e Interlibrary Loan	
College	1397
Vassar	iad TN: 8

Borrower: TXM

Lending String: *VXW,UCW

Patron: Clark, Victor

Journal Title: Museum notes.

Volume: 5 Issue:

Month/Year: 1952Pages: 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,

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

Vassar College Library

VASSAR COLLEGE LIBRARIES (VXW)

Contact:

Lisa Parkinson Phone (845) 437-5764 Fax (845) 437-5795 liparkinson@vassar.edu

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

ILL Number:	 <u> </u>				
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

AN EARLY FOURTH CENTURY HOARD FROM EGYPT

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

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

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

^{* &}quot;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.

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

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

time after 301; and the substitution by Constantine of the solidus (1/72 of the gold pound) for the aureus (1/60 of the pound).

The distribution of the hoard by periods and by mints is apparent in the following table.

	Treveri	Ticinum	Siscia	Rome	Ostia	Nicomedia	Lugdunum	Heraclea	Cyzicus	Carthage	Arelate	Aquileia	Antioch	Alexandria				STNIM			
=						•••			н						293						
<u>-</u>				и						н					306/8	305/6					
9			-											9	307						
23						4			2			I	10	6	293 306/8 307/308/11	308/10	308/9	307/11	310/11	310	
S		υr														309/13					
9			н			ı			ω					4	311/12						DATES
33													33		311/13						ŒS
79				6	4	υı	I	H	ယ			H		57	312/13	312					
129						6	N		7		21		14	79	313/14	313					
36 /				6										30	312/17	313/15					
36 / 178	=	н		114					I					61	311/12 311/13 312/13 313/14 312/17 315/17	313/15/314/17	313/17 101.				,
505		6	, 1)	128	4	16	,ω	н	17	н	21	13.	57	246			101.	3			

The table bears out Newell's description "a compact little hoard." The bulk of the coins were minted in 312-317. Only four pre-date the "first reduction of the follis in 307 and all but forty-one (perhaps fewer) postdate the second reduction in 311. The date of burial seems clearly indicated as later than 317 and earlier than 320. This is somewhat later than Newell's estimate. In a pencilled note on a draft of this manuscript he

remarked: "This was when the hoard was buried if we follow Maurice. Personally I think the hoard was buried circa 314/5 during the war between Licinius and Constantine. It is well known that Maurice's dates are frequently wrong." There is no point in speculating about the hoarder's motive, as in Egypt the urge to bury his savings has always been inordinately strong² and even if the date is 314/5 there is no reason for connecting it with war or political disturbance.

The coins have been struck from cast flans which are far more frequently elliptical than round. No attention was paid to the relative positions of obverse and reverse dies. Deep fissures point to uneven hammer blows. On the whole there is evidence of haste and carelessness in minting — perhaps an indication of the comparatively small value of the coin.

A green patina is present on practically all the specimens. One group from Alexandria, however, is almost mint-new and seems to have come into the possession of the owner shortly after coinage and distribution. On many of the coins occurs the characteristic silvery sheen which Lewis³ has demonstrated to be due to impurities in the metal. Since the publication of Lewis' convincing argument against the "silver-washed" follis it has been easy to explain away coins with some surface appearance of silver and to deny the practice of washing altogether. There are several coins in this hoard in which the trace remaining is provocative and one in which it is unmistakable.

¹ See in general Harold Mattingly, Roman Coins, New York 1928, pp. 223-228; Jules Maurice, Numismatique constantinienne, Paris 1908, I pp. xxxviii, xli-xliii, lxxix; Gunnar Mickwitz, Geld und Wirtschaft im römischen Reich des vierten Jahrhunderts, Helsingfors 1932, p. 85.

² J. G. Milne has stated this fact definitively in his discussion of the Fayoum hoard in the Yournal International d'Archeologie Numismatique 6 (1914) 1-27. He points out (26): "Probably the money in circulation in Egypt was constantly being depleted by the burial of large hoards: to this day the Egyptian prefers to bury his money... the number and size of the deposits of Graeco-Roman times which have been discovered in recent years are enormous: on the information which has reached me it would seem within the mark to say that during the last quarter of a century not less than three million ancient coins and possibly very many more, have come to light."

N. Lewis, A Hoard of Folles from Seliz (Alsace) with a Supplement on the Chemical Composition of the Folles by David Lewis (1937), pp. 76-81. Mickwitz (83-84) considered the presence of silver significant in relation to the value of the coin.

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

coin minted in Alexandria. The mint mark is K X and the

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

Diameter and weight of the coins vary as follows: 1st reduction 22-26 mm. 4.43-7.5 gm.

With these figures may be compared the statistics collected by 18-22.5 ,, 19.5-22 mm. 2.14-5.8 ,, 3.13-6.7 ,,

(1944) p.97 of changes in the bronze coins issued at Alexandria: West and Johnson Currency in Roman and Byzantine Egypt

EARLY FOURTH CENTURY HOARD FROM EGYPT

71

There are also substantially the same as those in Maurice I xl: 311 307 314-317 312-313 17-20 " 25-26 mm.20-21 ,, 7.50-8 gm. $3.45 \mathrm{gm}$. 6.64 gm. (average)

tion based on these coins must necessarily be-But the three sets of figures point out how inexact any tabula-

may indicate either that the previous coin had been demoneare rather common in Egypt but an overstrike of this sort are content to adopt his view. Fourth century cast forgeries suggested that it was an ancient forgery and in view of the reverse whose field but able to Licinius and an IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG the name of Galerius it was overstruck with an obverse attritized or that the new coin was worth appreciably more than barbaric style of its obverse and the crudity of its lettering we interest. One only calls for comment. Originally issued in The types are normal and individually have no special B assigns it to Alexandria. Newell

the original. Diocletian The distribution by rulers is as follows:

Maxentius Constantine I 194 Maximinus II 89 Valeria

Galerius

Maximian

Licinius 1....

....... 211 (one overstruck)

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

often represented by the head of the recently deceased emand that emperors in whose name money was issued were emperors are faithful when minted within their own realms, whom the coin is ascribed, that portraits of the reigning an exchange of statues was not always immediately made) peror, or by a stylized portrait of the sovereign emperor (since not changed, save for a reduction in the size of face and neck, was dead, but even as late as 317 the mint at Alexandria had lost Egypt to Licinius, and in the autumn of the same year One exception may be pointed out: in May 313 Maximinus II the representation of Maximinus to that of Licinius.

but also because of the tendency to develop regional types. not only because of variations in the imperial nomenclature nose joins the forehead at another angle, brows are heavy and head and forehead come together at a sharp angle, a small characteristics: features are regular though not handsome, The portraits of the Illyrian emperors display similar facial Identification of the portraits in this hoard is quite easy,

where emperor worship was particularly stressed.⁵ Maximinus stantine and Licinius, and fall, roughly, into four categories. natural that most (70 out of 110) of these coins, with their used the imperial cult as a foil to Christianity, and it is perhaps gives evidence of the importance placed on the slogan by adoption into the Jovian dynasty it advertises. Our hoard eastern, is most characteristic of Licinius (147 out 211) whose IOVI CONSERVATORI type, exclusively (with but one exception) unmistakable pagan connotations, are ascribed to him. The The GENIVS coins are with two exceptions from eastern mints, Licinius, for every one of his coins issued from Alexandria The great bulk of the coins are issues of Maximinus, Con-

EARLY FOURTH CENTURY HOARD FROM EGYPT

alike. It is particularly common in the realm of Maximinus. assumed descent, from Claudius Gothicus. With eight ex-SOLI INVICTO coins (116 out of 165) belong to Constantine, after his conquest of Egypt is of this type. Two thirds of the EXERCITVS coinage is, naturally enough in a state dominated ceptions they come from Constantine's territory, the west. The whose patron deity Apollo was taken over, together with his by the army, used for propaganda purposes by all the emperors

associated with different emperors, but each of these was also tine and Licinius (abbreviated respectively, M, C and L): bution, by types and mints, of the coins of Maximinus, Constanto his co-emperors. The following table summarizes the distrition from the ratio of coins issued by an emperor in his realm The fact that our hoard is incomplete precludes all generalizaperforce issued by the emperor in the name of his co-emperors. Of the four chief types, therefore, three are particularly

GENIO IMPERATORIS	GENIO EXERCITVS	GENIO CAESARIS	GENIO AVGVSTI	CONSERVATORES KART SVAE	BONO GENIO PII IMPERATORIS	
ro⊠	۲o≍	F 0 X		Fo≅	F C ⊠	
ω ω	i ·	ω	34 3 3	<u> </u>	H 3	ALE
	1 2		7			ANT
			μ ω			NIC
			ωω			CYZ
						HER
			1			SIS
			H			AQV
						ROM
-						OST
				1		KART
						ARE
						LVG
•						TRE
						TIC
	H ∪1	l w	56 16		н з	TOTAL

⁵ Cambridge Ancient History XII, pp. 349, 351, 418, 680; for the association with Mithra see Cumont, Les Religions orientales dans le Paganism romain, 139.

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 forvli 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.

CONSERVATORI

T C M

AVGG NN

AVGG IOVI

MARTI

Ŋ

CONSERVATORI

CONSERVATORI

L

CONSERVATORI

ယယယ

IVOI

GENIO POPVLI ROMANI GENIO POP ROM

ALE ANT NIC

CYZ
HER
SIS
AQV
ROM
OST
KAST
ARE
LVG
TRE

TOTAL

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 rovi conservatori issues of Constantine and Licinius and in 314-317 at Alexandria with the same types. The association of the corona with the rovi 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. After the death of the latter, Licinius' issues,

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

⁷ 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

			•				
	TOTALS	VIRTVTI EXERCITVS	VIRTVS EXER- CITVS	S.P.Q.R. OPTIMO PRINCIPI	SOLI INVICTO COMITI	SOLI INVICTO	SOLE INVICTO
	ro≰	F∩⊠	FC₹	F o ₹	F∩¤	ro≅	FOX
ALE	M 42 C 66 L 131		и				
ANT	31 7 18	1 3	и			ннω	н
NIC	× ω 4	, 1				H	
CYZ	ထယ ယ						=
HER	H						
SIS	ы						
AQV	н н						
ROM	85 40			ннн	84 39		
OST	2 = =	-		н	, = =		
KART	нн				H		
ARE	23				23		
LVG	ω				ω		
TRE	н				H		
TIC	H Vs				нω		
TOTAL	198	4 10	4	2 - 2	115 41	4 11 1	н
				a, an in the state of the state		en orașe a pendedese dele	e inspense Meridia di ma

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 exercitys. 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 AVGUSTI 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 Laffranchi⁸ as roma felix, saeculi 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.

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 $\frac{K|P}{N}$, $\frac{K|X}{N}$, $\frac{K|}{N}$, those of $\frac{312-314}{N}$ and $\frac{N}{N}$ while on issues of $\frac{N}{N}$ and its variants; on certain issues of Cyzicus and Nicomedia occurs the ligature $\frac{N}{N}$. The hoard offers no new evidence and we are convinced by the argument of West and Johnson⁹ that whatever their meaning it cannot be unit or value.

about in Egypt a period of comparative prosperity. It may goods and making them liable to treatment as spies. The provenience from western as well as eastern mints of the large against western merchants in his realms by confiscating their years 312-317 seems to point to great activity of mints to well as the standardization of the imperial coinage, brought Diocletian, and reinforces the view¹⁰ that this reopening, as opening of Egypt to the western world by the reforms of **n**umber of coins dated 313-317 is indirect evidence for the re-Eusebius (viii. 15) that Maximinus put up trade barriers the empire (Constantine and Maxentius, Licinius and Maxicoins prior to 313 may well be due to the fact noted by minus, Constantine and Licinius). The paucity of western meet the costs of the succession of wars carried on throughout drawn. Thus the relatively large number of coins from the political and economic conclusions which have already been knowledge of fourth century coinage, it confirms some of the Although this modest hoard offers no great addition to our

⁸ L. Laffranchi, Concordia zwischen staatlichen Münzateliers des IV. Jb. n. Ch. in NZ 1925, 85 note 1.

[•] Currency in Roman and Byzantine Egypt, Princeton 1944, pp. 98–102.
• Milne, "The Ruin of Egypt by Mismanagement," Journal of Roman Studies 17 (1927)
9; Mickwitz 110.

EARLY FOURTH CENTURY HOARD FROM EGYPT

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

last apparently in one shipment). The picture here presented the mint at Alexandria and half of the rest from Rome (these after the reform of Diocletian, half of the coins still came from evidence afforded by the distribution by mints. Thirty years only the fact that the "Luxor" importations into Egypt were channels of the great ports is very reasonable and applies as explanation of coin-drift as flowing through the normal while $34^{0}/_{0}$ come from the area about Constantinople. Milne's andrian is almost identical with those from Antioch (26%) may be compared with that presented by Milne's A Hoard of tioch. A comparison of the statistics from six13 Egyptian well to the "Luxor" as to the Fayoum hoard. The difference is (bought in the Fayoum) is 343-345; the proportion of Alex-Constantinian Coins from Egypt. 12 The date of that large hoard hoards of the fourth century is instructive: while those of the Fayoum came from the East through Anfunnelled largely from the Western mints through Rome But perhaps the most striking feature of this hoard is the

400	360	345	326	317-320	310	Date
3	7 7	Fayoum	Antinoe	"Luxor"	Denderah	Place
350/0	440/0	26%	470/0	50º/ ₀	70º/ ₀	Alexandrian mis
						mı

On the whole this presents another indication of the conser-

Into these statistics the "Luxor" hoard fits perfectly. later and which then levelled off at a slightly higher figure. proportion which steadily decreased to $26^{\circ}/_{0}$ a generation to imperial coinage an Egyptian hoarded 70% local coins, a vatism of the Egyptians. Shortly after the opening of Egypt

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

- = Henry Cohen, Description bistorique des monnaies fraptext by Arabic rather than Roman numerals. pées sous l'Empire romaine 2nd edition, VI (1886), VII (1888), VIII (1892). The volumes are cited in the
- II Jules Maurice, Numismatique constantinienne. Paris, 1908-1912, Vols. I-III.
- MS =Mattingly and Sydenham, The Roman Imperial Coinage, V² (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.

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

¹¹ Milne, Coins from Oxyrbynchus 162; Mickwitz 108-109

¹³ Five of these from Milne Coins from Oxyrbynchus 61.

LIST OF COINS IN HOARD

SEVERINA. Cyzicus. C 6, MS 249
$$\left(\frac{1}{XXI}\right)$$

Maximianus Herculius. Cyzicus. C 499, MS 291 $\left(\frac{E^{-\frac{\pi}{4}}}{XXI}\right)$

DIOCLETIAN. Antioch. C 421, NZ. 1917. 19 $\left(\begin{array}{c} + \\ \Delta \\ \hline \lambda \end{array}\right)$

GALERIUS. *Alexandria*. C 22, NZ. 1911. 174 (B/ALE); C 47,

NZ. 1911. 178 $\left(\frac{K \begin{vmatrix} F \\ P \end{vmatrix}}{ALE}, \frac{K \begin{vmatrix} \Delta \\ P \end{vmatrix}}{ALE}\right)$ Nicomedia. C 42, M 10–12 $\left(\frac{|}{SMNA}\right)$

Cyzicus. C 47, M 92–98 $\left(\frac{\mathsf{S}|}{\mathsf{MKV}}, \frac{\Delta|*}{\mathsf{MKV}}\right)$

VALERIA. Alexandria. C 9, NZ. 1911. 180 $\left(\frac{|\mathbf{F}|^{\frac{1}{4}}}{|\mathbf{ALE}|}\right)$

Maximinus II. Alexandria. C 40, NZ. 1911. 177-8

 $\left(\begin{array}{c|c}
K \mid A \\
\hline
ALE
\end{array}, X \mid P \\
\hline
ALE
This$

C 2 $\left(\frac{C}{K|P}\right)$; C 17, NZ. 1911. 180-1 $\left(3\frac{X|A}{ALE}\right)$, $\frac{C}{ALE}$

 $2 \frac{* | BI |}{ANT} ; C.116, NZ. 1917.21.8 \left(\frac{* | B}{ANT}, \frac{* | E}{ANT} \right) ; C.214, \\ NZ. 1917. 21.8 \left(\frac{* | Z}{ANT} \right) ; C.216 \left(2 \frac{* | I}{ANT} \right) ; C. 161, NZ, \\ 1917. 21.8 \left(\frac{A | *}{ANT}, \frac{E | *}{ANT}, \frac{\Delta I | *}{ANT} \right) \\ Nicomedia. C. 34, M. 3. 10-12 \left(\frac{| I|}{SMNA}, \frac{| A}{SMNB}, \frac{| A}{SMNF} \right) ; \\ C.118 M. 3. 20-23 \left(\frac{* | A}{SMN}, \frac{| A}{SMN}, \frac{* | B}{SMN} \right) ;$

 $C_{161}\left(\frac{|x|}{|x|}\right); C_{216}\left(\frac{|x|}{|x|}\right).$

Cyzicus. C 29, M. 3. 105-7 $\left(\frac{|\Delta|^{\frac{4}{3}}}{\text{SMK}}, \frac{|S|^{\frac{4}{3}}}{\text{SMK}}\right)$; C $\left(\frac{|S|^{\frac{4}{3}}}{\text{MKV}}\right)$

Aquileia. C 30, M. 308–309 $\left(\frac{|}{AOS}\right)$

Rome. C 181, NZ. 1925. 18 $\left(\frac{}{RP}\right)^{\frac{4}{7}}$ Ostia. C 167, M. 1. 282-7 $\left(\frac{}{MOSTT}\right)$

MAXENTIUS. Rome. C 21, NZ. 1925. 14-16 $\left(\frac{1}{RES}, \frac{1}{RET}\right)$

CONSTANTINUS I. Alexandria. FL VALER CONSTANTINUS PF AVG; Rev. IOVI CON SERVATORI, Jupiter. Not in C. or M; type in NZ. 1911. 8 but field has N/S (ALE);

C 172, NZ. 1911. 180–1 $\left(\begin{array}{c|c} * & ^{\dagger(1)} & * & \\ N & A & N & H \\ \hline & ^{3}LE & , & 2 & ^{3}LE \end{array}\right);$

C 172, NZ. 1911. 180–1 $\left(\begin{array}{c|c} * & B & * & E^{\dagger (1)} \\ N & S & N & S \\ \hline 2 & \frac{3}{4} & S \end{array} \right);$

VATORI, Jupiter I. with scepter, etc., eagle Not in C. without corona. $\left(\frac{N|E}{ALE}, \frac{N|S}{ALE}, \frac{N|Z}{ALE}\right)$;

 $3 \frac{|S|}{|ALE|}, 2 \frac{|S|}{|ALE|}, \frac{|S|}{|ALE|}, 3 \frac{|S|}{|ALE|}, 5 \frac{|S|}{|ALE|}, \frac{|S|}{|ALE$

5 × B 3

Antiocb. C 47 $\left(\frac{\Box|E|}{ANT}\right)$; C 507, NZ. 1917. 20. 8 $\left(\frac{Z|*}{ANT}\right)$;

 $\frac{T|F}{2 \frac{*}{QARL}} C 546, M. z. 155-9 \left(2 \frac{C|S|^{\frac{*}{2}(2)}}{SARL}, \frac{C|S|^{\frac{*}{2}}}{TARL}\right)$

Nicomedia. C 283, M. 3. 26-7 $\left(\frac{|A|^{\frac{1}{4}}}{SMN}, \frac{|B|}{SMN}, \frac{|Z|}{SMN}\right)$

Cyzicus. C 283, M. 3. IIO-I $\left(\frac{|B|}{SMK}, \frac{|E|}{SMK}, \frac{|Z|}{SMK}, \frac{|Z|}{SMK}\right)$

Rome. C 557, NZ. 1925. $18\left(\frac{1}{RP}\right)$; C 546 $\left(\frac{1}{RP}\right)$, RS $\left(\frac{1}{RT}\right)$; C 546, NZ. 1925. 20 $\left(\frac{1}{RP}\right)$; C 519 $\left(3\frac{1}{RS}, 2\frac{1}{RT}\right)$

 $\frac{R|F}{RQ}$, $\frac{R|F}{RP}$, $\frac{R|F}{RS}$, $\frac{R|F}{RT}$, $\frac{S|F}{RS}$, $\frac{S|F}{RQ}$, $\frac{R|F}{R*P}$,

 $9\frac{R|F}{R*S}$, $\frac{R|F}{R*T}$, $\frac{R|F}{R*Q}$, $\frac{R|F}{RP}$, $\frac{R|F}{A}$, $\frac{R|F}{RS}$, $\frac{R|F}{RS}$, $\frac{R|F}{RT}$

Ostia. C 546, M. 1. 282–287. $\left(\frac{|}{\text{MOSTS}}\right)$

Carthage. C 73, M. I. 347–353. $\left(\frac{1}{PKA}\right)$

Arelate. C 546, M. 2. 140-7; $(3\frac{S|F}{PARL}, 3\frac{S|F}{TARL}, 3\frac{F}{QARL},$

 $\frac{T|F}{PARL}$); C 536, M. 2. 140–7 $\left(\begin{array}{c|c} T|F^{\frac{1}{2}} & T|F & T|F \\ * & * \\ \hline PARL \end{array}\right)$, 2 TARL

C 530, NZ. 1917. 30. 25 $\left(\frac{S|F}{PLG}\right)$. Lugdunum C 536, NZ. 1917. 30. 25 $\left(\frac{F|T^{\dagger}}{PLG}, \frac{S|F|^{\dagger}}{?}\right)$; Treveri. C 546, M. 1. 403-7 $\left(\frac{T|F}{BTR}\right)$; C 15, M. I. 423-9 Ticinum. C 337, M. 2. 232-3 $\left(\frac{1}{PT}\right)$; C. 342 $\left(\frac{1}{ST}\right)$; $\left(2 \frac{1}{PTR}\right)$; C 454, M. I. 474-5 $\left(\frac{1}{STRE}\right)$, PTRE C 536, M. 2. 247-50 $\left(\frac{*}{ST}\right)$; C 546 $\left(2\frac{*}{P \cdot T}\right)$.

LICINIUS I. Alexandria. C 43, NZ. 1911. 179 $\left(\frac{|B|}{ALE}, \frac{|C|}{ALE}, \frac{|C|}{ALE}\right)$

 $\frac{|S|}{|ALE|}$; C 2, NZ. 1911. 180 $\left(\frac{|C|}{|K|}|X|\right)$; C. 32, NZ. 1911. 180

 $\begin{pmatrix} N \mid H \\ \frac{3}{ALE} \end{pmatrix}; C35 \begin{pmatrix} * \mid A & * \mid X \\ \frac{3}{A} \mid A & N \mid Z \\ \frac{3}{ALE}, & \frac{3}{ALE} \end{pmatrix}; C56 \begin{pmatrix} * \mid A \\ \frac{3}{A} \mid A \\ \frac{3}{ALE}. \end{pmatrix}$

C 72, NZ. 1911. 181 $\left(\frac{N|A}{ALE}, 2\frac{N|B}{ALE}, \frac{N|Z}{ALE}\right)$; C 108, NZ.

C 160, NZ. 1917. 20. 8 $\left(\frac{EI|**}{ANT}\right)$; C 123, NZ.1917. 21. 8 $\left(\frac{|E|^{\frac{4}{3}}}{ANT}, \frac{|B|^{\frac{4}{3}}}{ANT}, \frac{|\Delta I|^{\frac{4}{3}}}{ANT}\right)$; C 108, NZ. 1917. 21. 8

 $\begin{pmatrix} | \mathbf{S} & | \mathbf{S} & | \mathbf{S} & | \mathbf{S} & | \mathbf{S} \\ | \mathbf{\Gamma} & | \mathbf{E} & | \mathbf{Z} & | \mathbf{H} & | \mathbf{B} \mathbf{I} & | \mathbf{E} \mathbf{I} \\ | \mathbf{III} & | \mathbf{III} & | \mathbf{III} & | \mathbf{III} & | \mathbf{III} \\ | \mathbf{ANT} & \mathbf{ANT} & \mathbf{ANT} & \mathbf{ANT} & \mathbf{ANT} & \mathbf{ANT} \end{pmatrix}$

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

 $\left(\frac{|A|}{SMN}, \frac{|B|}{SMN}, \frac{|Z|}{SMN}\right)$

Cyzicus. VAL LICINNIANYS LICINNIVS PF AVG

Rev. SOLE IN VICTO Sol with head of Serapis $\left(\frac{S|\cdot}{MKV}\right)$ Not in C; M. 3. 99–102 has exergue and field but not

legend, 110 has legend but $\frac{S}{SMK}$; C. 38, M. 3. 99–102 $\left(\frac{|\cdot|}{MKVE}, \frac{\dagger}{MKVE}\right)$; C. 37, M. 3. 100–1 $\left(\frac{|\cdot|}{SMK}\right)$ C 70, MS. 3. 110–2 $\left(\frac{|\cdot|}{SMK}\right)$; C. 64, M. 3. 112–5 $\left(\frac{|\cdot|}{SMK}\right)$ Heraclea. C 108, M. 2. 565–7 $\left(\frac{|\cdot|}{SMHT}\right)$ Siscia. C 65, NZ. 1920. 108 $\left(\frac{|\cdot|}{SIS}, \frac{|\cdot|}{SIS}\right)$ Aquileia. C 107, NZ. 1925. 7–8 $\left(\frac{|\cdot|}{AQT}\right)$ Rome. C 165, NZ. 1925. 18 $\left(\frac{|\cdot|}{RQ}\right)$; C 162. NZ. 1925. 20 $\left(\frac{|\cdot|}{2}\right)$ R $\left(\frac{|\cdot|}{RP}\right)$, R $\left(\frac{|\cdot|}{RQ}\right)$, 3 $\left(\frac{|\cdot|}{RQ}\right)$, 3 $\left(\frac{|\cdot|}{R}\right)$, 2 $\left(\frac{|\cdot|}{R}\right)$, 3 $\left(\frac{|\cdot|}{R}\right)$, 4 $\left(\frac{|\cdot|}{R}\right)$, 6 Ostia. C 49, M. 1. 283 $\left(\frac{|\cdot|}{MOST[\cdot]}\right)$; C 165 $\left(\frac{|\cdot|}{MOSTQ}\right)$ Arelate. C 163, M. 2. 140–7 $\left(\frac{|\cdot|}{PARL}\right)$

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

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

Constantius II. Antioch. C 44, NZ. 1917. 23 $\left(\frac{\Gamma}{\text{ANA}}\right)$ Cyzicus. C 44. NZ. 1917. 23 $\left(\frac{\Gamma}{\text{SMK}}\right)$, .SMKS , $\frac{\Gamma}{2}$

Constantinople. Mattingly pl. 59, 13, NZ. 1917, 21-32

Constantius gallus. Alexandria. C7, NZ. 1917.21-32 ALEB

ALEA , ALE[.]

Casper J. Kraemer, JR. and Theodore G. Miles

A SOLIDUS OF ARTAVASDUS

 $(SEE\ PLATE\ XV)$

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

across his breast.2 His left hand is invisible. Cable border. Around rim, 1. to r., and ties on r. shoulder. In his right hand he holds patriarchal cross half-way cheeks and chin. Artavasdus' robe is represented by vertical lines; brooch four curls across forehead, wavy locks hanging down on either side; beard on Obv. Bust of Artavasdus wearing crown with cross; beneath crown, his hair in CAPTAYA SDOSMYLT.

given a brief account of Artavasdus' career.

The patriarchal cross had previously appeared on coins of Justinian II and his son A full account of the course and issue of the revolt is to be found in chapt. III of A. Lombard's Etudes d'histoire Byzantine, Constantine V, Empereur des Romains (740-Byzantine Seal," a reference for which I am indebted to Mr. James Breckenridge), has ums, II (Berlin, 1933), pp. 738-739. Recently T. Wittemore (Orientalia Christiana Periodica XIII, 1947, 1-2, Miscell. G. Jerphanion, pp. 376-383: "An Unpublished 324; 342-365; and from the point of view of the West, E. Caspar, Geschichte des Papst. Madison, 1928, pp. 317—318, and for a general survey of the iconoclastic era, pp. 307— Empire (University of Wisconsin Studies in the Social Sciences and History no. 13), this interlude in the reign of Constantine V, see A. Vasiliev, History of the Byzantine 775), Bibliothèque de la Faculté des Lettres, Paris, 1902, pp. 22-30. For brief accounts of

as a type see BMC. II, index, p. 653. **Theophilus** it was used as a reverse type (BMC.II, pp. 419, 427). For its subsequent use Tiberius (BMC. II, pp. 355-357) and Theodosius III (BMC. II, pp. 363-364). Under

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