

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

NOVA SERIES

VOL. II

HELSINKI 1958 HELSINGFORS

INDEX

Pentti Aalto	Marginal Notes on the Minoan Linear B . . .	7
Patrick Bruun	The Disappearance of Sol from the Coins of Constantine	15
Johan Chydenius	Nathan the Prophet in Dante's Paradiso . . .	38
Reino Hakamies	Remarques lexicographiques sur le latin médié- val de Finlande	42
Karl-Erik Henriksson	Epigraphica Christiana Vaticana	52
Iiro Kajanto	Notes on Livy's Conception of History	55
Edwin Linkomies	De textu Petroniano recensendo	64
Eino Mikkola	»Schole» bei Aristoteles	68
Päivö Oksala	»Fides» und »Pietas» bei Catull	88
Erkki Palmén	Die lateinischen pronominalen Ortsadverbien in Kasusbedeutung.	104
T. Steinby	A Pontifical Document	143
Jaakko Suolahti	The Council of L. Cornelius P. f. Crus in the Year 49 B.C.	152
J. Svennung	Numerierung von Fabrikaten und anderen Ge- genständen im römischen Altertum	164
Holger Thesleff	On the Origin of the Genitive Absolute	187
Rolf Westman	Textkritisches zu Senecas Dialogen	208
Henrik Zilliacus	<i>Τραγωδία</i> und <i>δρᾶμα</i> in metaphorischer Bedeu- tung	217

THE DISAPPEARANCE OF SOL FROM THE COINS OF CONSTANTINE

P a t r i c k B r u u n

I

Among the many intricacies of Constantinian chronology, there are but few indisputable dates serving historians as a backbone for the reconstruction of the course of events. One of the certain dates is the reconciliation between Constantine in the West and Licinius in the East on 1st March 317 A.D. The settlement between the two fellow rulers was confirmed through the appointment as Caesars of the sons of the imperial houses, Crispus, Constantine the Younger and Licinius the Younger.

The elevation to Caesarian rank conferred on the younger princes the right to be depicted on the coins and almost immediately after their *Dies imperii* new issues with obverses of the Caesars were struck in the majority of the imperial mints.

These issues have been observed and commented upon by several scholars although in a rather roundabout way. The fact that, in the West, Crispus as the oldest was connected with the reverse type *PRINCIPIA IVVENTVTIS*, Constantine II with *CLARITAS REIPVBLICAE* and the Licinii with *IOVI CONSERVATORI* has been regarded as satisfactory.

Reality, of course, is far more complex and the purpose of the present paper is to analyze these issues as a whole, i.e. to study the last issues of the Constantinian Sol Coinage. As a matter of fact a survey of the disappearance of Sol is highly instructive. Different mints chose different ways of carrying out the instructions of the central authority. Thus the last Sol Coinage reflects both imperial policy and local ambitions.

The post-Serdican mintmarks¹ of the Sol Coinage of Londinium were

¹ I. e. mintmarks struck after the settlement of Serdica on 1st March 317 A.D.

S
 S | P * | P ∪ | ∪ | *

four¹ $\overline{\text{PLN}}$, $\overline{\text{PLN}}$, $\overline{\text{PLN}}$ and $\overline{\text{PLN}}$. Remarkably enough the Licinii were completely ignored, no *IOVI CONSERVATORI* type was struck, no obverses of the Licinii are known. The reverse types were *SOLI INVICTO COMITI* standing left, *PRINCIPI* (later *PRINCIPIA*) *IVVENTVTIS* standing right and *CLARITAS REIPVBLICAE* standing left. It seems that no special reverse types were attributed to the different rulers. Of the first issue both *Soli* and *Claritas* have obverses of Constantine as well as of both his sons, Crispus and Constantine II. Of the third usual type, honouring the elder son as *Princeps iuventutis* one specimen only is known with the unusual legend *PRINCIPI IVVENTVTIS*, otherwise, in this context, known from the mint of Treveri only, as will be shown below. The obverse is of Constantine I.

The next complete issue representing all three reverse types was mintmarked $\overline{\text{PLN}}$. Here the same principles of connecting obverses of all three rulers with all the reverses was followed. The reverse legend *PRINCIPI IVVENTVTIS* was replaced by *PRINCIPIA IVVENTVTIS*.

S
 * | P ∪ | *

Both the starmarked issues $\overline{\text{PLN}}$ and $\overline{\text{PLN}}$ are characterized by the absence of all other reverse types except *Soli* although obverses of all three rulers are known. It is tempting, therefore, to regard them not as independent issues but as complementary ones where the marks of issue, in these cases $\overline{\text{S | P}}$ or a crescent, have been supplemented by a star.

Typical of the Sol Coinage of Londinium was the great variety of obverse legends. Long and short legends alternated for all rulers without any apparent system. All obverse busts were laureate.

The mint of Lugdunum was apparently closed shortly after the settlement in Serdica — sufficiently early to prevent the post-Serdican Sol Coinage to be struck.²

The Sol Coinage of Treveri has many interesting aspects, the most remark-

¹ The order of issues has been established by CARSON and KENT in »Constantinian Hoards and Other Studies in Late Roman Bronze Coinage« (CHAOS), Num. Chron. 1956, now in the press. I am much obliged to them for the opportunity to take part of their manuscript.

Their hoards, however, contained one specimen only of the $\overline{\text{S | P}}$ issue.

² Cf. the author's Arelate p. 63 type 3 (e.g. Pl. I, 13).

able being, as was the case in Londinium, the conspicuous disregard of the Licinii; no obverse of Licinius II is known and Licinius I disappears after the initial stages of the coinage. Another surprising feature is that the types *MARTI CONSERVATORI* and *GENIO POP ROM* obviously maintained themselves as late as the year A.D. 317.

The mint of Treveri struck the Sol coinage in two *officinae* numbered A and B. Three stages can be detected, namely

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{a) } \frac{\text{T} | \text{F}}{\text{ATR}} \quad \frac{\text{T} | \text{F}}{\text{BTR}} & \text{b) } \frac{\text{T} | \text{F}}{\cdot\text{ATR}} \quad \frac{\text{T} | \text{F}}{\text{BTR}} & \text{c) } \frac{\text{F} | \text{T}}{\cdot\text{ATR}} \quad \frac{\text{F} | \text{T}}{\text{BTR}} \end{array}$$

The first series comprised the reverse types *SOLI INVICTO COMITI*, stg 1, holding the globe at hip level, succeeded by the normal *Soli* type, stg 1, *MARTI CONSERVATORI*, Mars stg 1, *GENIO POP ROM*, Genius stg 1 and *CLARITAS REIPUBLICAE*, Sol adv. 1. An equal number (roughly) of coins was struck in both *officinae* except the first *Soli* type of which 8 coins only are known, all struck in off. A.

The types *Soli* (131 coins¹, in the Llangarren Hoard, published in CHAOS, 138 coins) and *Marti* (26 coins; Llangarren 6 coins) were allocated to Constantine, *Genio* (51 coins; Llangarren 83 coins) to Licinius I and *Claritas* (11 coins) to the sons of Constantine, Crispus and Constantine II. Apparently this issue started in the year 316 A.D., at any rate not later than at New Year 317 A.D. and was superseded by the next very soon after the introduction of the Caesars into the coinage, in early spring. Clearly some time must have elapsed before the news of the settlement in Serdica reached Treveri and before it was possible, for technical reasons, to carry out orders from the Head Quarters of Constantine. The different ways of executing the imperial will in the Gallic and British mints, i.e. in Treveri, Arelate and Londinium², show that many details were left to the discretion of the local mint authorities. Therefore some time must be allowed for communicating the orders to Treveri and some additional time for carrying out the instructions given.

Incorporating the Caesars into the coinage necessitated a reorganization of the coining system. The main features remained unaltered although Licinius and his *Genio* type disappeared (1 coin only known, struck in off. ·A).

¹ The material includes the coins of the collections in London, Oxford, Cambridge, Glasgow, Paris, Vienna, Munich, Milan (partly), the three big collections in Rome (partly) and the Scandinavian museums.

² Lugdunum, of course, struck no post-Serdican Sol Coinage.

Constantine retained both his reverse types, *Soli* and *Marti*, Crispus and Constantine II their common type *Claritas*, but still another type, *PRINCIPI IVVENTVTIS*, was struck for the sons of Constantine. As a matter of control, in order to differentiate the two issues, the first *officina* A was marked with a dot preceding the *officina* letter. For some obscure reasons this was not done for the second workshop. While the mintmark remained exactly the same new varieties of the reverse types common to both issues were introduced. The explanation is that, off. A in the second phase continued to strike identical types and therefore required to be differentiated by placing a dot by A. Off. B in the second phase struck distinct varieties of its types and therefore did not require to be differentiated.

T | F

We get the following system: Whereas the *officina* \cdot ATR (*officina* mark \cdot A) struck *SOLI INVICTO COMITI* as before stg 1, the *officina* \cdot BTR (*officina* mark B) struck *SOLI INVICTO COMITI* with Sol stg r, looking l. In the same way off. \cdot A struck *MARTI CONSERVATORI* stg r and *CLARITAS REIPVBLICAE* adv. l, both as before, whereas off. B struck *Marti* and *Claritas* stg r, look. l, exactly as Sol. The new types *PRINCIPI IVVENTVTIS* and *CLARITAS REIPVBLICAE* stg l were identical in both off., but in both these cases the chance of confusing them with the earlier issue was nil.

T | F

A comparison of the obverse legends of the two issues shows the justifica-

T | F

tion of this arrangement, i.e. the division of the coins mintmarked ATR,

T | F T | F

\cdot ATR and BTR into two separate issues. With the Sol stg l in off. \cdot A we have the obverse legends *IMP CONSTANTINVS PF AVG*, *IMP CONSTANTINVS P AVG*, *IMP CONSTANTINVS AVG* and *CONSTANTINVS PF AVG* (37 coins listed); all these obverse legends occur also with the Sol stg r, look. l in off. B with the addition of a single irregular *IMP CONSTANTINVS P AG* (in Oxford) altogether 47 coins and 3 hybrids with obverses of Crispus and Constantine II. The wide range of obverse legends is characteristic of this particular issue, especially the legend ending *P AVG*. The first

T | F

issue of the Sol Coinage A, BTR had the obverse legends *IMP CONSTANTINVS PF AVG*, *IMP CONSTANTINVS AVG* and *CONSTANTINVS PF*

F | T F | T

AVG, the third and last issue \cdot ATR and BTR had *IMP CONSTANTINVS*

AVG and *CONSTANTINVS PF AVG* only. The first *PRINCIPI IVENTVTIS* issue significantly had two alternative obverse legends for Crispus, *FL CL CRISPVS NOB CAES* and *FL IVL CRISPVS NOB CAES*. The former occurs solely connected with this particular issue; the different varieties of *Claritas* and the *PRINCIPI IVENTVTIS* of the F T issue have the *FL IVL CRISPVS*

T | F

NOB CAES legend only. And the parallel obverse legends occur both for ·ATR

T | F

and BTR. The obverses of Constantine II uniformly have the legend *FL CL CONSTANTINVS IVN NC* (·ATR 36 coins, BTR 30 coins of the type in

T | F

T | F

question). Thus the connection between the ·ATR and the BTR of the reverses indicated above is established beyond doubt and confirmed by the fact that the officinae of the last Sol Coinage issue were mintmarked ·A and B¹.

Little, then, remains to be said about the F T issue. *MARTI CONSERVATORI* now disappeared, Sol stg r, look. 1 both on the *Soli* and the *Claritas* coins was still confined to off. B, but Sol stg 1, *Claritas* stg 1 and *PRINCIPI IVENTVTIS* were now struck in both officinae. The F T issue concluded the Sol Coinage of Treveri.

The coinage of Arelate has been treated elsewhere by the author.² Although the general reverse types were the same as those of Treveri (with addition of *IOVI CONSERVATORI* in Arelate), some fundamental differences may be noted,

a) the allocation of a special reverse type to each ruler (except Licinius II who shared the *IOVI CONSERVATORI* with his father). In Treveri *PRINCIPI IVENTVTIS* and *CLARITAS REIPVBLICAE* had been the joint types of Crispus and Constantine II.

b) The introduction of *IOVI CONSERVATORI* as an Eastern type (for the rulers of the East).

c) the wording of the reverse legends, *PRINCIPIA* in Arelate instead of *PRINCIPI* in Treveri, *CLARITAS REIPVB* in Arelate for *CLARITAS REIPVBLICAE* in Treveri.

¹ The same method was used during the subsequent *VIRTVS EXERCIT* coinage, when the officinae were numbered P and S and the first workshop always was marked with a dot preceding the off. letter. Cf. the author's »The System of the Vota Coinages», Nordisk Numismatisk Årsskrift 1955 (in the press).

² The Constantinian Coinage of Arelate, Diss., Helsinki 1953.

The issues were, in chronological order:

R S R S R S C S P P
 ARLA, ARLP, PARL, PARL, P*A, P*A and P*A, P'A and P'A.

It is noteworthy that the post-Serdican Sol Coinage started without the Licinii. This can possibly be taken as a suggestion that Constantine already before the settlement in Serdica had appointed his own sons Caesars and only after the reconciliation gave the Licinii access to a coinage he had initiated some months earlier.¹ At any rate, the effects of Serdica became apparent during the second phase of the R S issue just as they made their impact felt during the second half of the T F coinage of Treveri. Whereas Treveri went on marking the first workshop with a dot and slightly varying the reverse types, Arelate varied the letters in the exergue, replacing ARLA with ARLP, and later with PARL.



The organization of the Sol Coinage did not remain unaltered during the whole period of issue. After the R S periods the *IOVI CONSERVATORI* became reserved for Licinius II while Licinius I joined Constantine on the *Soli* coins. The last issue of the Sol Coinage, probably in the year 322 A.D., when the tension between Constantine and Licinius was rapidly growing, was struck without any *Iovi* at all.

The Sol Coinages of the three Italian mints have only the main characteristics in common, i.e. the allocation of certain reverse types to certain rulers. In all three mints the *SOLI INVICTO COMITI* was reserved for Constantine, the *IOVI CONSERVATORI* for Licinius I, the *PRINCIPIA IVVENTVTIS* for Crispus² and the *CLARITAS REIPVBLICAE* for Constantine II.³ In Roma and Ticinum Licinius II shared his father's *Iovi* types, whereas in Aquileia a special type *CONCORDIA AVGG NN*, not known from any other mint, was designed for him.

Common to Roma and Ticinum were the bare-headed Caesarian busts struck at least on the initial stages of the coinage. Aquileia, however, consistently used laureate busts for the Caesars.

Three series of mintmarks are known from Roma, two from Ticinum, but one only from Aquileia.



The three issues of Roma were mintmarked R P A, R P , and R P . The first

¹ Cf. Arelate p. 25.

² Some obverses of Constantine II from the first issue of Roma are known.

³ Constantine and his sons shared this type in the first issue of Roma.

issue comprised the two usual varieties of Sol stg 1 and Sol stg r, look. 1, *Principia*, 3 varieties namely adv. r, stg r and stg 1, all chiefly reserved for Crispus but with a few coins of Constantine II of the two latter types, 2 varieties of *Claritas*, adv. 1, hold. whip (11 coins of Constantine, 6 coins of Crispus and 13 coins of Constantine II), and adv. 1, hold. globe and whip (1 coin only of Constantine II), and finally *Iovi*, two coins only of Licinius. Coins of all rulers were apparently struck in all *officinae*, the earliest coins of the two Caesars seem to have had bare-headed obverse busts, in the case of Crispus connected with the long obverse legend *CRISPVS NOBIL CAESAR*; all laureate busts of the elder son have the abbreviated legend *CRISPVS NOBIL CAES*.

In the next issue the organization within the mint had been carried a step further. All Caesarian obverses are laureate, *Principia* is strictly reserved for Crispus, *Claritas* for Constantine II, whereas the Licinii share the *Iovi* type. The *Soli* of Constantine were struck in all four *officinae*, the coins of Constantine II were struck in off. P, those of Crispus in off. S, the *Iovi* coins of Licinius II in off. T and those of the father in off. Q.

Exactly the same pattern was preserved during the third and last issue.

In addition we have a number of exceptional mintmarks on some *Principia* coins (and one *Claritas* of Constantine II, doublestruck) with obverses of Crispus. Both long legends and bare-headed obverse busts are known. The

sequence of mintmarks is RP, $\frac{*}{RP}$ and $\frac{*}{RP}$.

The first post-Serdican issue of the Sol Coinage of Ticinum was a very small one mintmarked PT; the coin lists of the present writer do not contain more than 15 coins of 4 different reverse types. *SOLI INVICTO COMITI* stg 1 and stg r, look. 1, *PRINCIPIA IVVENTVTIS* and *CLARITAS REIPVBLICAE* with obverses of Constantine, Crispus and Constantine II respectively. No obverses of the Licinii are known nor any coins of the type *IOVI CONSERVATORI*, which during the following issue was to be the Licinian reverse type; in this respect there is a similarity to the first issue of Roma although two exceptional *Iovi* with obverses of Licinius were known in that mint.

Now, there is one difficulty connected with the first post-Serdican issue of Ticinum. *SOLI INVICTO COMITI* coins of Constantine mintmarked in exactly the same way are known from an earlier period, between the battles of Ponte Molle and Tzirallum (October 312 — April 313).

The easiest way of approaching the first post-Serdican issue is to study

P

the second, mintmarked PT with coins of the reverses *Soli*, *Principia*, *Claritas* and *Iovi* for Constantine, Crispus, Constantine II and Licinius together with Licinius II respectively. Here the long obverse legend *IMP CONSTANTINVS PF AVG* was the only one struck for Constantine. The logical Constantinian obverse legend for the later PT issue would thus be the same. Accepting all the *IMP CONSTANTINVS PF AVG* obverses of *SOLI INVICTO COMITI* mintmarked PT as struck after or during the first Civil War with Licinius, there remains a great number of Constantinian obverses with short legends, i.e. *CONSTANTINVS PF AVG* which all have to belong to the earlier PT issue. That these obverse legends are the earliest of Ticinum after Constantine's conquest of the mint is proved beyond doubt by the *GENIO POPVLI ROMANI* issue with the obverses *CONSTANTINVS PF AVG* and *MAXIMINVS PF AVG*. Of this early PT issue only six coins with long obverse legends are known, all of *MARTI CONSERVATORI*, Mars stg r (against these 6 we have 28 of the short obverse legend). There is even the possibility that the six exceptional long obverses belong to the post-Serdican issue despite the fact that Mars is very rare on coins of that time (the only case proved so far is Treveri, as has been shown above). Mars and Sol are connected in all issues of Ticinum up to 317 A.D. except the very small issue mintmarked P R

P T (8 coins listed, all with obverses of Constantine). Thus we arrive at the conclusion that the first *Soli* issue of Ticinum used the short obverse legend *CONSTANTINVS PF AVG* except the six instances of long legends on coins of the type *MARTI CONSERVATORI* if they are not accepted as post-Serdican, and that all subsequent *Soli* issues carried the long obverse legend with *IMP*.

This way of distinguishing the coins of these issues appears to be much safer than the method of judging from weight and measure alone. The weights of the late PT *Soli* coins range from 2.62 grm to 3.70 grm, the *Marti* (Constantine, short legend) from 2.70 grm to 4.60 grm or (Constantine, long legend) from 2.74 grm to 4.25 grm, the early *Soli* (short legend) from 3.00—5.78 grm. Obviously there was a gradual decrease of weight, but single specimens cannot be dated on the evidence of weight alone.

There is little more to be said with regard to the first post-Serdican issue. Probably it already commenced before Serdica and was discontinued shortly after the introduction of the Caesars into the coinage as is proved by the

fact that only three coins of the Caesars are known, two of Crispus and one of Constantine II. On all three coins the Caesars were depicted as bare-headed.

P

With the second issue P T the Licinii also were introduced into the coinage, both of them consistently depicted with a laureate head on the obverse.¹ Two different obverse legends are known for Crispus and Licinius II, namely *IVL CRISPVS NOB CAES* and *CRISPVS NOB CAES*², and *LICINIAN LICINIVS IVN* and *LICINIVS IVN NOB CAES*, two different types of obverse busts are known for the sons of Constantine, laureate and bare-headed (for each type both draped, seen from behind and draped or cuir.). This suggests that the issue was struck in two or three stages:

I *CRISPVS NOB CAES*, bare-headed r, drap. or cuir.

CONSTANTINVS IVN NOB CAES, bare-headed r, drap., seen from behind.

After a transitional stage characterized by the obverse *CRISPVS NOB CAES*, laur. r, drap. or cuir. and *LICINIAN LICINIVS IVN*³, laureate head r we get

II *IVL CRISPVS NOB CAES*, laur. r, drap. or cuir.

CONSTANTINVS IVN NOB CAES, laur. r, drap., seen from behind

LICINIVS IVN NOB CAES, laureate head r.

The post-Serdican Sol Coinage of Aquileia formed a single issue mint-marked AQP, characterized by its regularity. The division of labour within the mint was the usual one with *Soli* for Constantine, *Iovi* for Licinius, *Principia* for Crispus and *Claritas* for Constantine II. Licinius II also had a type of his own, *CONCORDIA AVGG NN*, a quite exceptional reverse at least in this context. The division of labour strictly reserved all the coins of Constantine to off. P, the coins of his sons to off. T and the coins of the Licinii to off. S (one exception only is known, a Licinius of off. P).

This distribution of *officinae* conclusively proves that all these reverses together constituted a coherent issue. The only theoretically doubtful point

¹ One *Soli* coin with a laur., cuir. bust r of Licinius may be a hybrid. CHAOS (No. 690), however, also records a surprising *SOLI INVICTO COMITI*, obv. *IMP LICINIVS PF AVG*, mintmarked ST.

² The latter being the earlier, used already during the PT issue.

³ Mr. R. A. G. CARSON of the British Museum, who has been kind enough to read the manuscript remarks that a laur. bust of Lic. II very unlikely would have been associated with bare-headed busts of the sons of Constantine. Thus this early obv. leg. must belong to the transitional stage.

is the *Soli* type because *Soli* mintmarked AQP was struck before the Civil War I also. All these early *Soli* coins, however, were of the type Sol stg 1, captive by his feet to left, and at least the sequences of coins numbering the *officinae* P, S, Γ were struck before the break with Daza. On the other hand, the *Soli* marking the *officinae* P, S, T with the long obverse legend *IMP CONSTANTINVS PF AVG* cannot be part of the post-Serdican issue because these *Soli* were struck in all three *officinae*, not in off. P alone as would have been expected of the post-Serdican issue with its strict division of labour. A curious feature of the coinage is the high number of varieties of *Claritas* (advancing 1, adv. 1 with whip and adv. 1 with globe and whip) and of the obverse legends of Constantine II: *CONSTANTINVS IVN NOB CAES*, *CONSTANTINVS IVN NOB C*, *CONSTANTINVS IVN NB C*, *CONSTANTINVS IVN N C*, whereas for all other rulers one obverse legend only was used. There are also two coins of Constantine II with the exceptional obverse bust laureate, draped turned left.

The Sol Coinage of Siscia¹ offers some difficulties. We have three series of coins which conceivably might belong to the Sol issues. *_____

I. The *SOLI INVICTO COMITI*, Sol stg 1, mintmarked ASIS, all with obverses of Constantine, together with a *Claritas*, also of Constantine.

II. The *SOLI INVICTO COMITI*, Sol stg 1, mintmarked ASIS with Constantine II, the *PRINCIPIA IVVENTVTIS* with Crispus and Licinius II (1 coin) and the *CLARITAS REIPVBLICAE* with Constantine II.

III. The *IOVI CONSERVATORI*, Iup. stg 1, hold. Victory on globe, eagle with wreath to left, mintmarked ASIS with obverses of Licinius. *_____

Now, first of all, it seems natural to connect the *Soli* coins marked ASIS with the second group marked ASIS comprising coins of the sons of Constantine. It would certainly have been extraordinary to have an issue, elsewhere struck to celebrate the nomination of the Caesars, with just a few exceptional coins of the reverse *Claritas* with the obverse of Constantine. It would have been equally curious to have an issue of *Soli* without Constantine (regardless of whether or not the *Iovi* belonged to the same issue). Therefore one might regard the *SOLI INVICTO COMITI* and the *CLARITAS REIPVBLICAE* mintmarked ASIS, all with obverses of Constantine, as being part of the same issue as the *SOLI INVICTO COMITI* of Constantine II

¹ The mint of Siscia came into the hands of Constantine through the reconciliation of Serdica.

(exceptional, 4 coins only listed) the *Principia* of Crispus (20 coins against 1 of Licinius II) and the *Claritas* of Constantine II (25 coins). If so the star in the field should be interpreted as a special mark of Constantine.¹

This does not, however, solve the question of whether the *IOVI CONSERVATORI* mintmarked ASIS belonged to the pre-Serdican or post-Serdican period. *Iovi* is also missing in Thessalonica, the second mint ceded to Constantine after the settlement; Licinius had been neglected also in the Sol Coinage of other mints except Siscia. The absence of Licinian obverses in this particular coinage, the most significant one from the religious point of view, would therefore not have been surprising as such. The only Western coinage struck immediately after the reconciliation consistently carrying Licinian obverses was the ordinary Vota Coinage² without any religious stress. Even the *VICTORIAE LAETAE PRINC PERP — VOT PR* coinage of Siscia lacked obverses of Licinius during its initial stages.³ Moreover, had the ASIS *Iovi* issue been a part of the Sol Coinage one would have expected obverses of Licinius II as well as in some other mints (Arelate, Roma, Ticinum) or a special reverse for Licinius II as in the neighbouring mints of Siscia, Aquileia and Thessalonica.⁴ The fact that the *Iovi* coins are of small module and accordingly late is not proof enough for a date after the settlement of Serdica. The obvious solution is that this very small issue of *IOVI CONSERVATORI* (four coins only listed, all in Vienna, of the *officinae* A, B, Γ, E) was struck immediately before the war. This view is supported by the fact that the *Iovi* reverse of Siscia shows Iupiter holding Victory on globe, whereas the *Iovi* struck as part of the Sol Coinage in Arelate, Roma, Ticinum and Aquileia, have Iupiter holding a thunderbolt.⁵

In the second of the mints ceded to Constantine in the settlement in Serdica, Thessalonica, the most striking feature was the absence of coins of the type

¹ Very much in the same way as the christogram on the *VIRTUS EXERCIT VOT XX* of Ticinum was the mark of Constantine II and Licinius II; cf. The System of the Vota Coinages.

² Cf. Constantinian Mint Policy (Nordisk numismatisk årsskrift 1954, printed 1956). The only exception is the initial Vota Coinage of Lugdunum (ibid. p. 7). Londinium and Treveri struck the late Vota coins only when Constantine had broken with Licinius. VOETTER made the same conclusion as early as 1904 in his Catalogue Windischgrätz (p. 143 ff.). Although later opposed by MAURICE (Num. Const. II, p. 321 ff.) he maintained his point of view in NZ 53 p. 109 (cf. also Appendix, Tafel 7). In order to avoid difficulties MAURICE (l. c. p. 327) invented a sequence of *SOLI INVICTO COMITI* mintmarked ASIS without support of facts. He referred to VOETTER, although VOETTER never had recorded any such mintmark for *Soli*.

³ Cf. The System of the Vota Coinages.

⁴ The only coin of Licinius II belonging to the Sol Coinage is a *Principia*. The obverse legend was probably derived from the contemporary Vota coins.

⁵ Cf. Arelate p. 72, 75 ff., MAUR. I.

SOLI INVICTO COMITI, a unique occurrence in the Constantinian part of the Empire. Combined with the Licinian lack of *IOVI CONSERVATORI* this suggests an intentional break with the customary imagery of the prewar days in the frontier zone between West and East. Thus Thessalonica was instructed to strike the more or less neutral part of the usual post-Serdican coinage, *Principia* and *Claritas* with obverses of Crispus and Constantine II respectively, in accordance with the usage of other mints.

Now, there are some difficulties connected with analyzing and arranging the extant coin material. We have four groups of coins, all mintmarked ·TS·A·, the Vota coinage¹, with obverses of all five rulers, the Sol Coinage represented by the reverses *Principia* and *Claritas* (Crispus and Constantine II), the reverses *VICTORIA AVGG NN* and *VICTORIA CAESS NN* (together all five rulers) and *VIRT EXERC* (all five rulers).² Finally there is the otherwise unknown type *VIRTVS MILITVM DD NN*, Mars adv. r with obverses of Licinius II alone, which seemingly does not belong to any of these groups.

A study of the organization of the work of the mint, i.e. the division of labour, gives some indication of the system aimed at.

Obverses according to officinae					
Coinage	A	B	Γ	Δ	E
Vota Coinage	Lic. I	Const. II	Const. I	Crispus	Lic. II
Sol Coinage	Const. II	Const. II	Crispus	Crispus	Crispus
<i>VIRTVS MILITVM</i>	—	—	—	—	Lic. II
<i>VICTORIA AVGG</i>	Lic. I	—	Const. I	Const. I	—
» <i>CAESS</i>	Lic. II	Crispus ³	—	—	Crispus
		Const. II			
<i>VIRT EXERC</i>	Lic. I	Const. II	Const. I	Const. I	Crispus
	Lic. II				

Now, obviously, the Vota coins of Thessalonica formed an independent section of the Thessalonican coinage in the same way as the Vota Coinages of other mints.⁴ Therefore, it is nothing surprising to find a division of labour differing from the system adopted for the contemporary Sol Coinage.⁵ On

¹ Cf. Constantinian Mint Policy p. 40 ff.

² Cf. The System of the Vota Coinages.

³ Exceptional, 2 coins against 14 of off. E. The regular off. of Crispus was E as the similar arrangement of *VIRT EXERC* shows.

⁴ Cf. Mint Policy p. 52.

⁵ As to the date of the Vota Coinage, cf. Mint Policy pp. 40 f., 45. That the *Principia* and *Claritas* were struck as an outcome of Serdica, in the year 317 A.D. is proved by a comparison with other mints. How different sections of the coinage could allocate different *officinae* to different rulers is illustrated by the coinage of Arelate, cf. the author's Arelate p. 51 f. and Appendix I.

the other hand, there are, also in this respect, certain resemblances between the Vota Coinage and the Sol Coinage; in both sections Constantine II holds off. B and Crispus off. Δ. As Constantine and Licinius were left out with their reverses *Soli* and *Iovi* off. A was simply given to Constantine II and off. Γ and E to Crispus. Together the two reverse types *Principia* and *Claritas* thus employed the whole mint. Although the Sol Coinage of Thessalonica had a much narrower scope than the corresponding coinage of any other mint, it has to be regarded a complete section, or issue. This is, of course, of some consequence, when one considers the place of *VIRTVS MILITVM* in the whole system.

Again, the division of labour of the two complete issues comprising *VICTORIA AVGG NN* or *CAESS NN* and *VIRT EXERC* respectively is identical but differs from the basic division both of the Vota Coinage and of the Sol Coinage, above all manifest in the fact that Constantine now held off. Δ, previously allocated to Crispus. In the Victoria Coinage as well as in the *VIRT EXERC* coinage Licinius II consistently shared off. A with his father. It is important to keep this in mind when returning to the question of the *VIRTVS MILITVM* of Licinius II.

It is now quite clear that the special reverse struck for Licinius II should be classified together with the Sol Coinage. Very likely, it was conceived as a counterpart to *Principia* and *Claritas*.¹ However, the coin material available suggests that the original scheme did not include any obverses of Licinius II; otherwise it would be impossible to explain the coins of Crispus struck in off. E with regard to the otherwise strictly observed division of labour.

Now, two obverse legends of Crispus are known from the *Principia* coins, *CRISPVS NOBILISSIMVS CAES* and *CRISPVS NOBILISS CAES*. The former was struck in off. Γ (8 coins), Δ (4 coins) and E (4 coins), the latter in off. Γ and Δ only.² Conceivably the shorter obverse legend represented a later stage of coining, initiated when *VIRTVS MILITVM* was inaugurated as the special type of Licinius II.³

¹ Note the type *CONCORDIA AVGG NN* struck for Licinius II in Aquileia.

² The material is very scarce, only one coin of each off. listed. The lack of coins of off. E might, therefore, be due to pure chance.

³ Another possible connection between Licinius II and the Sol Coinage is formed by a hybrid *PRINCIPIA IVENTVTIS* with the obverse *LICINIVS IVN NOB CAESAR*, laureate head r (the regular obverse of the *VIRTVS MILITVM DD NN* coins), significantly struck in off. E. The coin is recorded by VOETTER's catalogue of the Gerin Collection as belonging both to the Voetter and Gerin collections, i.e. both in the middle of the page and in the margin, but cannot be found in Vienna. A pencil note of the coin has been added to the handwritten Voetter Catalogue kept in the Kunsthistorisches Museum.

These lengthy comments on the Sol Coinage of Thessalonica have proved that Constantine clearly wanted to give the coinage of the recently acquired mint a neutral character by means of excluding the reverses *SOLI INVICTO COMITI* and *IOVI CONSERVATORI* and thereby also the obverses of the two *augusti*. Because Licinius II in some other mints had shared the reverse *Iovi* with his father a new type was created, *VIRTVS MILITVM DD NN* and subsequently inaugurated with the coinage, which in its initial phase had comprised obverses — and reverse types — of Crispus and Constantine II only.

II

The crucial question with regard to the disappearing Sol Coinage concerns the dates of the issues discussed above. The coinage itself offers scarcely any help. The uniformity of the obverses within each mint deprives us even of the otherwise valuable reference to consulships as e.g. in the varied issues of *BEATA TRANQVILLITAS*. The only way to gain a foothold is to interrelate the different sections of the coinage of each mint.

Now, the BM research group (R. A. G. CARSON, J. P. C. KENT and P. V. HILL, in this context the two former) that recently has done so much to elucidate the problems of the Constantinian coinage, suggests that the evolution in one mint had parallels in other mints.¹ Generally speaking the suggestion is a sound one; the switch from Sol Coinage to *VICTORIAE LAETAE PRINCEPERP*, further from *VIRTVS EXERCIT* and Vota Coinage (or/and *BEATA TRANQVILLITAS*) to *PROVIDENTIAE AVGG* (or *CAESS*) is absolutely clear. Nevertheless, a summary of the *Soli* issues reveals some characteristic differences which make it impossible to accept the suggestion as such although it holds true for the mints of some geographically restricted areas, e.g. Northern Gaul and Britain, the Eastern frontier zone of the Constantinian Empire. Also, some important mints such as Treveri in the West, Arelate in Southern Gaul and Roma in Italy were likely to display a richer and more varied coinage than other mints, the peak outputs of which have been recorded on special occasions.²

¹ Mr. CARSON in recent letter to the present writer: »... that, however, is only an interpretation of the evidence and is possibly arguable».

² Cf. Aquileia and Ticinum striking Vota coins during Constantine's stay in Northern Italy A.D. 318, Constantinian Mint Policy p. 28.

A survey of e.g. the Londinian coins struck A.D. 317—324 might illustrate how the different sections of coinage were related to one another. Previously it has been noted how each section of coinage was an entity comprising special obverse legends and busts of each ruler concerned.¹ Now, there is a possibility of interrelating the different sections by means of intersectional hybrids; the sudden occurrence of a certain obverse bust, otherwise alien to the coinage in question, can at times be explained as deriving its origin from an other section of the coinage. In this case the two sections might conceivably be regarded as contemporary. The coins of Londinium provide some interesting instances of intersectional hybrids that serve as a means of fixing the dates of the various sections.

Now, the regular obverse busts of Constantine can be defined as follows:

- A. Sol Coinage laur., drap., cuir. r or laur., cuir. r
- B. *Victoriae laetae* laur. helm., cuir. r or high-crested helmet, cuir. r with spear and shield
- C. *Virtus exercit* helm., cuir. r
- D. *Beata tranquillitas* consular busts (varying), and helm. cuir. r or l
- E. Vota Coinage (*Sarmatia* for Constantine) laur. head r

All the busts not following this pattern belong to the later part of the *Beata* coinage, i.e. they are connected with the two issues of *BEATA TRANQUILLITAS*. The F B issue has (out of 36 coins recorded) ten specimens of two inexplicable busts laur., cuir. r (2) and laur., cuir. l (8), the PLON issue 3 obverses with spear, obviously borrowed from the obverses of Crispus. Accept-

P A

ing the order *BEATA TRANQUILLITAS* mintmarked PLON and PLON

F B

followed by *BEATA TRANQUILLITAS* mintmarked PLON and PLON² it may be noted that the ratio of helmeted busts grows gradually for the four issues, 3 (turned r) of 27, 4 of 12 (3 right, 1 left), 42 of 103 (14 + 28) and 17 of 36 (6 + 11), respectively.

¹ Arelate p. 51, Constantinian Mint Policy p. 9 f.

² Abandoning the view previously expressed in *The System of the Vota Coinages*, i.e. that the P A issue was the first, the F B issue the last of the *Beata* coinage. In favour of CARSON's and KENT's arrangement (cf. CHAOS) speaks i.a. that the issue marked with P A in the field comprises some coins (altogether 6 recorded, 2 of them in the unpublished Appleford hoard) with the abbreviated rev. leg. *BEATA TRANQUILLITAS*. There are some points in favour of the former view of the present writer but they seem definitely to be overruled by this argument together with the existence of an intersectional hybrid with the obv. leg. *CONSTANTINVS IVN NOB C*, further discussed below.

The obverse legends of Constantine are more illuminating than the busts. The legends employed for Constantine were:

1.		<i>IMP CONSTANTINVS AVG</i>	<i>IMP CONSTANTINVS AG</i>
	<i>Soli</i> S P	1 of 26	1 of 26 = 2 of 26
) I	4 of 27	— = 4 of 27
	<i>Victoriae</i> I	30 of 93	14 of 93 = 44 of 93
	II	11 of 30	3 of 30 = 14 of 30
2.		<i>CONSTANTINVS PF AVG</i>	<i>CONSTANTINVS P AVG</i>
	<i>Soli</i> S P	7 of 26	16 of 26
	S P	1 of 3	2 of 3
	*		
)	12 of 27	10 of 27
) *	2 of 7	4 of 7
	<i>Victoriae</i> I	—	1 of 93
	II	—	1 of 30
	<i>Beata</i> PLON	—	1 of 27
	P A	1 of 12	4 of 12
	<i>Beat</i> F B	—	1 of 36
	PLON	—	2 of 103
3.		<i>CONSTANTINVS AVG</i>	<i>CONSTANTINVS AG</i>
	<i>Soli</i> S P	1 of 26	— = 1 of 26
) *	1 of 7	— = 1 of 7
	<i>Victoriae</i> I	14 of 93	1 of 93 = 15 of 93
	II	2 of 30	— = 2 of 30
	<i>Virtus</i> PLON	8 of 8	— = 8 of 8
	PLN	9 of 13	4 of 13 = 13 of 13
	<i>Beata</i> PLON	24 of 27	2 of 27 = 26 of 27
	P A	4 of 12	3 of 12 = 7 of 12
	<i>Beat</i> F B	25 of 36	10 of 36 = 35 of 36
	PLON	72 of 103	29 of 103 = 101 of 103
	<i>Vota</i>	16 of 18	2 of 18 = 18 of 18

4. The obverse legends *IMP CONSTANTINVS MAX AVG*, *CONSTANTINVS MAX AVG* and *CONSTANTINVS MAX AG* are confined to the *Victoriae* coinage.

Of the five sections discussed the *Vota* coinage is without doubt the latest² as the connection with the reverse *SARMATIA DEVICTA* proves. Thus the obverse legend *CONSTANTINVS AVG* (or *AG*), almost exclusively struck

¹ A dubious *IMP CONSTANTINVS PF AVG* recorded in a lot in the Platt Hall Sale. Impossible to check, very likely a slip.

² Constantinian Mint Policy p. 11. Dr. KENT and Mr. HILL in their survey of the Constantinian coinage from the *Providentiae* onwards (in Spink's Numismatic Circular 1956, Jan.) and later Mr. CARSON in his account of the Canterbury hoard (Num.Chron. 1956, in print) have at least shaken my endeavour to date the beginnings of *Providentiae* to 323 A.D. (cf. Arelate p. 45 ff., coin lists p. 89 f.). Nevertheless, I still regard the question as open. In this context it is a pleasure to acknowledge my gratitude to Mr. CARSON for his readiness to send me a copy of his manuscript.

for the *Beata* and *Virtus* sections is shown to be a late one. Although both the Sol Coinage and *Victoriae laetae* employ this short legend it occurs much less frequently in those issues. The dominant obverse legends of the Sol Coinage are *CONSTANTINVS PF AVG* and *CONSTANTINVS P AVG* complemented by some *IMP CONSTANTINVS AVG* (or *AG*), the latter ones occurring frequently in the issues of *Victoriae laetae* together with legends with *MAX AVG* (or *AG*).

The regular obverse legends of Crispus were:

- A. Sol Coinage *FL IVL CRISPVS NOB CAES* and *CRISPVS NOB CAES*
- B. *Victoriae laetae* *FL IVL CRISPVS NOB CAES*
- C. *Virtus* *CRISPVS NOBIL C* and *CRISPVS NOB CAES*
- D. *Beata* *CRISPVS NOBIL C*
- E. Vota coinage *IVL CRISPVS NOBIL C*.

The regular obverse legends of Constantine II were:

- A. Sol Coinage *FL CL CONSTANTINVS IVN N C*
and *CONSTANTINVS IVN N C*
- B. *Victoriae laetae* *FL CL CONSTANTINVS IVN N C*
(and *CONSTANTINVS IVN N C?*)
- C. *Virtus* *CONSTANTINVS IVN N C*
- D. *Beata* *CONSTANTINVS IVN N C*
- E. Vota Coinage *CONSTANTINVS IVN NOB C*.

Again, for the Caesars, we find the long legends constituting the Sol Coinage and the *Victoriae laetae* issues as an earlier group, the intermediate groups *Virtus* and *Beata* with their dominating short legends being separated from the manifestly late Vota Coinage by its consistent use of the distinct legends *IVL CRISPVS NOBIL C* and *CONSTANTINVS IVN NOB C*.

Previously, when comparing the *BEATA TRANQVILLITAS* of the mints of Londinium, Treveri and Lugdunum, the present writer has propounded the theory that the *Beata* of Londinium were struck in the years A.D. 321—323.¹ Now the chronological connection between the Vota Coinage and the last *Beata* issue, *BEAT TRANQLITAS* mintmarked PLON, is established by a *BEAT TRANQLITAS* with the obverse *CONSTANTINVS IVN NOB C*, otherwise in this mint almost exclusively used on the vota coins.² Another

¹ The System of the Vota Coinages.

² It is interesting to note that we in Treveri have 16 intersectional hybrids with the obv. leg. *IVL CRIS|PVS NOB C* on *BEATA TRANQVILLITAS*, borrowed from the Vota Coinage. Here also the contemporaneity of *Beata* mintmarked ·PTR and vota can be established and not because of these hybrids alone (cf. The System of the Vota Coinages).

clear case of intersectional hybrids is constituted by two *VIRTUS EXERCIT* with the obverse *FL IVL CRISPVS NOB CAES*. Significantly enough the reverse is of the rare variety (in Londinium) without vota, clearly the earliest of the *Virtus* coinage.¹ Thus the transition from *Victoriae* to *Virtus* is illustrated.²

Trying to establish the sequence of the Londinian issues the most convenient point of departure is the close of the *Victoriae* issues and the start of the *Virtus* issues. Very likely the *VIRTUS EXERCIT* — *VOT XX* was introduced on Constantine's *Dies Imperii* on 24th July 320 when the quindecennial celebrations were initiated. Obviously the *VIRTUS EXERCIT* — *VOT XX* issue was preceded by the *Virtus* type without vota but with the same mintmark (PLON).³ The two intersectional hybrids of Crispus mentioned above prove the overlapping of *Victoriae* and *Virtus* and put the three ruler issue of *Victoriae* in the first half of the year 320 A.D. and the exclusively Constantinian *Victoriae* in 319 A.D. Our survey of the obverses has shown the connection between the Sol Coinage and *Victoriae*; whether the latter type covered the whole year or only the latter part from Constantine's *Dies Imperii*, is uncertain, but it is feasible that a Vota Coinage such as *Victoriae* struck *ad maiorem imperatoris gloriam* started on the day of his ascent to the throne. Thus the four mintmarks of the Sol Coinage covered at least the years 317—318 A.D., possibly a part of 319 A.D. also.

Now, the *BEAT TRANQLITAS* mintmarked PLON and the Vota Coinage were shown to overlap (if not the end of the former coincided with the start of the latter). Even if it is quite clear that the vota coins (and *SARMATIA DEVICTA* for Constantine) were struck 323 A.D. it is difficult to determine when the issue was initiated. As the vows must have been counted in years the Caesarian *Dies Imperii*, 1st March, is a plausible date, although other mints suggest that the issues began at New Year.⁴ The *Beata* issues, however, with their Constantinian vows, were likely to run from one *Dies Imperii* to another. Thus we get *BEATA TRANQVILLITAS* and *BEAT*

¹ Ibid. The majority of the Western mints follows the same pattern.

² Not accounted for is a number of confusing hybrid obverses: 4 *CONSTANTINVS IVN NOB C* on *Virtus* coins (PLN) although it is absolutely impossible to regard the *Virtus* as contemporary with the Vota Coinage, further the legends *FL IVL CRISPVS NOBIL C* (2) and *CRISPVS NOB CAESAR* (2) of *Victoriae* and finally some Constantinian busts of the *BEAT TRANQLITAS* issue marked with F B, namely laur., cuir. r (2) and laur., cuir. l (8).

³ The System of the Vota Coinages.

⁴ Constantinian Mint Policy p. 39 f.

TRANQLITAS covering the time from 24th July 321 — 24th July 323. A diagram of the entire coinage turns out like this:

317	Spring	Sol Coinage	
318		Sol Coinage	
319		Sol Coinage	24th July <i>VICTORIAE</i> (Constantine)
320		<i>VICTORIAE</i> (Constantine and his sons)	} 24th July <i>VIRTVS</i> <i>EXERCIT</i> — <i>VOT XX</i>
		<i>VIRTVS EXERCIT</i> (PLON)	
321		<i>VIRTVS EXERCIT</i> — <i>VOT XX</i> (PLN)	24th July <i>BEATA</i> (PLON)
		P A	F B
322		<i>BEATA</i> (PLON)	24th July <i>BEAT</i> (PLON)
323		<i>BEAT</i> (PLON)	to 24th July
		Vota Coinage with <i>SARMATIA DEVICTA</i> .	

III



The arrangement of the coins of Londinium can naturally not be regarded as conclusive of other mints; our survey of the Sol Coinage of the different mints in the Western part of the empire has disclosed so many individual features that it would be far too much to expect exact parallels with regard to the planning and striking of the many different sections of coinage concerned. Nevertheless, we have gained some insight in current mint usage and intersectional hybrids have provided us with a means of establishing overlapping sections. It should therefore be possible to give tentative dates for the last issues of the Sol Coinage with due regard to the number of issues struck. The dates will appear in the appended diagram (p. 34 f.).

Probably the most interesting historical result of this study of the Sol Coinage is the fact that the Licinii were neglected in a remarkable way in a number of mints. No coins of the Licinii were struck in Londinium and Treveri, Lugdunum being closed during the years in question. Arelate started without striking obverses of the Licinii and after a single issue Licinius was deprived of his own type; after one more issue he disappeared completely from the Sol Coinage. Roma also started without the Licinii¹, Siscia, although previously belonging to the Licinian part of the Empire, showed the rulers of the East a marked disregard when omitting the *IOVI CONSERVATORI* type. In Thessalonica Licinius likewise was left out of the coinage, this time together with Constantine himself and the coinage comprised no *Soli*, only

¹ Two exceptional coins of *Iovi* with obverses of Licinius are recorded.

SUMMARY OF THE POST-SERDICAN SOL COINAGE

MINTS, ISSUES	TYPES	SOLI INVICTO COMITI	I OVI CONSERVATORI	PRINCIPIA IVVENTVTIS ¹	CLARITAS REIPVBLICAE ²	CONCORDIA AVGG NN VIRTVS MILITVM DD NN	Tentative dating
LONDINIUM	S P PLN	C, Cr, C II	—	C ³	C, Cr, C II	—	Spring 317
	S P * PLN	C, Cr, C II	—	—	—	—	to
	v PLN	C, Cr, C II	—	C, Cr, C II	C, Cr, C II	—	Mid-year 319
	v * PLN	C, Cr, C II	—	—	—	—	
TREVERI	T F ATR BTR	C ⁴	—	—	Cr, C II	—	Spring 317
	T F ·ATR BTR	C ⁴	—	Cr, C II	Cr, C II	—	to
	F T ·ATR BTR	C	—	Cr, C II	Cr, C II	—	319
LUGDUNUM	—	—	—	—	—	—	
ARELATE	R S ARLA	C	—	Cr	C II	—	} New Year-Spring 317
	R S ⁵ ARLP	C	—	Cr	—	—	
	R S PARL	C	L, L II	Cr	C II	—	} Spring 317—318
	C S PARL	C, L	L II	Cr	C II	—	
	 P * A	C	L II	Cr	C II	—	} 319—320
	P P * A	C	L II	Cr	C II	—	
	P * A	—	—	Cr	C II	—	} 321
	P * A	C	—	Cr	—	—	
	P & A ⁵	C	—	Cr	—	—	} 322
	P & A ⁵	C	—	Cr	C II	—	

ROMA ⁶	A RP	C	L ¹⁰	Cr, C II ⁷	C, Cr, C II	—	Spring 317
		C	L, L II	Cr	C II	—	to
		C	L, L II	Cr	C II	—	319
TICINUM	P T	C ⁸	L, L II	Cr	C II	—	317 —
	P PT	C	L, L II	Cr	C II	—	318
AQVILEIA	AQP	C	L	Cr	C II	L II CONCORDIA	317
SISCIA	* ASIS; ASIS	C ⁹	—	Cr	C II	—	317
THESSALONICA	TS-A	—	—	Cr	C II	L II, VIRTUS	317

Abbreviations: C = Constantine, L = Licinius, Cr = Crispus.

S | P

¹ All the relevant coins of Treveri have the rev. leg. *PRINCIPI IVENTIVS*, in Londinium the *PLN* issue has *PRINCIPI*, the *PLN* issue has *PRINCIPIA*.

² Arelate consistently uses the rev. leg. *CLARITAS REIPVB*.

³ One coin only is known. The coins listed of this issue are: *Soli* 44 (Constantine 20, Crispus 14, Constantine II 10), *Claritas* 8 (Constantine 5, Crispus 2, Constantine II 1). It is impossible to decide whether or not Londinium in the same way as Treveri intended (had been ordered) to omit *Principi* in the beginning.

⁴ In addition to the Sol Coinage Treveri strikes, rather surprisingly, the type *MARTI CONSERVATORI* for Constantine and *GENIO POP ROM* for Licinius. Were it not for the fact that we have *Marti* coins struck also for the second issue, one would have been inclined to date the

T | F T | F

beginning of the mintmark *ATR*, *BTR* to early 316 A.D. and classify all *Marti* and *Genio* coins as pre-Serdican. The fact that 14 *Marti* of the second issue are listed and even one *Genio* makes this impossible.

⁵ The paucity of the coins known makes it almost impossible to trace the system of coining.

⁶ A number of regular looking *Principia* of Crispus mintmarked RP, RP and *RP*.

⁷ Three coins only of Constantine II against 25 of Crispus. Possibly hybrids.

⁸ A sequence of *Marti* coins has possibly to be regarded as contemporary.

⁹ The coins of Constantine are mintmarked *ASIS*, the others *ASIS*. A series of *IOVI CONSERVATORI* with obverses of Licinius has to be classified as pre-Serdican.

¹⁰ Two coins only of Licinius indicating that the Licinii did not take part in this coinage from the very beginning.

one type for each Caesar including Licinius II. The mints of Ticinum and Aquileia were the only ones to be observant towards the East, Aquileia to the degree that the mint introduced a special type for Licinius II.

Considering the imagery of the coins issued after the appointment of the Caesars in 317 A.D., the survival of the types *MARTI CONSERVATORI* (in Treveri, possibly in Ticinum) and *GENIO POP ROM* stands out as a feature equally unexpected as inexplicable. Thus the religious policy of Constantine, at least as mirrored in the bronze coinage of Treveri, appears unaltered during the ten years from A.D. 308 to 318.

The analysis of the Sol Coinage has shed some new light on the co-operation of the mints and on the co-ordination of issues. The resemblance between the issues of Londinium and Treveri is striking; except the consistent neglect of the Licinii in the Sol Coinage proper, the fact that no specific types for the Caesars were struck, should be noted. On the other hand the Treveran way of reserving the type *Soli* for Constantine contrary to the practice of Londinium shows that the common instructions to the mints did not go too far into detail. Another link between the mints is the wording *PRINCIPI IVVENTVTIS* on one of the reverse types (initial only in Londinium).

The coinages of Arelate, Roma and Ticinum correspond in many a respect, particularly in allocating special types to the different members of the house of Constantine and *IOVI CONSERVATORI* to the Licinii. The fact that, obviously, both Arelate and Roma started their Sol Coinage without obverses of the Licinii, whereas the first issue of Ticinum comprises all five rulers suggests that this issue was started a little later than the initiation of the Sol Coinage in the two other mints. Again, the two Italian mints did not continue their Sol issues long enough to see the Licinii with Licinius as the first disappear from the issues; it is even possible that the Sol Coinage was discontinued in Roma and Ticinum prior to Arelate's decision to let Licinius share the *Soli* reverse with Constantine.

There are some indications of connections between the three remaining mints of Aquileia, Siscia and Thessalonica just as on the first stage of the *Virtus* coinage.¹ All three mints strike one issue only. Aquileia and Thessalonica both have a special type for the son of the Eastern ruler, Siscia and Thessalonica carefully avoid to strike any obverses of Licinius. Generally, however, each ruler has a type of his own.

¹ Cf. The System of the Vota Coinages.

It remains to say a few words as regards the dates. Except the last Easternmost group mentioned, with a single issue of the year 317 A.D., the Sol Coinage was continued well into the year 319 A.D. Arelate was the only mint to carry the old traditional coinage of Constantine into the 320:ies. The reason was possibly that Arelate as the old Head Quarters of Constantine in many respects was a much favoured city as the renaming later was to prove. In Arelate the continuation of the Sol Coinage was balanced by scant issues of the *Virtus* and *Victoriae laetae* coinages; moreover, the full *Beata* issues of its Gallic neighbours never found any counterpart in Arelate. Thus we have, once more, seen a centrally organized imperial coinage in many ways retaining the individuality of the different mints.