

Borrower: TXM

(TXM-TN: 138917)

Lending String: *TJC,NGA,WEL,VYF,TFW

Trans.Date: 6/15/2007 12:34:46 PM

Patron: Clark, Victor

Journal Title: Studia romana in honorem Petri
Krarup septuagenarii /

Volume: Issue:

Month/Year: 1976

Pages: 122- 131

Article: Bruun, P.; Notes on the Transmission of
Imperial Images in Late Antiquity

Imprint: [Odense] ; Odense University Press,
1976

ILL Number: 31514067



Call #: DG14 .S76

Location: CENTRAL 3RD-FLOOR

ODYSSEY: 161.45.205.112

Ariel

Maxcost: Free

Billing Category: Exempt

Charge:

Shipping Address:

Middle Tenn. St. Univ. Lib

ILL

Box 13/1500 Greenland Drive

Murfreesboro, TN 37132

****VIA ATHENA COURIER****

Fax: (615) 898-5551

Odyssey

ARIEL: 161.45.205.82 OK

Notes

6/18

552

TJC-TN: 284401



TXM --- ATHENA

Needed: 6/20

Notes on the Transmission of Imperial Images in Late Antiquity

by PATRICK BRUN

The emperor Julian once ironically described his uncle Constantine as an ingrained materialist,¹ a money dealer (τραπέζιτης) a cook (ὀψοποιός) and a hairdresser's maid (κομμωρίτριά). An important point in his harsh criticism is obviously that, in the nephew's opinion, the uncle made too much of a fuss of his hair, which in real life seems to have been far from abundant.² A certain amount of male vanity would normally be a sufficient explanation for the attention an emperor pays to his hairstyle. In our particular case, however, Julian's words suggest something more than a frivolous joke at a ruler's worries over his increasing baldness. They reveal, as the context shows,³ a serious attack on the image of Constantine. As depicted by his apostate nephew the first Christian emperor appears to be greedy, wasteful and vain, and very alien to the philosophical ideal of a ruler. According to Silenus in Julian's *Saturnalian* dialogue Constantine's hairstyle and his looks reveal his true character.

Julian's severe criticism of Constantine's "fussing" over his hairstyle cannot be a chance illustration of his predecessor's concern with his outward appearance. Readers and listeners of Julian's text must have been familiar with the Constantinian portraits which were in evidence all over the empire, in statues, *imagines* and coins. Julian most certainly wrote with a purpose, which may reflect a reaction to Constantine's systematic – and no doubt also successful – attempts to undermine the values of the old world of Greek and Roman traditions, and to create a new image of the Roman emperor, different from that of the tetrarchic ruler. With careful attention to detail, a new

court ceremonial was developed, and old symbols were employed in a new setting both in regard to the imperial dress and to other external manifestations of power. The hairstyle was just one part of the new picture and Julian's words remind us of the fact that it was an important part.

The clean-shaven portraits and busts of Constantine which have been preserved bear witness first of all to a radical break with the tradition of the close-cropped hair and bearded face of the tetrarchs, and secondly to an infinite variety in the arrangement of locks and waves of hair. Certain aspects of the early appearance of this Constantinian portrait are the main object of this paper.

Portraits on Roman imperial coins have traditionally been of great importance to the art historian in the identification of Roman imperial sculptures. The comparison of busts in stone and on coins as a rule creates few difficulties as long as coining was restricted to one or two mints. This was the case during most of the third century A.D. Things changed, however, when the administrative reforms of the tetrarchies created centres coining regularly in all the four parts of the Empire;⁴ in this new situation the evaluation of coin portraits constitutes a methodological problem of its own.

An intimate knowledge of the process of coin production is a prerequisite when forming an opinion of the physical appearance of an emperor with the aid of coins. The closer to the model, to the emperor himself, the die-cutter worked, the greater the chance that the coin portrait corresponds to the model. This,

in a way trivial, methodological criterion of proximity of our source (the coin) to the object it describes (the physiognomy of the ruler) is valid in different ways; it extends into time, into space and into society. This implies also that the coins and the coining constitute valid evidence particularly when coins are allowed to testify collectively, when the coining process is regarded as an organic entity, and when only this organic whole is taken into consideration. Single parts of the process, individual coins, should be employed only when it can be shown that they are representative of the group to which they belong.⁵ But not even when the scholar seems to have a clear idea of the complicated administrative reality behind the widely varying imperial portraits, has the method of research been related to the character of the sources.⁶

When dealing with the history of the Later Roman Empire students of portraiture and iconography have to a large extent favoured the Constantinian or the post-Constantinian period.⁷ Consequently, the influence of the epoch-making administrative reforms of the tetrarchies on coin portraits has been very much ignored. Von Sydow⁸ is probably the first scholar to pay serious attention to regional differences without, however, attempting any systematic analysis or presentation of development in the provinces. What follows aims at clarifying certain general principles according to which coin portraits were circulated in the empire. Awareness of these and similar principles suggests what kind of images should be selected for the purpose of illustrating the artistic and iconographic development of a certain period.

I propose to make the Constantinian portrait the point of departure, and to demonstrate how the portrait created in conjunction with the *quinquennialia*⁹ was introduced in the parts of the Empire not governed by Constantine. The portrait is markedly different from the portraits of Constantine's fellow-rulers, and therefore not easily confused with the features of other emperors – regardless of local distortions. The period chosen covers the time from early A.D. 311 to the death of the ruler of

the East, Maximinus Daza in August 313. This conveniently limits our field of investigation, which nevertheless includes a study of the relations between the three tetrarchic rulers Maximinus, Constantine and Licinius.

The official internal relations of the members of any one imperial college are invariably reflected by the coinage, though they may be expressed in many different ways. A constitutionally elected emperor could on account of his *imperium* issue coins. Because the process of constitutional election was initiated by the *acclamatio* of the army, even when the Roman senate had no opportunity of confirming the result of the election, the person acclaimed by the soldiers in the place of the *acclamatio, de facto* always possessed the *imperium* necessary for coining. In fact, to wait for the acknowledgment of the Senate – which might never be forthcoming, particularly when the capital was in the hands of a rival – before issuing coins would have been disastrous to many newly appointed emperors. How could the newly acclaimed otherwise have been able to repay his trusting supporters and soldiers for their services?

The right to issue coins meant the power to have coins designed in order to present the ruler and his aims as much to his advantage as possible. The privileges of having his portraits and his titles circulated on the coins¹⁰ must have been an asset of fundamental importance to imperial propaganda.¹¹

The era of collegiate rule established with the tetrarchic system presupposed close cooperation; all rulers did in fact belong to the same *domus divina*¹² as members of the *gens Valeria*.¹³ Seston compares the relationship of the senior members of the college to the junior ones with the relation of an army commander to his second-in-command or with family fathers to their sons, who worked in the same profession. In this case of course Diocletian was at first very much the senior ruler as compared even with the other augustus, to Maximian.

The cohesion of the imperial college is apparent in all official documents, laws, edicts, papyri and inscriptions, and similarly in the

coinage. In normal conditions an issue of coins would present all the rulers of the empire, and depict their portraits.¹⁴

This brings us to one of the main problems of this paper: can the coin portraits really be regarded as true portraits of the ruler in question?

We have some literary evidence of the procedure adopted for the purpose of communicating imperial portraits all over the empire. This comes from the period after the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian, when the *domus divina* was less united than under the firm rule of the founder of the tetrarchic system. Lactantius tells us¹⁵ that Constantine, having been hailed his father's successor on July 25, 306 in Eboracum, after a few days sent his laureate portrait to the senior augustus Galerius, who hesitated for a while over whether to accept it or not. He did so finally, with reluctance, and sent to Constantine an imperial mantle as a token of his 'magnanimity' in taking the initiative to promote Constantine to imperial rank.¹⁶

About five years later, after several momentous changes on the political stage, the old Maximian, having resumed the purple, and been forced to retire as *privatus* to Gaul, nevertheless clashed with his son-in-law Constantine, who was then ruling the West. The conflict grew in intensity and finally resulted in Maximian's premature death in Massilia. Lactantius reports that Constantine ordered Maximian's statues to be overthrown and his portraits to be pulled down wherever they happened to be.¹⁷

Not very much later when Constantine had started his Italian campaign (spring of A. D. 312), Lactantius notes that the two champions of Christianity, Constantine and Licinius seemed to constitute a threat to Maxentius and Maximinus Daza, their counterparts among the remaining persecutors of the Christian faith. This forced the persecutors into an alliance; their friendship was a fact, and consequently the portraits of both rulers were set up in the appropriate places.¹⁸

A final instance¹⁹ again demonstrates that according to fourth century views, a political

alliance was confirmed by erecting statues and by displaying portraits of the rulers concerned.²⁰ Constantine, Lactantius writes, learned about Daza's perfidy in conspiring with Maxentius against himself when he, after the victory of the Milvian bridge, discovered the busts and the portraits of Maximinus in Rome.

A description of the actual ceremony of the presentation of the *imago* to an emperor has been preserved in Constantine Porphyrogenitus' *De caerimoniis*.²¹

The general situation described by Constantine Porphyrogenitus is – as the heading of the chapter shows – that an emperor acclaimed in *partibus occidentalibus* has not as yet been accepted as a legitimate ruler by the Byzantine emperor.²² The newly appointed sends an envoy and his *imagines* to Constantinople. Constantine first explains in general terms how the delegation is received, how they have to wait to be admitted and how they are finally granted an audience with His Majesty. As soon as they have delivered their message, the emperor of the eastern empire confirms the imperial status of the petitioner. Constantine then illustrates the ceremony by recounting what happened (in A. D. 467) when Anthemius, the emperor of Rome, turned to Leo the Great in Constantinople. Anthemius' envoy Heliocrates carried with him his masters' *imago laureata* (*τὰ λαυρεάτα*) and letters to Leo. The Roman delegation was received in the imperial consistory, where Heliocrates with Anthemius' *imago* was introduced to the emperor. After the introduction the *silentiarii* received the portrait and Diaferentius, the prefect of the City, pronounced a panegyric praising both emperors, after which his predecessor Dioscorius performed a similar feat. The emperor then resolved that *τὰ λαυρεάτα* should be distributed all over the empire and that the *imagines* of both emperors should be set up jointly. He did so, making the following discourse: "It has caused us great joy that the most gentle prince Anthemius' portrait, which we have been awaiting a long time, has finally now been presented to us. For this reason, by our divine wish, we command that this portrait of his, joined with ours shall share the same honours

as our portrait to the delight of all our people, so that all the cities joyfully shall realize that the rulers of both parts of the empire act in concert and that we have been united into one with His Indulgence."²³

The emperor Leo thought of the rejoicings in all the cities of the empire when the imperial portraits arrived and were officially set up. There is a piece of corroborating evidence for such celebrations in a papyrus²⁴ showing how Thebais in A. D. 566 celebrated the arrival and the reception of the *imagines* of Justinus II.²⁵

These fragmentary records of the process of the transmission of *imagines laureatae* should be regarded as complementary to one another. There is, of course, a considerable chronological difference between the reigns of Constantine the Great and Justinus II. Nevertheless, the rigid conservatism of the Byzantine court, which faithfully observed the rules and practices laid down by the first Christian emperor, should entitle us to draw some general conclusions from the texts referred to above.

(1) Constantine Porphyrogenitus' text, and particularly the records he has preserved of the visit of the Roman delegation in A. D. 467 above all convey a feeling of the solemnity of the occasion. Lactantius' words "laureata imago ... adlata est ... deliberavit diu an susciperet ... suscepit itaque imaginem" evoke nothing which corresponds to this but then, court ceremony was very far from being the main object of the treatise *De mortibus persecutorum*. All the same, both instances show that the *transmissio imaginis* in practice is equivalent to a request for recognition of imperial status. The Byzantine text shows that the confirmation of the legitimacy of the title to rule of the supplicating emperor (*ἐὰν δὲ βεβαιώσῃ τὴν βασιλείαν*) is the prerequisite for the exchange of courtesies and the transfer of the actual portraits. Once the emperor has decided to accept someone as a (necessarily junior) fellow-ruler, there are no difficulties. Deliberations concerning the crucial question of recognition were, no doubt, normally carried out in the wings. In the days of Leo

when the time factor may have been less pressing than during the agitations of the tetrarchies, delegations waiting to be admitted to the presence of the Divine ruler²⁶ can be expected to have negotiated the positive terms of the *amicitia*, which was to be sealed by the court ceremony. Lactantius records that Galerius hesitated whether or not he should accept Constantine in *societatem*. I believe that it is justified to assume that these deliberations did not take place openly, in the presence of the court, but during discussions with Constantine's emissaries behind the scenes. The political *amicitia* Lactantius speaks of does not sprout spontaneously out of the barren ground of tetrarchic troubles, nor was the *transmissio imaginis* simply a courier dashing along through the empire on a foaming horse with his master's portrait – or a master die of the portrait – in his saddle bag.

(2) There are several corollaries to the above interpretation of the ceremony of the presentation of the imperial portrait. The suppliant is always a junior ruler who wants his position to be legitimized. It is not a question of an exchange of portraits – the *imagines* of the senior emperor had long ago been communicated all over the empire. Galerius' portraits must have been known in the West as well in the East from the time he was nominated Caesar. When Galerius accepted the portraits of Constantine, he had them distributed all over the empire. As *maximus augustus* he had made a decision which was binding for Maximinus and Licinius also. We need not assume that delegations with Constantine's portraits had been sent separately to the junior rulers of the empire; in fact, negotiations between junior emperors in the ceremonial setting outlined by Constantine Porphyrogenitus would amount to conspiracy. However, when Galerius died, a new situation arose. I propose to deal with it presently.

(3) Behind the elaborate ceremonial connected with the presentation of the *imagines* lies, of course, the sacred character of the imperial portrait, the *sacri vultus* which were a guarantee of the authenticity of the coins, where they were depicted. Similarly the ima-

gines set up all over the empire in public places, or produced on solemn occasions, "sponsored" the administration in its dealing with the population. Likewise the medallic portraits fixed to the military *signa* represented the imperial presence which brought luck to the Roman arms and therefore were objects of worship also. Consequently, the *imagines*, which by the senior ruler were distributed *εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν πολιτείαν*²⁸ must have had a very large circulation indeed. I believe that the originals presented at the court were genuine ceremonial portraits, which subsequently were copied in different ways according to the future use of the portrait.²⁹

The following remarks concerning the distribution of imperial portraits in the years A.D. 311-313 may serve as a case study illustrating the application in practice of the theory just outlined.³⁰

I return now to my original field of inquiry, the vexed years which brought about the death

of the two last persecutors of the Christian faith, Galerius and Maximinus.

In order to clarify the background of the two years between Galerius' death in May 311 and Daza's in the Summer of 313, we should consider Constantine's position after the death of Maximian, senior augustus and Constantine's father-in-law.

Maximian had been a link with the legitimate ruling dynasty, the *gens Valeria*, after the abdications in A.D. 305 headed by Galerius. Originally Constantine was a usurper, although the imperial office had been forced upon him by the army acclaiming him *imperator* in accordance with the requirements of the constitution, on July 25, 306. Galerius had acknowledged him, though not as an augustus,³¹ but Constantine refused to be degraded to the rank of caesar. The old Heraculus now provided the young man with a means of compensation by marrying his daughter Fausta to him, thereby connecting him with

Key to page 127

(i) Coins ordered to be struck by Constantine.

1. Constantine as caesar. A.D. 306-307, Trier, argenteus, RIC vi, No 636. The reverse is *VIRTUS MILITVM*. This coin is from the sale catalogue Münzen und Medaillen, Basel 43, 454.

2. Constantine as augustus. A.D. 311-312, Trier, solidus, RIC vi, No 811. The reverse is *GAVDIVM REIPVBLICAE*. This coin from the sale catalogue Hess, Dec. 1933, 1027.

3. Constantine as augustus. A.D. 313, Arelate, solidus, RIC vii, No 6. The reverse is *VIRTVS AVGVSTI*. This coin from the Hess/Leu sale catalogue 36 (1968), 553.

(ii) Gold coins issued by Galerius at Thessalonica.

4. Constantine as *filius augustorum*. A.D. 309, aureus, RIC vi, No 28. The reverse is *CONSVL DD NN*. This coin from the sale catalogue Glendining, Nov. 1930, 2021.

(iii) Aurei issued by Licinius at Thessalonica.

5. Constantine as augustus. A.D. 310-313, RIC vi, No 44c. The reverse is *IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG*. This coin from the sale catalogue Münzen und Medaillen, Basel, 1967, 1509.

6. Licinius as augustus. A.D. 310-313, not in RIC vi, but belongs to the gold issue on pp. 516 sq. The reverse is *IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG*. This coin from the sale catalogue Glendining, Nov. 1950, 2018.

(iv) Aurei issued by Maximinus Daza at Antioch.

7. Constantine as augustus. A.D. 312, RIC vi, No 127b. The reverse is *CONSVL P P PROCONSVL*. This coin from the sale catalogue Münzen und Medaillen, Basel, 1967, 1513.

8. Maximinus as augustus. A.D. 311, RIC vi, No 127a. The reverse is *CONSVL P P PROCONSVL*. This coin from the sale catalogue Hess/Leu 49, 452.

The plate illustrates how Constantine, having grown up with the military hair-cut of his father (No 1) in Gaul adopted a hair dress of elaborately arranged locks and curls (No 2-3). Galerius, coining in A.D. 308-309 (No 4) and Licinius issuing coins in A.D. 311-312 (No 5) did not know - or employ - this new portrait, whereas Maximinus in Antioch contemporaneously uses it in his gold issues (No 7). The portrait of Licinius (No 6) and of Maximinus (No 8) serve the comparison of the portrait of Constantine with the one of the (actually coining) regional ruler.



the original tetrarchic dynasty. Moreover, Maximian as a member of this dynasty was, though officially retired, still capable of interceding in the affairs of the empire in the same way as Diocletian had done on several occasions. So, in conjunction with Fausta's marriage to Constantine, Maximian obviously invested his son-in-law with the divine power to rule, conferring upon him the rank of *augustus*. This day, December 25, 307, became Constantine's *natalis imperii*. This implied that he had broken his relations with Galerius — he had rejected Galerius' acceptance of him as a ruler of inferior rank. Consequently, Constantine had to reject the *dies imperii* of July 25, 306 acknowledged by Galerius.

From Constantine's *natalis imperii* as *augustus* at least to the death of Maximian, Maximian as a link to the divine *gens Valeria* was the ideological source and the legitimization of Constantine's imperial power. When Maximian died a rebel of the order established in Gaul, Constantine had to find a new justification and authorization of his position as emperor; at any rate it became imperative to be acknowledged by the rulers in the East. Therefore, Constantine took two as it would seem consecutive steps in order to confirm and motivate his status and his rank.³²

First he turned to Maximian in Antioch³³ — Galerius may by then have been dead or dying; his had been a long illness, the outcome of which would have been foreseen for a considerable time. Constantine's approach ended in the formation of a kind of alliance between the three rulers now left to share Galerius' heritage. There was *amicitia* and *imagines simul locantur* — at least on the coins. The usurper Maxentius in Italy, though brother-in-law of Constantine, of course remained outside the negotiations.

Secondly Constantine constructed a theory — or created the fiction — that his father Constantianus was a descendant of Claudius Gothicus, a worshipper of *Sol invictus*. This claim, which was accompanied by the abolition of the old reverse imagery on the coins in favour of *Sol*, superseded the previous fiction of his belonging to the divine tetrarchic dynasty

and constituted a clear rupture with tetrarchic ideas.

It may be vain to ponder the formal aspects of the reconciliation of Constantine to the eastern rulers as long as it appears impossible to establish in detail the strength, the influence and the contentions of the opposing parties, although certain features of the picture emerge very distinctly. Constantine wanted recognition, Daza the position as senior or *maximus augustus* and successor to Galerius. Licinius, at any rate, was in no bargaining position at all, discredited by his failure to reconquer Italy.

The coinage suggests that the overtures in the bargaining process were taken by Maximian³⁴ but there may have been several twists and turns in the talks between East and West before an acceptable compromise was found. There is, however, documentary evidence of one facet of the reconciliation. The new Constantinian portrait (figs. 2-3, cf. fig. 1) inaugurated in Gaul, characterized by an abundance of hair and by meticulously arranged locks at the forehead and the temples, was circulated all over the East at this time. How this came about is easily explained with reference to court ceremony — although such an explanation does not constitute any clear cut answer to the many questions concerning the causal relationship of the sequence of events.

After Galerius' death Maximian, despite Licinius' indisputable seniority as *augustus*, stood a good chance of acquiring the position of *maximus augustus* with some external support. After the overtures of Daza referred to above, it must have been very natural to Constantine to transmit to Daza his laureate images, thereby asking for recognition and for readmission to the tetrarchic community. The coins indisputably show that the request was granted (fig. 7, cf. fig. 8), the *imagines* circulated and the portraits publicized on the coin obverses. *Amicitia fit et imagines simul locantur*. The counterpart to Daza's acceptance of Constantine as legitimate *augustus* was, necessarily, Constantine's recognition of Maximian as *maximus augustus*.

It is not devoid of interest that the portrait

which circulated in the East does not appear contemporaneously in Licinius' part of the empire, although Licinius in these years was intermittently coining in the name of Constantine (fig. 5, cf. figs. 4, 6). Only after the conference at Milan in February 313 were the new Constantinian portraits introduced in the Balkan mints, but now the reason was that the Roman senate had conferred the *titulus primi ordinis* upon Constantine. In this situation Licinius preferred to yield gracefully to the authority of his, in formal respects, senior colleague in the hope of reaping a reward in the East at Maximian's expense instead of persisting in an attitude of overt grumbling.

Here it may be appropriate to add that no portrait of Maximian, the model of which can be traced back to the court engravers of Antioch, can be detected in the Constantinian issues in Gaul advertising the harmonious collaboration of Galerius' three successors. Again, this should permit the assumption that the *maximus augustus* did not condescend to have his *imagines* accepted by a junior ruler. Their existence and circulation was taken for granted. Conversely, the ceremony of the presentation of the *imagines laureatas* as described by Constantine Porphyrogenitus seems to apply only to a junior ruler petitioning for recognition. Consequently, the texts of Lactantius discussed above, concerns an exceptional procedure. It is not valid evidence for the common practice of communicating the features of rulers to regional courts and coining centres. An attentive study of the coin obverses in fact suggests that local artists had to content themselves with slight indications of the characteristics of the emperor to be depicted, such as "young", "clean-shaven", "aquiline nose". Otherwise the emperor, who was master of the mint, supplied the basic features of the portraits to be applied on the obverses (cf. figs. 5, 6).

In the end Constantine's new portrait won acceptance all over the empire, and introduced a new hairstyle in the Mediterranean world. In the same way as Constantine came to represent new political and religious ideas to posterity, so Julian, the pagan reactionary, could deride the external aspects of the first Chris-

tian emperor as characteristic of him and of his whole reign. But, had Constantine been nothing but an *ὀμοιωτός* and a *κομμορπία*, Julian would scarcely have deigned to mention him even in passing. The elaborate locks and curls adorning Constantine's forehead, temples and neck are therefore, for many reasons, a serious concern of the political historian also, and not merely of the chronicler of expressions of human vanity in times past.

NOTES

1. Caesares 335 B ed. Hertlein, p. 430,5 sqq.
2. Cedrenus I, p. 472,23 (Bonn) in fact tells us that his hair was straight and not very thick, and that his beard was sparse, growing in patches.
3. Cf. Vogt, Joseph, Kaiser Julian über seinen Oheim Constantin den Grossen. *Historia* 4 (1955), p. 348.
4. For the relation between the administrative division of the empire and the organization of the production of coins, cf. Hendy, M. F., Aspects of Coin Production and Fiscal Administration in the Late Roman and Early Byzantine Period. *Numismatic Chronicle* (1972), pp. 117-139 and, *idem*, Mint and Fiscal Administration under Diocletian, his Colleagues, and his Successors A.D. 305-324. *Journal of Roman Studies* (1972), pp. 75-82.
5. Otherwise the selection of coins may create the suspicion that they have been hand-picked to support preconceived ideas. Recently in Calza Raissa, *Iconografia romana imperiale da Carausio a Giuliano*, the *Iconografia monetale*, p. 90 sq. for instance of Diocletian, is supported with reference to gold coins from Trier along with other specimens from Alexandria or Tarragona (*sic!*) for a period from A.D. 290 to Diocletian's abdication, or even later. I have not been able to find any justification for this way of sampling the Diocletianic coin portraits.
6. Cf. Delbrück, Richard, Spätantike Kaiserporträts von Constantinus Magnus bis zum Ende des Westreichs (Studien zur spätantiken Kunstgeschichte 8), pp. 4-8.
7. Delbrück, op. cit., cf. p. 4 sq.; Alföldi, Maria R., Die constantinische Goldprägung, Mainz, 1963; Sydow, Wilhelm von, Zur Kunstgeschichte des spätantiken Porträts im 4. Jahrhundert n. Chr. *Antiquitas*, Reihe 3, Bd. 8 (1969).
8. Op. cit., pp. 1-4.
9. Cf. my Constantine's *Dies imperii* and *quinquennalia* in the Light of the Early Soli of Trier, *Numismatic Chronicle* (1969), pp. 177-205.
10. This right was granted to the tetrarchic junior rulers, the Caesars, from the very beginning, cf. Seaton, William, Diocletien et la tetrarchie I (Bibl. des

- Écoles franç. d'Athènes et de Rome 162), 1946, p. 236.
11. This right of the *imperatores caesares augusti* can be traced back to 44 B.C. when the Senate ordered the portrait of Caesar to be placed on the coins, Mattingly, H., *Roman Coins*, London, 1927, pp. 74 sq. Although the coin portraits of Caesar may not have been issued before his death, Sydenham, E. A., *The Roman Republican Coinage*, London, 1952, p. xxxviii, cf. also Babelon, J., *Le portrait dans l'Antiquité*, Paris, 1950, p. 107, his successors certainly made use of this prerogative.
 12. Seston, op. cit., pp. 235 sq.
 13. Sutherland, C. H. V., *Roman Imperial Coinage* (below abbreviated RIC) vi, London, 1967, p. 9 for the first tetrarchy, and further Seston, loc. cit.
 14. Sutherland, RIC vi, p. 88.
 15. *De moribus persecutorum* 25,1.
 16. 25,1 *Pauis post diebus laureata imago eius* (sc. Constantini) *adlata est ad malam bestiam. Deliberavit diu an suscipere...* 3. *Suscepit itaque imaginem admodum intus atque ipsi purpuram misit, ut ultro ascivisse illum in societatem videretur.*
 17. 42,1 *Eodemque tempore senis Maximiani statuæ Constantini iussu revellebantur et imagines ubicumque pictæ esset detrahebantur.*
 18. 43,3 *Et ipse* (sc. Maximinus) *legatos ad urbem misit occulte societatem Maxentii atque amicitiam postulatum. Scribit etiam familiariter. Recipiuntur legati benigne: fit amicitia, utriusque imagines simul locantur.*
 19. *De moribus persecutorum* 44,10.
 20. The passage in Lactantius entitles us to draw this conclusion regardless of the historicity of the alliance. The coins, i.e. the fact that obverses of Daza are absent in the coinage of Maxentius, at least in the years 311-312, and correspondingly that there are no obverses of Maxentius in the coinage of Maximinus, give us every reason to doubt the veracity of Lactantius' account. Professor Torben Christensen's recent analysis of the texts, including Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, in C. Galerius Valerius Maximinus. *Studier over politik og religion i romerriget 305-13. Festschrift udgivet af Københavns Universitet i anledning af Hendes Majestæt Dronningens fødselsdag 16. April 1974*, København, 1974, brilliantly shows that the alliance must have been an invention of the official propaganda of the Constantinian and/or Licinian court, cf. pp. 198 sqq. It is in this context a great pleasure for me to acknowledge my indebtedness to Prof. Christensen for many singularly stimulating thoughts expressed in his book. So Prof. Christensen is yet another instance of the give and take which has characterized the relations between Danish and Finnish classical scholarship and of which Per Krarup, to whom this paper is dedicated, always has been such an admirable exponent.
 21. Corp. Script. Hist. Byz. ed. Reiske, vol. I Bonn (1859), Chapter I, pp. 393-396.
 22. μηδέπω δεχθείς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐνταῦθα βασιλέως εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν.
 23. p. 395 sq.: τοῦ προστότου ἄρχοντος. Ἀνθρῖμου τὸν χαρακτῆρα ἐπὶ πολὺ ἐκδεξιμένοι νῦν ἀποδοθέντα, μεγάλην ἡμῖν εὐφροσύνην ἐνεποίησεν. διὰ τοῦτο θεῖα νεύσει τὸν αὐτὸν χαρακτῆρα τιμῶς πρὸς ἁρμονίαν πάντων τῶν λαῶν ταῖς ἡμετέραις εἰκόσιν κοινωνεῖν προστάσσομεν, ὥς ἀνῆσται αἱ πόλεις ἐνεὺφροσύνη διαγνώσκονται κοινωνούσας ἑκατέρων μερῶν τὰς ἐξουσίας, τῇ τε αὐτοῦ ἡμερότητι ἡμᾶς συνηθώσθαι."
 24. P. Cairo Cat. II n. 67183, cf. Stein, Ernst, *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Reiches*, Stuttgart, 1919, p. 26.
 25. Cf. Brehier, L., *Les institutions de l'Empire byzantin*, Paris, 1949, p. 73.
 26. Constantine Porphyrogenitus suggests that this happened regularly.
 27. Cf. for instance Codex Theodosianus VIII, 11.4 of Feb. 2, 383: *Quidquid nostrorum... sacros vultus inhiantibus coeperit prosperum... sacros vultus inhiantibus si forte populis inferemus, haec sine pretio munitiari excipique sanctimus.*
 28. Const. Porph., pp. 395, 17 sq.
 29. Generally, for the veneration of the imperial portraits, cf. Brehier, op. cit., pp. 72 sq.
 30. When considering the coin portraits it should be kept in mind that the wide distribution and the public display of *imagines laureatae* enabled the general public to identify the rulers on the coins. We are therefore entitled to assume a correlation between the public images and the coin portraiture.
 31. Lactantius, *De moribus persecutorum* 25,5: *sed illud excogitavit, ut Severum, qui erat actate maturior, Augustum nuncuparet, Constantinum vero non imperatorem, sicut erat factus, sed Caesarem cum Maximino appellari iubet, ut eum de secundo loco recederet in quartum.*
 32. Maximian died in A.D. 310 as is stated in Consularia Constantinopolitana (Mommesen, Chron. Min. I, p. 231) but very late in the year. This is a natural result of dating Constantine's *quinquennalia* in the year Dec. 25, 311-Dec. 24, 312 (cf. my Constantine's *Dies imperii*, referred to above; a closer discussion of the epigraphical sources and also of Constantine's restitution of July 25, 306 as his *dies imperii* is to be found in a forthcoming paper in *Archaeologia* 1976 "Constantine's Change of *Dies imperii*"). If the panegyric presented to Constantine in conjunction with the quinquennial celebrations was presented late in A.D. 311 and not in July 310, the sequence of events described by the speaker has to be adjusted accordingly if we can find corroborating evidence in other sources. Maximian's end can very well be dated in the way suggested above

types were created, HERCVLI VICTORI (RIC vi, Ant. 152) and IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG (RIC vi, Ant. 153a-c) which, decisively differing from the preceding monotonous hailing of *genii*, constitute a reversion to tetrarchic dynastic imagery. At Alexandria we find within the framework of a single issue (RIC vi, Alex. 124-130; 133-142) obverses of Licinius, Maximinus, Constantine and Galerius, the latter within the same mint mark appearing also on a series of consecration coins (RIC vi, Alex. 130). In this mark there appeared in addition a reverse created to commemorate the deceased ruler, BONO GENIO PII IMPERATORIS (RIC vi, Alex. 134a-138).

within the margin established by the Cons. Const. Licinius was scarcely implicated at an early stage. The final result of the negotiations was an alliance between all three rulers, as is eloquently demonstrated by the bronze coinage issued in all parts of the empire. Licinius was obviously forced to accept a settlement with his two colleagues acting in concert. Otherwise it is hard to understand why he yielded his position as oldest in rank to Maximinus and contented himself with the third place in the imperial college.

Of all the mints outside Constantine's realm, Daza were the only one to demonstrate a positive attitude to collegial co-operation prior to the death of Galerius in May 311. At Antioch two new reverse