

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. X

HELSINKI 1976 HELSINGFORS

INDEX

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|-----|
| Patrick Bruun | Portrait of a Conspirator. Constantine's Break with the Tetrarchy | 5 |
| Tapio Helen | A Problem in Roman Brick Stamps: Who Were <i>Lucilla n(ostra) and Aurel(i-us) Caes(ar) n(oster)</i> , the Owners of the figlinae Fulvianae? | 27 |
| Paavo Hohti | Die Schuldfrage der Perserkriege in Herodots Geschichtswerk | 37 |
| Iiro Kajanto | On the Significance of the Hammer and Other Tools Depicted on Christian Funeral Inscriptions | 49 |
| Saara Lilja | Vermin in Ancient Greece | 59 |
| Tuomo Pekkanen | <i>Nomine superioris</i> (Tac. Germ. 36,1) .. | 69 |
| Hannu Riikonen | The Attitude of Roman Poets and Orators to the Countryside as a Place for Creative Work | 75 |
| Heikki Solin | Analecta epigraphica XXXII-XXXIX .. | 87 |
| Jaakko Suolahti | <i>M. Claudius Glicia qui scriba fuerat dictator</i> | 97 |
| Holger Thesleff | The Date of the Pseudo-Platonic Hippias Major | 105 |
| Toivo Viljamaa | <i>Magnum fas nefasque</i> . Horace's Epode 5, 87-88 | 119 |
| Maija Väisänen | Alcune famiglie eminenti (Titii, Ulprii, Statilii) nelle iscrizioni onorarie a Prusia all'Ipso in Bitinia | 125 |
| De novis libris iudicia | | 133 |

PORTRAIT OF A CONSPIRATOR.

Constantine's Break with the Tetrarchy.¹

Patrick Bruun

1. The portrait of the Conspirator (Pl. I.1-2) dealt with in this paper refers to the Constantinian portrait created about the time of the *quinquennalia* in A.D. 311² at the moment when Constantine turns his back on the tetrarchy and on tetrarchical ideas, establishes the second Flavian dynasty and hails *Sol invictus* as his tutelary god. It is at this time that he embarks on a political game, one that he plays for high stakes. Soon afterwards his conspiratorial portrait appears on the coins minted under Maximinus Daza and only somewhat later on those issued by Licinius.³ Here I propose to outline some of the inferences to be drawn from the eastern coinages of roughly A.D. 310-313 with regard to the relations between Constantine, Licinius and Daza.

1 This is a slightly enlarged version of a paper read at the meeting of the Royal Numismatic Society, London, on November 18, 1975.

2 The portrait is clean-shaven, the borderline of the hair is drawn in a continuous curving line from the forehead to the ear (cf. my Constantine's *Dies imperii* and *quinquennalia* in the Light of the Early Solidi of Trier, Numismatic Chronicle 1969, 192). The quinquennial portrait shows meticulously arranged locks at the forehead and the temple.

3 The sequence of portraits employed at Siscia is highly instructive. In order to clarify the degree of individualization, I first present the effigy of Licinius, a hollow-eyed, bearded old warrior (Pl.I.7). The portrait of Constantine as Augustus appearing in the same series (Pl.I.8) is — except for the moustache — that of a clean-shaven youngster. In the same mark, when the draped busts have been discarded, and in connection with the same rev. type and legend, we get two different portraits, one bearded with a narrow strip of beard along the jaw (Pl.I.9), the other clean-shaven, much in the manner of the preceding one (Pl.I.10). The corresponding Licinian portrait (Pl.I.11) is much heavier and broader, the beard covering most of the cheek. Finally, with the same rev. imagery, through with an adjusted legend and in a new mark, we get a new Constantinian portrait (Pl.I.12) showing the continuous curve of the borderline of the hair running from the forehead to the lower jaw.

I believe that on this evidence we are justified in concluding that the first portraits of Constantine (Pl.I.8-10) were executed by Siscian engravers, without access to a proper model, *imago*, and with verbal instructions to modify the Licinian portrait in certain respects. On the other hand, the new portrait can be explained exclusively as an artistic interpretation of a model submitted by the Constantinian court. Some doubts may, however, prevail as to the exact model of the conspiratorial portrait of Siscia. I have presented above (Pl.I.1-2) two different stages of the development of the Constantinian portrait of Trier, the one created for Constantine as Caesar (my Notes on the Transmission of Imperial Images in Late Antiquity, *Studia romana in honorem Petri Krarup septuagenarii*, Copenhagen 1976, 127, fig. 1), the other for the *quinquennalia*. In both cases the figures are clean-shaven with a curving borderline of hair, the former, however, having short hair (the military hair-cut), the latter abundant locks, carefully articulated from the forehead to the temple. Most conspiratorial portraits of other mints are graphic in the attention they pay to this particular arrangement of the locks, thus suggesting that the model was the quinquennial portrait.

2. I shall start by presenting the chronological framework as it emerges in the West.⁴

- 307, Dec. 25. The rank and title of Augustus is conferred on Constantine.
 308 The conference of Carnuntum.
 Nov. 11. The title of Augusta is conferred on Galeria Valeria.
 Dec. 26. Licinius is acclaimed Augustus.
 309 Maximian reappears as active ruler.
 310 Maximian's rebellion breaks out in Arles.
 end. Maximian dies in Massilia.
 311, May. Galerius dies.
 summer. Constantine issues silver coins in honour of Daza, Licinius and himself.
 autumn. Solidus reform (and folles issued at 1/72, weight 4.54 grm.).
 Dec. 25. Initial celebration of Constantine's *quinquennalia*.
 312 spring. Constantine's Italian campaign.
 Oct. 28. Battle of the Milvian bridge.
 Dec. 24. Quinquennial year closes in Rome.
 313 Feb. Constantine and Licinius meet in Milan.

I think that these dates can no longer be regarded as controversial in view of the detailed research carried out particularly by Pierre Bastien and Lawrence H. Cope.

3. The imperial portraits, the iconography of the emperors, are central to the theme of this paper. I should, therefore, briefly record my view of the transmission and distribution of imperial images.⁵

I would like to make the following three points:

(a) The well-known passage in Lactantius recording how the laureate image of the newly acclaimed Constantine was transmitted to Galerius, seems to be an instance of the *transmissio imaginis* which was equivalent to a request for recognition of imperial status. Confirmation of the legitimacy of the title to rule constitutes the prerequisite for the exchange of courtesies and the transfer of the actual portraits. The supplicant is always a subordinate ruler. Lactantius records that Galerius hesitated whether or not he should accept Constantine *in societatem*, but he eventually *suscepit imaginem*. The transmission of images was not effected by a courier dashing through the empire on a foaming horse with his master's

4 For details I refer to my papers in NC 1969 and in the Festschrift Per Krarup, mentioned in the preceding note, and in addition to my Constantine's Change of dies imperii, Arctos IX, Helsinki 1975, 11-29. They are largely based on the recent findings of Dr. Pierre Bastien and Dr. Lawrence Cope. For Licinius' *dies imperii*, see Jean Lafaurie's fundamental paper *Dies imperii Constantini augusti: 25 decembre 307*, Mélanges André Piganiol, Paris 1966, 795-806.

5 Cf. my Transmission of Imperial Images.

portrait — or a master die of the portrait — in his saddle bag. It was a very serious *cérimonie protocolaire*.

(b) As a corollary it should be stated that it was not a question of an exchange of portraits when Constantine's emissaries visited the court of Galerius. Galerius' portrait must have been known in the West as well as in the East from the time he was proclaimed Caesar. Obviously the image must have been brought up to date at some time; it would, I believe, be a most rewarding study to check systematically when this process took place in the various mints. Again, when Galerius had accepted the portraits of Constantine, he had them distributed throughout the empire. As *maximus* he had made a decision which was binding for all fellow-rulers as a matter of principle. We need not assume that separate delegations on behalf of Constantine went petitioning to other junior rulers; we shall soon see how the Constantinian portrait reached his younger colleagues.

(c) Because of the importance of the portraits installed in public places all over the empire, or brought out on solemn occasions, they must have had a very large circulation indeed; moreover, they were most likely circulated in a number of adaptations according to the function the portrait was to assume. Therefore I believe that the *imagines laureatae* were genuine ceremonial portraits.

4. Turning from these generalities to specific political questions,⁶ we may note that

(a) the death of Maximian eliminated the main obstacle to a reconciliation between Constantine and the rulers in the East,

(b) when Maximian died, it was public knowledge that Galerius was seriously ill; the *maximus augustus* can be assumed to have been concerned by the problem of how to arrange the succession.

(c) In his plans to conquer Italy Constantine was bound to come into conflict with Licinius, to whom the task of regaining Italy for the tetrarchy had been given.

(d) Maxentius concentrated his forces along the north-eastern frontier in order to defend himself against the Licinian onslaught.

(e) Licinius gathered his forces and prepared for the attack. The Čentur hoard⁷ can well be interpreted as a sign of frontier fighting or of skirmishing in 311.

(f) Licinius' seniority in rank may have led him to regard himself as the natural candidate for the position of *maximus augustus* on the death of Galerius.

⁶ The political set-up is admirably described by prof. Torben Christensen in C. Galerius Valerius Maximinus. Festschrift udgivet af Københavns universitet . . . 16. april 1974, Copenhagen 1974, where the penetrating analysis of the literary sources, above all of Lactantius and Eusebius, seems at last to place the actions of Maximinus Daza in their correct perspective.

⁷ Cf. Aleksander Jeločnik, The Čentur Hoard, Situla 12, Ljubljana 1973.

(g) Sidestepped at Carnuntum, Daza can be assumed to have speculated on the death of Galerius. The rank of the most senior ruler together with large tracts of Galerius' territory were within his grasp, but he needed Constantine as an ally to counterbalance the power of Licinius.

5. Thus the stage is set and the curtain rises.

The Constantinian attitude to the political situation can be judged from his coinage

- the billon coinage of the summer of A.D. 311 associates him with Daza and Licinius⁸
- the Sol coinage initiated in the autumn 311 is struck with obverses of all three rulers⁹
- the quinquennial gold issues are struck with obverses of all three rulers¹⁰
- in addition, the joint consulship with Licinius in 312, and with Daza in 313, show him as a positive imperial collaborator¹¹
- finally, after the victory of the Milvian bridge, Constantine's political attitude is suggested by issues, in Rome of folles of the types VICTORIA AVGGG¹² and VIRTVS AVGGG.¹³

How did his eastern colleagues react to this?

6. I will begin by drawing attention to some series of eastern folles struck by Maximinus which, as with Constantine's Sol coinage, constitute a break with the imagery of the preceding years, IOVI CONSERVATORI, depicting Iupiter stg, holding globe with Victory, a reverse exceptional in the earlier tetrarchic tradition, but from now a dominating feature in the eastern coinage.

We have three varieties of the reverse legend:

IOVI CONSERVATORI issued at Antioch,¹⁴ Cyzicus¹⁵ and Nicomedia¹⁶

IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG issued at Heraclea¹⁷

8 Bruun, *Arctos IX*, 19, cf. *Roman Imperial Coinage* (=RIC) vi, Trier N:o 825-826, and RIC vii, Trier N:o 210-212.

9 Bruun, *NC 1969*, 195 ff.

10 Bruun, *NC 1969*, 197 ff.

11 Degrassi, *I fasti consolari dell'impero Romano*, Roma 1952, 78. Note that Daza as *maximus augustus* was responsible for the choice of consuls of 312, Constantine in his turn for the consuls of 313. Licinius entered his third consulship in 313 after the defeat of Daza.

12 RIC vi, Rome N:o 353-4.

13 Not in RIC. The rev. shows the emperor mounted, hold. spear and shield, the obv. IMP CONSTANTINVS P F AVG, bust laur., cuir. r. The coin was reported as being in Zagreb by Mr. Ivo Meixner, *Numismatičke vijesti*, Zagreb 1959, vi/13, 3 (subsequently in *Godina xvi*, 1969, Broj 27, 16-18, N:o 8, Pl.V.5, cf. also *Bulletin analytique viii* (1969), N:o 1310. I am very grateful to Mr. Efreem Pegan for drawing my attention to this highly interesting coin.

14 RIC vi, Ant. N:o 153a-c; 166a-c.

15 RIC vi, Cyz. N:o 105a-c; 109.

16 RIC vi, Nic. N:o 69a-c; 76; 79.

17 RIC vi, Her. N:o 73-75.

IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG NN issued at Thessalonica¹⁸ and Siscia.¹⁹

In all six mints the reverse was connected with obverses of the three legitimate rulers after the death of Galerius, namely Daza, Constantine and Licinius. Incidentally this is the protocol order established by epigraphical findings.²⁰ At Antioch, where this creation of Maximinus was first issued, two series were struck. Dr. Sutherland, with some reservation, records some coins of Galerius as belonging to the first series, referring to Voetter's publications and remarking that they need confirmation.²¹ Constantine's non-appearance in this series may be due to the rarity of the coins. Otherwise the triarchy is well documented on these coins, which appear shortly after the death of Galerius.

In this context we find in the easternmost mints the regional version of the Constantinian portrait created for the *quinquennalia*. A series of portraits created at Cyzicus may illustrate this. The quinquennial clean-shaven portrait showing the curving borderline of the hair (Pl.I.3) appears in the exergual mark SMK. It is easy to distinguish the corresponding bearded portrait of Daza (Pl.I.4). The effigy of Maximinus had been introduced in an earlier series, marked MKVA (Pl.I.5), quite different in fabric from the portraits of the last coinage of Galerius²² (Pl.I.6).

The picture presented by the coinage of Cyzicus is that, in the first mark after the death of Galerius, new portraits and coins of a different fabric are introduced (cf. Pl.I.5); similarly the first IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG reverse is introduced although it does not have the later triarchical design (holding Victory). Quite substantial issues of folles are coined until Iupiter holding Victory appears in the series with the exergual letters SMK.²³ Would this coincide with Daza's personal appearance in Asia Minor prior to his crossing into Europe?²⁴ The unusual epithet of Cyzicus, SM, suggests this. It would seem that for a period of time, Cyzicus is *the* aes striking mint.

I believe we are justified in regarding the IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG series issued by Daza in three different mints as originating in an overall design to propagate the triarchical alliance under the

18 RIC vi, Thess. N:o 51-61b.

19 RIC vi, Sis. N:o 232a-234c.

20 Cf. Roberto Andreotti s.v. Licinius in Ruggiero's Diz. epigr. iv, fasc. 31-33, 992.

21 RIC vi, 640, nn. 1-2.

22 In the later obverses the portrait, particularly the back of the head, follows the inner side of the obv. legend more closely. The relief is low, the surface of the head is even and flat as compared with the differentiation of the several parts of the face of Maximinus, and the wreath, for example, is executed with meticulous attention to the surprisingly small individual leaves.

23 RIC vi, 593 ff.

24 Dr. Sutherland, RIC vi, 91 f. is inclined to think so.

auspices of Iupiter the Victorious — a new notion in this context.²⁵ As far as I understand it, the victory suggested can only represent the eventual victory of the three legitimate rulers over the usurper Maxentius.

In Licinius' empire the imagery of Iupiter holding Victory on globe is of a somewhat later date; its military and political implications are, however, doubtful. From the death of Galerius, Licinius had consistently had Iupiter Conservator appearing on, and dominating his coins both at Thessalonica, initially at least his chief mint distinguished as *S(acra)M(oneta)*, and at Siscia. In this way he had wrongfully²⁶ claimed imperial seniority as Iovius. Iupiter with Victory appeared on his coins comparatively late. The corresponding reverse legend IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG NN appeared in both mints after the reduction of the follis weight to 1/96 of a Roman pound.²⁷ For the extensive series of Siscia we have just one chronological landmark, a consular bust of Licinius.²⁸

7. From the reverses of these series I now turn to the obverses, my main concern in this paper. You will remember the conspiratorial portrait of Cyzicus; corresponding local versions of the portrait of the conspirator appeared at Antioch and Nicomedia as you will soon see. But Siscia does not present us with any conspirator prior to the end of the triarchical type IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG NN (see Pl.I.8-10, and n. 3 above). We may note in passing that the Constantinian portraits of the corresponding Thessalonican series are all slightly adjusted portraits of Licinius, i.e. there is no genuine Constantinian portrait that could have been employed as a model at that mint at that time.

Now, the development of the Constantinian portraiture at Siscia calls for an explanation. When the triarchical Iupiter (wielding a thunderbolt) was introduced in the coinage of this mint, there cannot have been any up-to-date Constantinian portrait stored in the archives. Therefore the die cutters had to act on verbal instructions in order to create a portrait different from the Licinian one and characterized by at least some of the iconographic properties of Constantine. Only later was an *imago* submitted by Constantine

25 Except for a medal struck at Nicomedia in 294 (RIC vi, N:o 1), only two mints had previously issued the type Iupiter hold. Victory on globe, namely Alexandria on several occasions (RIC vi, Alex. N:o 41-44; 49-50; 54-55, cf. 666 ff., and 672 n.), but, above all, during the second tetrarchy; and Siscia, most recently during the second tetrarchy (RIC vi, 476).

26 Cf. Andreotti, op.cit., 991: "Licinio, creato a Carnuntum Herculus in sostituzione di Severo, per rivendicare l'eredità di Galerio doveva assumere la veste di Jovius, con un passaggio assai discutibile secondo la genealogia schematica della tetrarchia."

27 See below, p. 82. The successive stages of coin reduction in Licinian territory have not been established with the same exactness as for the Gallic empire.

28 In the possession of Dr. Vittorio Picozzi, Rome, who was kind enough to draw the author's attention to it. The obv. reads IMP LIC LICINIUS P F AVG, the bust is laur., turned r., wearing trabea, hold. eagle-tipped sceptre in r. hand, globe in l. The off. is marked A.

or then an image submitted earlier was used (see Pl.I.12). This must have occurred after Constantine's *quinquennalia* late in 311, when the conspiratorial portrait was created in Trier. The coin with a consular bust of Licinius mentioned above takes us further into the year 312, but clearly the appearance of the new Constantinian portrait has to be referred to a considerably later date, when coining in the name of Daza had ceased at Siscia.

Now the Siscian gold coinage may assist us in understanding how Licinius expressed his feelings towards his colleagues — numismatically.

At one stage in the coinage of Siscia we get aurei marked with X in the field. They occur with three different reverse legends. Thus we get three series marked X:

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG | Iupiter holding a thunderbolt ²⁹ |
| IOVI CONSERVATORI AVG | —,,— ³⁰ |
| IOVI CONSERVATORI | Iupiter holding Victory on globe. ³¹ |

Finally, the last type with the same reverse legend was issued with the mint mark SISC.³²

Now the X in the field on these gold coins is no doubt, as others have suggested,³³ a reference to Licinius' *quinquennalia*, recording the *vota decennalia suscepta*. Their proper date is therefore round about the New Year 313. I assume that the *dies imperii* was on December 26.³⁴ Consequently, it is fitting that Licinius alone should appear on the coins marked X. The internal order of the issues seems to be quite clear. All the portraits pay tribute to the high technical skill and artistic refinement of the engravers. The series closes with the same imagery, Iupiter holding Victory, which we are familiar with from the concluding issues of folles of the triarchical coinage. In this context, I suggest, a special gold type is assigned to Constantine, a fitting counterpart (in the eyes of Licinius) to the Licinian Iupiter holding Victory on globe, namely a Iupiter simply holding an orb.³⁵ A suggestion of the time of issue is provided by the Constantinian portrait with the crew-cut, encountered at this time in the IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG NN folles.³⁶ A much cruder version of this portrait appears in the last Licinian gold issue of Siscia, the one marked SISC.

The triarchical folles of Siscia were followed by a series with the same imagery, but inscribed IOVI CONSERVATORI, in three dif-

29 RIC vii, Sis. N:o 21A-B, cf. Addenda to p. 425 on p. 716.

30 RIC vii, Sis. N:o 19-21.

31 RIC vii, Sis. N:o 18.

32 RIC vii, Sis. N:o 12-13.

33 Dr. Sutherland, RIC vi, 453, 481.

34 See Jean Lafaurie's paper mentioned in n. 4 above.

35 RIC vii, Sis. N:o 1-2.

36 RIC vii, Sis. N:o 3-4.

ferent marks.³⁷ The conspiratorial portrait of Constantine appears in the first of these (Pl.I.12); the date will be discussed below.

An interpretation of the numismatic data of the Licinian empire in terms of political history makes it necessary to consider the two mints Thessalonica and Siscia together. Squeezed between two forceful opponents, Licinius and his propaganda had to make the most of the fact that one mint, Siscia, faced Constantine in the West, the other, Thessalonica, confronted Daza in the East, whereas officially the triarchical alliance and peace ruled the Roman world.

Allowing for the lack of technical information on some points (e.g. weight and measurements of certain coin sequences), the overall picture of the Licinian coinage from the inception of the triarchical type IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG NN, Iupiter holding Victory on globe, would present

- (i) Thessalonica with the mark $\overline{\text{A}}$ ·SM· $\overline{\text{TS}}$ · (RIC vi, Thes. N:o 51-54). The weight standard recorded by Dr. Sutherland (RIC vi, 518) suggests difficulties in maintaining the average weight of the preceding series, obviously corresponding to 1/72 of a pound (RIC vi, N:o 49-50b).
- (ii) Thessalonica, same mark, same rev. imagery but with an adjusted rev. legend ending in DD NN (not AVGG NN). Obverses are known exclusively of Licinius (RIC vi, Thes. N:o 55-6), but the rev. legend suggests that somebody else kept him company on them.
- (iii) Siscia, $\overline{\text{A}}$ $\overline{\text{SIS}}$, striking IOVI CONSERVATORI, showing Iupiter holding thunderbolt (RIC vi, Sis. N:o 229a-231b). The weight now seems to have been reduced to the 1/96 standard (cf. Dr. Sutherland, RIC vi, 454; here Licinius seems to have anticipated the corresponding reduction of the Constantinian empire). Coining was extensive but no obverses of Daza appear. The type, Iupiter hold. a thunderbolt is the traditional one; Siscia does not seem to have caught up with the symbolistic innovations of Thessalonica.
- (iv) Siscia, same mark, brought up to date, issuing IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG NN, Iupiter hold. Victoriola, first (a) excluding Daza (RIC vi, Sis. N:o 232a-b = RIC vii, Sis. N:o 3-4), then (b) including all the triarchs (RIC vi, Sis. N:o 233a-234c).
- (v) Thessalonica with the mark ·TS· $\overline{\text{A}}$ · now coining at the 1/96 weight standard, producing IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG NN, as above (RIC vi, Thes. N:o 57-61b) for all three rulers. At that juncture Thessalonica had ceased to be *S(acra)M(oneta)*.

37 RIC vii, Sis. N:o 5-11; 15-17; 22.

- (vi) Siscia with the same mark as before issues identical imagery inscribed IOVI CONSERVATORI (RIC vii, Sis. N:o 5-11), excluding Daza. The conspiratorial portrait of Constantine appears on the obverses.

The picture of development is clear insofar as the quinquennial portrait of Constantine is introduced at a moment when Maximinus had definitely disappeared from the obverses issued by Licinius. This must have occurred during or after the conference of Milan.

If we try to fit the gold coinage, particularly the quinquennial gold coinage marked X, into the picture of the issues of aes, we would be inclined to couple the rev. imagery of the aurei with the corresponding symbolism of the folles. The two versions of Jupiter holding a thunderbolt would then have to be connected with the issue (iii), a connection which fits admirably into the political picture suggested by the coinage: in both cases Licinius shows his negative attitude to his colleagues, in the aes issues solely to Daza, in the gold issues both to Daza and Constantine (the AVG of the rev. legend, in contrast to AVGG, actually underlines the existence of one legitimate ruler only, Licinius). The aureus issue depicting Jupiter hold. Victoriola runs alongside (iv).

The SISC aurei were subsequently struck, before the introduction of the new Constantinian portrait. They may roughly coincide with the conference of Milan, but would have been struck before its conclusion.

This reconstruction of the coining, particularly of the mint of Siscia, suggests intense minting towards the end of 312, especially in connection with Licinius' *quinquennialia*, which is only natural. Striking went on in Siscia up to the Milan conference, and beyond, whilst Thessalonica, facing the threat of Maximinus, was deprived of the imperial treasury, and in this way forfeited the honour of being a *Sacra Moneta*.

All this has rather devastatingly destroyed what two RIC volumes have patiently constructed. When dating most of these issues to 313-317 and the coins with the singular IOVI CONSERVATORI AVG to Civil War I, I for one was led astray by the absence of obverses of Maximinus Daza.³⁸ The conclusion here was obvious; all the coins belonged to the period after the death of Maximinus. But I have changed my mind, and I trust the coinage of Heraclea to give the reason for this.

8. Heraclea was one of the mints to strike the new type Jupiter holding Victory.³⁹ It employs the rev. legend IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG instead of the plain IOVI CONSERVATORI of the Dazan empire or AVGG NN of the Licinian mints. It is a case *sui generis*, and its location makes it a highly interesting mint.

³⁸ RIC vii, Introduction to Siscia, 415.

³⁹ RIC vi, Her. N:o 73-75.

8.1. Galerius' last issues at Heraclea show him trying to patch up the empire and to establish an alliance between Licinius, Maximinus and Constantine. Acknowledging Daza as augustus he appends to the title of this junior ruler the epithet *invictus*.⁴⁰ In the issues of GENIO IMPERATORIS we find the obverses of Galerius and the younger rulers, Maximinus and Constantine both named *pius felix invictus augustus*.⁴¹ This usage continues up to and after the death of Galerius.

After the death of Galerius, Heraclea issues the type IOVI CONSERVATORI⁴² in the mark HTA with a wreath in the field, an innovation with regard to the imagery (for an obv., cf. Pl.II.1). The obv. legends of this series are really exceptional. First of all, we have two sets of legends, one with Daza and Constantine named *pius felix invictus* as before, whereas Licinius is simply *pius felix*.⁴³ This type is continued with the rev. legend supplemented with AVGG with a change of the exergual mark to SMHT⁴⁴ (for the portrait, see Pl.II.2).

In the next issue important changes take place. Although the legend is still IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG, we have obverses of all three rulers, all now simply noted as P F AVG⁴⁵ (Pl.II.3, Licinius; Pl.II.4-5, Constantine in an older and in a conspiratorial version). The mint mark is SMHT with the officina letter in the field.

How should this development be interpreted?

That the coinage is biased in favour of Daza and Constantine and against Licinius is quite clear on the evidence of the obv. legends. Further evidence of the influence of Maximinus on this coinage is provided by the employment of the conspiratorial portrait of Constantine (Pl.II.5), which was accepted comparatively late, only after the conference in Milan, in Licinian territory.⁴⁶

If the conspiratorial portrait had originated in the West, i.e. in Licinius' territory, we would date it at the earliest the same time as the corresponding portrait of Siscia, since in the early months of 313 Siscia was the chief mint of that ruler. Consequently, if the conspiratorial portrait of Constantine had been distributed by Licinius, the earliest date it could have been used by the mint of Heraclea would have been February-March 313.

Now two types of gold coins, namely IOVI CONSERVATORI

40 RIC vi, Her. N:o 47; 49a; 52; 54a; 57; 60a.

41 For Constantine, see RIC vi, Her. N:o 49b; 54b; 60b.

42 RIC vi, Her. N:o 64-67.

43 RIC vi, 540, cf. conspectus of obv. legends preceding coin lists.


44 RIC vi, Her. 68-72.

45 RIC vi, Her. N:o 73-75.

46 With reference to Licinius' quinquennial gold coinage, it is clear that the conspiratorial portrait of Siscia should be dated not 312 but early 313.

AVGG⁴⁷ (Pl.II.6) and VOTIS V-MVLTIS X/VICTORIA AVG⁴⁸ (Pl.II.7) struck at Heraclea, display the conspiratorial portrait of Constantine;⁴⁹ the latter was the vota type conceived for Constantine's *quinquennalia* in Trier and subsequently as a token of collaboration issued by Daza at Antioch and Nicomedia. The latter coins will be briefly discussed below. The appropriate time of issue in those mints would have been December 312, when Constantine's and Licinius' quinquennial celebrations coincided. If issued at Heraclea by Licinius, the appearance of the new portrait of Constantine which, as mentioned above, was adopted so late in the Licinian empire, would help us establish the *terminus post* of this coin series as February-March 313. Such a delayed issue of a vota coinage on the part of Licinius I find impossible to accept, since this type as such had not previously been adopted and struck in Licinian territory; there would have been no precedent for this type. Therefore we have to exclude the possibility of this coinage being issued by Licinius. On the other hand, Maximinus had employed both the type and the conspiratorial portrait earlier, and the latter in all mints in his empire after the death of Galerius. To accept him as the ultimate source of and force behind the Heracleian coinage in question is therefore only natural.

The next step is to explain the Dazan or pro-Dazan coinage of Heraclea against the background of general political development; the most simple explanation would be that, on the death of Galerius, Heraclea fell to Maximinus or to his supporters. This would be a very straightforward solution since all coins issued after the death of Galerius, and not only the Heracleian gold coins, decidedly favour Maximinus. The aes marks are:



- (i) RIC vi, N:o 64 HTA introducing the new type IOVI
CONSERVATORI, Iup.hold.globe.
The only verified obv. is IMP C
GAL VAL MAXIMINVS P F INV
AVG. *Invictus* is, however, no inno-
vation.⁵⁰
- (ii) RIC vi, N:o 65-67  HTA Daza and Constantine *invicti*
augusti, Licinius simply *augustus*.

47 RIC vii, Her. N:o 1-2.





48 RIC vii, Her. N:o 3-4. The coin references have unfortunately been switched. The Hunter and the Budapest coins have a Constantinian obv., the others a Licinian, the specimen illustrated being a British Museum coin.

49 Neither rev. is connected with an obv. of Daza. For this very reason in RIC vii I referred these issues to the time following the death of Daza. The non-appearance of Daza is not, however, in this context conclusive proof of such a late date. Firstly, the coins are scarce, and the omission of Daza may thus be accidental. Secondly, particular reasons may have induced Maximinus to issue these quinquennial coins although he himself did not appear in the coinage.

50 Employed by Galerius (RIC vi, Her. N:o 47; 49a; 52; 54a; 55; 57-8; 60a; 61). Constantine was also named *invictus* (N:o 49b; 54; 60b).

- (iii) RIC vi, N:o 68-72  IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG, obs. as above. There is, however, an alternative set of obv. legends recording Daza and Licinius as P F AVG but Constantine as P F INV AVG.
- (iv) RIC vi, N:o 73-75  Iup. on rev. holding Victory on globe. All three rulers P F AVG. New portrait of Constantine introduced. In this mark we have some additional rev. types connected exclusively with obs. of Daza (RIC vi, N:o 76-78).

This sequence of issues, of obverses and reverses, reflects a logical development, in theory at least, where new elements and features gradually replace the old ones. They may be tabulated in the following way:

| | | Connecting links | New features |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
| Galerian issues | | | |
| (i) |  | MAXIMINVS P F INV AVG MAXIMINVS P F INV AVG CONSTANTINVS P F INV AVG LICINIVS P F AVG rev. type obv. legends: P F INV AVG S(acra)M(oneta) | rev. type IOVI CONSERVATORI, Iup. hold. globe mint: S(acra)M(oneta) rev. legend with AVGG Daza simply P F AVG rev.: Iup. hold Victory all augusti P F AVG special types for Daza Const.: new portrait |
| (ii) |  | | |
| (iii) |  | | |
| (iv) |  | | |

On the evidence of the coins alone one would say that from the death of Galerius in May 311 to Daza's flight from Europe to Asia Minor two years later the mint city was in the hands of Maximinus. Yet Lactantius is quite explicit on this point; after the death of Galerius both Licinius and Maximinus, contesting the inheritance of the deceased ruler, arrived on the shores of the Bosphorus. On board a ship in neutral waters they reached an agreement which made the straits between Europe and Asia the borderline between the two realms. As a result Heraclea fell to Licinius.⁵¹

⁵¹ On June 27, 311 the inscription ILS 664 from Licinius' part of the empire records, in order of protocol, the emperors Maximinus, Constantine and Licinius showing that after the death of Galerius a triarchical agreement had been reached without delay, an agreement that also included a new gradation of imperial rank and seniority, cf. Christensen, *op.cit.*, 168, n. 58.

Nevertheless, Licinius does not seem to have employed the mint at all — understandably, as his preoccupations at that time were in the West, with the reconquest of Italy.

If then, the four successive series of coins issued in favour of Daza could not have been struck immediately after the death of Galerius, when were they struck?

The sequence ends with the SMHT mark (without wreath in the field), which was also employed for a number of very special rev. types coupled with obverses of Daza alone.⁵² This issue can be assigned to Maximinus' campaign in Europe and Thrace in 313.⁵³ In the same series, Constantine's conspiratorial portrait appears for the first time in the aes coinage.⁵⁴ We have previously encountered the same portrait in the Heracleian gold coinage, with the issue of the vota coins VOTIS V-MVLTIS X/VICTORIA AVG. The exergual mark was SMHTB.⁵⁵ With the mark SMHT we also get the gold reverse IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG with the same imagery as in the aes coinage, Jupiter holding Victory on globe.⁵⁶ It is therefore quite clear that these gold types were issued in conjunction with the series numbered (iv) above. Furthermore, it is also clear that these coins were issued during Maximinus' campaign in Europe. The letters *S(acra)M(oneta)* in the mint mark therefore assume added significance; they are, as Dr. Sutherland has suggested in a different context, a mark of the Imperial Presence,⁵⁷ of the emperor personally employing the services of the mint thus named. We are therefore entitled to assume that the series (iii), also marked with SMHT in the exergue, was similarly issued during Daza's European campaign.

How, then, were the series marked HTA, with and without a wreath in the field, connected with the issues of the *Sacra Moneta*? I believe that they should be assigned to the period immediately preceding the SM-series; as the table above shows, the series (ii) and (iii) are linked by the rev. type and by the unusual obv. legend with P F INV AVG. An alternative explanation, though much less plaus-

52 Dr. J.P.C. Kent, *The Pattern of Bronze Coinage under Constantine I*, NC 1957, 29, was the first to note the existence of a short series (corresponding to RIC vi, Her. N:o 76-78, cf. also RIC vii, with obverses exclusively of Daza, and to draw the logical conclusion that they had been issued by Maximinus, who must have broken the agreement with regard to the division of the Galerian empire, and consequently conquered Heraclea, thus constituting a threat to Licinius. One of the aims of this paper is to show not only that Dr. Kent's observations appear to have been correct, but also that behind the scanty issues of Daza at Heraclea, identified by him, other substantial issues in gold as well as in aes are discernible, all of these being struck by the same emperor.

53 Cf. Lactantius, *de mortibus persecutorum* 45,2.

54 Cf. RIC vi, Her. N:o 75 illustrated by Pl.II.1 (an older portrait) and Pl.II.2 (the conspiratorial portrait).

55 RIC vii, Her. N:o 3-4.

56 RIC vi, Her. N:o 73-75.

57 RIC vi, 43, 90 ff. mentions the imperial *comitatus*; the Heracleian case is, however, explained by a reference to an "invasion area".

ible, would be that the first two series (i and ii) had been struck in an anti-Licinian vein in 311 when the two emperors confronted one another across the Bosphorus.⁵⁸

Summing up the activities of the Heracleian mint, I suggest that

(1) after the death of Galerius and the agreement between Licinius and Maximinus, the mint was closed;

(2) fearing that the political equilibrium of the triarchy was in jeopardy when Constantine's surprise campaign in Italy proved successful, Maximinus left his headquarters in Antioch, arrived on the Bosphorus, crossed over into Europe and conquered Heraclea, whose mint was then reopened.

8.2. For a better understanding of the coinage we should now endeavour to date the issues against the political background.

The triarchical peace and balance of power was disturbed in the spring of 312 when Constantine moved his Gallic troops against Maxentius. The fact that Licinius ran the risk of being outmanoeuvred by the emperor of Gaul can scarcely have caused Maximinus any compassionate concern for his fellow-ruler in the Balkans, but he was doubtless put on his guard, and diplomatic activity in the empire would certainly have increased; Lactantius' otherwise groundless account of the alliance between Daza and Maxentius⁵⁹ may contain an element of truth, in that Maxentius might well have tried to solicit support in Antioch. However, the victory of the Milvian bridge and the death of Maxentius, dramatically altered the situation. The conquest of the Eternal City increased Constantine's prestige and material resources; the Senate's decision to confer the *titulus primi nominis* on the conqueror was tantamount to challenging Maximinus as the *maximus augustus*.

Prof. Christensen's analysis of the pertinent passages in Lactantius and Eusebius' Ecclesiastical history now suggests the following sequence of events:

Immediately after Constantine's entry into Rome he was acclaimed *maximus augustus* by the Senate. Lactantius⁶⁰ tells us that Constantine informed Maximinus of the outcome of the campaign and of the decree of the Senate. At the same time, relying on his

58 Lactantius' account does not support the assumption that Maximinus crossed into Europe at that time and occupied part of the European coast inclusive of Heraclea. The inscription ILS 664 with the *terminus ante* of June 27, makes this solution well nigh impossible as has been emphasized above, n.51.

59 For perceptive analysis of the text, cf. recently Torben Christensen, op.cit., 198-201.

60 This is not explicitly stated in *de mortibus persecutorum*. 37,1 shows that Constantine prevented Daza from pursuing an anti-Christian policy; 44,11-12 records the decision of the Senate and Maximinus' reaction to this. Christensen, op.cit., 224 f. connects these two communications, and would seem justified in doing so since the request concerning the Christians must postdate the capture of Rome and antedate the letter to Sabinus (written in the year 312) discussed below.

newly acquired position, in the so called *litterae Constantini*,⁶¹ he requested Daza to refrain from his previous anti-Christian policy and to grant the Christians religious freedom.⁶² Maximinus reluctantly decided to yield, but in order to uphold his own authority and to show that he himself was the source and origin of the new religious policy, he wrote to his *praefectus praetorio* Sabinus⁶³ explaining the new policy and attaching the *litterae Constantini*, the contents of which would have to be respected in the future.⁶⁴

In reality this implies that Maximinus accepted the proclamation of Constantine as *maximus augustus* and that he himself abdicated that position. This happened towards the end of 312 as we can see from Eusebius' text of Daza's mandate to Sabinus.⁶⁵

It may appear strange that Maximinus so promptly yielded to Constantine's claims. Why did he do so? What did he get in exchange?

Most of the details must remain obscure — others are no more than conjectures. That some kind of agreement between Constantine and Maximinus was reached is clear. The joint consulship of these two rulers in 313 is proof of this.⁶⁶

Licinius at that time constituted Constantine's main political problem. Maximinus was his natural ally against Licinius, who, if the evidence of the Siscian coinage is to be trusted (cf. above), refused after the battle of the Milvian bridge to acknowledge his fellow-rulers and triarchical allies. Whether or not Constantine at this juncture promised Daza any (territorial?) compensation at Licinius' expense, is not known. Prof. Christensen⁶⁷ suggests that Maximinus together with Licinius was invited to a top level conference in Milan where the affairs of the empire⁶⁸ were to be settled once more. Regardless of this possible invitation to Milan, it is obvious that negotiations between Licinius and Constantine were to follow. Their outcome would no doubt affect Maximinus' future position in the empire. To follow them at close quarters or even to influence their outcome, if possible, would have been in Daza's best interests. It is therefore to be assumed that he abandoned his headquarters in Syrian Antioch without undue delay after the

61 Lactantius 37,1.

62 Christensen, l.c.

63 Eus. H.E. 9,9a,1-9.

64 Cf. Christensen, 232.

65 Eus. H.E. 9,9a, 4, cf. Christensen, 230, particularly n. 147.

66 Cf. Christensen, 233 ff., and 235, n. 162 referring to the inscription AE 1969/1970 (printed 1972) N:o 118 from Gaeta, dated Jan. 22, 313, recording the consulships, and mentioning Constantine's first. In contrast it is interesting to note that the well-known inscription from Arykanda in Lycia is justifiably dated by Prof. Christensen (201, n. 14) to the end of 312. Here the name of Constantine, located between the names of Maximinus and Licinius, had been erased. This fact may well reflect an averse attitude to the infringement of the triarchical alliance by Constantine's invasion of Italy.

67 237.

68 *Universa quae ad commoda et securitatem publicam pertinerent*, Lactantius 48,2.

arrival of the *litterae Constantini*⁶⁹ and proceeded to Nicomedia and the shores of the Bosphorus. As a kind of precaution he took his army across into Europe and seized Byzantion and Heraclea; the invasion could well have begun in January. Again, the news of the attack may have been the decisive factor in making Licinius, who celebrated his *quinquennalia* at the end of December 312 without officially admitting the existence of other legitimate rulers, come to terms with Constantine in Milan in February 313.

At roughly the same time, coining was resumed at Heraclea under the auspices of Maximinus — carried out characteristically enough here, as at his other mints, in a pro-triarchical vein — coining which prominently recorded the *quinquennalia* of Constantine and Licinius in the preceding December.⁷⁰ The general character of these gold issues show how keen Maximinus still seemed to be on the triarchical agreement of 311. His invasion of Europe was not accompanied by any warlike propaganda.

9. I will now concentrate my remaining remarks around the Vota type just discussed. This clearly originates in Constantine's quinquennial issues at Trier in December, 311. Subsequently it was issued at Nicomedia⁷¹ (Pl.II.8-9) and Antioch⁷² (Pl.II.10-12) — though not in that order — but made no appearance at all in Licinius' part of the empire.

For years I have been puzzled by the fact that a coin type of an exceptional design such as this, created at a moment which can be safely established, appears, according to the dating of RIC, years later in the easternmost mints of the empire. Why suddenly this absence of symbols, of artistic ideas, why this repetition so little warranted by the political situation? We have the answer now: we should subtract almost a year from the RIC dates; we should regard the use of the type at Antioch, subsequently at Nicomedia

69 This chronology is more in keeping with Lactantius' account of the rigors of the winter Maximinus had to endure on his march through Asia Minor, cf. *de mortibus persecutorum* 45,2-3.

70 We have to make allowance here for a slight timelag; the quinquennial issues in gold had first been issued at Antioch, subsequently, on the arrival of Daza in Bithynia, at Nicomedia. Other features of the Heracleian coinage which have been discussed here and which did not keep abreast of the general development are (a) the initial employment in the HTA marks (with and without wreath in the field) of the obv. legends for Constantine and Daza with *INVICTUS* originating in the last issues of Galerius, and (b) the Constantinian portrait of the first aes series. Generally speaking this suggests an emergency in the resumption of coining, which was embarked on simply by using the resources available and without waiting for all the niceties to be brought up to date. The archives of the mint provided the coin portraits and the obv. legends, and the administrative officers of Daza, who were put in charge of the coining, obtained the gold types from Nicomedia. The mint signum HT (series i and ii) used initially was, I suggest, employed as long as the emperor himself had not taken up his residence in the mint city. On his arrival *S(acra)M(oneta)* was added to the exergual letters.

71 RIC vii, Nic. N:o 1-2; 5-6.

72 RIC vii, Ant. N:o 1-3.

and Heraclea, as a courtesy by Maximinus who was concluding or had concluded a triarchical treaty with his western colleagues. He had become *maximus augustus*; consequently he could be generous in appointing his younger colleagues consuls in the New Year 312, borrow the imagery of their coins and celebrate the *quinquennalia plena* of Constantine and *incipientia* of Licinius, which happened to coincide in December 312. This is also the natural explanation for Daza's non-appearance on this coin type, since it does not mean that no gold was struck in his name at the time in question.

Similarly, Constantine celebrated his own and Licinius' jubilees by issuing — at Rome⁷³ and at Ticinum⁷⁴ — the VICTORIAE LAETAE PRINC PERP / VOT X solidi with obverses of both rulers.

10. I should now like to sum up what I regard as the results of this inquiry. Let me suggest this:

(1) The coinages of the easternmost mints issued after the death of Galerius contained many unexpected features, which had to be explained in terms of general politics as well as coining policies. Some details were worthy of note, for example the occurrence in the East of a vota reverse created for Constantine's *quinquennalia* at Trier in December 311, and further the conspiratorial portrait of Constantine. All this shows that Daza at this time was prepared to reach an understanding with his fellow-rulers to the exclusion of the usurper Maxentius, but presumably on the condition that the position of *maximus augustus* was reserved for himself.

(2) All the coinage of Heraclea from the death of Galerius to Maximinus' ignominious departure from Europe in May 313, appears to have been struck by Maximinus. Provided the mint remained in Licinius' hands, it was inactive. The issuing of coins marked *S(acra)M(oneta)* coincide with Daza's stay in Europe.

(3) Licinius, aspiring to the conquest of Italy, was initially, i.e. about the time of Constantine's *quinquennalia* in December 311, quite willing to co-operate with Constantine. Nevertheless, Constantine's conspiratorial portrait was not struck in the Licinian empire until Constantine had taken the peninsula. Similarly Daza was regarded with distrust or enmity by Licinius, and consequently on at least two occasions excluded from his coinage: Daza constituted a threat in that although he had not violated Licinian territory he had usurped the position of *maximus* which in the natural order of things belonged to Licinius. Therefore, when Daza struck aurei celebrating the *quinquennalia* of his colleagues, originally at Antioch,

73 Not published in RIC; excluded from RIC vi by Dr. Sutherland as being issued at Constantine's *decennalia*, cf. Addenda, 688 with reference to my referring the type to the *quinquennalia*, RIC vii, 281.

74 Not published in RIC, cf. RIC vi, 297, n. 1.

subsequently at Nicomedia and Heraclea,⁷⁵ Licinius issued vota coins at Siscia taking no account of his fellow-rulers in the East or in the South.

(4) The chronological landmarks on the coins indicate the time around the New Year 313 as having been the most critical and possibly the most decisive in the relations of the three emperors.

Q

The vota coins indicate this period as does the II sign (cf. Pl.II.12-13), possibly signifying *quinquennalia duorum augustorum* or *bis celebranda* on the Antiochene aurei;⁷⁶ significantly enough, with this mark we also have a consular reverse of Constantine (Pl.II.13), which confirms the dating. Licinius' refusal to co-operate at this juncture is understandable — Constantine had just crowned his piratical Italian campaign with the capture of Rome, rightly Licinius' share of the empire. Soon, however, Licinius realizes that he has to come to terms at least with one of his opponents, and so, in February, he meets Constantine in Milan, marries his sister and concludes the famous agreement on religious tolerance. Peace is restored in the western empire — and Licinius once more coins in Siscia in the name of Constantine, introducing the conspiratorial portrait of Trier (Pl.I.2), and, thereby, admitting that the conspirator had won the day after all.

⁷⁵ The first vota aurei of Nicomedia may have been contemporaneous with the issue of Antioch, but we have to consider the possibility of a time lag, and even more so in the case of Heraclea.

⁷⁶ For the coins, see RIC vii, Ant. N:o 4-6.

KEY TO PLATES

In the list of coins illustrated I have recorded (a) the number in the coin lists of Roman Imperial Coinage (RIC), (b) the denomination, (c) the rev. legend, (d) the specific coin illustrated, citing either collection or sale catalogue, and (e) the officina for the folles. As the main argument of the paper concerns the portraiture, reverses have been illustrated in exceptional cases only. For the same reason most obverses have been considerably enlarged. The folles are all from the collection of the National Museum of Finland in Helsinki.

PLATE I

1. Obv. of Constantine, RIC vi, Trier N:o 814, solidus PRINCIPI IV-VENTVTIS, from sale catalogue Rollin and Feuarent 1896 (Montagu coll.), 805.
2. Obv. of Constantine, RIC vi, Trier N:o 812, solidus GLORIA EXER-CITVS GALL, in National Museum, Belgrade.
3. Obv. of Constantine, RIC vi, Cyz. N:o 101b, follis GENIO AV-GVSTI, National Museum, Helsinki, off. A.
4. Obv. of Maximinus, RIC vi, Cyz. N:o 101a, follis GENIO AV-G-VSTI, National Museum, Helsinki, off. A.
5. Obv. of Maximinus, RIC vi, Cyz. N:o 77a, follis GENIO AV-GVSTI CM-I, off. A.

6. Obv. of Maximinus, RIC vi, Cyz. N:o 70, follis GENIO IMP-ERATORIS, off. Γ .
7. Obv. of Licinius, RIC vi, Sis. N:o 234a, follis IOVI CONSERVATORI AVGG NN, off. E.
8. Obv. of Constantine, RIC vi, Sis. N:o 234c, follis IOVI CON-SERVA-TORI AVGG NN, off. B.
9. Obv. of Constantine, RIC vii, Sis. N:o 3, follis IOVI CON-SERVATORI AVGG NN, off. Γ .
10. Obv. of Constantine, RIC vii, Sis. N:o 3, follis IOVI CONS-ERVATORI AVGG NN, off. E.
11. Obv. of Licinius, RIC vii, Sis. N:o 4, follis IOVI CON-SERVATORI AVGG NN, off. B.
12. Obv. of Constantine, RIC vii, Sis. N:o 15, follis IOVI CON-SERVATORI, off. Γ .

PLATE II

1. Obv. of Constantine, RIC vi, Her. N:o 67 var., follis IOVI CONS-ERVATORI, off. Δ .
2. Obv. of Licinius, RIC vi, Her. N:o 68, follis IOVI CONSER-VATORI AVGG, off. B.
3. Obv. of Licinius, RIC vi, Her. N:o 73, follis IOVI CONSER-VATORI AVGG, off. Δ .
4. Obv. of Constantine, RIC vi, Her. N:o 75, follis IOVI CONSER-VATORI AVGG, off. Γ .
5. Obv. of Constantine, RIC vi, Her. N:o 75, follis IOVI CONSER-VATORI AVGG, off. E.
6. Obv. of Constantine, RIC vii, Her. N:o 1, aureus IOVI CONSER-VATORI AVGG, in Castello Sforzesco, Milan.
7. Obv. and rev., RIC vii, Her. N:o 4, aureus VOTIS V-MVLTIS X/VICTORIA AVG, in the Hunterian Museum, Glasgow.
8. Obv. and rev., RIC vii, Nic. N:o 1, aureus VOTIS V-MVLTIS X/VICTORIA AVG, from sale catalogue Schlessinger 31.1.—1.2.1939, 585.
9. Obv. of Constantine, RIC vii, Nic. N:o 5, aureus VOTIS V-MVLTIS X/VICTORIA AVG, sale cat. Hess, May 1935 (Trau coll.), 3905.
10. Obv. and rev., RIC vii, Ant. N:o 1, aureus VOTIS V-MVLTIS X/VICTORIA AVG, sale cat. Hess/Leu 41, 564.
11. Obv. of Licinius, RIC vii, Ant. N:o 3, aureus VOTIS V-MVLTIS X/VICTORIA AVG, in Dumbarton Oaks.
12. Obv. and rev., RIC vii, Ant. N:o 4, aureus VOTIS V-MVLTIS X/VICTORIA AVG, sale cat. Hess, May 1935 (Trau coll.), 3788.
13. Obv. and rev., RIC vii, Ant. N:o 5, aureus CONSVL P P-PROCONSVL, in the British Museum.

PLATE I



1



2



3



4



5



6



7



8



9



10



11



12



1



2



3



4



5



6



7



8



9



10



11



12



13

