



ILLiad TN: 81397

**Borrower:** TXM

**Lending String:** \*VXW,UCW

**Patron:** Clark, Victor

**Journal Title:** Museum notes.

**Volume:** 5 **Issue:**

**Month/Year:** 1952 **Pages:** 65-88

**Article Author:**

**Article Title:** Kraemer, Casper J., Jr. and Miles, Theodore G.; An Early Fourth Century Hoard from Egypt. ; Constantine I

**Imprint:** New York, American Numismatic Society,  
1

**ILL Number:** 30318501



**Call #:** CJ1 .A63 v.5

**Location:** Art AVAILABLE

**ARIEL**

**Charge**

**Maxcost:** Free

**Shipping Address:**

Middle TN State Univ. Lib.

Middle TN State Univ

Box 13 1500 Greenland Drive

Murfreesboro, TN 37132

**Fax:** (615) 898-5551

**Ariel:** 161.45.205.82

[ill@ulibnet.mtsu.edu](mailto:ill@ulibnet.mtsu.edu)

Vassar College Library  
VXW

## VASSAR COLLEGE LIBRARIES (VXW)

### Contact:

Lisa Parkinson

Phone (845) 437-5764

Fax (845) 437-5795

[liparkinson@vassar.edu](mailto:liparkinson@vassar.edu)

If there are any problems with this document, please let us know within 2 business days. Thank you.

ILL Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Borrower Symbol: \_\_\_\_\_

Ariel Address/Fax Number \_\_\_\_\_

Obscurity: \_\_\_\_\_

Please resubmit this page to us with needed corrections via Ariel or fax and we will make corrections as soon as possible.

## AN EARLY FOURTH CENTURY HOARD FROM EGYPT

This collection of bronze coins came to America in the spring of 1931, when it was offered for sale in New York by the well-known Syrian dealer, Azeez Khayat. It was described by Khayat as "found in Luxor," but this can mean little more than that it probably came from Egypt,\* a conclusion made reasonable by internal evidence. It was not complete, as "some coins" had been sold before the hoard left for this country and E. T. Newell, to whom the collection was first offered, purchased a select group. The rest, apparently without further diminution, were auctioned off by Thomas Elder as the "Luxor Hoard" in the course of four sales held in 1931 (July 1, Nov. 20, Dec. 18) and were purchased for the Washington Square College of New York University. In the course of these sales a few lots unfortunately were obtained by other bidders and the auctioneer refused to give information which might lead to the recovery of these lots. Consequently, there are at least 112 coins which are left without record unless the purchasers at the above sales are able to identify the missing lots.

Nov. 20, 1931, catalog pp. 6-8:

Lot 20 (10 coins), 21 (8), 22 (7), 63 (3). Total 28 coins.

\* "My recollection is that he *said* they came from Egypt, and they look like an Egyptian find. But he often buys his coins in Syria where he lives .... He buys most of his things in Cairo, a few in Alexandria, once in a while he travels up to Luxor. In any case, he buys only from dealers and agents, not from the peasants and finders directly. This does not apply, however, to things he buys in Palestine and Syria. There he frequently does buy directly from the finders, as he is at home there and travels up and down the country." E. T. Newell, letter, Aug. 4, 1933.

Nov. 21, 1931, catalog p. 50:

Lot 946 (8), 947 (8), 948 (15), 950 (10). Total 41 coins.

Dec. 18, 1931, catalog pp. 19-20:

Lot 295 (6), 297 (5), 298 (7), 300 (5), 302 (5), 305 (1), 306 (8), 308 (6). Total 43 coins.

In 1936 a single coin, which certainly belongs to the hoard, was acquired from the dealer and added to the collection, but no more have been traced. The hoard as studied here is therefore incomplete, but we do not believe that our conclusions are much affected by that fact. There is, on the contrary, every reason to suppose that all the missing coins, if found, would fit without difficulty into the list presented here.

The evidence for this conclusion is presented rather more fully than necessary both as an example of the way in which hoards may be distorted in the hands of dealers and as another instance of the sagacious critical method of E. T. Newell. We, like so many others, were so much indebted to Newell for his kindly, patient helpfulness that we are glad to pay this tribute to his memory. He pointed out to us, in a letter dated July 19, 1940, explained how he was able to detect intruded coins in the hoard as it came to us: "I *know* there were no coins of Constantius II and Constantius Gallus in the hoard! When I saw them in Khayat's possession they formed a compact little hoard running, in the main, from the last years of Maximinus Daza to about the time of the Licinius-Constantine war. I do not remember either the Severina — which I should certainly have "copped" if I had seen it! My invariable practice when picking from a hoard (i.e. not purchasing the lot *in toto*) is to make a selection of (a) the coins I lack, (b) all the earliest coins in the hoard (c) all the latest coins in the hoard. The earliest coin I saw was the single piece of Hercules. The latest coins I saw were the joint issues of Licinius and Constantine for Alexandria."

We have judged it best to list *all* the coins and in the light of the above data to indicate (+) those which in Newell's opinion were inserted into the hoard. Of these, the piece of Severina, the four of Constantine from Treves, and the last eight coins of the list are so obviously aberrant in date, type or patina that there can be no question at all. The argument for the omission of the three pieces of Constantine from Aretale is not so clear. Two of these have the soft green patina that is almost a hallmark of the group and the third has been cleaned. Date and mint are concordant and the only differentiating feature is the appearance of C/S. Newell was sure that he would have chosen these coins had he been offered them and wrote consequently that they were "almost certainly not in the hoard." Despite our own uncertainty we have followed his judgement and marked them with daggers.

Omitting these 16 coins, therefore, the authentic hoard now consists of 506 coins. Roughly a hundred of the 112 coins sold by Elder may be assumed also to belong to it. The hoard when it was brought to this country by Khayat, therefore, consisted of slightly more than 600 pieces. In the discussion which follows, we have dealt of course only with the 506 about which there can be no doubt. In the statistics the ancient forgery is also omitted.

Uniformity in type (laureate head obverse), size, and weight makes it clear that the hoard consisted for the most part of *folles*. This is the coin which in Diocletian's system of 295 A.D. supplanted the *antoninianus*, but which after rapid depreciation (the first "reduction" taking place in 307, the second in 311) was in its turn (314) supplanted as the principal bronze coin by the *nummus centenionalis* of Constantine. Two other changes in the monetary system of this period are important in connection with the hoard: the shift (on which the hoard throws light) from *denarius* to *nummus* as the basic unit some



On the latter the wash is spread over the whole coin, appearing in some places dull gold and in one spot on the reverse a lustrous green, quite different from the light powdery green exhibited so commonly elsewhere in this hoard. Pending chemical analysis it is unwise to lay much stress on this coin but several facts may be kept in mind. Lewis' hoard from Selz had an overwhelmingly Western provenience, contained no Alexandrian issues and was limited to the dates 295-307. West and Johnson, reserving judgement about coins smaller than the follis, report (p. 98) that "coins struck by Licinius and marked  $\frac{\cup}{\text{SMAL}}$  (17-20 mm; dated A.D. 317/18) sometimes occur with a definite silver wash." No. 401 is a Licinius coin minted in Alexandria. The mint mark is  $\frac{\text{K}}{\text{ALE}} \frac{\text{X}}{\text{A}}$  and the

date is 314-317 but size (20 mm.) and weight (3.4 gm.) are so exactly in accord with the statistics cited (p. 97) that there can be no doubt that this coin is of the type described by them and not analyzed by Lewis. It is also worthy of note that the three other coins on which the wash is apparent belong to this series. All are Alexandrian issues of Licinius, all are dated 314-317, and all have the IOVI CONSERVATORI reverse. The sizes are respectively 20, 19.13, 21 mm. and the weights 3.99, 4.13 and 3.69 gm.

Diameter and weight of the coins vary as follows:

|               |             |              |
|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| 1st reduction | 22-26 mm.   | 4.43-7.5 gm. |
| 2nd "         | 19.5-22 mm. | 3.13-6.7 "   |
| 3rd "         | 18-22.5 "   | 2.14-5.8 "   |

With these figures may be compared the statistics collected by West and Johnson *Currency in Roman and Byzantine Egypt* (1944) p. 97 of changes in the bronze coins issued at Alexandria:

## EARLY FOURTH CENTURY HOARD FROM EGYPT 71

|         |           |                    |
|---------|-----------|--------------------|
| 308-311 | 23-25 mm. | 6.64 gm. (average) |
| 312-313 | 19-21 "   | 4.92 "             |
| 314-317 | 17-20 "   | 3.45 gm. "         |

There are also substantially the same as those in Maurice I xl:

|     |           |            |
|-----|-----------|------------|
| 307 | 25-26 mm. | 7.50-8 gm. |
| 311 | 20-21 "   | 4-5 "      |

But the three sets of figures point out how inexact any tabulation based on these coins must necessarily be.

The types are normal and individually have no special interest. One only calls for comment. Originally issued in the name of Galerius it was overstruck with an obverse attributed to Licinius and an IOVI CONSERVATORI AVG reverse whose field  $\frac{\text{X}}{\text{B}}$  assigns it to Alexandria. Newell

suggested that it was an ancient forgery and in view of the barbaric style of its obverse and the crudity of its lettering we are content to adopt his view. Fourth century cast forgeries are rather common in Egypt but an overstrike of this sort may indicate either that the previous coin had been demonstrated or that the new coin was worth appreciably more than the original.

The distribution by rulers is as follows:

|                     |                      |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| Diocletian .....    | 1                    |
| Maximian .....      | 1                    |
| Galerius .....      | 6                    |
| Valeria .....       | 1                    |
| Maximinus II .....  | 89                   |
| Constantine I ..... | 194                  |
| Maxentius .....     | 2                    |
| Licinius I .....    | 211 (one overstruck) |

Study of the hoard from the viewpoint of imperial iconography substantiates Maurice's conclusions (I pp. 4-13) that the head on a coin is not necessarily that of the emperor to



[illegible]

In addition to mint marks and marks of value (see below) the coins display insignia which not infrequently served as symbols to recall or emphasize some aspect of imperial policy or of the emperor's reign. These are the palm branch, wreath, star, crescent, and altar.

The *palm branch* (in every instance but one accompanied by a star) is significantly confined to Alexandria in 312-313, when it appears on the GENIO AVGVSTI issues of Maximinus, Constantine and Licinius. Ten specimens (only one ascribed to Maximinus) have wreath added to star — these also are GENIO AVGVSTI and GENIO POPVLI ROMANI issues. The exclusive association of the palm branch with the Genius type and with the Egyptian mint point to some connection with the policy of Maximinus — perhaps an anticipation of his decennalia.<sup>6</sup>

The *wreath*, in addition to its association with the palm branch and star noted above, appears in 313-314 at Alexandria and Antioch in the *IOVI CONSERVATORI* issues of Constantine and Licinius and in 314-317 at Alexandria with the same types. The association of the corona with the *IOVI CONSERVATORI* type (all except the series with palm branch and star) would connect these coins closely with Licinius. However, since in a few instances it does appear with the palm branch, both symbols cannot mark the completion of five (or ten) years unless they refer to different emperors. Licinius in 313 was celebrating his quinquennalia (votis V on gold: Maurice III 183) the corona may refer to that event while the palm branch continues to anticipate the decennalia of Maximinus.<sup>7</sup> After the death of the latter, Licinius' issues,

<sup>6</sup> Maurice, III 181. Vows were sometimes celebrated in advance and may appear on the coins of the junior emperors although applying strictly to the senior alone (Mattingly 244).

<sup>7</sup> The Alexandria mint, as noted above, continued to use with slight modifications the head of Maximinus for that of Licinius. Is it possible that the palm-branch-corona series

with the exception of the palm-star-corona series, were restricted to the wreath alone.

The *star* as a symbol of divinity is closely related to emperor worship and is found in both east and west. It is associated in the west with Constantine's SOLI INVICTO type, since the coins on which it appears come from mints within his realm (in this hoard, Rome, Arelate, and Ticinum).

The exact significance of the *crescent* is as yet undetermined — it may be an obscure reference to Isis or Mithra and the eastern cults. With but three exceptions the coins of this group come from Antioch (310-311, Maximinus and Constantine) and bear, in addition to the crescent, an altar and GENIO EXERCITVS. The prevalence of eastern cults in the army makes this a natural connection. Even the three exceptions are closely related issues; Alexandria 311-313 GENIO AVGVSTI (Maximinus, Licinius).

The *altar* designates (Maurice III 223) a provincial centre of the imperial cult — in this hoard, Cyzicus and Aquileia (both represented by GENIO AVGVSTI coins of Maximinus 312-313) as well as Antioch (mentioned above). Its appearance is a reminder of Maximinus' attempt to set up a syncretism with emperor worship at its head.

In addition to the foregoing symbols it is quite possible that slogans are to be discerned in some of the letters current in Western mints: R|F and S|F at Rome, T|F at Arelate, F|T and S|F at Lugdunum, and T|F at Treveri. These abbreviations were resolved by Laffranchi<sup>8</sup> as ROMA FELIX, SAECVLI FELICITAS and TEMPORUM FELICITAS, an interpreta-

represents a parallel situation — namely, that the old Maximinus die with palm branch was used by Licinius who only added his corona? It will be noted that the preceding series (Maximinus) has the palm branch alone, the succeeding series (Licinius) only the corona.

<sup>8</sup> L. Laffranchi, *Concordia zwischen staatlichen Münzmeistern des IV. Jh. n. Ch. in NZ* 1925, 85 note 1.

tion preferable to that of Maurice (I 374) who saw in them references to the Flavian dynasty.

We do not venture at all into the vexing problem of the marks which have been taken as designations of value or monetary units. They are of the usual type. In Alexandria for example some of the issues of 307-312 contain K|P, K|X, X|, K|; those of 312-314 |N and |N| while on issues of 314-317 are found K|A<sup>X</sup> and its variants; on certain issues of Cyzicus and Nicomedia occurs the ligature GM. The hoard offers no new evidence and we are convinced by the argument of West and Johnson<sup>9</sup> that whatever their meaning it cannot be unit or value.

Although this modest hoard offers no great addition to our knowledge of fourth century coinage, it confirms some of the political and economic conclusions which have already been drawn. Thus the relatively large number of coins from the years 312-317 seems to point to great activity of mints to meet the costs of the succession of wars carried on throughout the empire (Constantine and Maxentius, Licinius and Maximinus, Constantine and Licinius). The paucity of western coins prior to 313 may well be due to the fact noted by Eusebius (viii. 15) that Maximinus put up trade barriers against western merchants in his realms by confiscating their goods and making them liable to treatment as spies. The provenience from western as well as eastern mints of the large number of coins dated 313-317 is indirect evidence for the reopening of Egypt to the western world by the reforms of Diocletian, and reinforces the view<sup>10</sup> that this reopening, as well as the standardization of the imperial coinage, brought about in Egypt a period of comparative prosperity. It may

<sup>9</sup> *Currenty in Roman and Byzantine Egypt*, Princeton 1944, pp. 98-102.

<sup>10</sup> Milne, "The Ruin of Egypt by Mismanagement," *Journal of Roman Studies* 17 (1927) 9; Mickwitz 110.



even be that the large proportion of coins from mints outside of Alexandria is evidence for the traffic in money (either importation of, or speculation in, copper coins) for which other evidence is available.<sup>11</sup>

But perhaps the most striking feature of this hoard is the evidence afforded by the distribution by mints. Thirty years after the reform of Diocletian, half of the coins still came from the mint at Alexandria and half of the rest from Rome (these last apparently in one shipment). The picture here presented may be compared with that presented by Milne's *A Hoard of Constantinian Coins from Egypt*.<sup>12</sup> The date of that large hoard (bought in the Fayoum) is 343-345; the proportion of Alexandrian is almost identical with those from Antioch (26%) while 34% come from the area about Constantinople. Milne's explanation of coin-drift as flowing through the normal channels of the great ports is very reasonable and applies as well to the "Luxor" as to the Fayoum hoard. The difference is only the fact that the "Luxor" importations into Egypt were funnelled largely from the Western mints through Rome while those of the Fayoum came from the East through Antioch. A comparison of the statistics from six<sup>13</sup> Egyptian hoards of the fourth century is instructive:

| Date    | Place    | Alexandrian mint |
|---------|----------|------------------|
| 310     | Denderah | 70%              |
| 317-320 | "Luxor"  | 50%              |
| 326     | Antinoe  | 47%              |
| 345     | Fayoum   | 26%              |
| 360     | "        | 44%              |
| 400     | "        | 35%              |

On the whole this presents another indication of the conser-

<sup>11</sup> Milne, *Coins from Oxyrhynchus* 162; Mickwitz 108-109.

<sup>12</sup> Note 2 above.

<sup>13</sup> Five of these from Milne *Coins from Oxyrhynchus* 61.

vatism of the Egyptians. Shortly after the opening of Egypt to imperial coinage an Egyptian hoarded 70% local coins, a proportion which steadily decreased to 26% a generation later and which then levelled off at a slightly higher figure. Into these statistics the "Luxor" hoard fits perfectly.

In the following list the coins are arranged according to emperor and mints. The following abbreviations and symbols have been used:

- C = Henry Cohen, *Description historique des monnaies frappées sous l'Empire romaine* 2nd edition, VI (1886), VII (1888), VIII (1892). The volumes are cited in the text by Arabic rather than Roman numerals.
- M = Jules Maurice, *Numismatique constantiniennne*. Paris, 1908-1912, Vols. I-III.
- MS = Mattingly and Sydenham, *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, V<sup>2</sup> (by Percy Webb), 1923-38.
- NZ = Otto Voetter, articles in *Numismatische Zeitschrift*, 1901, 1911, 1917, 1918, 1920, 1923, 1925, 1926.
- † = coin from the collection of Edward T. Newell, and now in the American Numismatic Society. All other coins are in the possession of the Washington Square College of New York University.
- ‡ = coin purchased as part of the hoard but rejected for reasons stated in the text.

Our indebtedness to Mr. Newell will be apparent to readers of this monograph and we owe it to him to state that he did not see the final draft of the manuscript and cannot be held responsible for errors which it may well contain. We wish also to extend to Mr. Sydney P. Noe our thanks for the encouragement and assistance rendered us at the American Numismatic Society.

## LIST OF COINS IN HOARD

SEVERINA. *Cyzicus*. C 6, MS 249  $\left(\frac{1}{XXI}^{\dagger}\right)$ MAXIMIANUS HERCULIUS. *Cyzicus*. C 499, MS 291  $\left(\frac{E}{XXI}^{\dagger}\right)$ DIOCLETTIAN. *Antioch*. C 421, NZ. 1917. 19  $\left(\frac{\Delta}{ANT}^{\dagger}\right)$ GALERIUS. *Alexandria*. C 22, NZ. 1911. 174  $\left(\frac{B}{ALE}\right)$ ; C 47,NZ. 1911. 178  $\left(\frac{K|F}{ALE}, \frac{K|\Delta}{P}\right)$ *Nicomedia*. C 42, M 10-12  $\left(\frac{1}{SMNA}\right)$ *Cyzicus*. C 47, M 92-98  $\left(\frac{S}{MKV}, \frac{\Delta}{MKV}^{\dagger}\right)$ VALERIA. *Alexandria*. C 9, NZ. 1911. 180  $\left(\frac{1}{ALE}, \frac{F}{P}^{\dagger}\right)$ MAXIMINUS II. *Alexandria*. C 40, NZ. 1911. 177-8 $\left(\frac{K|A}{P}, \frac{X|F}{P}, \frac{K|S}{P}\right)$ ; C 49  $\left(\frac{K|F}{ALE}\right)$ ;C 202  $\left(\frac{K|B}{ALE}, \frac{K|E}{P}^{\dagger}\right)$ ; C 52  $\left(\frac{K|F}{ALE}, \frac{K|S}{P}\right)$ ;C 2  $\left(\frac{1}{ALE}, \frac{F}{P}^{\dagger}\right)$ ; C 17, NZ. 1911. 180-1  $\left(\frac{X|A}{ALE}, \frac{X|B}{ALE}\right)$ 

$$\begin{array}{c} * \\ N|B \\ \frac{3}{ALE} \end{array}, \begin{array}{c} * \\ N|F \\ \frac{4}{ALE} \end{array}, \begin{array}{c} * \\ N|\Delta \\ \frac{5}{ALE} \end{array}, \begin{array}{c} * \\ N|E \\ \frac{7}{ALE} \end{array}, \begin{array}{c} * \\ N|S \\ \frac{3}{ALE} \end{array}, \begin{array}{c} * \\ N|Z \\ \frac{6}{ALE} \end{array},$$

$$\begin{array}{c} * \\ N|H \\ \frac{8}{ALE} \end{array}, \begin{array}{c} * \\ N|Z \\ \frac{8}{ALE} \end{array}$$
*Antioch*. C 202, NZ. 1917. 18-19  $\left(\frac{\Delta}{ANT}, \frac{O}{ANT}^{\dagger}\right)$ ; C 157,NZ. 1917. 19  $\left(\frac{A}{ANT}^{\dagger}\right)$ ; C 47, NZ. 1917. 7  $\left(\frac{1}{ANT}, \frac{1}{ANT}^{\dagger}\right)$ , $\frac{1}{ANT}, \frac{1}{ANT}^{\dagger}$ ; C 21, NZ. 1917. 21. 8  $\left(\frac{2}{ANT}, \frac{2}{ANT}^{\dagger}\right)$ , $\frac{1}{ANT}, \frac{1}{ANT}^{\dagger}$ ; C 21, NZ. 1917. 21. 8  $\left(\frac{2}{ANT}, \frac{2}{ANT}^{\dagger}\right)$ , $\frac{2}{ANT}, \frac{2}{ANT}^{\dagger}$ ; C. 116, NZ. 1917. 21. 8  $\left(\frac{1}{ANT}, \frac{1}{ANT}^{\dagger}\right)$ ; C 214,NZ. 1917. 21. 8  $\left(\frac{1}{ANT}, \frac{1}{ANT}^{\dagger}\right)$ ; C 216  $\left(\frac{2}{ANT}, \frac{2}{ANT}^{\dagger}\right)$ ; C. 161, NZ,1917. 21. 8  $\left(\frac{A}{ANT}, \frac{E}{ANT}^{\dagger}\right)$ ;*Nicomedia*. C 34, M. 3. 10-12  $\left(\frac{1}{SMNA}, \frac{1}{SMNB}, \frac{1}{SMNF}\right)$ ;C 118 M. 3. 20-23  $\left(\frac{1}{SMN}, \frac{1}{SMN}^{\dagger}\right)$ ;

$$C 161 \left( \begin{array}{c|c} * & \dagger \\ \hline \Gamma & \hline \hline \text{SMN} \end{array} \right); C 216 \left( \begin{array}{c|c} * & \dagger \\ \hline \text{Z} & \hline \hline \text{SMN} \end{array} \right).$$

$$Cyzius. C 29, M. 3. 105-7 \left( \begin{array}{c|c} \Delta & \dagger \\ \hline \text{SMK} & \hline \hline \text{SMK} \end{array} \right), \frac{|S|}{\text{SMK}} \dagger; C 34$$

$$\left( \begin{array}{c|c} |S| & \dagger \\ \hline \text{MKV} \end{array} \right)$$

$$Aquilaia. C 30, M. 308-309 \left( \begin{array}{c|c} | & \dagger \\ \hline \text{AQS} \end{array} \right)$$

$$Rome. C 181, NZ. 1925. 18 \left( \begin{array}{c|c} | & \dagger \\ \hline \text{RP} \end{array} \right)$$

$$Ostia. C 167, M. 1. 282-7 \left( \begin{array}{c|c} | & \dagger \\ \hline \text{MOSTT} \end{array} \right)$$

$$\text{MAXENTIVS. Rome. C 21, NZ. 1925. 14-16} \left( \begin{array}{c|c} | & \dagger \\ \hline \text{RES} & \hline \hline \text{RET} \end{array} \right) \dagger$$

CONSTANTINUS I. *Alexandria*. FL VALER CONSTANTINVS PF AVG; *Rev.* IOVI CONSERVATORI, Jupiter. Not in C. or M; type in NZ. 1911. 8 but field has  $\frac{|S|}{\text{ALE}}$   $\left( \frac{|S|}{\text{ALE}} \right)$ ;

$$C 172, NZ. 1911. 180-1 \left( \begin{array}{c|c} * & \dagger^{(1)} \\ \hline \text{N} & \hline \hline \text{A} \end{array} \right), \frac{10}{\text{ALE}} \frac{|N|}{\text{ALE}}, \frac{2}{\text{ALE}} \frac{|N|}{\text{ALE}} \left( \begin{array}{c|c} * & \dagger^{(1)} \\ \hline \text{H} & \hline \hline \text{ALE} \end{array} \right);$$

$$C 172, NZ. 1911. 180-1 \left( \begin{array}{c|c} * & \dagger^{(1)} \\ \hline \text{B} & \hline \hline \text{N} \end{array} \right), \frac{2}{\text{ALE}} \frac{|B|}{\text{ALE}}, \frac{2}{\text{ALE}} \frac{|E|}{\text{ALE}} \left( \begin{array}{c|c} * & \dagger^{(1)} \\ \hline \text{H} & \hline \hline \text{ALE} \end{array} \right);$$

$$C 235, NZ. 1911. 180-1 \left( \begin{array}{c|c} * & \dagger \\ \hline \text{B} & \hline \hline \text{N} \end{array} \right), \frac{2}{\text{ALE}} \frac{|B|}{\text{ALE}}, \frac{|E|}{\text{ALE}}, \frac{|E|}{\text{ALE}} \left( \begin{array}{c|c} * & \dagger \\ \hline \text{N} & \hline \hline \text{ALE} \end{array} \right);$$

$$C 236, NZ. 1911. 180-1 \left( \begin{array}{c|c} \text{N} & \Delta \\ \hline \text{N} & \hline \hline \text{ALE} \end{array} \right), \frac{|N|}{\text{ALE}}, \frac{|S|}{\text{ALE}}, \frac{|Z|}{\text{ALE}} \left( \begin{array}{c|c} \text{N} & \Delta \\ \hline \text{N} & \hline \hline \text{ALE} \end{array} \right);$$

FL VALER CONSTANTINVS PF AVG *Rev.* IOVI CONSERVATORI, Jupiter I. with scepter, etc., eagle Not in C. without corona.  $\left( \frac{|N|}{\text{ALE}}, \frac{|S|}{\text{ALE}}, \frac{|Z|}{\text{ALE}} \right)$ ;

$$C 297, NZ. 1911. 181 \left( \begin{array}{c|c} | & \dagger \\ \hline \text{A} & \hline \hline \text{N} \end{array} \right), \frac{5}{\text{ALE}} \frac{|A|}{\text{ALE}}, \frac{2}{\text{ALE}} \frac{|B|}{\text{ALE}}, \frac{4}{\text{ALE}} \frac{|F|}{\text{ALE}},$$

$$\frac{3}{\text{ALE}} \frac{|A|}{\text{ALE}}, \frac{2}{\text{ALE}} \frac{|E|}{\text{ALE}}, \frac{|S|}{\text{ALE}}, \frac{3}{\text{ALE}} \frac{|Z|}{\text{ALE}}, \frac{5}{\text{ALE}} \frac{|H|}{\text{ALE}} \left( \begin{array}{c|c} | & \dagger^{(1)} \\ \hline \text{H} & \hline \hline \text{N} \end{array} \right); C 297,$$

$$M. 3. 260-264, \left( \begin{array}{c|c} \text{K} & \text{X} \\ \hline \text{A} & \hline \hline \text{ALE} \end{array} \right), \frac{2}{\text{ALE}} \frac{|K|}{\text{ALE}}, \frac{3}{\text{ALE}} \frac{|B|}{\text{ALE}}, \frac{6}{\text{ALE}} \frac{|X|}{\text{ALE}},$$

$$\frac{5}{\text{ALE}} \frac{|K|}{\text{ALE}}, \frac{|B|}{\text{ALE}}, \frac{|X|}{\text{ALE}} \left( \begin{array}{c|c} | & \dagger^{(1)} \\ \hline \text{X} & \hline \hline \text{ALE} \end{array} \right)$$

$$\text{Antioch. C 47} \left( \begin{array}{c|c} \text{E} & \dagger \\ \hline \text{ANT} & \hline \hline \text{ANT} \end{array} \right); C 507, NZ. 1917. 20. 8 \left( \begin{array}{c|c} \text{Z} & * \\ \hline \text{ANT} & \hline \hline \text{ANT} \end{array} \right);$$

$$C 297, NZ. 1917. 21. 8 \left( \begin{array}{c|c} \text{B} & \dagger \\ \hline \text{ANT} & \hline \hline \text{ANT} \end{array} \right), \frac{|B|}{\text{ANT}}, \frac{|I|}{\text{ANT}}, \frac{|I|}{\text{ANT}}, \frac{|I|}{\text{ANT}},$$



$$7 \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline \Delta \\ \hline N \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ALE}}, 21 \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline E \\ \hline N \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ALE}}, 4 \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline S \\ \hline N \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ALE}}, 12 \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline Z \\ \hline N \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ALE}}, 7 \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline H \\ \hline N \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ALE}};$$

$$\text{C. 108, M. 3. 260-4} \left( 11 \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline K \\ \hline X \\ \hline A \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ALE}}, 15 \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline K \\ \hline X \\ \hline B \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ALE}} \right); \text{C 108, M. 3.}$$

$$260-4, \left( 7 \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline K \\ \hline A \\ \hline X \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ALE}}, 12 \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline K \\ \hline B \\ \hline X \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ALE}} \right).$$

$$\text{Antioch. C 35, NZ. 1917. 20. 8} \left( \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline B \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ANT}}, 2 \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline H \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ANT}}, 2 \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline I \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ANT}}, \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline B \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ANT}}, \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline E \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ANT}} \right); \text{C 200, NZ. 1917. 20. 8} \left( \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline H \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ANT}} \right);$$

$$\text{C 160, NZ. 1917. 20. 8} \left( \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline E \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ANT}} \right); \text{C 123, NZ. 1917. 21. 8}$$

$$\left( \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline E \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ANT}}, \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline B \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ANT}}, \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline A \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ANT}} \right); \text{C 108, NZ. 1917. 21. 8}$$

$$\left( \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline T \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ANT}}, \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline E \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ANT}}, \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline Z \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ANT}}, \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline H \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ANT}}, \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline B \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ANT}}, \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline E \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{ANT}} \right)$$

$$\text{Nicomedia. C 37, M. 3. 15-18} \left( \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline A \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{SMN}} \right); \text{C 64, M. 3. 25.}$$

$$\left( \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline A \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{SMN}}, \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline B \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{SMN}}, \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline Z \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{SMN}} \right).$$

*Cyzicus.* VAL LICINNIANVS LICINNIVS P F AVG

*Rev.* SOLE IN VICTO Sol with head of Serapis  $\left( \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline S \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{MKV}} \right)$

Not in C; M. 3. 99-102 has exergue and field but not

legend, 110 has legend but  $\frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline S \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{MK}}$ ; C. 38, M. 3. 99-102

$\left( \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline V \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{MKVE}}, \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline E \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{MKVE}} \right); \text{C 37, M. 3. 100-1} \left( \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline H \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{SMK}} \right) \text{C 70, MS.}$

3. 110-2  $\left( \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline A \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{SMK}}, 2 \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline B \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{SMK}} \right); \text{C. 64, M. 3. 112-5} \left( \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline I \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{SMK}} \right)$

*Heraclea.* C 108, M. 2. 565-7  $\left( \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline A \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{SMHT}} \right)$

*Siscia.* C 65, NZ. 1920. 108  $\left( \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline E \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{SIS}}, \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline B \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{SIS}} \right)$

*Aquileia.* C 107, NZ. 1923. 7-8  $\left( \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline A \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{QGT}} \right)$

*Rome.* C 165, NZ. 1925. 18  $\left( \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline R \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{Q}} \right); \text{C 162, NZ. 1925. 20}$

$\left( 2 \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline R \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{RP}}, \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline S \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{RS}}, 4 \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline R \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{RQ}}, \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline R \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{RQ}}, 3 \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline R \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{RP}}, 4 \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline R \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{RS}}, \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline R \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{RQ}}, \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline S \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{RQ}} \right)$

$\frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline R \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{RQ}}, \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline S \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{RQ}} \right)$

*Ostia.* C 49, M. 1. 283  $\left( \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline M \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{MOST}} \right); \text{C 165} \left( \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline M \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{MOSTQ}} \right)$

*Arelate.* C 163, M. 2. 140-7  $\left( \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline S \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{PARL}} \right)$

*Ticinum.* C 163, M. 2. 247-50  $\left( \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \{ \\ \hline P \\ \hline \end{array}}{\text{PT}} \right)$

*Forgery.* Apparently over-struck on earlier coin. The second strike is an Alexandrian IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG

obverse to Licinius, but the coin was originally issued in the name of Galerius. For attribution as forgery see above p. 69.

$$\left( \begin{array}{c} \text{X} \\ \text{B} \end{array} \right)^{+}$$

CONSTANTIUS II. *Antioch*. C 44, NZ. 1917.23  $\left( \frac{\Gamma}{\text{ANA}} \right)^{+}$

*Cyzicus*. C 44, NZ. 1917.23  $\left( \frac{\Gamma}{\text{SMK?}} + \frac{\Gamma}{\text{SMKS}} + \frac{\Gamma}{?} \right)^{+}$

*Constantinople*. Matingly pl. 59, 13, NZ. 1917, 21-32

$$\left( \frac{\text{CONSH}}{\text{CONSH}} \right)^{+}$$

CONSTANTIUS GALLUS. *Alexandria*. C 7, NZ. 1917.21-32  $\left( \frac{\text{ALEB}}{\text{ALEB}} \right)^{+}$

$$\frac{\text{S.} \left| \begin{array}{c} + \\ \text{S.} \end{array} \right|^{+}}{\text{ALEA} \text{ , } \text{ALE}[\cdot]^{+}}$$

CASPER J. KRAEMER, JR. AND THEODORE G. MILLES

## A SOLIDUS OF ARTAVASDUS

(SEE PLATE XV)

Early in 1949 the Museum purchased an extremely rare Byzantine solidus, a piece bearing the name of the usurping general and brother-in-law of Constantine V, Artavasdus, an image-worshipper who, with his two sons, attempted to displace the iconoclastic emperor and failed, after having actually held Constantinople for some time.<sup>1</sup>

*Obv.* Bust of Artavasdus wearing crown with cross; beneath crown, his hair in four curls across forehead, wavy locks hanging down on either side; beard on cheeks and chin. Artavasdus' robe is represented by vertical lines; brooch and ties on r. shoulder. In his right hand he holds patriarchal cross half-way across his breast.<sup>2</sup> His left hand is invisible. Cable border. Around rim, 1 to r.,  $\text{CAPTA} \text{YA} \text{ SDO} \text{SMQLT}$ .<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A full account of the course and issue of the revolt is to be found in chapt. III of A. Lombard's *Études d'histoire Byzantine, Constantine V, Empereur des Romains (740-775)*, *Bibliothèque de la Faculté des Lettres*, Paris, 1903, pp. 22-30. For brief accounts of this interlude in the reign of Constantine V, see A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire (University of Wisconsin Studies in the Social Sciences and History no. 13)*, Madison, 1928, pp. 317-318, and for a general survey of the iconoclastic era, pp. 307-324; 342-365; and from the point of view of the West, E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, II (Berlin, 1933), pp. 738-739. Recently T. Wittenmore (*Orientalia Christiana Periodica* XIII, 1947, 1-2, Miscell. G. Jerphanion, pp. 376-383: "An Unpublished Byzantine Seal," a reference for which I am indebted to Mr. James Breckenridge), has given a brief account of Artavasdus' career.

<sup>2</sup> The patriarchal cross had previously appeared on coins of Justinian II and his son Tiberius (*BMC*. II, pp. 355-357) and Theodosius III (*BMC*. II, pp. 363-364). Under Theophilus it was used as a reverse type (*BMC*. II, pp. 419, 427). For its subsequent use as a type see *BMC*. II, index, p. 653.

<sup>3</sup> On this abbreviated acclamation wishing long life to the Emperor, see *BMC*. II, p. 332, note 1. In the records of the Councils of this period there are instances of similar acclamations (Cabrol, *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie et de Liturgie Chrétienne, s.v. Acclamations*, col. 244), and a precedent for this form of acclamation can be found in the life of Severus Alexander in the collection of imperial biographies known to us as the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, X, 8: *multis annis imperes*. Other acclamations occur in these biographies, but they usually take a different form such as *di te servent*.