

Fordham University Interlibrary Loan

ILLiad TN: 240856.0

VYF 150.108.156.223

Borrower: TXM

Lending String: *VYF,HCD,PSC,QWC

Patron: Clark, Victor

Journal Title: Eranos ; acta philologica Suecana.

Volume: 53 **Issue:**
Month/Year: 1955 **Pages:** 193-198

Article Author:

Article Title: Patrick Bruun; Some Dynastic
Bronze Coins of Constantine the Great

Imprint: Upsaliae ; V. Lundstro'm ; Lipsiae ; Har

ILL Number:31243139



Call #: P1.E66

Location: RH

ARIEL
Charge
Maxcost: Free

Shipping Address:
Middle Tenn. St. Univ. Lib
ILL
Box 13
Murfreesboro, TN 37132

Fax:
Ariel: 161.45.205.82

friedigt.» Darin möchte ich ihm völlig
 Versuche sind m. E. von einem oder
 ehtspunkte aus verfehlt: Zusammenhang,
 zeit, Sprachgebrauch und Klauseltechnik
 e Punkt des überlieferten Satzes ist, wie
 erbindung *firmatus confixi*. Das Partizip
 agelt', macht in diesem feierlichen Zu-
 trivialen Eindruck und kommt auch
 . Es fehlt, wie Z. hervorhebt, ein *verbum*
totus orbis und ein Verbindungsglied zu
 Satzes. Aber *firmatus confixi* kann, wie
 eine Verschreibung von *firmatur, cum*
 er Meinung nach der Ursprung des Ver-
 durch Irrtum oder absichtliche Änderung
 lt wurde, lässt sich nicht entscheiden.
 arten Gesichtspunkten aus scheint mir
 Textes sehr wahrscheinlich: *et sic totus*
firmatur, cum fixi operis immortalis radice
 — Die *immortalis radix* wird durch den
 Kreuzes gebildet, denn das Kreuz ist
 (16) *lignum crucis vitam in mortali*
 l sie hält die *fundamenta orbis* fest, vgl.
lignum crucis caeli sustinet machinam,
et a corroborat.
 bedeuten nichts anderes als das verehrungs-
 Kreuzes. Durch das eine langgestreckte und
 des Zeichens wird der Himmel gestützt, die
 malten, und von dem Gefüge der zwei, die
 der Osten erreicht, der Westen gestützt,
 rd die ganze Welt durch dreifache Festi-
 Grundlagen von der unsterblichen Wurzel
 ten werden.'

Some Dynastic Bronze Coins of Constantine the Great.

By

Patrick Bruun.

Helsingfors.

One of the many controversial problems connected with the coinage of Constantine the Great is the proper dating and interpretation of the Dynastic Consecration Coins of the types REQVIES OPTIMORVM MERITORVM and MEMORIAE AETERNAE with obverses of Constantius Chlorus, Maximianus Herculeus and Claudius Gothicus. OTTO VOETTER was the first to understand the dynastic significance of these coins¹ and he explained them as struck in order to emphasize Constantine's claim on the whole empire on hereditary grounds. The coins were used as imperial propaganda against Licinius; because of the variations in weight, VOETTER concluded that the coins must have been issued on two different occasions and that the logical dates were the months immediately preceding Constantine's two wars against Licinius, i.e. 314 A. D. and 324 A. D.² In his Numismatique Constantinienne, JULES MAURICE readily accepts VOETTER's point of view³ and catalogues coins of the Requies type for the mints Treveri, Roma, Aqvileia, Arelate, Siscia and Thessalonica; according to him coins of the heavier denomination were struck in the three former mints, the coins

¹ Ahnenmünzen Kaiser Constantin des Grossen, Mittheilungen des Clubs der Münz- und Medaillenfreunde 1895, pp. 76—79, 88—89.

² Ahnenmünzen p. 77.

³ Num.Const. I, Introduction p. XCIV f. and CXXVI; pp. 211 f., 235 f.

of lighter standards in all six. The *Memoriae* coins were struck solely in Rome and in accordance with Voetter Maurice speaks of an earlier issue of 314 A. D. and a later of 324 A. D.

Now, this classification based on weights seems to need revising. A visit to the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna during the autumn 1954 proved that consecration coins of two different standards were struck in the mint of Rome only. The average weight of 49 coins of the reverse *REQVIES OPTIMOR MERIT* in Vienna was 3.05 grm., the average weight of 15 coins of the reverse *REQVIES OPTIMORVM MERITORVM* 1.36 grm., all of them struck in Roma. All *Reqvies* coins struck in Treveri, Arelate, Aqvileia, Siscia and Thessalonica were of lighter standard with an average weight less than 1.5 grm.

Checking the *Numismatique Constantinienne*, it is easy to see that MAURICE does not succeed in proving that coins of heavier standards were struck in Treveri and Aqvileia. For Treveri (I, p. 406) he does not give any weights for the »heavy denomination» and he illustrates what he describes as an early consecration issue with a small size coin (Pl. XXII, 3). To support the theory of two denominations having been struck in Aqvileia he refers (I, pp. 314, 325 f.) to the coins in Vienna (from the collections Markl and Voetter) but all these coins are in fact of lighter standards. The illustration of an »early, heavy» coin (Pl. XX, 9) clearly shows a small size one. Accordingly neither Treveri nor Aqvileia struck any consecration coins of the heavier standard.

Even if the mint of Rome apparently struck coins of the *Reqvies* type at two different standards, it seems impossible to speak of two denominations of the *MEMORIAE AETERNAE* types. Five different reverses are known; as can be ascertained in the exceptionally fine collection in Vienna the coins differ very little with regard to style and flan-size. The weights in Vienna are as follows:

Lion r., with club: 9 coins, average weight 1.76 grm. (heaviest 2.0, lightest 1.32 grm.) Lion r.: 24 coins, 1.88 grm. (2.4—1.46 grm.). Lion l.: 4 coins, 2.04 grm. (2.48—1.73 grm.) Eagle l., looking r.: 24 coins, 1.74 grm. (2.4—1.02 grm.). Eagle r., looking l.: 29 coins, 2.03 grm. (3.99—1.36 grm.).

These figures are corroborated by the coins which I have come across in other collections (see also Voetter, William, Hunter, Guildhall of London and Voetter, 1954). The weight figures seem to indicate that the coins are of the same denomination. The average weights of the groups differ very little indeed despite the fact that in each group. In the last group (eagle r., 1 coin of 3.99 grm. is quite exceptional and represents the one end of a long series of coins of continuing weight.

MAURICE's and VOETTER's division of the coins is thus deprived of the only positive evidence which would justify it. It is possible that one or more of the coins struck earlier, the others considerably later, were struck in an arrangement seems highly improbable.

Apparently both VOETTER and MAURICE are misled by the idea of dividing the *Memoriae* coins into two groups because the *Reqvies* coins of Roma unquestionably represent two different standards, partly because the Constantinian character suggested strikings before the wars against Licinius.

A few words should be added with regard to the dynastic issues. Clearly the coins must have been struck after the first Civil War, fought in the year 316 A. D. to prove elsewhere¹; only after the settlement of the year 317 A. D. the mints of Siscia and Thessalonica struck coins in the name of Constantine. A survey of the three groups from Luxor, Nagytétény and Langwith conclusively shows that the consecration issues to be earlier than 320 A. D. And, no doubt, the year 317 when Constantine received their princely honours was the time for expressing dynastic ideas.

When discussing the dynastic issues of the Constantinian coins, the difficulty to explain the absence of the *Memoriae* (according to Voetter and Maurice) in this material is obvious.

¹ The author's *The Constantinian Coinage of Arelate*.

² Arelate p. 42 f.

l six. The Memoriae coins were struck in accordance with Voetter Maurice speaks of 324 A. D. and a later of 324 A. D. The analysis based on weights seems to need revision. The numismatist at the Historisches Museum in Vienna during the 1930s, who made that consecration coins of two different types were struck at the mint of Rome only. The average weight of the reverse REQVIES OPTIMOR MERITVS, the average weight of 15 coins of the OPTIMORVM MERITORVM 1.36 gm., all struck in Treveri, Thessalonica and Thessalonica were of lighter standard, about 1.5 gm.

At the Numismatique Constantinienne, it is easy to see that he did not succeed in proving that coins of heavier standard were struck in Treveri and Aqvileia. For Treveri he gives any weights for the «heavy denomination» what he describes as an early consecration coin (Pl. XXII, 3). To support the theory that coins having been struck in Aqvileia he refers to the coins in Vienna (from the collections of the Emperor) all these coins are in fact of lighter standard than that of an «early, heavy» coin (Pl. XX, 9) and of a lighter size one. Accordingly neither Treveri nor Thessalonica consecration coins of the heavier standard. Some apparently struck coins of the Reqvies type are of lighter standards, it seems impossible to speak of the MEMORIAE AETERNAE types. The coins known; as can be ascertained in the collection in Vienna the coins differ very little in size and flan-size. The weights in Vienna are as follows:

Coins, average weight 1.76 gm. (heaviest 2.4 gm.) Lion r.: 24 coins, 1.88 gm. (2.4—1.46 gm.) Eagle l.: 2.04 gm. (2.48—1.73 gm.) Eagle l.: 1.74 gm. (2.4—1.02 gm.). Eagle r., looking up: 3.99—1.36 gm.).

These figures are corroborated by the altogether 79 coins I have come across in other collections (BM, Ashmolean, Fitzwilliam, Hunter, Guildhall of London and Bibliothèque Nationale). The weight figures seem to indicate that all the Memoriae coins are of the same denomination. The average weights for the five groups differ very little indeed despite weight differences within each group. In the last group (eagle r., looking l.) the heaviest coin of 3.99 gm. is quite exceptional and does not stand at the one end of a long series of coins of continually decreasing weight.

MAURICE's and VOETTER's division of the Memoriae coins is thus deprived of the only positive evidence supporting it. Theoretically it is possible that one or more of the five groups were struck earlier, the others considerably later, but in reality such an arrangement seems highly improbable.

Apparently both VOETTER and MAURICE had been attracted by the idea of dividing the Memoriae coins into two issues, partly because the Reqvies coins of Roma unquestionably were struck at two different standards, partly because their dynastic, anti-Licinian character suggested striking before Constantine's two wars against Licinius.

A few words should be added with regard to the dates of the dynastic issues. Clearly the coins must have been struck after the first Civil War, fought in the year 316 A. D. as I have tried to prove elsewhere¹; only after the settlement in Serdica in 317 A. D. the mints of Siscia and Thessalonica came into the possession of Constantine. A survey of the three important hoards of Luxor, Nagytétény and Langwith conclusively proves the consecration issues to be earlier than 320 A. D. and later than 317 A. D.² And, no doubt, the year 317 when the sons of Constantine received their princely honours was the most appropriate time for expressing dynastic ideas.

When discussing the dynastic issues of Arelate I had some difficulty to explain the absence of the heavy denomination (according to Voetter and Maurice) in this mint against the sup-

¹ The author's *The Constantinian Coinage of Arelate*, pp. 17—21.

² Arelate p. 42 f.

posed presence of heavy coins in Treveri and Aqvileia. The above study has shown that, in reality, the difficulty did not exist; Treveri and Aqvileia never struck any heavy coins.

Accepting the date 317 A. D. for the dynastic coins of Arelate it also became necessary to explain why the light denomination had been struck in Treveri, Arelate, Roma, Aqvileia, Siscia and Thessalonica, but not in Ticinum, Lugdunum and Londinium.¹ Later I have been able to elucidate the co-operation between the mints in the Constantinian part of the empire in the years 317—327 A. D. when arranging the Vota coinages of the Western mints.² In this connection it was easy to see that the entire coinage of each single mint was built up of fairly independent sections of coinage, the Sol coinage with the reverse types SOLI INVICTO COMITI, IOVI CONSERVATORI, PRINCIPI(A) IVVENTVTIS and CLARITAS REIPVB(LICAE), the Vota coinage, later the Providentia coinage etc.

In the Western Group consisting of the mints of Londinium, Treveri and Lugdunum, Lugdunum was exceptional in so far as the mint struck the very earliest Vota issues of the year 317 A. D. but not the complementary reverse types of the Sol coinage with observes of the Caesars. The Vota issues clearly ceased after the initial stage. The two other mints struck no early vows nor any Vota V at all. All three mints, however, struck the Vota X for the sons of Constantine in closely co-ordinated issues, probably 323—324 A. D. With regard to the Sol coinage of the mints of Londinium and Treveri with Caesarian observes we are entitled to assume that Lugdunum must have been closed 317—about 320 A. D. while the other mints were working all the time.

The Italian Group, consisting of the mints of Roma, Ticinum and Aqvileia struck Vota coins on three different occasions, 318 A. D., 321—22 A. D. and 325—26 A. D. (Aqvileia was closed during the last period). In addition Rome struck a number of own types such as ROMAE AETERNAE — XV, VOT X ET

¹ Arelate p. 40 ff.

² Constantinian Mint Policy and the Imperial Vota, *Nordisk Numismatisk Årsskrift* 1954 (published in the Autumn 1955).

XV F, VOT XV, VOT XX and VO chief mint in Italy with a higher nu frequency of striking.

Against this background it is easy to see why the light denomination was struck in the years after the reconciliation in Londinium was very small. True, the Sol coinage was introduced, but no vow coins issued. Again, Lugdunum closed after it was introduced into the Sol coinage, before it is quite natural that no coins were ever struck in this mint.

In Italy both Aqvileia and Ticinum showed a higher activity after 317 A. D. To explain why Aqvileia struck dynastic issues and Ticinum omitted to do so. Possibly the reason was Aqvileia — on geographical grounds — more suited as a means of imperial propaganda in the West to which Constantine concentrated his efforts. The dynastic issues were struck in the West, the empire, Treveri, Arelate and Roma, while Aqvileia was situated in the actual area itself or in its neighbourhood.

The enormous output of Rome is easily explained by the ritual importance of the old capital and the political importance of the city. Also other sections of the empire showed a high frequency of striking in the mint of Rome.

Concluding we may say that the dynastic coinage of Constantine in an admirable way mirrored the needs of the coinage, faithfully adapted as it was to the political need of the day. Considering the fact that the following picture of the dynastic coinage is based on the following picture of the dynastic coinage.

The first issue REQVIES OPTIMO was struck in Roma only, probably during the war 312—13, earlier, and this issue was immediately replaced by the issue REQVIES OPTIMO.

¹ Cf. SEECK, *Regesten* p. 165 f., Arelate p. 1.

coins in Treveri and Aqvileia. The above in reality, the difficulty did not exist; never struck any heavy coins.

317 A. D. for the dynastic coins of Arelate to explain why the light denomination Treveri, Arelate, Roma, Aqvileia, Siscia and Ticinum, Lugdunum and Londinium.¹ to elucidate the co-operation between Constantinian part of the empire in the years changing the Vota coinages of the Western Empire it was easy to see that the entire coinage was built up of fairly independent secondary coinage with the reverse types SOLI DOMINI CONSERVATORI, PRINCIPI(A) FELICITATIS REIPVB(LICAE), the Vota Arelatensis coinage etc.

The group consisting of the mints of Londinium, Lugdunum was exceptional in so far as the very earliest Vota issues of the year 317 had elementary reverse types of the Sol coinage of the Caesars. The Vota issues clearly ceased after 317. In two other mints struck no early vows nor did the three mints, however, struck the Vota issues of Constantine in closely co-ordinated issues, probably in the year 317.

With regard to the Sol coinage of the Western Empire and Treveri with Caesarian obverse and reverse that Lugdunum must have been closed after 317 while the other mints were working all over the Empire.

The group consisting of the mints of Roma, Ticinum struck Vota coins on three different occasions, 317 A. D. and 325—26 A. D. (Aqvileia was closed after 317). In addition Roma struck a number of Vota coins ROMAE AETERNAE — XV, VOT X ET

policy and the Imperial Vota, Nordisk Numismatisk Tidsskrift for the Autumn 1955).

XV F, VOT XV, VOT XX and VOT XV FEL XX, being the chief mint in Italy with a higher number of types and a higher frequency of striking.

Against this background it is easy to explain the absence of dynastic issues in Londinium, Lugdunum and Ticinum; during the years after the reconciliation in Serdica the output of Londinium was very small. True, the Sol coinage with Caesarian obverse was introduced, but no vows were struck, no dynastic coins issued. Again, Lugdunum closed before the Caesars had been introduced into the Sol coinage, very early 317 A. D. Therefore it is quite natural that no commemorative consecration were ever struck in this mint.

In Italy both Aqvileia and Ticinum show sporadic outbursts of higher activity after 317 A. D. Therefore it seems difficult to explain why Aqvileia struck dynastic coins while Ticinum omitted to do so. Possibly the reason was that the coins of Aqvileia — on geographical grounds — more easily could be used as a means of imperial propaganda in the newly conquered areas, to which Constantine concentrated his activities after the war¹; the dynastic issues were struck in the chief Western mints of the empire, Treveri, Arelate and Roma and in the three mints situated in the actual area itself or in the immediate neighbourhood.

The enormous output of Rome is easily explained by the spiritual importance of the old capital and by the economic significance of the city. Also other sections of coinage give proof of a high frequency of striking in the mint of Roma.

Concluding we may say that the dynastic coins struck by Constantine in an admirable way mirror the flexibility of the bronze coinage, faithfully adapted as it was to the economic and political need of the day. Considering the facts given above we conceive the following picture of the dynastic coinage:

The first issue REQUIES OPTIMOR MERIT was struck in Roma only, probably during the war 316 A. D., possibly slightly earlier, and this issue was immediately followed by the MEMO-

¹ Cf. SEECK, Regesten p. 165 f., Arelate p. 19.

RIAE AETERNAE with a reduction of standards by one third. After the war, early in the year 317 A. D., as is proved by the participation of the mints of Siscia and Thessalonica, the Requies-type of even more reduced standards was issued in the main mints of the Constantinian part of the empire, in Treveri, Arelate, Roma, Aquileia, Siscia and Thessalonica.

Miscell.

Ad Verg. e

E codicibus Vergilianis aevo a maximam eclogae quintae partem Palatinus, versum 15 his verbis *iubeto certet Amyntas*, quod E. DE SAINT-DENIS,² alter, Romanu priores plerique editores iam inde FORBIGER, CONINGTON, JAHN, HOS Metricis autem rationibus probare li Palatino *ut* omisisse. De iis enim qu de caesuris et elisionibus utilissim 106 eclogarum versibus (eo de qu mimeren cum penthemimere non c autem horum versuum in hephthem penthemimere praeditis 13^{ies} in hep in Georgicorum libris I et II, qui ad menti sunt, quod in Georgicis mul elidi constat, eandem fere quam in enim in 134 versibus hephthemime conjuncta occurrit, in nullo eorum in facillimas particulae *que* elisiones I etiam fieri potest ut a n t e *que* caes

¹ Vergili Opera, Romae 1930.

² Virgile, Bucoliques, Texte établi et tr 2^{me} éd. Paris 1949.

³ P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica, ed. C. H.

⁴ V. p. 49 libri nostri »Metrische Stildiffer Uppsala 1952, et quos libros ibi laudavim