmatic series of coins seems to have escaped the major reference works. My long interest in this coinage and the fact that in the last few years a number of new specimens of several of these types have appeared on the market suggests that a brief description and discussion of them might not come amiss although most of them have been published before, types 4 and 5b as long ago as 1847<sup>1</sup>, 8 and 9 in 1861<sup>2</sup> and type 6 in 1870<sup>3</sup>.

These issues have been arranged into three series. All are eastern issues, without mint marks, and certainly all struck in Constantinople, the first two series in ca. 330 and the third series in the sixth century, which resurrected two types of the first series.

---

\*13 Ashley Mansions, 264 Vauxhall Bridge Road, London SW1V 1BS, Grande-Bretagne. The author wishes to express his thanks for their help to Mr C. Størmer, Peter J. Casey, David Vagi, Jean-Pierre Callu, Cécile Morrisson and Wolfgang Hahn.

1 I. J. SABATIER, *Iconographie d'une collection de cinq mille médailles romaines, byzantines et celtibériennes*, St. Petersburg, 1847.

2 J. SABATIER, Lettre à M. R. Chalon, sur quelques monnaies romaines inédites de la collection de feu Octave Fontana, de Trieste, *RBN*, 3rd series, Vol. V (1861), p. 17-18 and pl. II.

3 MISSONG, Eine römische Münzprobe, *NZ*, 2, 1870, p. 449-452.

The suggestions proposed here by the writer are not written in stone. Many coins discussed here have appeared recently from three or four hoards, unfortunately not recorded, and many of the theories proposed here are merely suggestions and are therefore quite subjective.

Although this is an article on the silver coinage, a certain number of bronze types have to be considered. The former are numbered while the latter are listed by the letters A-F.

### Fourth Century - First Series

There has been little dispute regarding the dating of the five types listed below, most authorities considering them as having some connection with the foundation of Constantinople.

#### 1. Obv. Helmeted and draped bust of Constantinopolis left.

Rev. K.

Ref. Lanz auction 82, 24 Nov. 1997, lot 773; 0.92 g.

Lanz auction 86, 18 May 1998, lot 736; 1.13 g. (fig.1).

Lanz auction 102, 28 May 2001, lot 1009; 1.11g.

#### 2. Obv. Helmeted and draped bust of Roma right.

Rev. P.

Ref. SABATIER, *RBN*, 1861, pl II, 7<sup>a</sup>; GÖBL 145<sup>5</sup>; C. p.327, 3<sup>e</sup>.

Private colln. 0.89 g (fig. 2).

Trau 3982

Vecchi auction 8, 4 Dec. 1997, lot 454; 1.00g.

Triton I, 2-3 Dec. 1997, lot 1704; 0.95g.

CNG mail bid sale 46, 24 June 1998, lot 1453; 1.00g.

CNG mail bid sale 49, 17 March 1999, lot 1800; 0.98g.

Rauch auction 65, 10 April 2000, lot 809; 0.98g

A.H. Baldwin list 32, Jan. 2000, no. 1; 1.02g

Giessener Munzhandlung auction 87, 2 March 1998, lot 751; 1.02g.

Giessener Munzhandlung auction 97, 11 Oct. 1999, lot 1202; 1.41g.

Hirsch auction 186, 10-11 May 1995, lot 1495; 0.95g. = Hirsch auction 188, 22-24 Nov. 1997, lot 1045.

Giessener Munzhandlung auction 102, 24 May 2000, lot 590, 1.02g.

CNG Mail Bid Sale 55, 13 Sept. 2000, lot 1449; 1.18g.

A.H. Baldwin fixed price list 34, Oct. 2000, lot 1; 1.15g.

Giessener Munzhandlung auction 107, 2 April 2001, lot 585; 0.70g.

CNG Sale 58, 19 September 2001, lot 1361, 0.93g.

Hungarian National Museum, Inventory no. 19A, 1994; 1.19g.

BM, B 7550, de Salis, 1.00g.

BM, 1860-6-2-163, Eastwood, pierced, 0.72g.

BnF, E 1330, 0.86g.

BnF, D 6357, 0.86g.

---

4 SABATIER as footnote 2.

5 R. GÖBL, *Antike Numismatik*, Munich, 1978.

6 H. COHEN, *Description historique des monnaies frappées sous l'Empire romain*, Paris, 1880.

## 3. Obv. Helmeted and draped bust of Roma left.

Rev. P.

Ref. —

Private colln. = Hirsch auction 206, 24-26 Nov. 1999, lot 577; 0.95 g (fig 3).

## 4. Obv. Diademed and draped female bust right; pearl diadem with ties.

Rev. K.

Ref. SABATIER, *Iconographie*, pl. sup. XI, 37 and *RBN* 1861, pl. II, 5; C.287 (Constantine II). MAZZINI V, pl. XXXVIII, 287<sup>7</sup>.

Private colln. 1.18 g (fig. 4).

Trau 3995<sup>8</sup>.

Auctiones A.G. auction 26, 16-19 Sept. 1996, lot 1205; 1.16g.

Lanz auction 82, 24 Nov. 1997, lot 787; 1.13g.

CNG, Triton II, 1-2 December 1998, lot 1062; 1.13g.

Hirsch auction 203, 24-26 Feb. 1999, lot 715.

Lanz auction 100, Leo Benz colln., 20 November 2000, lot 558; 0.72g.

CNG, Triton IV, 5 December 2000, lot 704; 0.90g.

Giessener Munzhandlung auction 108, 3 April 2001, lot 2074; 0.95g.

Hungarian National Museum, Inventory Delhaes colln. 1764-VI; 1.02g.

Ashmolean Museum, 0.91g.

BM 1844.4-25.2583, 0.96g.

BnF, E 1329, 1.16g, Vente Fontana 1860, lot 2008, published by Sabatier, *RBN* 1861.

## 5a. Obv. Diademed and draped female bust right; pearl diadem without ties.

Rev. K.

Ref. —

BM 1853-7-16-312, 1.53g. (fig. 5).

## 5b. Obv. Diademed and draped female bust right; hatched diadem without ties.

Rev. K

Ref. SABATIER, *Iconographie*, pl. sup XII, 38 and *RBN* 1861, Pl. II, 4 and 6; GÖBL 144; C.23 (Fausta).

Tkalec sale, 24 Oct. 1994, lot 352. 1.00g.

Bank Aufhauser sale 11, 21-22 Mar. 1995, lot 440. 1.02g.

Private colln. 1.04g (fig. 6).

Trau 4050.

Busso Peus auction 345, 1-3 Nov. 1995, lot 816; 1.00g. = Busso Peus auction 364, 27-29 Apr. 2000, lot 377; 0.99g. = Jean Elsen auction 64, 2 Dec. 2000, lot 619; 0.99g.

BM 1853.7-16.311, 1.03g.

Madrid, Photo nos. 5979/7-8; 0.98g.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Monete Imperiale Romane*, collection of G. Mazzini, Vol. V., Ratto, Milan, 1958.

<sup>8</sup> *Sammlung Trau, Gilhofer & Rauschburg and Adolph Hess auction*, Vienna, 22 May 1935.

*Copper Coins*

A. Obv. CONSTAN-TINOPOLIS. Bust as on type 5b.

Rev. P - R. Pax standing left, holding branch and transverse spear.

Ref. *RIC* VIII (Rome) 106<sup>9</sup>; *LRBC* 612 (fig. 7).<sup>10</sup>

B. Obv. ROMA. Helmeted and draped bust right.

Rev. P - R. Military figure standing, holding spear and shield.

Ref. *RIC* VIII (Rome) 104-5; *LPC* 611 (fig. 8).

The first point to make regarding the coins of the first series is that the bust on type 4 is female despite the fact that it was published by Cohen in 1862 as an anonymous coin of Constantine II and has been so described ever since. However, as early as 1861 Sabatier had noted that both types 4 and 5b bore female busts, considering them possibly coins of Fausta with the letter K probably referring to Constantinople. He noted the difference in the module but not apparently the minor difference in the diadems. On type 4 the bust wears a pearl diadem with ties while the bust of type 5b wears a hatched diadem but without ties. Type 5a, on the other hand, depicts a pearl diadem also without ties. All three types depict a semicircular projection above the front of the diadems, linear on type 5b but pearled, as the diadems, on types 4 and 5a.

Type 5a, a unique specimen in the British Museum, depicts a bust exactly the same as that on the copper type A which is clearly identified as Constantinopolis (fig. 7). In *RIC* VIII Kent considered types A and B as issues struck at Rome to celebrate the 1100th anniversary of the city in 348 while earlier, in *LRBC*, he had considered these types were struck in c.339/40 although admitting that the coinage struck in Rome between 336 and 341 was extremely complex. I do not know what grounds there are for attributing types A and B to Rome unless the reverse legend P - R (*Populi Romani*) doubled as a mint mark. The « trade » provenances known to the writer seem to be eastern. Types E (fig. 7) and F (fig. 8), struck in Constantinople, also depict the Roman People and bear the city's mint mark.

Since types 1-4 and 5b seem to come from the same recent finds, they surely must be contemporary. Specimens of type 5a have not, however, appeared in these recent finds although, since the unique specimen in the British Museum was acquired together with a specimen of type 5b from the Paris dealer Rollin on 16 July 1853, and the fact that stylistically types 5a and 5b are very similar, surely indicates that they are contemporary. Type 5a weighs 1.53g and must represent a half-siliqua rather than the third-siliqua of the other types 1-4 and 5b. It is unlikely that type 5a was a completely separate issue struck with types A and B in Rome in 348. Where is the western provenance for this type and

<sup>9</sup> J.P.C. KENT, *RIC*, VIII, London, 1981

<sup>10</sup> P.V. HILL, J.P.C. KENT and R.A.G. CARSON, *LRBC*, London, 1965.

where is the comparable issue for Roma? Considering the rarity of type 5a the Roma issue might remain to be discovered.

As can be seen from the table, types 1-4 and 5b have been appearing in auctions over the last few years, all in good condition. This might indicate a hoard that is being slowly fed onto the market in order to keep the prices up. I have been told that these coins found in recent years have all been found singly on a site near Sirmium which might indicate a dispersed hoard. There seems to be no other contemporary imperial silver coins found with them, both by report and also because otherwise they would also surely have appeared in auction. Type 6 (see below) does not apparently come from this site since my enquiries indicate that one specimen came from Hungary while another was purchased from a Bulgarian which does, however, not preclude a Hungarian provenance. Superficially the recent specimens of type 6 appear to be slightly more porous and with eroded edges (fig. 10) but some specimens of types 1-5 are also slightly corroded. It should be noted that the National Museum of Hungary acquired a specimen of type 2 in 1994 which might indicate a Hungarian provenance for this particular coin and thus possibly for all recent types 1-6. Is it a coincidence that so many coins of types 1-6 have appeared since 1994, types 1-5 from one hoard and type 6 from another or are they from a single hoard?

Since the obverses of types 4 and 5 represent the bust of Constantinopolis we no longer have to consider whether the bust on type 4 is Constantine I or II or whether the female bust represents Fausta, Helena or Theodora. There seems little doubt about the date of these coins – c. A.D. 326-330. Even Sabatier in 1861 dated types 4 and 5b to the reign of Constantine I, suggesting that they were possibly an issue of Fausta and that the K probably represented Constantinople. The K and P surely represent the initials letters of Constantinople and Rome. The fact that Rome is represented by P can be accounted for by the fact that the coins were struck in Constantinople in the Greek East. It seems probable that they were struck to commemorate either the formal founding or the dedication of Constantinople.

While the dedication of the city took place on 11 May 330, its « birthday » or ceremonial foundation was somewhat earlier. The « birthday » of Constantinople was possibly the day that Constantine announced that it would be his capital which might have been in March 326 since Constantine was briefly in the city. This also seems to have been the time that the mint was established in the city. On the other hand Burckhardt stated that the ceremonial foundation of the west wall of Constantinople took place in 326 « on the 4th of November when the sun was in the sign of Sagittarius but the Crab ruled the hour. »<sup>11</sup> This might well be considered the « birthday » of the city although Constantine does not seem to have been present at the time. Constantine appears to have been

---

<sup>11</sup> J. BURCKHARDT, *The Age of Constantine the Great*, trans. Moses Hadas, New York, 1989, p. 347.

present in the city briefly for some time between the 5 March and 1 April 326 and again at some time from the beginning of March and the end of July 327. He does not appear to have visited Constantinople again until the Spring of 330 when he arrived for the formal dedication of the city on the 11th of May.<sup>12</sup>

Since the « birthday » of Rome was 21 April and, if the types celebrating both Rome and Constantinople were struck on the same occasion, it would be more likely that, if the « birthday » of Constantinople was on the 4th November 326 but the dedication on the 11 May 330, the closeness of the two dates in April and May might well suggest an issue of coins commemorating both cities in 330 at the same time especially since types 1 and 2 depict helmeted busts of each city as depicted on the common *URBS ROMA* and *CONSTANTINOPOLIS* coinage and the medallions of the period which according to Bruun were first struck in 330 (*RIC* VIII).

However, it should be pointed out that type A, the copper type with a bust comparable to type 5a and identified as Constantinopolis, is a companion issue to *RIC* 104-5, the obverses of which bear a helmeted bust and the legend *ROMA*. Dr. J.P.C. Kent attributed these types to the mint of Rome possibly because, firstly, Rome often struck unusual issues not found at other mints (but so did Constantinople) and secondly, because the reverse legends read *P R* (*Populi Romani*). However types E (fig. 13) and F (fig. 14), (see below) are issues of Constantinople and depict the Roman People on their obverses. I see no reason why types A and B should not be issues of Constantinople. In *RIC* VIII Kent attributes types E and F to 348, representing the celebration of the 1100th anniversary of the foundation of Rome although in *LRBC* he had assigned them to the period c. 339/40 immediately after the cessation of the common *Urbs Roma* and *Constantinopolis* issues, while admitting that that the coinage at Rome at this period is extremely complex.

While there were coins celebrating the thousandth anniversary of Rome struck in 248, 1100 years represented a *saeculum*, a much more important division of time in Roman eyes, referred to in the Sibylline prophecies. However, the issues of 348 look forward to the future with their legend *Fel. Temp Reparatio* and the type of a phoenix, and not back to the past as do types 1-5. It seems possible therefore that types A and B could be issues of 330 and, in view of the similarity of the busts on types 5a and A, products of Constantinople.

Kent also listed for Constantinople coins of Helena and Theodora (*RIC* VIII, 33-6, 38 and 48-51) as special issues struck to celebrate the dedication of city. The busts of the empresses are similar to those of types 4 and 5 especially in the form of the diadem although they lack the loop above the diadem.

It should be noted that type 1, depicting Constantinople with a helmeted bust, is known from only three specimens while types 2 and 3, the comparable

---

12 D. KIENAST, *Römische Kaisertabelle*, Darmstadt, 1990, p. 300.

issue for Rome, is represented by at least 23 specimens (22 and 1 respectively). It may be that type 1 was issued for only a short time, the design for Constantinople being changed to the female bust of types 4 and 5. The total of types 1, 4 and 5 comes to some 28 specimens which is approximately the same as the numbers for types 2 and 3, an indication perhaps of equal production commemorating both cities jointly.

Types 1-6 from recent auctions, price lists and personal acquisitions.

Type	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
1					1	1		1
2	1	1		2	2	3	5	2
3						1		
4			1	1	1	1	2	1
5b	1		2		1		2	
6					1		2	

*Note.* Since all the auctioneers who have sold the above coins are also dealers it is impossible to say whether these coins were consigned by the finder(s) or purchased by the auctioneers who then placed them in their own auctions on their own account. Of all these recent specimens of types 1-6, the writer knows of only two coins sold privately – a specimen of type 6 and one of specimen of type 2.

Göbl called these coins « Aufwurfmünzen » – that is special coins produced for distribution to the public, presumably on the birthday or dedication of Constantinople. This surely must be correct if only because of their comparative rarity. They are probably now much more common than the silver imperial coins of 330.

#### Fourth Century - Second Series

6. Obv. Star.

Rev. Wreath.

Wt. a. 1.43g, slightly corroded. Ex. Missong (1.49g), Froehner and Private collection (fig. 9).

b. 1.23 g., very corroded. Ex Vierordt (Schulman auction, 15 March 1923, lot 2818), Garrett colln., Sotheby's, New York, 16-18 October 1984, lot 348 and Private collection.

c. 1.23 g, CNG Sale 55, 13 September 2000, lot 1448

d. 1.81 g. Tkalec Auction, 23 October 1998, lot 353.

e. 1.23g, edges slightly eroded; Private colln. (fig. 10).

f. 1.30 g, CNG sale 58, 19 September 2001, lot 1360.

Ref. MISSONG, *Eine Römische Münzprobe*, NZ, 2, 1870, p. 449-452.

S. BENDALL, An anonymous Constantinian coinage, *Numismatic Fine Arts Inc. Journal, Publication* 32, Summer/Fall 1986, p. 2-3.



Missong published the first specimen of this coin in 1870 and considered that it was a pattern of the period of Julian II because a similar star formed the reverse of silver coins of Julian II and Constantius Gallus as Caesars (351-360), not an unreasonable assumption at the time. However, since they are now at least six known specimens, it must be considered an official issue, albeit an extremely rare one. The Vierordt specimen is patinated and corroded to much the same extent as the Missong specimen and they surely must have been found together.

Hahn has suggested, in private correspondence, that the type might possibly be an issue struck in 359/360 to commemorate the fact that on 11 December 359 Constantinople received its rank as a city prefecture, comparable to Rome. Even if we disregard the slight evidence of recent finds linking types 1-5 and type 6, it is still possible that all type 6 also dates to c.330 because of the comparable copper coins of types C and D as well as types E and F which are described and discussed below.

### *Copper Coins*

C. Obv. Star.

Rev. Wreath.

Wt. a. 1.00g. Private collection. (fig. 11).

Ref. Bendall, *op. cit.*

*Note.* This coin, although smaller, is exactly the same as type 6. It appears to be unique.

D. Obv. Star.

Rev. Wreath containing the letters O/C S/C in three lines.

a. Berlin; uncertain weight.

b. Ars Antiqua Auction 1, 3 November 2000, lot 440; 1.00g (fig. 12).

c. CNG Sale 53, 15 March 2000, lot 1736; 0.79g.

d. Freeman and Sear Mail bid sale 6, 6 October 2000, lot 629, 0.91g.

Ref. GÖBL, *Antike Numismatik*, 1978, pl. 9, 105.

*Note.* More coins of this type are known, but I cite here only those which I could find in catalogues at my disposal.

This type is exactly the same as types 6 and C but with the addition of letters within the wreath which might represent the initials of a four word phrase. What this might mean is anybody's guess. Could it possibly represent the phrase OB CIVES SERVATOS CONSTANTINOPOLITENSIS? The first three letters of the phrase are also found within a wreath on the first century coinage of Augustus, a wreath awarded to him by the citizens of Rome for saving them, as well as on the coins of Caligula, Claudius I and Galba. Did the citizens of Constantinople consider that Constantine had «saved» them by uniting the empire and making them citizens of New Rome, the new capital of the empire?

On the other hand P.J. Casey has suggested to the writer that the letters might represent a duplication of COS and represent two imperial consuls. The two consuls for the years 327-328 and 330 comprised private persons but in 326 the consuls were Constantine I (for the seventh

---

13 R.S. BAGNALL, A. CAMERON, S. R. SCHWARTZ, K.A. WÖRPE, *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire*, Atlanta, Georgia, 1987, p. 616-617.

time) and Constantius II (for the first time) and in 329, Constantine I (for the eighth time) and Constantine II (for the fourth time)<sup>13</sup>. It would be pleasing if this was the correct interpretation of these letters but this would then mean that types 6, C and D were issued between November 326 (if the 4th November was the «birthday» of the city) and 1st January 327 when the consulship of the two emperors ended and new non-imperial consuls took office or in 329. However, this latter year has not hitherto been considered as being a contender for either the birthday or the dedication of Constantinople. The short period of about two months at the end of 326 seems unlikely but might account for the rarity of types 6 and C and D. All the known specimens of type 6 seem to have come from two small hoards, the first, two coins from the late 1860's and another hoard from the mid-1990's containing perhaps half some a dozen specimens although these coins might possibly have come from the same hoard as the bulk of the coins of types 1-5.

Neither explanation for the letters on the reverse of type D seems particularly feasible particularly if, as I suspect, all these celebratory issues were struck in 330. Although the mint of Constantinople commenced striking coins in 326 (on the occasion of Constantine's vicennalia?), if Constantine did not finally take the decision to make the city his capital until his return to the city in March 326, I see no reason that there would have been any special issue of coins at this time. Constantine would merely have announced his intentions. The dedication in 330 would have been far more likely to have been the occasion for the issue of types 1-6, C and D.

It has been suggested that if, but only if, the letters do represent OB CIVES SERVATOS CONSTANTINOPOLITENSES, type D might have been issued when Constantius II mildly tamed the uprising of the inhabitants in 342<sup>14</sup>. This seems unlikely to me since this would mean that types 6 and C would also date to 342 while there is some evidence that the recent coins of type 6 might come from the same hoard as types 1-5 while type A is exactly the same size as types C and D which certainly date to 330 (see below).

What is the meaning of the star? In the 350's it represented a Caesar, on whose silver coins it appears, within a wreath, as the reverse type. In the first and second centuries it represented the deification of an emperor or empress. It is unlikely that types 6, B and C were struck on Constantine's death in 337 since he had been baptised on his deathbed. In this case could the star represent a birth, that of Constantinople? Stars on Roman coins usually had some astral or religious significance (see below for type E).

Since it is possible that the recent finds of type 6 may not possibly have been from the same site as those of types 1-5, we might give serious consideration to Hahn's suggestion if it were not for the existence of two comparable copper types C and D. Although these two small copper types appear to be of slightly different sizes, they both weigh 1.00g or less and are undoubtedly contemporary with the silver type. Indeed Classical Numismatic Group (CNG) note in their auctions 53 and 58 that specimens of type 6 and D are struck from the same obverse die. A pointer to the date of type 6 might lie in the date of the following two copper types which are of the same size and weight as types C and D.

---

<sup>14</sup> I am grateful to Jean-Pierre Callu (in correspondence) for this indication. He refers me to the narrative in Libanius' *Oratio* § 94-97.

**E. Obv. POP ROM**

Rev. Star and CONS and officina letter within wreath.

Ref. *RIC* VIII, 20; (fig. 13).

*Note.* It surely cannot be a coincidence that, apart from the mint mark, the reverse of this type combines the obverse and reverse of types 6 and B. Claude Brenot suggests that the star might represent the planet under which Constantinople was founded<sup>15</sup>.

**F. Obv. POP ROM**

Rev. Bridge over river, CONS and officina letter above.

Ref. *RIC* VIII, 21. (fig. 14).

*Note.* Dr. Kent included these two types in *RIC* VIII, which in theory covered the coinage from 337 to 364, presumably because they had been omitted by Bruun from *RIC* VII, since Kent considered them as issues struck at the time of the dedication of Constantinople in 330, the only mint at which they were struck. He suggested that the reverse of the two types represented Constantinople and Rome, the bridge representing Rome but without giving any reasons. Of course Rome was on a river and had several bridges while Constantinople was not on a river and had no bridge. However, is it too fanciful to see the design as representing the new capital, Constantinople, as being the bridge between east and west and the unification of an empire which had until 324 been ruled by separate emperors? Would the general public in Constantinople have recognised a bridge rather than a figure of Roma as the symbol of Rome?

However, C. Brenot considers that type F has no connection with Rome and that the bridge represents that over the Danube at Sucidava connecting the empire on the south bank with the fortress *Constantiniana Dafne* which Constantine built on the north bank in 328, the construction of which was celebrated by an issue struck only in Constantinople (*RIC* 29-38)<sup>16</sup>. I believe she is correct and that type F has no connection with Rome.

Types E and F are the same size and weight as type C and D and since they have been attributed to 330, it seems very likely that types C and D and therefore type 6 date to the same period.

**Metrology**

The theoretical weight of the siliqua in 330 was either 3.35g (Bruun, *RIC* VII, p. 4-7) or 3.41g (Mickwitz, cited *RIC* VII, p. 4). In fact it is rare to find a siliqua of the period that reaches even the lower of these two figures. Although the weights of the silver coins can vary, it seems very likely that types 1-4 and 5b represent one third of a siliqua and types 5a and 6, a half-siliqua. That these denominations are not found in the regular currency of the time which, combined with their types and rarity, confirm that they were unusual and, by design, celebratory issues. If type 5a is contemporary with types 5b and therefore with types 1-4, since it is a half-siliqua, it might represent the earliest commemorative issue before the series was reduced to a third-siliqua denomination although this runs counter to the earlier suggestion that type 1 might have been the earliest issue.

All four copper types (C-F) are somewhat smaller than the regular imperial issues of *ca.* 330 which are generally somewhat larger and were also silvered.

<sup>15</sup> C. BRENOT, Les monnaies au nom de « *populus romanus* » à Constantinople, *NACQT*, 9, 1980, p. 299-313.

<sup>16</sup> C. BRENOT, *loc. cit.*

There is no trace of silvering on specimens of types C-F but we lack analyses for these types. The imperial copper coinage did not sink to this size and weight of types C and D in the east until about the end of the fourth century by which time the style was considerably cruder.

### Fifth Century - Third Series

7. Obv. Helmeted and draped bust of Roma right.

Rev. P

Tkalec Auction, 19 Feb. 2001, lot 378, 1.07g (fig. 15).

8. Obv. Helmeted and draped bust of Constantinopolis right.

Rev. K

Var. a. Private colln., 0.98g (fig. 16).

Var. b. Private colln., 0.85g (fig. 17).

Var. c.

Ref. SABATIER, *RBN*, pl II, 9 and SABATIER, *Monnaies byzantines*, pl. XII, 10 (13);<sup>17</sup> GÖBL 147; KENT pl. 13,28;<sup>18</sup> TOLSTOÏ, pl. 28, 612-616;<sup>19</sup> RATTO 471-2.<sup>20</sup>

CNG sale 55, 13 September 2000, lot 1450; 1.18g.

BM, B 7548; 1.02g.

BM, 1862-7-28-33; 1.44g.

BM, 1904-5-11-47, Rollin; 1.29g.

BM, 1866-12-1-3230, Wigan; 0.91g.

Private colln.; 0.65g (fig. 18).

Private colln.; 0.65g. (fig. 19).

*Note.* Type 8c are the commonest coins of the series and have appeared in so many dealers lists and auction catalogues that there is little point or possibility in recording all examples. A number are listed above. Three specimens noted recently in trade in London weighed 0.98, 0.79 and 0.63g respectively. Two specimens of this common type depict Constantinople wearing some form of body armour. These are discussed below (types 8a and 8b).

9. Obv. Helmeted and draped bust of Roma right.

Rev. R.

Ref. Sabatier, *RBN* 1861, pl. II, 8 and *Monnaies byzantines*, pl. XII, 9; Göbl 146; Kent, pl. 13/30;

TOLSTOÏ, pl. 28, 617; 0.79g.

Private colln. 0.85g (fig. 20).

Private colln. 0.77g (fig. 21).

BM, 1867-12-23-33, de Salis, 1.01g.

BM, 1867-12-23-34, de Salis, 0.69g.

BM, 1902-6-7-28, Noury Bey, 0.68g.

Madrid, Photo nos. 5979/5-6; pierced, 0.52g.

17 J. SABATIER, *Description générale des monnaies byzantines*, Paris, 1862.

18 J.P.C. KENT, *Urbs Roma and Constantinopolis medallions at the mint of Rome, Scripta Nummaria Romana, Essays presented to Humphrey Sutherland*, London, 1978.

19 J. TOLSTOÏ, *Monnaies byzantines*, St. Petersburg, 1913-1914.

20 *Monnaies byzantines*, Ratto auction, Lugano, 9 December 1930.

**10. Obv. Helmeted and draped bust right.****Rev. CV.**

Ref. TOLSTOĬ, pl. 28, 618; 0.65g.

Private colln. 1.02 g (fig. 22) = Hirsch Auction 178, 12-14 May 1993, lot 1202.

*Note.* These appear to be the only recorded specimens of this type.**11. Obv. Draped bust of Tyche right, wearing mural crown.****Rev. T.**

Ref. —.

BnF, M 7983, 0.95g. Purchased (17 November 1910) from Mr. Dosseur, representing Mr. Marcopoli of Aleppo. (fig. 23).

Private collection, 0.98g (fig. 24).

*Note.* Again, these are the only recorded specimens of this type.**12. Obv. Helmeted, diademed and draped bust right.****Rev. T with X (fig. 25).**

Ref. TOLSTOĬ, pl. 28, 620; 0.95g.

CNG Review, vol. 17,4, 1992, lot 295, 1.32g = CNG Sale XXV, 24 March 1994, lot 946 = CNG Sale XXIX, 30 March 1994, lot 1100 = A.H.Baldwin price list 33, June 2000, no. 18 = private colln. (fig 25).

Lanz sale 72, 29 May 1995, lot 901. 0.83g.

Harlan J. Berk catalogue 101, 24 Mar. 1998, lots 594-5.

Harlan J. Berk catalogue 103, 28 July 1998, lots 570-3.

BM, 1981-1-28-1, 0.67g. (edge broken)

*Note.* Siliquae of Phocas appeared in Berk's catalogue 100 (29 Jan 1998, lot 442) and in catalogue 103 where they are noted as being found with type 12.**Comments**

**Type 8** (figs. 16-19). This is the commonest of all the anonymous types, the majority (type 8c) being quite crude and often very light and obviously of sixth century date. They seem to be found throughout the eastern empire. They are a copy of type 1 but with a bust to the right, of much inferior style and generally struck on larger flans, except for the smallest specimens which are the crudest of all. This copying leaves little doubt that type 8 was resuscitated on the anniversary of the issue of type 1, presumably in 530. However, type 8c (figs. 18-19) is so common and of varying styles and weights that it must have continued to be struck after 530 in considerable numbers, perhaps for another 50 years since it has been found in a hoard deposited after 602. The type is far commoner than any sixth century silver coin bearing the imperial portrait and obviously formed a larger part of the currency.

Of course, it is not possible to date single finds of anonymous coins but there have been hoards, unfortunately unrecorded, containing coins of type 8c. Some 20 years ago I was shown a group of coins found apparently with some Byzantine silver plates, spoons and other objects. These coins had been found fused in a lump attached to the silver plate and had been separated mechani-

cally. Only six coins were good enough to photograph (but not good enough to reproduce here). They comprised two contemporary forgeries of tremisses of Justinian I (527-565), gold plated on a silver core, three coins of type 8c and one coin of type 12, all in a very poor style and corroded condition. I also have an enlarged photocopy, presumably of a polaroid, of a pile of silver coins that was in the hands of the Munich dealer Lanz a few years ago, unfortunately again too poor to reproduce. What could be identified comprised a few *siliquae* of Justinian I and Justin II (?) in good condition, many coins of type 8c and a single coin of type 12.

There were also coins of type 8c and 12 in a recent hoard containing silver coins of Tiberius Constantine and Maurice Tiberius (582-602), apparently found in Syria which was dispersed on the market c. 1991-1993. Another hoard found somewhat later, c. 1997, closed with silver coins of Phocas but contained no coins of Tiberius Constantine and Maurice Tiberius. This hoard also included specimens of types 8c, and type 12. Type 8c was obviously still circulating in the early seventh century. In these two late hoards the coins of type 8c were poorer than those of type 12, a point which will be mentioned again in the discussion of the metrology of these types. I would suggest that while these two types may have overlapped slightly, it is possible that type 12 succeeded type 8c since the best specimens of type 12 are heavier and of better style than the worst of type 8c. However, the fact that type 8c has been found in a hoard deposited later than 602 is certain confirmation that the type continued to be struck for many years after 530 and comprised a major part of the silver coinage of the sixth century since they are far commoner than the imperial sixth century silver coinage.

If we consider that type 8 was originally struck to celebrate the bicentennial of the foundation of Constantinople, what reasons might there be for the continued striking of this type for so long. Was it struck in large quantities at intervals, perhaps every succeeding tenth anniversary of the foundation of Constantinople or was it struck more frequently in smaller quantities? This is probably an unanswerable question but I would make one suggestion. Consuls distributed coins to the populace at the consular games, the emperors in gold and non-imperial consuls in silver<sup>21</sup>. Originally the consulship had been a great honour since the consuls named the year. However, by the early sixth century, consulships were not held every year and the cost of the games so expensive that in the east, where the senators were not as wealthy as the old families in the west, the emperor defrayed part of the costs. Justinian I held his last consulship in 540 and the last private consulship was held the following year.<sup>22</sup> It is possibly not a coincidence that, since the consulship was no longer annual, thus making its use in annual dating prone to error, its demise basically coin-

---

<sup>21</sup> Novel 105.2.

<sup>22</sup> *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire*, as above n. 13.

cided with the commencement of dating official documents by regnal year from 538. A further reason for the demise of the consulship was that Justinian possibly no longer wished to subsidise the games at a time when he needed every penny to pay for his reconquest of Africa and Italy.

The consulship was not held again until Justin II took it in 566. It was held thereafter at irregular intervals and only by the emperors; Tiberius Constantine in 579, Maurice for six days at the end of 583 and from July to November 602 while Phocas took the consulship in December 603 which was the last occasion that it was held. The taking of the consulship by Justin II in 566 was well received by the populace of Constantinople but they can hardly have been starved of entertainment during the previous 25 years. In fact the founding of the city had always been celebrated and it may well be that this now took on a more important part in the entertainment of the citizens. Could it be that type 8 was struck annually on these occasions, after 530 or, possibly, after 541? A regular small annual issue might well have been sufficient to introduce these coins into the currency pool.

While the bulk of the coins of type 8 are undoubtedly of sixth century date, there are one or two specimens that might conceivably be earlier than 530. The prime contender is type 8a. (fig. 16). The details and style of the obverse are far superior to the regular issues. Constantinopolis is depicted in low relief and armour which takes the form of a band on the right shoulder containing a wavy line with pellets within the curves and also wears a necklace. The city's features are rather elongated, comparable to that on early fifth century coinage. Professor W. Hahn suggested to me in private correspondence, before the appearance of this particular coin, that the centenary of the foundation in 430 might have been celebrated with a small issue of this type. This coin might be a contender.

This might be confirmed by a coin that recently appeared in an auction in 2001 (type 7 and fig. 15). The style is quite unlike that of the more common specimens of type 2, the features of the bust of Roma being slimmer and more elongated and comparable to the bust on type 8a (fig. 16).

Type 7 can hardly be an issue of 330 and can certainly not be an issue struck in 530 since the style is superior to that of type 9 which in any case has a R rather than P as the reverse. It seems possible, therefore, that types 7 and 8a are the only extant specimens of a rare commemorative issue struck in 430.

Type 8b (fig. 17) is also an interesting coin. The style, while not as good as that of type 8a, is superior to the bulk of the coins of type 8c. The style is slightly better, the relief high and Constantinopolis is armed since she bears a shield on her left shoulder. If we consider this coin earlier than the coins of type 8c but later than 8a, then, if we consider that 8a does indeed date to 430, we have two alternatives. The first, which seems unlikely, is that there may have been a small issue in 480 to celebrate the 350th anniversary of the city. More likely is that there was in fact quite a small issue struck in 530 (comparable in size to

that of type 9), of which type 8b is one and that the bulk of this type (i.e. type 8c) was indeed struck after 530, annually or at intervals and that the increased production over some 50 years became gradually cruder (figs. 18 and 19), the type becoming so common that it came to comprise the major part of the silver coinage of the second half of the sixth century.

**Type 9** (figs. 20-21). Since types 2, 3 and 4 were certainly struck at the same time as type 1 in c. 330, it might be supposed that type 9 was also struck at the same time as type 8 in 530 since the reverse, R, should equate to the P on the earlier types. However, it should not be forgotten that in 530 Rome was still occupied by the Ostrogoths. It was not recaptured until December 536. The type is very rare, known from only some dozen specimens. If type 8 had been struck in large quantities in 530 we might expect type 9 to be as common if it had been struck on the same occasion, especially since the comparable Rome issue for 330 (type 2) is far commoner than the Constantinople issue (type 1). On the other hand, if type 8 was only struck in a small quantity in 530 in a fine style and its commonness is due to the fact that the bulk of this type (fig. 18) was struck over the succeeding 50 years, then this might suggest that type 9 might not have been struck until 537 to celebrate the recapture of Rome since its style is slightly better than that of type 8c and rather like that of 8b.

**Type 10** (fig. 22). This type is extremely rare, being only known from two specimens. The style is somewhat similar to that of types 8b and 9 and is slightly better than that of type 8c. What is the meaning of the letters CV on the reverse? Hahn has suggested that it is an abbreviation of the word *Synkletos*, the Senate of Constantinople and that the type was a companion issue to type 12 (the monogram represented *Tyche*) which seems unlikely considering the evidence we have regarding the type.<sup>23</sup> It is also unlikely that the letters represent a denomination – 105 units. Since the letters on types 8 and 9 represent cities, as does that on type 11 (discussed below), it is probable that the letters CV also represent a city. If this is so, it might possibly represent Syracuse which was captured by Belisarius on the last day of 535. It might be that this type was struck in 536 or possibly 537 together with type 9 thus celebrating the recapture of both Rome and Syracuse.

The letters CV cannot represent the mint of Cyzicus since, firstly, there was no reason to commemorate this city at this time and secondly, because the mint mark of Cyzicus always began with the letter K. The earliest mint in Sicily seems to have been in Catania. The mint of Syracuse seems only to have opened under Constans II and not to have signed its name CVPKOVCI until the first reign of Justinian II which surely confirms that this type was struck in Sicily.

---

23 W. HAHN and M.A. METLICH, *Money of the Incipient Byzantine Empire*, Vienna, 2000, p. 52.



**Type 11** (figs. 23 and 24). This type is equally rare, also known from only two specimens, which possibly also indicates an issue struck on one single occasion despite the difference in style of the two existing coins. The obverse differs from that of the other types in depicting a female bust wearing a turreted crown. This can only be the Tyche of a city and surely represents Antioch which had been represented by such a figure since its foundation by Seleucus I in c. 300 B.C. when he commissioned a statue of Tyche from Eutychides, pupil of Lysippus. This figure appears often on the Greek and Roman coins of the city and was resuscitated for a short time on the Byzantine pentanummia of Justin I and Justinian I of Antioch which might confirm the date of this type.

The reverse bears the letter T. It cannot represent a denomination since it would represent 300 in greek numerals while type 10 would represent 105 in latin numerals and yet the two types are basically the same weight. The T must surely represent Antioch after its renaming as Theoupolis. Antioch was levelled by an earthquake on 2 November 528 and was renamed after its rebuilding. Perhaps this was the occasion for the striking of this type, possibly in 530. On the other hand 530 is surely too early a date for the issue of this type, partly because of its poorer style of the second specimen and also because I would not consider that there were any issues other than those celebrating the bicentennial of Constantinople, depicting Constantinople and Rome, struck in 530. I would suggest that this type might have been struck in 540 to celebrate the reoccupation of Antioch after the Sassanian sack and occupation of the previous year since types 9 and 10 were possibly issued on the occasions of the recapture of Syracuse and Rome a few years earlier in 536/7. However, the great difference in style between the two existing coins of this type might possibly indicate that the Paris specimen was indeed issued in 530 and the poorer specimen in 540, although I consider this extremely unlikely.

**Type 12** (fig. 25). Until the 1990's this type was extremely rare but a number of specimens have recently appeared in the two hoards closing with coins of Maurice Tiberius and Phocas.

This type is somewhat enigmatic. The monogram formed by the letters TX on the reverse does not represent the name of a city. Hahn has suggested that it may represent a monogram of the word *Tyche* and be a partner to type 10 which he thought represented *Synkletos*, both coins struck at the same time, celebrating both the senate and the good fortune of Constantinople. This is very unlikely since there is a certain amount of evidence to show that type 12 is later than type 10. The fact that the first hoard mentioned above contained coins of types 8 and 12 as well as forgeries of tremisses of Justinian I is not of importance since the coins of both silver types were crude, small and corroded while tremisses of Justinian I were extremely common and could have been forged even after Justinian I's death. Most specimens of type 12 have only been found in two recent hoards indicating that it was circulating both slightly before and

after 602. Before these hoards the type was almost as rare as types 9-11. The type is still very rare and obviously not found in sufficient quantities as to form a significant part of the currency as does type 8c.

However, the photocopy of the Lanz polaroid indicates that type 12 was circulating in small quantities while the siliquae of Justinian I were still quite unworn and type 8c comprised the bulk of the silver currency. Since precious metal coins at this time tended to be hoarded and did not circulate from hand to hand regularly as earlier Roman denarii had done, it is perhaps not surprising to find siliquae of Justinian so well preserved many years after they were issued. Silver coins of the sixth and seventh centuries are often found in poor condition but this is usually due to poor striking and subsequent corrosion but seldom through wear as a result of circulation. The form of the reverse, a monogram, is not unlike the *Chi-Rho* monogram on the later « miliarenses » of Tiberius Constantine and Maurice Tiberius<sup>24</sup> and might therefore confirm a date of c. 580 for the introduction of this type.

**Metrology.** The main types of the silver coinage of Justinian I and Justin II comprised two denominations, a light miliarensis<sup>25</sup> and a siliqua<sup>26</sup>. An examination of the weights of the easily accessible published specimens indicate that the miliarensia weighed between 3.92 and 4.90g with an average of 4.31g (13 specimens) while the siliquae weighed between 1.99 and 2.59g with an average of 2.28g (10 specimens). It seems obvious therefore that when type 8 was reintroduced in c. 530 it was struck at the same weight as its prototype but that in the sixth century it represented a half siliqua rather than a third of a siliqua as it had done in the fourth century.

It seems probable that the silver coins of Justin II were struck early in his reign since they are of exactly the same design and weight as those of Justinian I, being of what might be called « late Roman design », having the standing emperor holding spear and globus with the GLORIA ROMANORVM legend, whereas the silver « miliarenses » of Tiberius Constantine and Maurice Tiberius break with the past, having facing busts and a monogram in the form of a Christogram somewhat comparable to the monogram on type 12. The silver coins of these two emperors are so rare that it is difficult to make anything of their weights which are quite erratic. The « miliarenses » of Tiberius Constantine and Maurice weigh 1.65, 2.15, 2.70 and 3.15g while the « siliquae » of Maurice Tiberius weigh 1.44, 1.44 and 1.40g. On the other hand the « siliquae » of Phocas seem to have been struck to a more accurate standard. While the single specimen in Dumbarton Oaks weighs only 1.55g the weights of the specimens in the recent hoard for which weights are available weigh 2.45, 2.24,

---

24 Tiberius, *DOC* I, nos. 8-9; *MIB* 18-19; Maurice, *DOC* I, 18-19; *MIB* 51.

25 *MIBE* 42-45 and 47-49.

26 *MIBE* 48, 50.

2.04 and 2.03g. While the weights of the silver coins of Tiberius Constantine and Maurice Tiberius are quite erratic, Phocas seems to have attempted to revive the standard of Justinian I and Justin II.

It is in this light that we should consider the issues of type 8, the crude issues of which descend to as little as 0.63g. If, as I suspect, Justin II's imperial *siliquae* were struck early in his reign, then there might have been a short period when type 8c was the only Byzantine silver coin being issued. Since it was of a celebratory type, its weight might have declined when there was no other silver coin being struck to which it was necessary to be metrologically related. On the other hand it should not be overlooked that the St. Petersburg specimen of type 10 only weighs 0.65g, almost the lowest weight recorded for type 8 and if the suggestion that the type 10 was struck as early as 536/7 is accepted, the decline in weight and style of type 8c might have commenced much earlier and that the decline of its weight commenced early in the period of its continued production.

The major reason why type 12 might have succeeded type 8c and did not overlap with it lies in the fact that the earliest coins of type 12 seem to be heavier than the later coins of type 7. Of three coins of type 8c from the Phocas hoard, only one has a recorded weight, 0.89g. These three coins of type 8c are themselves poorer than the few coins of type 12 that the writer saw in the earlier hoard closing with coins of Maurice. It may therefore be that the production of type 8c had ceased by c. 580 when it was superseded by type 12. Type 8c, however, was still common enough to be in circulation after 602 and may possibly have continued to have been struck after 580, overlapping with the production of type 12.

Weight, on the other hand, might not be so important. Could it be that, because these coins were possibly struck for celebratory purposes and were not part of the «imperial» coinage, they may have been struck *al marco* and not *al pezzo*?

**Mints.** Where known, all the provenances for all the types are east of Constantinople. The hoard closing with coins of Maurice Tiberius definitely came from Syria or Lebanon and the hoard closing with coins of Phocas probably came from the same region. Despite the fact that that we have suggested that types 9 and 10 celebrated the recapture of Syracuse and Rome, possibly in 537, since none of these types have been found in Sicily or Italy they can hardly have been struck at these mints which did not open until c. 540. The fact that a single specimen of type 11 came from Aleppo does not necessarily mean that this type was struck in Antioch since so many coins of type 8c have been found at the eastern end of the Mediterranean. That one specimen of type 11 was acquired there only indicates that it travelled East as did so many coins of type 8c. It seems certain that all these anonymous coins were struck in Constantinople.

## Conclusion

As we have seen, there is evidence that type 8 was struck from c. 530 for some 50 years, gradually becoming cruder but not necessarily lighter with the possibility that there may have been a very small issue to celebrate the centenary of the founding in Constantinople in c. 430. The reason for the continual issue of type 8 after 530 is uncertain but may have something to do with the increased importance in the annual celebration of Constantinople's birthday after the cessation of the consulship in 541 but possibly from 530.

I would suggest that the rare issues of types 9-11 were each struck on a single occasion to celebrate the reconquest of a Byzantine city from foreign occupation, types 9 and 10 for Rome and Syracuse in 536/537 and type 11 for Antioch in 540. Of course, prior to these reconquests was that of Carthage in 533/4. Why was this not celebrated? Perhaps it was but since both Constantinople and Carthage bore the same initial letter, a larger issue of type 8 might have served the purpose. These issues commemorating the recapture of important cities would fit well with Justinian's expansionist programme.

If we accept that types 9-11 were issued between 536/7 and 540 it would seem possible that type 8c had begun to be struck regularly before the this, probably from 530 since I cannot envisage a period when types 9-11 were being issued but not type 8b or 8c.

The indications are that type 12 might possibly only have been struck in the last twenty years of the sixth century.

Date	Type	Fig.	Obverse	Reverse FIRST SERIES	Weight	Main reference
330	1	1 <sup>1</sup>	Helmeted and draped bust of <i>Constantinopolis</i> left	K	1.13*; 1.11; 0.92 g (3 spec.)	Lanz 86, 18 V 1998, 736
330	2	2 <sup>2</sup>	Helmeted and draped bust of <i>Roma</i> right	R	1.19 to 0.86 (23 spec.) 0.89*	Sabatier, <i>RBN</i> , 1861, pl. II, 7 etc.; Göbl, <i>Antike Numismatik</i> , 1978, 145
330	3	3 <sup>3</sup>	Bust of <i>Roma</i> as above but left	R	0.95* (unique?)	Hirsch 206, 24-26 XI 1999, 577
330	4	4 <sup>4</sup>	Diademed and draped female bust right (pearl diadem with ties)	K	1.18* to 0.72 (15 spec.)	Cohen 287 (Constantine II); Sabatier, <i>Iconographie</i> , pl. suppl. XII, 37; Id., <i>RBN</i> , 1861, pl. II, no.5
330	5a	5 <sup>5</sup>	As above but pearl diadem has no ties	K	1.53* (unique)	Unpublished (BM)
330	5b	6 <sup>6</sup>	As above but hatched diadem with no ties	K	1.04* to 0.98 (9 spec.)	Cohen 23 (Fausta); Sabatier, <i>Iconographie</i> , pl. suppl. XII, 38; Id., <i>RBN</i> 1861, pl. II, 4 et 6; Göbl, <i>Antike Numismatik</i> , 1978, 144
330	A	7 <sup>7</sup>	As above (hatched diadem with no ties) CONSTAN - TINOPOLIS	Pax standing left holding branch and spear P - R	2.12g*	<i>RIC</i> VIII (Rome) 106; <i>LRBC</i> 612
330	B	8 <sup>8</sup>	As type 2 RO MA	Military fig. standing holding spear and shield P - R	2.13g*	<i>RIC</i> VIII (Rome) 104-105; <i>LRBC</i> 611
				SECOND SERIES		
330	6	9 and 10 <sup>10</sup>	Star	Wreath	1.81; 1.49 to 1.23* (5 spec.)	Missong, <i>NZ</i> , 2, 1870, p. 449-52
330	C	11 <sup>11</sup>	Star	Wreath	1.00 (unique)	Unpublished
330	D	12 <sup>12</sup>	Star	O/C S/C within wreath	1.00*-0.79 (4 spec.)	Göbl, <i>Antike Numismatik</i> , 1978, pl. 9, 105
330	E	13 <sup>13</sup>	POP ROM	*/CONSA within wreath	1.13g*	<i>RIC</i> VIII, p. xxx, 20
330	F	14 <sup>14</sup>	POP ROM	Bridge over river CONSA above	1.22g*	<i>RIC</i> VIII, p. xxx, 21

Summary table of the issues of anonymous silver and bronze

Date	Type	Fig.	Obverse	Reverse	Weight	Main reference
THIRD SERIES - FIFTH SIXTH C.						
430?	7	15 <sup>15</sup>	Helmeted and draped bust of <i>Roma</i> in armour right. Superior style	P	1.07g*	Tkalec Auction, 19.2.2001, 378
430?	8a	16 <sup>16</sup>	Helmeted and draped bust of <i>Constantinopolis</i> in armour right. Superior style	K	0.98*	—
530	8b	17 <sup>17</sup> and 17A	Helmeted and draped bust of <i>Constantinopolis</i> right, with shield. Slightly better style	K	0.85*	—
530ff. to ca580?	8c	18 <sup>18</sup> 19 <sup>19</sup>	Helmeted and draped bust of <i>Constantinopolis</i> right. Common issue of varying styles and weights	K	0.65* common issue (1.44 to 0.63)	Ratto 471-472; Tolstoï 612-616
536/537?	9	20 <sup>20</sup> -21 <sup>21</sup>	Helmeted and draped bust of <i>Roma</i> right.	R	0.85*, 0.77* (1.01-0.68) (5 spec.)	Tolstoï 617
536/537?	10	22 <sup>22</sup>	Helmeted and draped bust right	C V	1.02	Tolstoï 618
540?	11	23 <sup>23</sup> 24 <sup>24</sup>	Draped bust of Tyche right	T	0.95* 0.98	Unpublished
ca580-600?	12	25 <sup>25</sup>	Helmeted, draped (diademed ?) bust right	Crossed T T X monogram ?	1.32*-0.95 0.83 (3 spec.)	Tolstoï 620

### Summary table of the issues of anonymous silver and bronze

1. Lanz 86, 18 V 1998, 736. 2. Private coll. 3. Private coll. ex Hirsch 206, 24-26 XI 1999, 577. 4. Private coll. 5. British Museum 1853-7-16-312. 6. Private coll. 7. *RIC* VIII (Rome) 106 Private coll. 8. *RIC* VIII (Rome) 104-105 Private coll. 9. Private coll. ex Missonig and Froehner, 1.49g. 10. Private coll. 1.23g edges eroded. 11. Private coll. 12. *Ars antiqua*, auction 1, 3 XI 2000, 440. 13. *RIC* VIII, 20 Private coll. 14. *RIC* VIII, 21. 20 Private coll. 15. Tkalec Auction, 19 Feb. 2001, lot 378. 16. Priv. coll. 17. Priv. coll. 18. Priv. coll. 19 Priv. coll. 20. Priv. coll. 21. Priv. coll. 22. Priv. coll. ex ex Hirsch auction 178, 12-14 V 1993, 1202. 23. BnF M 7983, 0.95g. 24. Priv. coll., 0.98g. 25. Priv. coll. from CNG and various sales (see above).

Note : Arabic figures refer to silver coins; letters to bronze coins.