

NOTAE NUMISMATICAE

ZAPISKI NUMIZMATYCZNE



Tom XVII

MUZEUM NARODOWE W KRAKOWIE
SEKCJA NUMIZMATYCZNA
KOMISJI ARCHEOLOGICZNEJ PAN
ODDZIAŁ W KRAKOWIE

Kraków 2022

NOTAE NUMISMATICAE

ZAPISKI NUMIZMATYCZNE

Tom XVII

MUZEUM NARODOWE W KRAKOWIE
SEKCJA NUMIZMATYCZNA
KOMISJI ARCHEOLOGICZNEJ PAN
ODDZIAŁ W KRAKOWIE

Kraków 2022

Komitet naukowy / Scientific Committee:

Prof. Peter van Alfen, Prof. Michael Alram, Prof. Aleksander Bursche, Prof. François de Callatay, Dr Karsten Dahmen, Prof. Georges Depeyrot, Dr Haim Gitler, [Zofia Gołubiew], Prof. Wiesław Kaczanowicz, Elżbieta Korczyńska, Prof. Katerini Liampi, Prof. Andrew Meadows, Prof. Mariusz Mielczarek, Dr Jiří Militký, Prof. Janusz A. Ostrowski, Prof. Maciej Salamon, Prof. Bernhard Weisser

Redakcja / Editorial Board:

Redaktor / Editor in Chief – Jarosław Bodzek
Zastępca redaktora / Associate Editor – Mateusz Woźniak
Sekretarze / Secretaries – Dorota Malarczyk, Anna Bochnak, Barbara Zajac

Redaktor tematyczny / Theme Editor:

Peter van Alfen

Redaktor językowy / Linguistic Editor:

Peter van Alfen

Recenzenci / Reviewers:

Prof. Peter van Alfen, Dr Hab. Bartosz Awianowicz, Dr Hab. Katarzyna Balbuza, Dr Roger Bland, Dr Hab. Tomasz Bochnak, Prof. Kevin Butcher, Dr Lilia Dergaciova, Dr Hab. Arkadiusz Dymowski, Dr Wolfgang Fischer-Bossert, Prof. Peter Guest, Dr Helle Horsnaes, Dr Krzysztof Jarzęcki, Dr Piotr Jaworski, Dr Hab. Agata Kluczek, Prof. Koray Konuk, Dr Hab. Mirosław Piotr Kruk, Dr Hab. Barbara Lichočka, Dr Kris Lockyear, Dr Lucian Munteanu, Dr Kyrillo Myzgin, Prof. Marek Olbrycht, Dr Hab. Judyta Rodzińska-Nowak, Dr David Wigg-Wolf, Dr Hab. Marcin Wołoszyn, Dr Dmitriy Yanov, Dr Bernward Ziegau

Redaktorzy prowadzący / Managing Editors:

Barbara Zajac, Anna Kowalczyk, Dorota Malarczyk

Tłumaczenia / Translations:

Piotr Godlewski, Marcin Fijak

Korekta / Proofreading:

Aeddan Shaw

Projekt graficzny i typografia / Graphic design and desk top publishing:

Luiza Berdak

Skład i lamanie / Typesetting and page layout:

Knight Press Dariusz F. Jasek

Adres redakcji / Address of the Editorial Office:

Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie
ul. Marszałka Józefa Piłsudskiego 12, 31-109 Kraków
tel. (+48) 12 433 58 50, e-mail: notae@mnk.pl
<http://mnk.pl/notae-numismatica-zapiski-numizmatyczne-1>

Wyłącznie odpowiedzialność za przestrzeganie praw autorskich dotyczących materiału ilustracyjnego ponoszą autorzy tekstów.
Authors of the texts bear the sole responsibility for observing the copyright illustrations.

Wersją pierwotną *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne* jest wersja elektroniczna.
The electronic edition of the *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne* is treated as its original version.

© Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie i Autorzy, 2022

ISSN 1426-5435

SPIS TREŚCI / CONTENTS

- 9 Od redakcji
10 From the Editors

ARTYKUŁY / ARTICLES

- 13 WILHELM MÜSELER
“Out of Area” : The Involvement of Non-Local Powers in Lycian Affairs between the 5th and the 4th Centuries BC
„Poza obszarem”. Zaangażowanie zewnętrznych potęg w sprawy Licji między V a IV w. p.n.e.
- 43 ŁUKASZ BUL
The Development of Krakow Type Staters
Ewolucja staterów typu krakowskiego
- 75 ADAM JEGLIŃSKI
The Imperial Eastern Bronze Coinage of CA/AVGVSTVS, SC, OB CIVIS SERVATOS Types Issued under Augustus. Chronology and Political, Economic, Propaganda Contexts
Wschodni cesarski pieniądz brązowy typu CA/AVGVSTVS, SC, OB CIVIS SERVATOS za panowania Augusta. Chronologia oraz konteksty polityczny, gospodarczy i propagandowy
- 115 JAROSŁAW BODZEK
A Note on the Cypriote GIC 603 and GIC 38 Countermarks
Notatka na temat cypryjskich kontramarek GIC 603 i GIC 38
- 127 JAROSŁAW BODZEK, IWONA LEWOC, KYRYŁO MYZGIN
A Coin in the Name of the Bosporan Ruler Cotys Found in the Suburbs of Augustów
Znalezisko monety z imieniem władcy Królestwa Bosporańskiego Kotysa w Augustowie
- 145 DAWID MACIEJCZUK, KRZYSZTOF JAWORSKI
Votive Offering or Accidental Loss? Finds of Roman Coins in the Sudetes in the Context of Medicinal Springs: A Case Study of Recent Finds from Stare Rochowice (Bolków-Zdrój)
Dary wotywnie czy przypadkowe zguby? Sudeckie znaleziska monet rzymskich w kontekście źródeł leczniczych – studium przypadku na tle najnowszych znalezisk ze Starych Rochowic (Bolkowa-Zdroju)

- 159 SZYMON JELLONEK
Final Chapter of Roman Colonial Coinage (AD 235–275): Reminiscence of *Romanitas*
Końcowy rozdział rzymskiego mennictwa kolonialnego (235–275). Reminiscencja Romanitas
- 199 KYRYŁO MYZGIN
New Finds of Gold Coins of Magnentius from Ukraine: The Short Report
Nowe znaleziska złotych monet Magnencjusza z Ukrainy. Krótkie doniesienie
- 221 VITAL SIDAROVICH
A Solidus of Valentinian III Found near the Village of Roŭnaje Pole in Belarus: An Unusual Find from the Belarusian-Lithuanian Borderland
Solid Walentyniana III znaleziony w pobliżu wsi Roŭnaje Pole na Białorusi – niezwyčajne znalezisko z białorusko-litewskiego pogranicza
- 235 YURIY ZAYONCHKOVSKIY, ANDREI BOIKO-HAHARIN
The Silver Coins of “Prince Simeon’s People”: An Unknown Part of the Numismatics of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania
Srebrne monety „ludu księcia Symeona” – nieznaną część numizmatyki Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego
- 247 ARKADIUSZ DYMOWSKI
A Graphical Method for Analysing Chronological Patterns of Coin Sets
Graficzna metoda analizy profili chronologicznych zestawów monet

POLEMIKI / POLEMICS

- 261 ANDREW M. CHUGG, ELENA VAROTTO, MICHAEL E. HABICHT, FRANCESCO M. GALASSI
Holt’s Fourth Porus Chariot-Type Medallion: A Point-by-Point Rebuttal
Czwarty „medallion Porusa z rydwanem” Holta. Odpowiedź punkt po punkcie

RECENZJE / REVIEWS

- 269 SZYMON JELLONEK
JIŘI MILITKÝ, MICHAL MAŠEK, *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. Czech Republic. Vol. I, part 10: Bactria and India (Early Bactria, Graeco-Bactrian and Indo-Greek Coins, Imitations, Indo-Scythians)*, National Museum, Prague 2019

- BARBARA ZAJĄC
272 SVITLANA A. BULATOVICH, EVGENIA F. REDINA, *Elektrovyye monety Kizika v sobranii Odesskogo arkeologicheskogo muzeya NAN Ukrainy. Katalog / Electrum Coins of Cyzicus in the Collection of the Odessa Archaeological Museum. Catalogue*, edited by M. MIELCZAREK and J. BODZEK, TEC, Odessa 2021
- GRZEGORZ SOCHACKI
277 JIŘI MILITKÝ, LUBOŠ KRÁL, *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. Czech Republic. Vol. IV: The Luboš Král Collection. Egypt: Roman Provincial Coinage*, National Museum, Prague 2021

KRONIKA / CHRONICLE

- MATEUSZ WOŹNIAK
285 Kronika Gabinetu Numizmatycznego Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie (2021)
290 *The Chronicle of the Numismatic Cabinet of the National Museum in Krakow (2021)*

Szanowni Państwo,

oddajemy w Państwa ręce tom XVII *Notae Numismaticae – Zapisków Numizmatycznych*. Zgodnie z przyjętymi przez nas zasadami wszystkie teksty publikujemy w językach kongresowych, z angielskimi i polskimi abstraktami. Zawartość całego obecnego tomu oraz tomy archiwalne są zamieszczone w formie plików PDF na stronie internetowej Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie (<https://mnk.pl/notae-numismaticae-zapiski-numizmatyczne-1>). Na stronie dostępne są ponadto wszelkie informacje ogólne o czasopiśmie oraz instrukcje dla autorów i recenzentów.

Rok 2022 był wyjątkowy dla całego środowiska numizmatyków w Polsce. Pierwszy raz w historii naszego kraju, a ujmując rzecz szerzej – w krajach Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej – odbył się XVI Międzynarodowy Kongres Numizmatyczny, najważniejsze spotkanie numizmatyków z całego świata, organizowane co sześć lat pod auspicjami International Numismatic Council. Wybór Polski, jako miejsca organizacji Kongresu traktujemy jako wielkie wyróżnienie. Głównym organizatorem tego wydarzenia był Uniwersytet Warszawski, a w przygotowaniach uczestniczyły również Muzeum Narodowe w Warszawie, Zamek Królewski w Warszawie, Polskie Towarzystwo Numizmatyczne, Narodowy Bank Polski oraz Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie. W tym ostatnim przypadku szczególnie zaangażowani w prace nad XVI INC byli pracownicy Gabinetu Numizmatycznego. Całością działań kierował profesor Aleksander Bursche z Wydziału Archeologii Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, pomysłodawca organizacji Kongresu w Polsce, którego wspierał Komitet Organizacyjny reprezentujący wszystkie najważniejsze polskie ośrodki numizmatyczne. Obrady kongresowe — które zgromadziły ponad 600 uczestników, czy to na miejscu w Warszawie, czy też w mniej licznych przypadkach, dzięki transmisji na żywo, w miejscach ich zamieszkania — uzupełniały liczne wydarzenia towarzyszące: wystawy, koncerty i spotkania.

Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie przygotowało z tej okazji specjalną wystawę: „Medal prywatnie. Medale w I Rzeczypospolitej (od XVI do XVIII wieku)”, której kuratorem była Agnieszka Smołucha-Sładkowska. Jednocześnie we współpracy z Uniwersytetem Jagiellońskim, krakowskim oddziałem Polskiego Towarzystwa Numizmatycznego, Królewską Biblioteką w Brukseli i Królewskim Towarzystwem Numizmatycznym w Belgii zorganizowano poprzedzającą właściwe obrady Kongresu międzynarodową sesję „Joachim Lelewel and Numismatics in the Nineteenth Century”. W ramach kongresu tradycyjnie opracowany został również Survey of Numismatic Research za lata 2014–2020, w prace nad którym aktywnie zaangażowani byli pracownicy Gabinetu Numizmatycznego: Jarosław Bodzek, Dorota Malarczyk i Barbara Zając. Co więcej, Gabinet Numizmatyczny Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie był silnie reprezentowany w obradach Kongresu, w czasie których wymienione powyżej osoby wygłosiły referaty. Kongres zakończył się wielkim sukcesem i stanowił znakomitą wizytówkę polskiej numizmatyki.

Redakcja

Dear Readers,

It is with great pleasure that we present volume 17 of *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne* to you. In accordance with the principles that we have adopted, our texts are published in the conference languages with English and Polish abstracts. The whole of the present volume can be found as PDF's on the website of the National Museum in Krakow (<https://mnk.pl/notae-numismaticae-zapiski-numizmatyczne-1>), as are previously published volumes of the journal. The website also contains general information about the journal as well as information for prospective authors and reviewers.

2022 was a special year for the entire numismatic community in Poland. It saw the XVI International Numismatic Congress being held in Warsaw, marking the first time that this most important meeting of numismatists from all over the world, organised every six years under the auspices of the International Numismatic Council, had been held in our country, or more generally in a country from Central and Eastern Europe. The choice of Poland as the venue for the Congress was a great honour. The main organiser of the event was the University of Warsaw, and also involved in its organisation were the National Museum in Warsaw, the Royal Castle in Warsaw, the Polish Numismatic Society, the National Bank of Poland, and the National Museum in Krakow. In this last case, the staff of the Museum's Numismatic Cabinet were particularly active in the work on the INC 2022. In charge of all activities was Professor Aleksander Bursche of the Faculty of Archaeology at the University of Warsaw, who was the driving force behind the organisation of the Congress in Poland, and who was supported in his role by the Organising Committee, representing all major Polish numismatic centres. The congress proceedings, which attracted more than 600 participants, either on-site in Warsaw or, in lesser numbers, thanks to live streaming, were complemented by a wide range of accompanying events, including exhibitions, concerts, and meetings.

The National Museum in Krakow organised a special exhibition for the occasion: "Private medal. Private medals in the 1st Republic of Poland (from the 16th to the 18th century)", curated by Agnieszka Smołucha-Sładkowska. At the same time, an international session on "Joachim Lelewel and Numismatics in the Nineteenth Century", preceding the Congress proper, was organised in cooperation with the Jagiellonian University, the Krakow Branch of the Polish Numismatic Society, the Royal Library of Brussels, and the Royal Numismatic Society of Belgium. As part of the Congress, the Survey of Numismatic Research for the years 2014–2020 was traditionally produced, with Jarosław Bodzek, Dorota Malarczyk and Barbara Zajac of the Numismatic Cabinet actively involved in its preparation. The Numismatic Cabinet of the National Museum in Krakow was also strongly represented in the proceedings of the Congress, where the abovementioned staff delivered papers. The congress was a great success and a real showcase for Poland.

The Editors

ADAM JEGLIŃSKI
Independent Researcher
ORCID: 0009-0007-6711-6648

The Imperial Eastern Bronze Coinage of CA/AVGVSTVS, SC, OB CIVIS SERVATOS Types Issued under Augustus. Chronology and Political, Economic, Propaganda Contexts

ABSTRACT: For over a century, Roman eastern bronze coins of the types CA/AVGVSTVS, SC and OB CIVIS SERVATOS, issued under emperor Augustus, have been the subject of numerous papers and studies which have led to divergent conclusions regarding their chronology, provenance, and function. While the main topic of this paper is their chronology, accurately establishing this entails the need for multi-faceted research encompassing historical data, art, archaeological artefacts, as well as insights into economy and geostrategy. This allows us to see how much that coinage reflects changes in the various aspects of the reality of the time, connected with the instauration of a new political system, namely the principate. Changes in legends, propaganda content and style of performance of imperial busts on the coins compared to the full-bodied portraiture testify not only to the solidification of Augustus's power, but also reflect current events of that time, propaganda drives, and the role of the army in the economy. They also reveal to some extent how the state administration was organized. The objective of the present paper is to review and analyse the material available and to provide a fresh outlook on the question, corroborating the existing conclusions and hypotheses or proposing new ones, wherever these appear more probable and are more convincingly substantiated.

KEY WORDS: Roman eastern bronze coins, Augustus, CA, SC, OB CIVIS SERVATOS, Antioch, Syria, Asia

ABSTRAKT: *Wschodni cesarski pieniądz brązowy typu CA/AVGVSTVS, SC, OB CIVIS SERVATOS za panowania Augusta. Chronologia oraz konteksty polityczny, gospodarczy i propagandowy*

Rzymskie wschodnie monety brązowe typów CA/AVGVSTVS, SC i OB CIVIS SERVATOS, wyemitowane za Augusta, są od ponad wieku przedmiotem wielu prac i badań, które doprowadziły do rozbieżnych wniosków w zakresie ich chronologii, pochodzenia i funkcji. Głównym tematem jest chronologia, dokładne jej ustalenie wymaga jednak wielowątkowego studium obejmującego dane historyczne, sztukę i artefakty archeologiczne oraz wglądu w gospodarkę i geostrategię. To pozwala zobaczyć, jak bardzo monety odzwierciedlają zmiany różnych aspektów ówczesnej rzeczywistości związane z wprowadzeniem nowego politycznego systemu, pryncypatu. Zmiany w legendach, treści propagandowej, stylu wykonania popiersi cesarskich na monetach w porównaniu z portretem pełnoplastycznym świadczą nie tylko o umacnianiu się władzy Augusta, lecz także odzwierciedlają bieżące wydarzenia epoki, działania propagandowe czy rolę wojska w gospodarce. Odślaniają do pewnego stopnia organizację administracji państwowej. Celem niniejszej pracy jest przegląd i analiza dostępnego obecnie materiału oraz dostarczenie świeżego poglądu na zagadnienie, a także potwierdzenie istniejących wniosków i hipotez lub zaproponowanie nowych, jeśli takie wydają się bardziej prawdopodobne i bardziej przekonujące uzasadnione.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: rzymskie wschodnie monety brązowe, August, CA, SC, OB CIVIS SERVATOS, Antiochia, Syria, Azja

INTRODUCTION

The bronze coinage of CA/AVGVSTVS, SC and OB CIVIS SERVATOS types issued in Syria and Asia Minor under the emperor Augustus, in the present paper referred to as the “imperial eastern bronzes”, has been the object of numerous studies. The establishment of their accurate chronology is rendered difficult by the absence of yearly dates and other pieces of information which would allow narrowing down issue dates to a single year of accuracy. Representations placed on the obverse of imperial eastern bronzes are limited to portraits of Augustus, the ones on the reverse follow a simple pattern: the letters CA or SC or else AVGVSTVS placed in the middle of the coin and surrounded by a laurel wreath, *corona civica* or *corona rostralis*. In the case of OB CIVIS SERVATOS type we have a variant of the above pattern, in which the word CIVIS is located in the middle of the coin field, surrounded by an oak wreath termed a *corona civica*, with OB inserted above and SERVATOS below the wreath (Fig. 1). The title AVGVSTVS and the abbreviation TR.POT in the legend on the obverse side of the coins set merely certain *termini post quem* for the issues, respectively 27 BC and 23 BC. The *terminus ante quem* is provided by Augustus’s

death in AD 14. I am unfamiliar with any dated coin hoards that would allow this chronological spread to be narrowed down further. During the period 27 BC – AD 14 several events occurred in the east of the empire where the dates are known and can be associated with the issues of the discussed bronzes, i.e. Augustus's visit to Syria and the conclusion of peace with the Parthians in 20 BC.

The differences between proposals of chronology for the emission of the imperial eastern bronzes presented in the literature, ranging from several to a dozen years, are brought about by the scarcity of data that would allow accurate dating. In RIC, the emission of bronzes of CA/AVGVSTVS type was dated generally to 19–15 BC.¹ Mattingly dated bronzes with CA/AVGVSTVS and those without TR POT. in the legend to 27–23 BC, those with TR. POT. to 23 BC and later *sestertii* of OB CIVIS SERVATOS type to 23–21 BC.² Wruck believed that the beginning of the minting of imperial eastern bronze coins in Syria may have been connected with emperor Augustus visiting the East in 20/19 BC or with the second emission of silver coinage in Syria in the last years of the 1st century BC.³ Grant tied the beginning of the issuing of SC type bronzes with Agrippa's stay in the East in 23–21 BC, and minting the series of OB CIVIS SERVATOS type⁴ with the subsequent stint of his stewardship over this part of the empire in 17–13 BC.⁵ He deemed eastern *denarii* with a *corona rostralis* (Fig. 59) and IOVI OLVM (Fig. 57) to be prototypes of the series CA/AVGVSTVS.⁶ Robertson dated the CA/AVGVSTVS type to the years following 23 BC.⁷ Kunisz proposed 19–14 BC as the emission date of the CA/AVGVSTVS and SC types.⁸ Burnett dated the bronzes in question to 29–19 BC, placing within the range 29–27 BC coins which did not bear either the title of AVGVSTVS or TR. POT in their legend. He placed all other series within 27–23 BC except for those with TR. POT in their legend, for which he proposed 23–19 BC as the emission date.⁹ Carson dated coins of the CA type to 19 BC, surmising that there existed a relationship between these and the cistophores of the COMASIAE type which bore the annual date TR.POT.V in the legend (19/18 BC).¹⁰ Howgego proposed dating the majority of bronzes of the CA /AVGVSTVS type

¹ MATTINGLY and SYDENHAM 1923: 64. The SC type was not included in this catalogue.

² MATTINGLY 1923: ciii, cxix–cxxi.

³ WRUCK 1931: 14.

⁴ GRANT 1946: 99.

⁵ *Ibidem*: 145.

⁶ *Ibidem*: 103. MATTINGLY 1923: cxxiv, and GIARD 1976: 4, dated these *denarii* to 27 BC. Later GRANT 1946: 103, wrote, that Mattingly had moved the emission date thereof to the time of Augustus's visit to the East in 21–19 BC; SUTHERLAND 1984: 34, dated them to 21 BC.

⁷ ROBERTSON 1962: xxviii–xxix.

⁸ KUNISZ 1976: 68.

⁹ BURNETT 1977: 47–48.

¹⁰ CARSON 1980: 12.

without TR. POT in the legend to 27–23 BC, with a reservation that the emission thereof may have been continued to 19/18 BC.¹¹ In reference to other imperial eastern bronzes that scholar stated that any date between 23 BC and death of Augustus in AD 14 is possible, noting at the same time that plausible historical contexts for these bronzes are provided by the events of 23–19/18 BC and 5 BC.¹² Sutherland proposed 28–15 BC as an emission date for the CA/AVGVSTVS type and the years after 23 BC for SC type.¹³ Giard tentatively adopted 28 BC as the emission time of coins without the title AVGVSTVS in their legend and 18 BC for the other coins.¹⁴ The authors of the RPC volume I deemed 29–19/18 BC the most probable time range for the emission of imperial eastern bronzes in Asia, admitting though that this period might be narrowed down to 27–23 BC. They suggested that the first issue of bronzes of CA/AVGVSTVS type (group I in the present paper) took place around 27 BC, while the second one (here group II) around 25 BC. They also proposed the years following 23 BC as the issue date for the part of bronzes struck in Syria (RPC, August, group 2; groups IV and V in the present paper), possibly the penultimate decade of the 1st century BC, admitting though that these coins may have been struck after 5 BC.¹⁵ They found the emission time of the mysterious bronzes of the AT-CA type uncertain. They dated bronzes of the AVGVSTVS and SC types of Cyprus to around AD 1 on the basis of their stylistic similarity to other Cypriot bronzes bearing the effigy of Gaius Ceasar, Augustus's grandson. The legend COS placed on the latter coins referred to the consulship granted to Gaius in AD 1.¹⁶ McAlee dated bronzes of AVGVSTVS type to 27–23 BC, bronzes of the CA type without a legend on the obverse (here group II) to 27–23 BC and CA bronzes with legend as well as SC and OB CIVES SERVATOS bronzes broadly to 23–25 BC, noting that coins of the SC type with a wreathed bust of Augustus may have been issued later still, between 5 BC – AD 14.¹⁷

Scholars have agreed that the letters SC should be read as an acronym of *Senatus Consulto*.¹⁸ The question of how to interpret CA is disputed. A short time ago the most probable interpretation of the acronym was commonly believed to be

¹¹ HOWGEGO 1982: 7.

¹² *Ibidem*: 15 ff.

¹³ SUTHERLAND 1951: 34; IDEM 1976: 56.

¹⁴ GIARD 1976: 7, 11, 44–45.

¹⁵ BURNETT, AMANDRY and RIPOLLÈS 2006: 376–377, 380–381, 602–603.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*: 576.

¹⁷ MCALEE 2007: 110–111.

¹⁸ WRUCK 1931: 24; SUTHERLAND 1976: 15–22; BUTCHER 2004: 235–236; MCALEE 2007: 3–6. McAlee, *Ibidem*, outlined briefly the history of studies on the interpretation of SC letters; NEUMANN 2015: 121–122.

COMMUNAE ASIAE.¹⁹ In recent papers, however, the view prevails of this being CAESAR AVGVSTVS.²⁰ This interpretation appears to be best substantiated, since one cannot convincingly reconcile the COMMUNAE ASIAE interpretation with the fact that a part of the coins of the CA type was also issued and circulated in Syria. It is not out of the question that the letters CA were a sign for bronze coins issued upon the emperor's decision, contrary to senate bronzes marked with the letters SC. If so, then should the letters CA be read *Caesar Augustus* or perhaps *Caesaris Augusti*? From that point, it is quite near to Grant's *Caesaris Auctoritate* (footnote 19). It is conjectured that the mints in which imperial eastern bronzes were struck, were located in the provinces of Asia and Syria, most probably in the cities of Ephesus, Pergamon and Antioch.²¹ Another relevant premise in favour of an Asian origin for the early bronzes of the CA/AVGVSTVS type, apart from their provenance, is the quite strong similarity of busts on a part of the group of imperial eastern bronzes to the busts on some coins of the Lycian League (Figs. 2–3). M. Grant surmised that imperial eastern bronzes were produced by a greater number of mints, also beyond the area of Asia and Syria, among others in Cyprus and in the Balkans and McAlee conjectured that coins of AT-CA type were struck in a petty mint in Syria or Phoenicia.²² The hypothesis that a part of the AVGVSTVS and SC bronzes would have been issued in Cyprus was corroborated by the authors of RPC I on the basis of comparative analysis, an analysis of the provenance of the coins, and of countermarks occurring on these.²³

The present paper presents a new proposal for the chronology of the emission of imperial eastern bronzes. It is based on the results of stylistic and comparative analysis of busts on coins of Augustus, supported by an analysis of the propaganda on the coins of Augustus and of the political and historical context. The coins are classified into eight groups, set in chronological order, in line with their geographical origin. This classification is partly based on my own conclusions, in part it draws

¹⁹ GRANT 1946: 107 ff, interpreted the acronym CA as *Caesaris Auctoritate*. His interpretation did not gain the recognition of the other scholars. It was rejected among others by the authors of RPC I, see BURNETT, AMANDRY and RIPOLLÈS 2006: 380. Interpretation of CA letters as *Communae Asiae* was accepted by: SUTHERLAND 1976: 55; MATTINGLY and SYDENHAM 1923: 52; GIARD 1976: 7, footnote 3; CARSON 1980: 12; SUTHERLAND 1984: 37; MATTINGLY 1985: 256; SARTRE 1991: 92, footnote 11. BURNETT 1977: 47, set together interesting parallels for this interpretation.

²⁰ ROMEO 1998: 29, found the *Caesar Augustus* interpretation for CA more probable than *Communae Asiae*. This opinion is shared by BURNETT, AMANDRY and RIPOLLÈS 2006: 381; BUTCHER 2004: 236, and MCALEE 2007: 110.

²¹ MATTINGLY and SYDENHAM 1923: 64; GIARD 1976: 44–45, 156; SUTHERLAND 1984: 37; BUTCHER 2004: 28; BURNETT, AMANDRY and RIPOLLÈS 2006: 23, 602–603. In the last two of the papers referenced to, no specific city was suggested for the location of the mints of Asian issues.

²² GRANT 1946: 105–107; MCALEE 2007: 111.

²³ BURNETT, AMANDRY and RIPOLLÈS 2006: 376–377, 380.

from Howgego's classification²⁴ and from the results of later research, i.e. RPC I and BUTCHER 2004.

STYLE ANALYSIS OF BUSTS ON COINS

In the coinage of Augustus there are two groups of coins on which his busts are noticeably similar to his busts on the imperial eastern bronzes of the CA/AVGVSTVS type (groups I–III according to the classification put forth below). The first one is made up of cistophores of Sutherland's groups V and VI,²⁵ probably issued in Ephesus and Pergamon.²⁶ To the second one pertain a series of eastern *denarii* with: temple IOVI OLVM, *corona rostralis*, a bull, *quinarii* with Victoria standing on the prow of a ship²⁷ as well as a part of a series of eastern *aurei* with a cow and with a bull. The workmanship style of the busts on most of the bronzes is to a greater degree similar to the style of busts on the cistophores than to that on the eastern *denarii* and *aurei*. The portraiture of Augustus on all the aforementioned groups of coins is similar to a varying degree,²⁸ but in every case the similarity is large enough to make a claim that these coins are chronologically close to each other.²⁹

ASIA MINOR

Group I (Howgego class 1)

Group I is distinguished by the erroneously written title CAISAR on the obverse, which hints that it may have been issued earlier than groups II and III.³⁰ The busts are executed mainly in a simplified manner, with slightly convex occiput and straight neck with no muscles outlined (Figs. 4–6). Judging from a low number of specimens appearing at auctions and in museum collections, group I seems to have been

²⁴ HOWGEGO 1982: 2–3 and 13–15. This scholar distinguished three groups ("classes") and additionally four 4 "intermediate issues" differing from his classes by the occurrence of TR POT in the legend. Apart from CA/AVGVSTVS type, the SC and OB CIVIS SERVATOS types belong as well to his intermediate issues. Cf. also Burnett's classification – BURNETT 1977: 46–47. The classifications of both scholars partly converge.

²⁵ Certain observations in this subject were made. Cf. MATTINGLY 1923: cxix–cxxi; SUTHERLAND and KRAAY 1975: tab. 18, comments on items nos. 691–719.

²⁶ See the classification of the cistophores and chronology of the respective groups in SUTHERLAND 1970: 12 ff. On location of the mints see *Ibidem*: 89 ff; MATTINGLY 1923: cxxv; GIARD 1976: 7, 11, 43–44.

²⁷ On relationships between these types see MATTINGLY and SYDENHAM 1923: 52; SUTHERLAND 1974: 53, 62–64.

²⁸ The very cistophores within one group are often not homogenous, which results in varied degree of similarity between portraiture on cistophores and bronzes. The portraits of group V of the cistophores, that can be divided into three types, can serve as an example. Cf. SUTHERLAND 1970: 25–29.

²⁹ The stylistic similarity between these groups of coins was highlighted by SUTHERLAND 1976: 27, and by the authors of RPC I (BURNETT, AMANDRY and RIPOLLÉS 2006: 380). GRANT 1946: 103, 107, stated that eastern *denarii* with temple IOVI OLVM and those with a wreath are more similar in style to groups II and III of the imperial eastern bronzes, than to cistophores. HOWGEGO 1982: 3, had similar observations regarding *denarii* with a bull.

³⁰ HOWGEGO 1982: 13.

a small issue with *sestertii* of this group being unique.³¹ Portraits on the bronzes of group I very closely resemble portraits on the cistophores of Sutherland's group V (cf. Figs. 4–6 with Fig. 7). The hair arrangement is very similar and the neck, save a few exceptions on some cistophores, is also straight, rendered smoothly, without a pronounced musculature. One can also observe a substantial similarity of busts on the bronzes of this group to busts on eastern *denarii* with a wreath, temple IOVI OLVM, *corona rostralis* and on eastern *quinarii* with Victory (cf. Figs. 4–6 with 8–10).

<i>sestertius</i>	IMP CAISAR	CA in <i>corona rostralis</i>	(RPC I 2227)
<i>sestertius</i>	IMP CAISAR	AVGV/STVS in <i>corona rostralis</i>	(RPC I 2228)
<i>dupondius</i>	IMP CAISAR	CA in <i>corona rostralis</i>	(Fig. 4)
<i>as</i>	CAISAR	AVGV/STVS in laurel wreath	(Fig. 5)
<i>semis</i>	CAISAR	CA in laurel wreath	(Fig. 6)

Group II (Howgego class 2)

Based on the workmanship style of coins of this group, it may be concluded that three subgroups occur, although this classification is not obvious in some cases. On the coins of group II, the title CAESAR is already written correctly, save few specimens with the error *CAISAR* in the first subgroup (Fig. 13). This spelling may signify that the coins of the first subgroup had started to be minted earlier than the others, where the error was not repeated anymore. Busts on coins of the third subgroup differ somewhat from the previous ones. They have a wider, square-like head with the hair forming a kind of a cap, as if it was a wig. The occurrence of three stylistic variants within group II is accompanied by a vast number of surviving coins. It is probable that this was a more massive issue necessitating the employment of a greater number of engravers and dies.

The bronzes of group II still appear to resemble the cistophores of Sutherland's group V (cf. bronzes of the first subgroup in particular, Fig. 7 with 11 and 13), more than the bronzes of group I. Sutherland convincingly determined the issue date for his group V of cistophores to 25 BC, and for group VI to 24–20 BC.³² That is why the commencement of the emission of bronzes of the CA/AVGVSTVS type of group I and II may have fallen in 25 BC at the earliest. It is worth accentuating the aforementioned stylistic resemblance of bronzes of groups I–II to the bronze coin of the Lycian League (Fig. 3) dated to 27–23 BC.³³ Thus, it cannot be ruled out

³¹ The only published *sestertius* is stored in Berlin – see RPC I 2229. With HOWGEGO 1982 it makes up a separate subgroup 1c, which differs from the rest by the title AVGV/STVS being in laurel wreath instead in *corona rostralis*, but this specimen may be false, cf. HOWGEGO 1982: 2, footnote 7, therefore it is not incorporated here.

³² SUTHERLAND 1970: 12 ff.

³³ RPC I: 525, cat no. 3317/5.

that the emission of bronzes of groups I–II in Asia was carried on until 20 BC. An argument in favour of this hypothesis is the already mentioned stylistic resemblance of bronzes of these groups to eastern *denarii* with the temple IOVI OLVM, with a bull (cf. especially Figs. 18–20), *corona rostralis*, *quinarii* with Victoria and *aurei* with a bull and a cow, which were probably struck in 21–20 BC.³⁴

Subgroup 1

<i>sestertius</i>	AVGVSTVS	CA in laurel wreath	(Fig. 11)
<i>dupondius</i>	CAESAR	AVGVSTVS in laurel wreath	(Fig. 12)
<i>semis</i>	CAISAR	CA in laurel wreath	(Fig. 13)

Subgroup 2

<i>sestertius</i>	AVGVSTVS	CA in laurel wreath	(Fig. 14)
<i>dupondius</i>	AVGVSTVS	CA in <i>corona rostralis</i>	(Fig. 15)
<i>as</i>	CAESAR	AVGVSTVS in laurel wreath	(Fig. 16)

Subgroup 3

<i>sestertius</i>	AVGVSTVS	CA in laurel wreath	(Fig. 17)
<i>dupondius</i>	CAESAR	AVGVSTVS in laurel wreath	(Fig. 18)
<i>dupondius</i>	AVGVSTVS	CA in <i>corona rostralis</i>	(Fig. 19)

82

SYRIA

Group III (Howgego class 3)

The busts on the bronzes of group III display stylistic similarities to busts on the cistophores of Sutherland's group VI (Figs. 21–22), therefore the bronzes are most likely to have been struck at the same time, that is 24–20 BC. The emission of group III took place in Syria, despite the stylistic affinity to bronzes of groups I and II that were issued in Asia. Hence, there arises a conjecture that some of the minting workshops may have been shifted from Asia to Syria, where they would have commenced production of bronzes of group III and subsequent groups. The presented stylistic analogies between groups I–III of imperial eastern bronzes and groups V–VI of cistophores lead one to think that the portraits of the emperor on the silver coins were a pattern to follow for the portraiture on the bronze coins.

<i>as</i>	CAESAR	AVGVSTVS in laurel wreath	(Fig. 21)
-----------	--------	---------------------------	-----------

³⁴ In RIC I these issues are dated to 19–15 BC, see BURNETT, AMANDRY and RIPOLLÈS 2006: 52. MATTINGLY 1923: cxxiv, 107–108, and GIARD 1976: 44–45, 158, dated them to 27–23 BC. CARSON 1980: 10–11 and ROMEO 1998: 28–31, found that most probable emission time were the years after 23 BC inclusively. SUTHERLAND 1984: 34–35, dated them to 21 BC. Later on MATTINGLY 1923: footnote 19, moved his dating to the time of Augustus's visit to the East in 21–19 BC.

Group IV (Howgego intermediate issue 4; GIARD 1976 atelier secondaire A de Syrie; RPC I gr. II)

The busts on the bronzes of group IV are stylistically closest to the cistophores of Sutherland's group VI. The hair on the busts of Augustus on some *asses* is arranged in a similar manner to the hair cut typical for portraits on many of the cistophores of group VI (cf. Figs. 23–22). Thus, on this basis one may assume that their emission fell within the period of 24–20 BC. Taking into consideration the fact that group V is much more numerous than group IV, and that the conferment of tribunitian power to Augustus in 23 BC may have given a stimulus to placing TR. POT in the legends of the bronzes of group V, it would make sense to restrict the emission time of group IV to 24–23 BC. From the propaganda point of view, the further striking of bronzes without reference to the tribunitian power of Augustus would have made little sense after 23 BC. The short emission period seems to be justified by the small number of bronzes of group IV in circulation.

as no legend CA in laurel wreath (Fig. 23)

Group V (Howgego intermediate issue 5; GIARD 1976 atelier secondaire A de Syrie; RPC I 4101–4105)

The TR. POT in the legend on bronzes of group V determines 23 BC as the *terminus post quem* for the emission date. Their stylistic affinity with the busts of the cistophores of Sutherland's group VI delimits an emission period between 23–20 BC.³⁵ It cannot be ruled out that the production of bronzes of groups IV and V in Syria partly overlapped with the emission of bronzes of groups I–II in Asia. Once the peace with the Parthians had been concluded by Augustus, the legionary standards recovered and the Roman captives from the legions of Crassus and Antonius released, *sestertii* of group V with legend OB CIVIS SERVATOS³⁶ may have taken on a new purport, or were perhaps even struck only in 20 BC, as a celebratory act immediately after that event. The small number of surviving specimens provides a reliable argument for such a hypothesis.

A coin worth mentioning here is a beautiful *sestertius* with the legend OB CIVIS SERVATOS, familiar from the collection of the British Museum.³⁷ The *sestertius* is tooled, thus its significance remains significantly limited for the purposes of this analysis. The coin appears to be a sequel to the *sestertii* of group V with the

³⁵ HOWGEGO 1982: 14

³⁶ *Ibidem*: 15, footnote 85, did not incorporate these into his issue 5, he stated though: “The rare *sestertii* with OB CIVIS SERVATOS may belong to issue 5...”.

³⁷ Photos available on BM site <https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection>, museum no. 1866,0721.9 BMC I, no. 737.

same legend, however with a completely different emperor's bust. The head appears larger and more massive than that on the *sestertii* of group V (Fig. 24). Whatever might have been reshaped on the bust by tooling, the bust could have been tooled by carving out in the relief existing on the flan, rather than by removing parts of the relief and altering its outline. Taking this into consideration, the original bust on the tooled *sestertius* appears to have been performed in the convention of a mature man, discussed in detail on pages 91–92. This, in connection with the legend and the historical context, points to an issue date of 20–19 BC. For the determination of the *terminus ante quem*, a hint is provided by the fact that the last coins of the OB. C(IVIS) S(ERVATOS) type were struck by the mint of Rome in 12 BC (*aurei* signed by Caninius Gallus).³⁸ Taking heed of the consequence of Augustus's propaganda, the most probable emission period of the tooled *sestertius* encompasses a date range of 20–12 BC, with a particular emphasis on 20–19 BC.

<i>sestertius</i>	IMP.AVGVST.TR.POT	OBCIVISSERVATOS in <i>corona civica</i>	(Fig. 24)
<i>dupondius</i>	IMP.AVGVST.TR.POT	SC in laurel wreath	(Fig. 25)
<i>as</i>	AVGVST.TR.POT	SC in laurel wreath	(Fig. 26)
<i>as</i>	AVGVST.TR.POT	CA in laurel wreath	(Fig. 27)

Group VI (Howgego intermediate issue 5; RPC I 4247–4249, 4260, 4261)

Group VI is divided into phases, rather than subgroups, so as to accentuate the chronological nature of the division. On all of the bronzes of group VI, the emperor's bust is presented in a laurel wreath.³⁹ One may easily have the impression that Augustus's busts on these coins are imitations of busts on Antiochene tetradrachms with Tyche on the obverse and of those on bronze archihieratic drachms, also emitted in Antioch and bearing annual dates (Figs. 28–43).⁴⁰ Such a close resemblance allows the secure assumption that the annual dates on the Antiochene tetradrachms delimit the time frame for the emission of bronzes of group VI. The beginning of the emission would fall on 5 BC,⁴¹ when the first Antiochene tetradrachms with the portrait of Augustus and the first archihieratic drachms appeared, whereas the end of the emission would be the death of Augustus in AD 14. This period is divided here

³⁸ BURNETT, AMANDRY and RIPOLLÈS 2006: 78, catalogue number of the *aurei* in question is 177.

³⁹ The classification by Howgego of some bronzes to his intermediate issue 5 seems to be wrong, cf. HOWGEGO 1982: Tab. 4, Fig. 9 – an *as* of CA type, and Fig. 13 – an *as* of SC type. They differ in style from the other bronzes of the issue 5 and are definitely more similar to the bronzes of my group VI as well as to the Antiochene tetradrachms of phase I. Another argument for the assignment of these coins to group VI is the occurrence of the laurel wreath on the emperor's bust. On the other coins of Howgego's intermediate issue 5, the emperor's bust is bare, without a wreath.

⁴⁰ BUTCHER 2004: 323.

⁴¹ From 5 BC the emperor's bust on eastern bronzes and Antiochene tetradrachms was decorated with a wreath. Cf. MCALEE 2007: 111.

into three phases based on alterations in the style of portraits on the tetradrachms. During the first phase (Figs. 28–35), lasting from 5/4 BC to AD 5/6, Augustus was portrayed as a man in his late youth with ideal facial features. The neck of busts is rendered in a fairly straight fashion, with a truncation shaped like a bow or a gentle, single wave.

Rare, untypical SC *dupondii* with a Greek legend on the obverse start this phase. They display a close stylistic affinity in the portraiture and truncation of the bust to the first Antiochene tetradrachms to bear the portrait of Augustus (Figs. 28–29), dated to 5 BC by Augustus' twelfth consulship.⁴² Howgego rightly believed them to be the earliest unstandardized coins of the series because of the Greek legend and the filleted border on the obverse which were replaced on subsequent SC bronzes by the Latin legend and the dotted circle and so he proposed 5/4 BC.⁴³ His date is corroborated by the date on tetradrachms with the seated Zeus which appear to be the pattern for these bronzes. The Greek legend is reminiscent of bronzes of the CA type pertaining to group I which bore the erroneous Graecism CAISAR in the legend. Conjecturally, a team of local moneyers may have copied the obverse directly from tetradrachms currently struck at that time, including the identical legend and the filleted border, normally not used on imperial eastern bronzes. The team would have continued their production in this fashion until the introduction of the tetradrachms with Tyche on the reverse in the same year.

Also, bronzes with the ligature EA placed just under the bust (Fig. 32, RPC I 4260), pertain to this phase. The ligature may stand for the 35th year of the Actium era, that is AD 4/5.⁴⁴ Rare asses of the CA type (RPC I 4249) appear to have been struck in phase I too, given the style in which the imperial bust was performed.

Phase II

In AD 5/6, the last tetradrachms of the first phase were struck together with the first ones of the second phase. The emperor's face in the portraiture of the second phase also has ideal facial features, but these are somewhat sharper and deprive the face of remnants of adolescence, giving maturity instead. The muscles of neck are clearly rendered and the truncation of the neck took on the shape of a double wave (cf. Figs. 36–39). The legend on the reverse also changed, with ΕΤΟΥΣ ΝΙΚΕΣ being replaced by ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΕΩΝ.

⁴² BUTCHER and PONTING 2009: 62. These tetradrachms were the last ones to show on the reverse the seated Zeus, which had featured on so called Posthumous Philips, the earliest Antiochene tetradrachms struck under Roman rule, imitating the issues of the last Seleucid king Philip Philadelphus.

⁴³ HOWGEGO 1982: 8–9.

⁴⁴ Letters EA are read as a date of the era beginning since the battle of Actium, cf. HOWGEGO 1982: 9; BUTCHER 2004: 328; BURNETT, AMANDRY and RIPOLLÈS 2006: 620. GRANT 1946: 100, conjectured that this would have been an abbreviation of the word *ελευτερα* qualifying Antioch as a free city.

Phase III

The third phase began in AD 11/12 and continued until AD 14. The muscles of the neck are rendered even more expressly, with the face becoming leaner as if growing older (Figs. 40 and 41). We witness here a form of the evolution of style going on for twenty years.⁴⁵ The facial features on portraits on some bronzes of this phase resemble Tiberius even more than Augustus (Figs. 42 and 43).⁴⁶ Considering this puzzling resemblance, a surmise seems justified that the last bronzes of group VI must have been struck in the first months following the death of Augustus,⁴⁷ when the first official imperial portraits of Tiberius were reaching the provinces, but the coinage was still being produced in the name of Augustus. The emission of coinage with the portraits of an Augustus resembling Tiberius, being carried out yet under Augustus is of little probability, because that would not have been in conformity with the rules Augustus practised in his propaganda.

<i>dupondius</i>	IMP AVGVST.TR.POT	SC in laurel wreath	(Figs. 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42)
<i>dupondius</i>	ΚΑΙΣΑΡΟΣ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ	SC in laurel wreath	(Fig. 28, RPC I 4246)
<i>as</i>	AVGVST.TR.POT	SC in laurel wreath	(Fig. 30, RPC I 4248)
<i>as</i>	AVGVST.TR.POT	CA in laurel wreath	(RPC I 4249)

Group VII AT-CA (Howego intermediate issue 7)

Portraits of the emperor on the bronzes of group VII (Fig. 44) are most similar to the Antiochene tetradrachms of the phase I. The truncation of the neck is notably characteristic for this phase. Some bronzes of this group have the same truncations, but the outline of the emperor's head and facial features are rendered more schematically (Fig. 45). The outline of the head rather resembles portraits on tetradrachms of phase II. This similarity is not that strong however and may be accidental, resulting from the individual manners of the engravers. Grant's hypothesis,⁴⁸ according to which the AT on the reverse denotes the 330th year since the era of Alexander the Great, beginning in 333/332 BC appears probable and in line with the findings of the stylistic analysis of the portraiture. McAlee was of the opinion that the coins of group VII were struck in a petty mint in Syria or Phoenicia.⁴⁹ Furthermore, he believed that Grant's interpretation of the date might have been correct. Should Sidon have restored the era of Alexander, then the number of 330 would correspond to

⁴⁵ MCALEE 2007: 112, also set out a similar evolution of portrait style on these coins. He recognized coins with the ligature EA as one of the four phases of the evolution, which appears to me stylistically unfounded due to the lack of essential differences from the other bronzes of my phase I within group VI.

⁴⁶ BUTCHER 2004: 329.

⁴⁷ MCALEE 2007: 112, made a similar observation. Additionally, he noticed that bronzes with portraits of Augustus resembling Tiberius were coined at a lower weight standard than that in force under the rule of Tiberius.

⁴⁸ GRANT 1946: 344–345.

⁴⁹ MCALEE 2007: 112.

3/2 BC. In reference to the above, 5/4 BC – AD 11/12 would be the emission time of group VII, with a particular emphasis on 5/4 BC – AD 5/6.

as AVGVST.TR.POT. ΔT-CA in laurel wreath (Figs. 44–45)

CYPRUS

Group VIII (Howgego intermediate issue 6; RPC I 3914, 3915)

The busts of Augustus on the coins of group VIII were performed in a very characteristic, exceptional style (Figs. 46–47) which can also be encountered on a series of *asses* issued in AD 1 in Cyprus to commemorate the consulship of Gaius, Augustus's step-grandson (Fig. 48). The issue date of the *asses* proposed in RPC I is unquestionable.⁵⁰ Interestingly, the portraits of Augustus on the bronzes of group VIII definitely resemble the portrait of Gaius on the reverse of Cypriot *asses* more than the portrait of Augustus on the obverse of the said *asses*. It is obvious that the difference in age between the adolescent and his grandfather had to be reflected on the busts on these coins. This leads to the hypothesis that the portraits of Augustus on the bronzes of group VIII were performed in the convention of an adolescent at the latest until around 1 BC, i.e. by the time when new instructions came. As a result, Augustus was represented in the same style on the Cypriot *asses*, but in the convention of a mature man with ideal facial features. The same adolescent portrait of Augustus which had been applied earlier on the bronzes of group VIII was employed on the Cypriot *asses* for Gaius. That would imply that the bronzes of group VIII can be dated to the last years BC, but not later than AD 1.

The bronzes of the CA/AVGVSTVS type found in Cyprus, mainly in Nea Pafos, were deemed by some researchers⁵¹ to be of local origin. However, they definitely pertain to groups I–II and possibly also to III of the imperial eastern bronzes issued in Asia and Syria, from where they must have been imported to Cyprus.⁵² No essential stylistic similarities can be seen between these and Cypriot bronzes with Nike, dated to 26 BC, which Nicolaou invokes.⁵³

dupondius IMP.AVGVST.TR.POT AVGVST in laurel wreath (Fig. 46)

dupondius IMP.AVGVST.TR.POT SC in *corona civica* (Fig. 47)

⁵⁰ BURNETT, AMANDRY and RIPOLLÈS 2006: 576.

⁵¹ NICOLAOU 1990: 116–117; PARKS 2004: 45–47.

⁵² The coin no. 512 (204) pertains to group I of imperial eastern bronzes, the coins nos. 513 (2582), 519 (2571) to group II, the coin no. 520 (188) probably pertains to group III, see NICOLAOU 1990: pl. XVII, and PARKS 2004: 44, Figs. 7, 8. The series of the SC type: NICOLAOU nos. 523 (882), 524 (2609) and that in PARKS 2004: Fig. 6 should be considered as specimens of Cypriot origin, that is pertaining to group VIII. The classification of the other coins is impossible due to their poor state of preservation.

⁵³ NICOLAOU 1990: 117.

DATING OF EASTERN BRONZES, *DENARII* AND *AUREI* IN THE CONTEXT OF FULL BODIED PORTAITURE AND PORTRAITURE ON COINS

Changes in Augustus's physiognomy occurring naturally with the lapse of time were reflected in a veiled way on many of his full-bodied effigies.⁵⁴ There also occur many other portraits on which Augustus was represented as a young man with ideal facial features. However, D. Kleiner's view that Augustus was represented as a young man on all of his portraits, even before his death in AD 14, when he was 76 years old,⁵⁵ must be rejected definitively. None of Augustus's effigies depicts him as an old man, however, and in this respect his portraiture is very far from the realism of republican portraits. The establishment of accurate dates on which Augustus's portraits were created based on the stylistic analysis alone would be very difficult, if not impossible.⁵⁶ A few portraits have survived, however, whose creation dates have been successfully established with accuracy owing to their archaeological context, historical data and inscriptions. Analysing these will allow us to answer the question of whether and how changes in Augustus's age were rendered on his portraits with the lapse of time. On the majority of the sculptures of the period of the civil wars and the first years after the battle of Actium, Octavian's youthful or almost boyish facial expression is clearly discernible (for instance, the Perugia head). The Meroe head, dated to 30–25 BC, also displays youthful traits.⁵⁷ However, the same cannot be said of the heads of the Florence (Galleria degli Uffizi, 1914.76) and Vatican Museums (Braccio Nuovo, inv. no. 2290) dated to 20 BC⁵⁸ or a little later. These sculptures represent a mature man. The softness of the features present on the sculptures of the period of the civil wars and the Meroe head had disappeared from these faces, whose traits are sharper and sterner and, on the Gallerii degli Uffizi head, even wrinkles are visible. The face of Augustus on the Ara Pacis of 17 BC and one of the Louvre heads (Musée du Louvre, MA 1280⁵⁹) represent a similar age. The bronze statue of Augustus of Athens (National Archaeological Museum, inv. no. X 23322) dated to around 10 BC, despite not having wrinkles, gives away the middle age of

⁵⁴ RODENWALDT 1942: 18–28, describes examples of changes in age being reflected on selected portraits. HOMO 1935: 68–69, also drew attention to this fact.

⁵⁵ KLEINER 1992: 62.

⁵⁶ BOSCHUNG 1993: 63–64; ZANKER 1990: 166–167. A good example of the difficulty with dating is illustrated by the history of the research on the bust of Ostia (Vatican, Bust 273) presented by KISS 1975: 162 ff.

⁵⁷ BOSCHUNG 1993: 160, cat. no. 122.

⁵⁸ *Ibidem*: 112, cat. no. 10; 180, cat. no. 171.

⁵⁹ ZANKER 1990: 166, believes that the Louvre MA 1280 type of Augustus's portrait was created around 17 BC. He wrongly stated that the expression of timelessness in this portrait remains intact. The Louvre MA 1280 head represents an Augustus at a mature age, with wrinkles on the forehead and sharpened facial features. BOSCHUNG 1993: 129, dates the sculpture generally to the period between the early and middle reign of Augustus.

the model through its facial features.⁶⁰ The Boston head (Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 1971.325) dated by inscription to 2 BC⁶¹ has more idealized features than the Florence and Vatican Museum heads, despite being created around 20 years later, representing Augustus as an adult man. A good example of a portrait on which signs of a fully mature age of the model were rendered visible, and according to some opinions even showing signs of the subject's pending old age, is the bronze statuette of the Louvre (Musée du Louvre N 3254), probably from the late period of Augustus's reign.⁶² It is also worth mentioning the famous Via Labicana statue (Museo Nazionale Romano, inv. no. 56 230) representing Augustus as a man no longer in his prime, but still not too old.⁶³ Some scholars date its creation to as late as the beginning of Tiberius's reign. Others believe it to still be under the influence of sculptures performed during Augustus's lifetime.⁶⁴ In the light of the present considerations it seems obvious that moderate realistic tendencies do occur on numerous portraits of Augustus and reflect to a limited degree the changes in his appearance connected with growing old. As a rule, the changes would be displayed in a veiled way, not going beyond the boundaries of the overall canon of the idealized effigy of the princeps that was in force.⁶⁵ At the same time, alongside these realistic tendencies, idealization is also clearly present and was a feature which was predominant and persistent throughout the entire reign of Augustus.

In parallel, the replacement of youthful portraits of Augustus with those of a mature man took place on coins in the second half of 20-ies BC across the Empire and was one of manifestations of the realistic tendencies. It can be observed from the above presented examples that a similar change occurred more or less in the same period in the full-bodied portraiture. That change had to be connected with a change in political situation in the Empire. Augustus's effigy of a young hero like man was suitable during the period of the civil wars and in the first years after the victory over Anthony, when Augustus's power was stabilizing. In subsequent years, when Augustus began to implement his systemic and economic reforms as well as to place an emphasis on the cultivation of old Roman traditions, there emerged the need to change his effigy from a heroic young man to a wise and experienced statesman, a man at a mature age. The process of the update of the imperial effigy on coins was embarked on in Hispania. Probably shortly before P. Carisius's emission,

⁶⁰ KALTSAS 2003: 318, cat. no. 664.

⁶¹ BOSCHUNG 1993: 125, cat. no. 35.

⁶² *Ibidem*: 134, cat. no. 55.

⁶³ ARIAS 1943: 60.

⁶⁴ BOSCHUNG 1993: 176. HAUSMANN 1981: 581 and ARIAS 1943: 60, dated the sculpture to the beginning of the reign of Tiberius.

⁶⁵ An example of an exception to this rule is the mentioned statuette to be found in the Louvre (N 3254).

a series of *denarii* was struck in Emerita showing a shield on the reverse and the legend IMP CAE SAR DIVI.F. around it.⁶⁶ The portraits of Augustus on those coins follow the convention of him as a young man. On Carisius' coins one can already distinguish portraits of Augustus in both conventions, that of a man at a youthful age (Fig. 49) and that of a man of mature age with ideal facial features (Fig. 50), as if the convention of portraiture was changed in the course of that emission.

A change in the emperor's age can also be observed on coins issued by the mint of Rome. Comparing portraits on coins struck after the battle of Actium, that is after 31 BC, to these on coins issued after the reopening of the mint shortly after 23 BC,⁶⁷ it is easy to notice traits of youth on the former portraits, and signs of ideal maturity on the latter. Portraits on imperial eastern bronzes of groups I–V, on cistophores of Sutherland's groups V and VI as well as on eastern *quinarii* with Victory, on majority of eastern *denarii* (with temple IOVI OLVM, *corona rostralis*, a bull) and on eastern *aurei* with a cow and a bull have one common feature. On all these coins Augustus is depicted as a young man with features of a hero. Portraits of Augustus on Antiochene tetradrachms, on imperial eastern bronzes of groups VI and VII as well as on cistophores of Sutherland's group VII (Fig. 61) represent him as a man entering his adulthood or already at a mature age, but with ideal facial features, except for coins struck in the last years of his life. Then, the face took on sharper, rougher traits and the musculature of the neck became accentuated. The head gives an impression of being more robust and the features of a hero and the smoothness of the face disappeared. Overall, the model is rendered in the classical style. The new conception of the portrait of Augustus also appeared on *aurei* and *denarii* devoted to the successes achieved by Roman diplomacy in 20 BC in relations with Parthia (SIGNIS PARTHICIS RECEPIS types) and Armenia (ARMENIA CAPTA types), as well as on some of eastern *denarii*⁶⁸ and *aurei* with a bull and a cow. Cistophores of Sutherland's group VII bear the date 19/18 BC, which is provided by TR.PO.V in the legend. The emission of *aurei* and *denarii* focusing on the recovery of legionary standards from the Parthians and Rome's seizure of control over Armenia for obvious reasons could only have taken place no earlier than in 20 BC. Thus, portraits of Augustus in the convention of a mature man started to be applied on coins in the

⁶⁶ According to SUTHERLAND 1951: 34–35, the emission of these *denarii* took place in 27–26 BC; GIARD 1976: 45, believed it took place shortly before P. Carisius's issues. MATTINGLY 1923: cix, dated them to 22–19 BC. Sutherland's and Giard's suppositions seem to be most probable, since the coins with respect to the legend and portrait style of Augustus resemble more closely the series of the first years after the battle of Actium, than those struck later.

⁶⁷ KUNISZ 1976: 139, 142–143, was of the opinion, that the reopening of the mint of Rome may have happened as early as in 22 BC. ROBERTSON 1962: xxxiv, GIARD 1976: 41, and SUTHERLAND 1984: 32, 61, believe that it occurred in 19 BC.

⁶⁸ SUTHERLAND 1970: 33–39. Resemblance between portraits on eastern *denarii* of the three types and on cistophores of group VII was observed by SUTHERLAND 1974: 65.

east of the empire no earlier than in 20 BC. What is interesting, the occurrence of portraits in both conventions on eastern *aurei* with a cow and a bull (compare Figs. 51, 53 with 52, 54) as well as on eastern *denarii*⁶⁹ (compare Figs. 55, 57, 59 with 56, 58, 60) allows us to infer that portraiture in the convention of a mature man was rolled out in course of their emission in 20/19 BC.⁷⁰ On *denarii* of the IOVI OLVM type, the change of portrait was also accompanied by modifications in the design of the temple on the reverse through the narrowing the facade of the structure and the intervals between the columns. *Denarii* with the new, mature portrait are rarer than those with the youthful one, which seems to suggest that their emission after the change of the portrait convention was continued for a shorter time. As already noticed earlier, portraits on the OB CIVIS SERVATOS *sestertii* of group V and on the tooled *sestertius* of the British Museum underwent similar changes. Similarly, among cistophores of Sutherland's group VI there occur specimens with portraits resembling these on the cistophores of his group VII.⁷¹

It seems as if the portraiture on the coins in the mature man convention was introduced simultaneously in Asia and Syria around 20 BC as part of a wide-ranging propaganda drive. This date therefore constitutes a *terminus post quem* for the emission of all eastern bronzes of an uncertain date, on which Augustus is depicted as a mature man. Since Augustus's propaganda displayed a great deal of consistency, logics and attention to details (for instance, *Ara Pacis*⁷²), it needs to be assumed that after the change in the age of the emperor's portraiture on coins, the previous portrait convention was not in use anymore on coins within the given area.

⁶⁹ On the above grounds one cannot agree with Sutherland's statement, SUTHERLAND 1974: 65, that differences between portraiture types on these *denarii* are of little importance and that coins displaying portraits in both conventions were being struck simultaneously. The explanation that such a variety of workmanship styles of portraits on *denarii* was merely the result of engravers being affected by various influences should be deemed insufficient, because this variety stems from the changes in the portrait model connected with a propaganda drive, whereas various workmanship styles were rather a secondary factor.

⁷⁰ It should be noted that the adolescent type of portraits of Augustus on some *aurei* with a cow (Fig. 53) neither resemble portraits characteristic for the cistophores of groups V and VI, the bronzes of groups I–V, nor the adolescent portraits on the eastern *denarii*. Portraits of the mature type on *aurei* with a cow are also heterogenous. The first variety (Fig. 52) fits into the framework defined by the mature man convention introduced around 20 BC, while the second one (Fig. 54) is reminiscent of Julius Cesar. HAUSMANN 1981: 539, found portraits of Augustus on coins with a cow in the mature man convention deprived of divine and heroic qualities, which occurred on youthful portraits of the same emission. He perceived a similar tendency in the evolution of monetary portraiture in Spain and Gaul.

⁷¹ SUTHERLAND 1970: 101.

⁷² The analysis alone of reliefs on the altar displaying the great procession testifies to the tremendous accuracy and consistency of the propaganda in reference to the political situation and realities of the epoch. Vide MORETTI 1938: 9–10; POULSEN 1946: 1 ff; SCHEID 1978: 615.

It is relevant that the switches from the youthful man convention of Augustus's portraiture to the mature one in Hispania, Rome, and in the East occurred in conjunction with Augustus's visits to these places. The princeps arrived in Hispania in 26 BC in order to lead the army in person in the campaign against the Cantabrians and Asturians.⁷³ Subsequently, he returned to Rome, from where he set out on a journey to the East in 22 BC. He spent the winter of 21/20 BC on Samos, arriving in Syria in the spring of 20 BC,⁷⁴ returning to Rome in the following year. These visits and the changes in portraiture do not seem to be a coincidence and lead to the hypothesis that the new models of Augustus's portraits that accommodated changes in his age were distributed during his stay in the given area.⁷⁵ It would not be wrong, therefore, to assume that the portraits on coins of the mature man convention were introduced in Syria and Asia also during Augustus's visit in 20 BC. It was perhaps then that the strongly heroic Prima Porta type of portrait, introduced several years earlier and applied on cistophores of 27–25 BC,⁷⁶ was reworked. The head was remade in a squatter fashion, with the chin becoming sharper and less fleshy. These realistic features were rendered in the classical style.⁷⁷

In turn, a good example of strong idealizing tendencies are the first series of coins struck in Lugdunum in 15–10 BC (types with a charging bull, Actian Apollo and Diana, with Tiberius and Drusus giving olive branches marked with the sign IMP X or IMP XII to Augustus). Augustus is depicted on them as a young man despite his advanced age. Portraits representing the princeps as a mature man appear in that mint as late as in 10 BC on the so-called altar series and were used until his death. Eight years later, in 2 BC, the same mint commenced an extensive emission of *denarii* of the CL CAESARES type that was continued up to AD 14. On these coins, Augustus clearly looks older than on the *denarii* struck in 20 BC in Colonia Patricia in Hispania, regardless of the idealized features.⁷⁸ The later introduction of the emperor's portraiture in the mature man convention onto the Lugdunum coins may be connected with the late opening of that mint and with the direction of Roman policy towards the Gallic provinces and the Rhine area. The emperor's effigy as a heroic commander was surely more adequate for the purposes of Roman propaganda in these recently conquered provinces for the sake of the unstable political situation. Only in later times did the civilian aspect of Augustus's power

⁷³ Cass. Dio LIII, 25, 5–7.

⁷⁴ Cass. Dio LIV, 7, 6.

⁷⁵ SUTHERLAND 1951: 48–49, linked issues of coins and locations of the mints with residence of Augustus.

⁷⁶ SUTHERLAND 1970: 110–111; HAUSMANN 1981: 567–568, 572, 594–595; FITTSCHEN and ZANKER 1985: 4; BOSCHUNG 1993: 61.

⁷⁷ HAUSMANN 1981: 576–577.

⁷⁸ BREGLIA 1968: 34–35, 38–39, tab. I, III.

start to be propagated there, with him being represented as an experienced statesman in the mature man convention. One more conclusion can be drawn from the above comparison: that major alterations in the emperor's portraiture on coins appear to go hand-in-hand with those on full-bodied portraits.

THE DATING OF EASTERN BRONZES OF GROUPS I–III IN THE CONTEXT OF AUGUSTUS'S PROPAGANDA ON COINS

This part of the paper has the objective of determining by means of the analysis of Augustus's propaganda on coins in which period the eastern bronzes of the CA and SC types were most probably emitted. Two periods are taken into consideration: from January 27 BC to June 23 BC and from June 23 BC to 12 BC. The boundaries of the periods are fixed by the years in which respectively the title of *Augustus*, tribunal power (*Tribunitia Potestas*) and the title of the supreme priest (*Pontifex Maximus*) were conferred upon the princeps. These titles featured in the legends of coins and automatically delineate a *terminus post quem* for the coins, which do not bear annual dates. In 27–23 BC few coins were issued. Augustus's propaganda on coins mostly focused on two subjects: military successes and the subtle worship of the person of Augustus. The series of AEGYPTO CAPTA *aurei* (dated to 27 BC by COS VII in legend) would refer to the former, as would the emission of coins signed by P. Carisius, Augustus's legate, issued in Hispania in 27–22 BC,⁷⁹ making reference to heavy fighting experienced by the legions against the tribes of Cantabrii and Asturii, as well as *quinarii* with Victory on the prow of a ship and *denarii* with *corona rostralis*. If these two last series were to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the battle of Actium then that would locate them in the second period under analysis. A small number of scholars date imperial eastern bronzes of the CA/AVGVSTVS type of groups I–III⁸⁰ to the first period since they clearly pertain to a military subject (*corona rostralis* and laurel wreath). Possibly, *denarii* with a bull may have a military purport, should the theory be right in linking them to the worship of Poseidon on Samos and through that indirectly to the battle of Actium.⁸¹ The subject of worship of Augustus is covered by the series of cistophores struck in Asia: a series with corn ears symbolizing the prosperity experienced under Augustus's rule,⁸² and with a capricorn, Augustus's zodiac sign. A hint to the person of Augustus

⁷⁹ MATTINGLY and SYDENHAM 1923: 82. MATTINGLY 1923: cix, and GIARD 1976: 45–46, proposed the date of 25–23 BC.

⁸⁰ MATTINGLY 1923: cxxiv, 107–108; GIARD 1976: 44–45, 158. Giard stated that in the absence of convincing evidence it is difficult to decide whether the coins were struck in the East or in Rome. He did not take a stance on the type with a bull.

⁸¹ SUTHERLAND 1974: 61–62; IDEM 1984: 34–35.

⁸² In ancient sources one can find numerous mentions of security and stability restored in the state by Augustus, including the numerous actions undertaken by him to provide help and support to Roman citizens and the populations of the provinces: Velleius Paterculus, II, 89; Svetonius, *Div. Aug.*, 28, 41–42, 47; Tacitus, *Annales* I, 2.

was also made on *denarii* of the IOVI OLVM type.⁸³ In the context of the period in question it is difficult to interpret the coins which feature a cow. In Rome in 27 BC a series of *aurei* was struck, which commemorated the conferment by the senate of the title of *Augustus*, the distinctions of *corona civica*, and laurel wreaths and branches to the princeps on January 13th of the same year.⁸⁴ On the obverse of these coins is placed the legend CAESAR.COS.VII. CIVIBVS. SERVATEIS, on the reverse an eagle between laurel branches, holding a *corona civica* in its claws. This image on the reverse is accompanied by the inscription AVGVSTVS SC denoting that the new title has been conferred to Octavian by a resolution of the senate. This is the sole series of coins in the period 27–23 BC to make a reference to that important event.⁸⁵ In the period 23–12 BC the propaganda on coins continues the two main subjects of the years 27–23 BC. The military subject is abundantly reflected on vast emissions struck in Hispania and in the city of Rome, on huge output of the mint of Lugdunum in Gaul commenced in 15 BC, and on eastern series devoted mainly to the diplomatic-military successes in relations with Parthia.⁸⁶ Similarly, the worship of Augustus was strongly emphasized. Suffice it to mention the IOVI TONANS type baldly commenting on a random event,⁸⁷ the capricorn type and Rome types PRO VALETVDINE CAESARIS, FORTVN.REDVX .CAESARI AVG. S.P.Q.R. and other. New subjects occasionally presented on coins are the dynastic policy, economic development (QUOD.VIAE. MVN.SVNT type), single important events like the games *Ludi saeculares* referred to in great detail by the mint of Rome. In case of eastern *denarii* of IOVI OLVM type, with a bull, *corona rostralis* and *quinarii* with Victoria, apart from the tenth anniversary of the battle of Actium, there can be discerned a connection with Augustus's visit to Greece and his stay on Samos in winter 21/20 BC, a stopover in his further journey to the East.⁸⁸ Likewise, the untypical *aurei* with a bull and cows (Figs. 51–54) are believed to refer to the famous bronze statues of Myron's cows, which became an object of Augustus's

⁸³ The interpretation of the message conveyed by the IOVI OLVM type is based on an account of Suetonius (*Aug.* 60) of the client rulers willing to complete the construction of the temple of the Olympian Jove in Athenes and to consecrate it to the genius of Augustus. Cf. MATTINGLY 1923: cxxv.

⁸⁴ It is difficult to agree with GIARD 1976: 44 that these *aurei* were struck in Ephesus. Style does not always allow us to determine with certitude the provenience of coins. It would have been bizarre if Augustus, soon after being granted such important distinctions and titles by the senate in Rome, had decided to have a small series of *aurei* commemorating that event issued in distant Ephesus. After all, the fate of the political system of the empire was weighed in Rome. This type of representation was only placed on *aurei*, which seems to indicate that the addressee of the issue were mainly the higher strata of the Roman society.

⁸⁵ The shield represented on *denarii* with the legend IMP/CAE SAR/DIVI F., most probably struck in Hispania, cannot be taken for a *clipeus virtutis* due to its different appearance. Cf. BMC I: 45.

⁸⁶ Cf. DEBEVOISE 1938: 140.

⁸⁷ The incident in which Augustus was almost killed by lightning is mentioned by Suetonius, *Aug.* 29. Cf. also Cass. Dio LIV, 9, 4–5.

⁸⁸ SUTHERLAND 1984: 34–35; IDEM 1974: 58, 61–62; IDEM 1976: 58.

interest.⁸⁹ In this period one more common subject appears alongside the military and that of the personal worship. That is the conferment to the princeps by the senate in January 27 BC of the title of *Augustus* and the distinctions of *corona civica*, golden laurel branches and *clipeus virtutis*, *clementiae*, *iustitiae*, *pietatis*. That theme is displayed in a variety of versions on numerous series struck in vast numbers in all the mints throughout the Empire. Regarding imperial eastern bronzes, the *corona civica* theme was picked up on the OB CIVIS SERVATOS *sestertii* of groups V as well as on the SC *dupondii* of group VIII.

The question arises as to why the conferment of the title of *Augustus* and related distinctions upon Octavian by the senate on 13 January 27 BC was displayed so widely on coins after 23 BC, whereas during the first four years it appeared only once on a rare series of *aurei* struck in Rome. That theme was one of the pivotal elements of Augustus's propaganda.⁹⁰ The *clipeus virtutis* motif rapidly became so common in the times of the Julio-Claudian dynasty that even olive lamps⁹¹ and altars were ornamented with it. The replica of the *clipeus virtutis* of Arles, dated to 26 BC by inscription (COS VIII), was probably consecrated to mark Augustus's passing through the city in the same year on his way from Hispania to Rome.⁹² The *clipeus virtutis* was represented among others on the altars *Lares Augustales* of Vatican and Florence; the former being consecrated not earlier than in 12 BC, the latter in 2 BC.⁹³ Amid coins of the period 27–23 BC the absence of “civilian” motifs of *clipeus virtutis* and *corona civica* from coins signed by P. Carisius, designated for soldiers' pay, can be justified by their purely military and local character. The local character of Ephesian and Pergamonian cistophores also narrowed their propaganda content. How should one explain the absence of these motifs on eastern *denarii* and *aurei*? Why is *corona civica* absent from the CA/AVGVSTVS bronzes of groups I–III, and only appears on the *sestertii* of the OB CIVIS SERVATOS type of group V? As is already known, dating of the said coins to the period before 23 BC has no solid basis and is not confirmed by any annual date in the legend. If their emission date were shifted down to the period 23–12 BC, this would leave only early cistophores (Sutherland's groups I–V), Hispanic issues of P. Carisius, the AEGYPTO CAPTA series and the AVGVSTVS SC series of *aurei* in the period 27–23 BC. The first

⁸⁹ RAMBACH and WALKER 2012: 45–46. Myron had made the cows on the orders of Athens following the conclusion of the Nicias peace with Sparta in 421 BC. After the victory of Actium, Augustus would have had them dispatched to Rome to the temple of Apollo.

⁹⁰ The qualities of character conferred upon Augustus by such a *clipeus* were necessary for a model Roman commander and citizen. Cf. MARKOWSKI 1936: 109–128.

⁹¹ BAILEY 1980: no. Q 870, tab. 11. The lamp is dated to AD 40–70.

⁹² GIARD 1976: 4, 51. The inscription on the *clipeus* of Arles reads: *Senatus / Populusque Romanus / imp. Caesari Divi f. Augusto / cos VIII dedit clupeum / virtutis clementiae / iustitiae pietatis erga / deos patriamque.*

⁹³ BENOIT 1952: 52.

two issues can be left out due to their local or purely military nature. Then, it would be the case that, in the period 27–23 BC (exactly in 27 BC), only two series were struck, for which the absence of *clipeus virtutis* and *corona civica* would be hard to explain: AEGYPTO CAPTA and AVGVSTVS SC. However, the *corona civica* motif was placed on the latter.⁹⁴ This signifies that the rarity of occurrence of these motifs on coins in 27–23 BC is not linked to a purposeful intention, but to the cessation of vast money emissions at least till 23 BC, which automatically precludes propaganda actions in the domain of coinage. The above conclusion invites the conjecture that had there been more coins with statewide content issued in the period 27–23 BC, many would have displayed *clipeus virtutis* or *corona civica* in a proportion typical for the overall emission, most probably approximate to the proportion noted for the period 23–12 BC. The lack of such motifs on the series of bronzes of the CA/AVGVSTVS type of groups I–III, eastern *denarii*, *aurei* and *quinarii* with Victory provides one more premise for dating of these coins to after 23 BC.

THE POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC CONTEXT

A factor, which had a considerable impact on the emission of money and representations placed on coins in the east of the Empire under Augustus were movements of troops, to a large extent determined by the relations between the Roman Empire and the Parthian kingdom. The decision to conclude peace with the Parthians and its overall shape must have been taken by Augustus as early as in 23 BC.⁹⁵ Agrippa's mission in the East in 23–21 BC had the objective of preparing the groundwork for future actions toward this goal.⁹⁶ Representations of *corona rostralis* on the bronzes of the CA/AVGVSTVS type of groups I–II may have been related as well to Agrippa's stay in the East, like the afore mentioned type of eastern *denarii* with *corona rostralis*.⁹⁷ Such an indirect and veiled form of promoting Agrippa on coins may have had two reasons. The first one was the senate's misgivings about Agrippa, stemming from his lowly social origin, that Augustus had to reckon with.⁹⁸ The second reason may have been Augustus's concern about the massive promotion on statewide coins of this very talented strategist and organizer, the most important man in the state after himself, one exceedingly popular with the lower strata of the society.⁹⁹ It seems that Augustus preferred to wait until his own prestige and position

⁹⁴ Given the rarity of the AVGVSTVS SC type, that series can be supposed to have been struck soon after 13 January 27 BC, mainly for propaganda purposes.

⁹⁵ COOK, ADCOCK and CHARLESWORTH 1952: 262.

⁹⁶ MAGIE 1908: 150–151.

⁹⁷ *Ibidem*.

⁹⁸ Cass. Dio LIV, 29, 6.

⁹⁹ On the popularity of Agrippa see Cass. Dio LIII, 31, 4; LIV, 29, 3–4.

of the head of the state had become solidified and only then could he promote Agrippa overtly.¹⁰⁰ During his own stay in the East in 21–19 BC Augustus finalized the entire undertaking by concluding peace with Phraates, the king of the Parthians.¹⁰¹ Concentration of troops and Tiberius's lightning expedition to Armenia arguably aimed to frighten and induce greater compliance on the part of the Parthian king, who had to reckon with the danger of revolt in his own country.¹⁰² The laurel wreaths, less numerous oak wreaths and *coronae rostrales* displayed on eastern bronzes of groups I–V had a vast purport. They arguably referred to the victory at Actium and to the conclusion of peace with Parthia without war in 20 BC, which undoubtedly saved the lives of many citizens serving in the army, the fact the legend *ob cives servatos* seems to allude to. The signs AVGVSTVS and most probably CA too (cf. page 79 and footnotes 19 and 20), placed in the middle of wreaths, hinted expressly that the principal author of the victories and of the ensuing peace was Augustus. The emission of many imperial eastern bronzes, notably of group V, probably had a direct connection with Augustus's arrival at the east of the Empire in 21 BC, with the needs of the troops brought by Tiberius from Illyricum the following year¹⁰³ and with Augustus's return once the peace with the Parthians had been concluded. Those events coincided with the tenth anniversary of the battle of Actium, something considerably favouring the propaganda drive. Numerous examples of the emphasis and celebration of jubilees of great events by means of propaganda on Roman coins are known.¹⁰⁴ Representations of wreaths of this kind on coins during the crisis in Roman-Parthian relations may have suggested that a great victory over an eastern power,¹⁰⁵ like that of Actium, would be repeated by Augustus.

The next noteworthy period is 1 BC – AD 4 during the mission of Augustus's adopted son, Gaius Caesar, and the preparations preceding it. His stay in the East may have partly influenced the size of the emission of *dupondii* and *asses* of group VI struck from 5/4 BC to AD 5/6. There are examples of some cities in Asia Minor, where a correlation between the increased emission of bronze monies and the presence of large numbers of soldiers and warfare being waged in the east of the Empire is distinctly visible. The cities were located along the marching routes of troops and of the imperial court and their presence generated an extra demand

¹⁰⁰ Cf. COOK, ADCOCK and CHARLESWORTH 1952: 92 – “Of Agrippa it is not too much to say that, had there been no Augustus, he had capacities which might have made him the first man in Rome.” Also cf. Cass. Dio LIV, 6, 5, the alleged words of Mecenas, who, heeding Agrippa's position, advised Augustus to either make him his son-in-law or to kill him.

¹⁰¹ Cass. Dio LIV, 8, 1.

¹⁰² Cass. Dio LIV, 8, 1; 9, 4–5. Cf. DEBEVOISE 1938: 143; PARETI 1955: 524; WOLSKI 1994: 92.

¹⁰³ ROMEO 1998: 34.

¹⁰⁴ GRANT 1950: 11, 21 ff.

¹⁰⁵ On the stoking of anti egyptian hysteria by Octavianus, see Cass. Dio L, 3–4, 24–26.

for change coins.¹⁰⁶ However, not all of the bronze issues had to be designed for the needs of troops.¹⁰⁷ Bronzes of groups VI and perhaps of VII were most probably emitted for around twenty years, which would imply that the emission thereof was not linked exclusively with the presence of soldiers and Gaius Cesar's mission. The emission of the bronze coinage was arguably run to meet the current economic needs of the region and typically increased during the presence of larger masses of troops. The fact, that most legionary countermarks are found on bronzes of the SC type,¹⁰⁸ rather testifies to their widespread occurrence in circulation and to both regional and even statewide status (*Senatus Consulto* after all referred to the senate in Rome), than to their purely military character.

It is also worth approaching the imperial eastern coinage under Augustus in the strategic context. Particularly relevant is Howgego's observation, who perceived a relationship between the activity of mints and the military strategy shaped by the eastern policy of Rome: "the shift in the major positions of coinage from Asia and Syria to Syria alone reflected a change in strategic approach".¹⁰⁹ The annexation of the kingdom of Galatia in 25 BC initiated a long process of absorption by Rome of the dependent states in the East and the shifting of the borders of the Empire toward the kingdom of the Parthians. Consequently, Asia Minor naturally had to lose its strategic and economic importance for the benefit of the frontier province of Syria, across which ran the sole trafficable route linking the Mediterranean area with Mesopotamia and Egypt across Anatolia and the Syrian ports.¹¹⁰ The shift of the emission of regional monies from western Asia Minor to Syria seems to be a consequence of the said changes. Considerable numbers of surviving imperial eastern bronzes and the range of their occurrence indicate their vast importance in the monetary circulation of the region.¹¹¹ The geographical distribution of specimens struck under Augustus, despite their scarcity, hints that their primary area of circulation must have formed itself already during his reign. They were found in northern and western Syria (Adiyaman and Gaziantep, in what is now Turkey, Antioch, Abou Dannah near Aleppo, Apamea, Homs), in Dura Europos, Palmyra,

¹⁰⁶ ZIEGLER 1996: 121–127. Cf. also KRZYŻANOWSKA 1970: 61 ff.

¹⁰⁷ BUTCHER 2004: 246–247, 250, convincingly presented the view that not every period of increased coinage emission had to be associated with military activities.

¹⁰⁸ HOWGEGO 1985: 18, 22–23.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibidem*: 11–12. Howgego expressed the view that the military character of SC bronzes can be expanded onto bronzes of CA/AVGVSTVS type as well as onto parallel issues of silver coins, albeit the evidence for this is not conclusive.

¹¹⁰ MANN 1974: 521–525.

¹¹¹ HOWGEGO 1985: 22–23; BURNETT, AMANDRY and RIPOLLÈS 2006: 23; BUTCHER 2004: 257–260. Butcher, *Ibidem*: 19, qualified the imperial eastern bronzes in question as "provincial imperial bronze". Cf. also HARL 1996: 107–108. MCALEE 2007: 46, supposed that imperial eastern bronzes had the status of official Roman money.

Beyruth, Jerash in Arabia (northwest Jordan), Cyprus, western and southern Anatolia (Priene, Afyon, Side), and in the southern Levant, although representing under 3% of the share there.¹¹² The finds reported as discovered in Anatolia are all of the AVGVSTVS (group II) and CA types, which would tend to corroborate the shift of the minting activity from Asia to Syria carried out by 20 BC. A similar conclusion can be drawn from Howgego's compilation of finds of bronzes of groups I–III (CA and AVGVSTVS types): 53% of 73 specimens come from western Anatolia (including Samos), 19% from northern Syria (including 1 coin from Dura Europos), 8% from Greece, 7% from Cyprus, 5% from Bulgaria and 5% from the western part of the Empire, mainly from frontier military camps and borderland areas.¹¹³ Out of nineteen bronzes undoubtedly determined as pertaining to group I and II, seven came from western Anatolia, four from Cyprus, three from Greece, three from Bulgaria and only two from Syria, whereas the seven coins classified with certainty to group III, all were found in Syria.¹¹⁴ From the 1st to the middle of 3rd centuries AD imperial eastern bronzes constituted the prevailing part of the mass of bronze monies in circulation not only in Antioch, but also in Hama and Apamea, and less than a half, but still more than a third of all bronzes found at excavations in Palmyra, Dura Europos and Berytus.¹¹⁵ In Seleucia Pieria they occurred in quantities comparable to the own bronze emissions of this city. In the cities mentioned above during this period, when they were not issuing their own monies, it was mainly imperial eastern bronzes of the SC type that were in circulation, whereas the share of bronzes of the neighbouring cities was noticeably lower (in Seleucia), or negligible (in Hama and Apamea). Bronzes of the SC type were also more or less widespread throughout Decapolis.¹¹⁶ In Palmyra, Antiochene coins made up at least one third of all coin finds in Polish and Swiss excavations (only bronze coins were found there) and they were most frequently represented by the SC type.¹¹⁷ An updated output of the Polish excavations in Palmyra yields an even more explicit picture, with Antiochene coins constituting over half of all the early Roman coins found on the site and the SC type making up a little more than a half of the Antiochene

¹¹² Based on over twenty site finds registered in: BUTCHER 1991: 179–195; BURNETT, AMANDRY and RIPOLLÈS 2006 (<https://rpc.ashmus.ox.ac.uk/> : no. 2232 coin 14; no. 2233 coins 20, 21; no. 2234 coins 34, 35; no. 2235 coins 24, 25; no. 4101 coin 5; no. 4246 coins 5, 9); KRZYŻANOWSKA and GAWLIKOWSKI 2013: 20; and on NEUMANN 2015: chapters from 6 to 9. BUTCHER 1991: 195 wrote that “Antiochene coinage occasionally travelled northwards, although not in great quantities”.

¹¹³ HOWGEGO 1982: 3–4.

¹¹⁴ *Ibidem*: 4.

¹¹⁵ BUTCHER 2002b: 149–150; NEUMANN 2015: 236, 252, quotes a 53.6% share in the assemblage for Dura Europos in the 1st century AD. Neumann, *ibidem*: 230–232, draws attention to a drop in the share rate in the 2nd century and the Severan period, most probably caused by the competition from local emissions by other cities of the region that were crowding out the Antiochene imperial bronze output.

¹¹⁶ AUGÉ 2002: 159.

¹¹⁷ KRZYŻANOWSKA 2002: 168.

coins.¹¹⁸ The next group in terms of quantity were small Palmyrene bronzes. It seems that both groups of coins fulfilled complementary functions in circulation: the bronzes of SC type served as the denomination of medium size, the Palmyrene ones as local small change.¹¹⁹ Imperial eastern bronzes of the SC type constituted a material, but not dominant component of the monetary mass circulating in southern Syria and Roman Mesopotamia.¹²⁰ Taking heed of the existence of many local mints striking change coinage in line with various standards, a uniform bronze money of a regional status emitted in the form of larger denominations must have been a practical solution. The above data seem to indicate that initially imperial eastern bronzes of the CA/AVGVSTVS type performed just such a role in Syria and soon after did so bronzes of SC type. The legends and representations on these coins, which do not contain any references to either the authorities of a specific province or to local authorities (unless we accept the unlikely interpretation of CA letters – *Communae Asiae*¹²¹), make an additional case for this conclusion. Their emission positions under Augustus in Asia, Syria, and Cyprus also seem to testify to their regional role.¹²² Besides, the imperial eastern bronzes of the SC and OB CIVIS SERVATOS types bear very similar images and have a weight approximate to the same types struck in the mint of Rome. The first years of the emission were also probably a testing period for the new bronze money prior to launching the emission on a considerably larger scale in the mint of Rome between 22 and 19 BC.¹²³ The multitude of types: CA, AVGVSTVS, and later OB CIVIS SERVATOS, AT-CA and SC gradually vanished. Under Augustus's successors, exclusively bronzes of SC type were emitted, following the style of the mint of Rome. The similarity in form and weight decreased and the emission of *sestertii* ceased in the East.¹²⁴ It appears that, as if with the resumption of activity by the mint of Rome, a long term mass production of bronzes was launched, the reverse types for which had been selected out during the earlier experiments carried out in the eastern provinces.¹²⁵ It is worth

¹¹⁸ KRZYŻANOWSKA and GAWLIKOWSKI 2013: 16, 20–30.

¹¹⁹ *Ibidem*.

¹²⁰ BUTCHER 1996: 108–109.

¹²¹ Cf. footnote 19. BURNETT, AMANDRY and RIPOLLÈS 2006: 381, presented in RPC I various propositions of how to interpret these letters.

¹²² NEUMANN 2015: 125, referred to the SC bronze coinage as “a standardized Roman provincial currency”.

¹²³ The emission of imperial eastern bronzes is supposed to have been an attempt to introduce a uniform standard into the coinage of the eastern regions of the empire. Cf. BURNETT, AMANDRY and RIPOLLÈS 2006: 23, 380–381; BUTCHER 2002a: 116–117; BUTCHER 2004: 268. HARL 1996: 76, perceived in the emission of bronzes of the CA/AVGVSTVS type the final rehearsal of Augustus's monetary reform.

¹²⁴ MCALEE 2007: 35, 47, 111 believed that basic denominations of imperial eastern bronzes of the SC type over one and half a century, starting from the last decennium of 1st century BC (from group VI of imperial eastern bronzes onwards) were asses and *semisses*, not *dupondii* and asses.

¹²⁵ *Ibidem*: 49, he found it very probable that the Roman government tried to roll out the Roman monetary system of bronze coinage into the provinces of Asia and Syria in this way.

remembering that Nero's reform was probably implemented first in Syria for the emission of tetradrachms and only a slightly later in Rome.¹²⁶

SUMMARY

The emission of imperial eastern bronze coinage of Augustus, that is of the CA, AT-CA, AVGVSTVS, OB CIVES SERVATOS and SC types, most probably commenced around 25 BC in Asia, where groups I and II were issued. In connection with political and military actions that led to conclusion of the advantageous peace with Parthian kingdom in 20 BC, the centre of minting activity for imperial eastern bronzes was shifted to Antioch in Syria, where the emission of group III began in 24 BC, soon followed by groups IV and V. Coins of these groups ceased to be issued around 20 BC, when the new type of imperial portrait on coins in the convention of a mature man was introduced into the eastern provinces.

This was most likely not a coincidence and the change in the model of the imperial portrait on coins was implemented during Augustus's visit to the eastern provinces in 21/20 BC. The minting of imperial eastern bronzes was resumed in 5 BC and continued as groups VI and VII throughout the rest of Augustus's reign. The imperial portraiture on the bronzes, following that on Antiochene silver tetradrachms, underwent subtle alterations during that period and by the end of the reign delicately reflected the process of the ageing of the emperor. Imperial eastern bronzes served as a regional "middle" coinage filling in the gap between silver denominations and change coinages issued by the local entities. They mainly circulated in Syria, Roman Mesopotamia, Lebanon, Decapolis, and Cyprus. Their circulation area was wider than the range of Antiochene civic issues which seems to corroborate their regional status. This is also reinforced by the fact that imperial eastern bronzes were very similar in appearance and weight to their counterparts from the mint of Rome, in this way giving the impression of also being a sort of state-wide currency. Their emissions were undoubtedly connected with the increased presence of Roman troops and the highest authorities like the visits of Agrippa and Augustus, the campaigns of Tiberius's legions at the end of twenties BC, as well as the visit of Gaius Caesar at the transition from BC to AD. Some issues were produced, however, to cater to purely local demand. The project that had taken final shape under Augustus, wound up enjoying a remarkable longevity, lasting almost three centuries. Antioch would remain the final minting centre for imperial eastern bronzes until the end of the emission of this coinage in mid 3rd century. An exception was group VIII which was issued locally in Cyprus in the last decade of 1st century BC. The final form and circulation range of the imperial eastern bronze coinage appears to have been shaped

¹²⁶ BUTCHER 1996: 105.

already under Augustus. During his reign this coinage went through a test phase that resulted in the SC type being selected for further emission in two denominations: *as* and *dupondius*. The stylistic affinity of portraits on the imperial eastern bronzes to those on cistophores, then on Antiochene tetradrachms and archihieratic drachms which bear yearly dates, is so high that it allows quite a precise date to be determined for the bronzes. It also makes a strong case for the hypothesis that both coinages may have been executed by the same workshops and moneyers or at least that the workmanship style of the silver coins was very closely imitated on the bronzes. It is worth noting that imperial eastern bronzes, in terms of style of imperial portraiture and propaganda, appear to constitute just an element of a very consistent and well-organized system and were most probably subjected to the same centralised policy as other coins and full bodied sculpture. This claim provides a useful time frame for the dating of imperial eastern bronzes. Besides, one can infer from the coincidence in time and space that the introduction of new types of imperial portraiture on coins under Augustus was implemented directly during visits by the authorities, including the emperor himself.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank to Prof. Mariusz Mielczarek for his valuable remarks and suggestions.

ABBREVIATIONS

BMC = H. MATTINGLY, *Catalogue of Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*, vol. I: *Augustus to Vitellius*, London 1923.

CNG = Classical Numismatic Group

NAC = Numismatica Ars Classica

RIC I = H. MATTINGLY and E.A. SYDENHAM, *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, vol. 1: *Augustus to Vitellius*, London 1923.

RPC I = A. BURNETT, M. AMANDRY and P.P. RIPOLLÈS, *Roman Provincial Coinage*, vol. I: *From the Death of Caesar to the Death of Vitellius (44 BC – AD 69)*, London–Paris 2006.

REFERENCES

ARIAS, P.E. 1943. *La scultura Romana*, Messina.

AUGÉ, CHR. 2002. “La place des monnaies de Décapole et d’Arabie dans la numismatique du Proche-Orient à l’époque romaine”. In: CHR. AUGÉ and F. DUVRAT (eds), *Les monnayages syriens. Quel apport pour l’histoire du Proche-Orient hellénistique et romain? Actes de la table ronde de Damas, 10–12 novembre 1999*, Beyrouth: 153–166.

BAILEY, D.M. 1980. *A Catalogue of the Lamps in the British Museum, 2: Roman Lamps Made in Italy*, London.

- BENOIT, F. 1952. "Le sanctuaire d'Auguste et les cryptoportiques d'Arles", *Revue Archeologique* 39: 31–67.
- BOSCHUNG, D. 1993. *Die Bildnisse des Augustus. Das römische Herrscherbild*, part I, vol. 2, Berlin.
- BREGLIA, L. 1968. *L'arte romana nelle monete dell'eta imperiale*, Milano.
- BURNETT, A.M. 1977. "The Authority to Coin in the Late Republic and Early Empire", *The Numismatic Chronicle* 137: 37–63.
- BURNETT, A., AMANDRY, M. and RIPOLLÈS, P.P. 2006. *Roman Provincial Coinage*, vol. I: *From the Death of Caesar to the Death of Vitellius (44 BC – AD 69)*, London–Paris.
- BUTCHER, K. 1991. *Coinage in Roman Syria: 64 BC – AD 253*, vol. I, PhD Thesis, London.
- BUTCHER, K. 1996. "Coinage and Currency in Syria and Palestine to the Reign of Gallienus". In: C.E. KING and D.G. WIGG (eds), *Coin Finds and Coin Use in the Roman World. The Thirteenth Oxford Symposium on Coinage and Monetary History*, 25–27.3.1993, *Studien zu Fundmünzen der Antike* 10, Berlin: 101–112.
- BUTCHER, K. 2002a. "Syrian Coinage and Romanization from Pompey to Domitian". In: CHR. AUGÉ and F. DUYRAT (eds), *Les monnayages syriens. Quel apport pour l'histoire du Proche-Orient hellénistique et romain? Actes de la table ronde de Damas, 10–12 novembre 1999*, Beyrouth: 115–122.
- BUTCHER, K. 2002b. "Circulation of Bronze Coinage in the Orontes Valley in the Late Hellenistic and Early Roman Periods". In: CHR. AUGÉ and F. DUYRAT (eds), *Les monnayages syriens. Quel apport pour l'histoire du Proche-Orient hellénistique et romain? Actes de la table ronde de Damas, 10–12 novembre 1999*, Beyrouth: 145–152.
- BUTCHER, K. 2004. *Coinage in Roman Syria. Northern Syria 64 BC – AD 253*, London.
- BUTCHER, K. and PONTING, M. 2009. "The Silver Coinage of Roman Syria Under the Julio-Claudian Emperors", *Levant* 41 (1): 59–78. DOI: 10.1179/175638009X427594
- CARSON, R.A.G. 1980. *Principal Coins of the Romans II*, London.
- COOK, S.A., ADCOCK, F.E. and CHARLESWORTH, M.P. 1952. *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. X: *The Augustan Empire, 44 BC – AD 70*, Cambridge.
- DEBEVOISE, N.C. 1938. *A Political History of Parthia*, Chicago, IL.
- FITTSCHEN, K. and ZANKER, P. 1985. *Katalog der römischen Porträts in den Capitolinischen Museen und den anderen kommunalen Sammlungen der Stadt Rom*, vol. I: *Kaiser und Prinzenbildnisse*, Mainz am Rhein.
- GIARD, J.-B. 1976. *Catalogue des monnaies de l'empire romain*, vol. 1: *Auguste*, Paris.
- GRANT, M. 1946. *From Imperium to Auctoritas. A Historical Study on Aes Coinage in the Roman Empire 49 BC – AD 14*, Cambridge.
- GRANT, M. 1950. *Roman Anniversary Issues. An Exploratory Study of the Numismatic and Medalllic Commemoration of Anniversary Years 49BC – A.D.375*, Cambridge.
- HARL, K.W. 1996. *Coinage in the Roman Economy, 300 B.C. to A.D. 700*, Baltimore, MD–London.
- HAUSMANN, U. 1981. "Zur Typologie und Ideologie des Augustus porträts". In: H. TEMPORINI and W. HAASE (eds), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Teil II, Band 12.2, Berlin–Boston, MA: 513–598. DOI: 10.1515/9783110850697-010
- HOMO, L. 1935. *Auguste 63 av. J. C. - 14 ap. J. C.*, Paris.
- HOWGEGO, C.J. 1982. "Coinage and Military Finance: The Imperial Bronze Coinage of the Augustan East", *The Numismatic Chronicle* 142: 1–20.
- HOWGEGO, C.J. 1985. *Greek Imperial Countermarks. Studies in the Provincial Coinage of the Roman Empire*, London.
- KALTSAS, N. 2003. *Sculpture in the National Museum, Athens*, Los Angeles, CA.

- KISS, Z. 1975. *L'iconographie des princes Julio-Claudiens au Temps d'Auguste et de Tibère*, Varsovie.
- KLEINER, D.E.E. 1992. *Roman Sculpture*, Yale, CT.
- KRZYŻANOWSKA, A. 1970. *Monnaies coloniales d'Antioche de Piside*, Varsovie.
- KRZYŻANOWSKA, A. 2002. "Les monnaies de Palmyre: leur rôle dans la circulation monétaire de la région". In. CHR. AUGÉ and F. DUYPAT (eds), *Les monnayages syriens. Quel apport pour l'histoire du Proche-Orient hellénistique et romain? Actes de la table ronde de Damas, 10–12 novembre 1999*, Beyrouth: 167–173.
- KRZYŻANOWSKA, A. and GAWLIKOWSKI, M. 2014. *Studia Palmyreńskie 13. Monnaies des fouilles polonaises à Palmyre*, Warszawa.
- KUNISZ, A. 1976. *Recherches sur le monnayage et la circulation monétaire sous la règne d'Auguste*, Wrocław.
- MAGIE, D.Jr. 1908. "The Mission of Agrippa to the Orient", *Classical Philology* III: 145–152.
- MANN, J.C. 1974. "Frontiers of the Principate". In. H. TEMPORINI (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Teil II, Band I, Berlin–Boston, MA: 508–533.
- MARKOWSKI, H. 1936. "De quattuor virtutibus Augusti in clupeo aureo ei dato inscriptis", *Eos* 37: 109–128.
- MATTINGLY, H. 1923. *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*, vol. 1: *Augustus to Vitellius*, London.
- MATTINGLY, H.B. 1985. "Review Article. Money for an Empire: The Julio-Claudian Experiment", *The Numismatic Chronicle* 145: 255–263.
- MATTINGLY, H. and SYDENHAM, E.A. 1923. *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, vol. 1: *Augustus to Vitellius*, London.
- MCALEE, R. 2007. *The Coins of Roman Antioch*, Lancaster, PA–London.
- MORETTI, G. 1938. *L'Ara Pacis Augustae*, Roma.
- NEUMANN, K.M. 2015. *Mapping the Transformation of Roman Antioch: The Coin Evidence*, PhD Thesis, University of Cincinnati, OH.
- NICOLAOU, I. 1990. *Paphos II: The Coins from the House of Dionysos*, Nicosia.
- PARETI, L. 1955. *Storia di Roma e del mondo Romano*, vol. IV, Torino.
- PARKS, D.A. 2004. *The Roman Coinage of Cyprus*, Nicosia.
- POULSEN, V.H. 1946. "Studies in Julio-Claudian Iconography", *Acta Archeologica* 17: 1–48.
- RAMBACH, H. and WALKER, A. 2012. "The 'Heifer' on Aurei of Augustus", *Revue Suisse de Numismatique* 91: 41–62. DOI: 10.5169/seals-323746
- ROBERTSON, A.S. 1962. *Roman Imperial Coins in the Hunter Coin Cabinet*, vol. I: *Augustus to Nerva*, Oxford.
- RODENWALDT, G. 1942. *Kunst um Augustus*, Berlin. DOI: 10.1515/9783111479163
- ROMEO, I. 1998. *Ingenius Leo. L'immagine di Agrippa*, Roma.
- SARTRE, M. 1991. *L'orient romain. Provinces et sociétés provinciales en Méditerranée orientale d'Auguste aux Sévères (31 avant J.C. – 235 après J.C.)*, Paris.
- SCHEID, J. 1978. "Les prêtres officiels sous les empereurs julio-claudiens". In. H. TEMPORINI and W. HAASE (eds), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Teil II, Band 16.1, Berlin–Boston, MA: 610–654. DOI: 10.1515/9783110854503-014
- SUTHERLAND, C.H.V. 1951. *Coinage in Roman Imperial Policy, 31 B.C. – A.D. 68*, London.
- SUTHERLAND, C.H.V. 1970. *The Cistophori of Augustus*, London.
- SUTHERLAND, C.H.V. 1974. "L'attribution des deniers augustéens aux types du «temple», de la 'couronne' et du 'jeune taureau'", *Revue Numismatique* 16: 49–67. DOI: 10.3406/numi.1974.1064
- SUTHERLAND, C.H.V. 1976. *The Emperor and the Coinage. Julio-Claudian Studies*, London.
- SUTHERLAND, C.H.V. 1984. *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, vol. 1: *From 31 B.C. to A.D. 69*, Revised edition, London.

- SUTHERLAND, C.H.V. and KRAAY, C.M. 1975. *Catalogue of Coins of the Roman Empire in the Ashmolean Museum*, part I: *Augustus (c. 31 BC – 14 AD)*, Oxford.
- WOLSKI, J. 1994. "Rzymska polityka na Wschodzie". In: J. WOLSKI, T. KOTULA and A. KUNISZ (eds), *Starożytny Rzym we współczesnych badaniach*, Kraków: 81–103.
- WRUCK, W. 1931. *Die Syrische Provinzialprägung von Augustus bis Traian*, Stuttgart.
- ZANKER, P. 1990. *Augustus und die Macht der Bilder*, München.
- ZIEGLER, R. 1996. "Civic Coins and Imperial Campaigns". In: D.L. KENNEDY (ed.), *The Roman Army in the East*, *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, Supplementary Series no. 18, Ann Arbor, MI: 119–134.

Author's address:

Adam Jegliński
83/40 Srebrzyńska Street, 94-209 Łódź, Poland
aspokowodza@op.pl

PLATE 1

Fig. 1. Reverses of the coins:

a) *As* or *dupondius*, CA on reverse, 14.60 g, ø 26 mm, RPC I 2234
Roma Numismatics Limited, e-sale 17, lot 404, auction date 25.04.2015

b) *as*, AVGVSTVS on reverse, ø 26 mm, 12.26 g, RPC I 4100
Roma Numismatics Ltd, e-sale 30, lot 217, 29.10.2016

c) *dupondius*, SC on reverse, 13.32 g, RPC I 4264
Fritz Rudolf Künker GmbH & Co. KG, Osnabrück, auction 124, lot 8732, 16.03.2007
owner of the coin image Lübke & Wiedemann KG, Leonberg, <http://www.kuenker.com>

d) *sestertius*, OB CIVIS SERVATOS on reverse, 25.98 g, RPC I 4101
Numismatica Ars Classica NAC AG, auction 86, lot 54, 08.10.2015

Fig. 2. *Dupondius*, CA on reverse, 11.69 g, ø 25 mm, RPC I 2234
Numismatik Naumann, auction 75, lot 338, 03.03.2019

Fig. 3. Drachm of Lycian League, 3.22 g, ø 18 mm, RPC I 3309b
Nomos AG, auction 13, lot 265, 07.10.2016

Fig. 4. *Dupondius*, CA on reverse, 12.30 g, ø 26 mm, RPC I 2230
Classical Numismatic Group LLC, electronic auction 424, lot 290, 11.07.2018

Fig. 5. *As*, AVGVSTVS on reverse, 13.84 g, ø 26.5 mm, RPC I 2231
Classical Numismatic Group LLC, auction 105, lot 585, 10.05.2017

Fig. 6. *Semis*, CA on reverse, 5.03 g, ø 20 mm, RPC I 2232
Classical Numismatic Group LLC, electronic auction 115, lot 286, 20.05.2005

Fig. 7. Cistophore of Sutherland's group V, corn ears on rev., 11.85 g, 26 mm, RPC I 2214
Nomos AG, auction Nomos 22, lot 279, 22.06.2021

PLATE 2

Fig. 8. *Denarius*, wreath on reverse, 3.79 g, RIC I 473
Classical Numismatic Group LLC, electronic auction 188, lot 355, 28.05.2008

Fig. 9. *Denarius*, IOVI OLUM on reverse, 3.60 g, RIC 472
Nomos AG, auction Nomos 2, Lot 165, 18.05.2010

Fig. 10. *Quinarius*, Victory on reverse, 1.71 g, ø 15 mm, RIC I 474
Roma Numismatics Ltd, e-sale 38, lot 529, 29.07.2019

Fig. 11. *Sestertius*, CA on reverse, 25.63 g, RPC I 2233
Numismatica Ars Classica NAC AG, auction 51, lot 805, 25.03.2009

Fig. 12. *As*, AVGVSTVS on reverse, 10.47 g, ø 25 mm, RPC I 2235
Nomos AG, auction Obolos 20, lot 1066, 03.10.2021

Fig. 13. *Semis*, CA on reverse, 6.77 g, ø 21 mm, RPC I 2232
Leu Numismatik, web auction 4, lot 625, 24.06.2018

Fig. 14. *Sestertius*, CA on reverse, 24.06 g, RPC I 2233
Numismatica Ars Classica NAC AG, auction 100, lot 411, 29.05.2017

Fig. 15. *Dupondius*, CA on reverse, 11.69 g, ø 25 mm, RPC I 2234
Numismatik Naumann GmbH, auction 75, lot 338, 03.03.2019

Fig. 16. *As*, AVGVSTVS on reverse, 11.32 g, ø 27 mm, RPC I 4100
Classical Numismatic Group LLC, electronic auction 133, lot 212, 15.02.2006

PLATE 3

Fig. 17. *Sestertius*, CA on reverse, 27.08 g, ø 35 mm, RPC I 2233
Roma Numismatics Ltd, auction 20, lot 507, 29.10.2020

Fig. 18. *Dupondius*, AVGVSTVS on reverse, 12.93 g, ø 26.5 mm, RPC I 2235
Nomos AG, obolos Web auction 16, lot 1058, 11.10.2020

Fig. 19. *Dupondius*, CA on reverse, 11.15 g, ø 28 mm, RPC I 2234
Roma Numismatics Ltd, Auction 19, lot 765 26.03.2020

-
- Fig. 20. *Denarius*, bull on reverse, 3.89 g, ø 19 mm, RIC I 475
Roma Numismatics Ltd, auction 18, lot 1036, 29.09.2019
- Fig. 21. *As*, AVGVSTVS on reverse, 12.26 g, ø 26 mm, RPC I 4100
Roma Numismatics Ltd, auction 30, lot 217, 29.10.2016
- Fig. 22. Cistophore of Sutherland's group VI, capricorn on reverse,
11.97 g, ø 25 mm, RPC I 2211
Roma Numismatics Limited, e-sale 32, lot 549, 07.01.2017
- Fig. 23. *As*, CA on reverse, 9.39 g, ø 23 mm, RPC I 4103
Solidus Numismatik, auction 5, lot 163, 26.04.2015
- Fig. 24. *Sestertius*, OB CIVIS SERVATOS on reverse, 25.98 g, RPC I 4101
Numismatica Ars Classica NAC AG, auction 86, lot 54, 08.10.2015

PLATE 4

- Fig. 25. *Dupondius*, SC on reverse, 12.31 g, ø 26 mm, RPC I 4105
Classical Numismatic Group LLC, electronic auction 246, lot 248, 15.12.2010
- Fig. 26. *As*, SC on reverse, 10.52 g, RPC I 4105
Helios Numismatik GmbH, auction 5, lot 1109, 25.06.2010
- Fig. 27. *As*, CA on reverse, 11.26 g, ø 26 mm, RPC I 4104
Classical Numismatic Group LLC, electronic auction 110, lot 144, 16.03.05
- Fig. 28. *Dupondius*, SC and Greek legend on reverse, 16.23 g, ø 27 mm, RPC I 4246
Vauctions auction 212 lot 53 18.09.2008
- Fig. 29. Antiochene tetradrachm, 5 BC, 15.12 g, 26 mm, RPC I 4150
Nomos AG, Obolos 19, lot 612, 08.05.2021
- Fig. 30. *As*, SC on reverse, 11.19 g, ø 21.5 mm, RPC I 4248
Saint Paul Antiques, auction 5, lot 194, 06.05.2017
- Fig. 31. Antiochene archihieratic drachm, 5/4 BC, 9.95 g, ø 23 mm, RPC I 4251
Roma Numismatics Ltd, e-sale 30, lot 218, 29.10.2016
- Fig. 32. *Dupondius*, SC on reverse, 16.27 g, ø 28 mm, RPC I 4248
Roma Numismatics Ltd, e-sale 19, lot 425, 01.08.2015
- Fig. 33. Antiochene tetradrachm, 2/1 BC, 14.88 g, ø 27 mm, RPC I 4156
Nomos AG, Obolos Web Auction 19, lot 611, 08.05.2021
- Fig. 34. *Dupondius*, SC on reverse, 19.71 g, ø 25 mm, RPC I 4264
Nomos AG, Obolos Web Auction 15, lot 692, 24.05.2020
- Fig. 35. Tetradrachm of Antioch, 2/1 BC, 14.62 g, ø 27 mm, RPC I 4155
Leu Numismatik, web auction 13, lot 954, 15–16.08.2020
- Fig. 36. *Dupondius*, SC on reverse, 16.97 g, ø 26 mm, RIC I 528
Classical Numismatic Group LLC, electronic auction 71, lot 59, 22.08.2003

PLATE 5

- Fig. 37. Antiochene tetradrachm, 5/6 AD, 15.15 g, ø 25 mm, RPC I 4158
Nomos AG, Nomos 20, lot 300, 10.07.2020
- Fig. 38. *Dupondius*, SC on reverse, 13.31 g, ø 25 mm, RPC I 4264
Nomos, auction 14, lot 322, 17.05.2017
- Fig. 39. Antiochene tetradrachm, AD 11/12, 14.92 g, RPC I 4159
Roma Numismatics Limited, e-sale 18, lot 595, 27.06.2015
- Fig. 40. *Dupondius*, SC on reverse, 13.32 g, RPC I 4264
Fritz Rudolf Künker GmbH & Co. KG, Osnabrück, auction 124, lot 8732, 16.03.2007
owner of the coin image Lübke & Wiedemann KG, Leonberg, <http://www.kuenker.com>
- Fig. 41. Antiochene tetradrachm, AD 13/14, 15.15 g, ø 26 mm, RPC I 4160
Classical Numismatic Group LLC, electronic auction 111, lot 511, 29.05.2019

Fig. 42. *Dupondius*, SC on reverse, 15.92 g, ø 26 mm, RIC I 528, RPC I 4264
Solidus Numismatik, auction 6, lot 215, 19.07.2015

Fig. 43. Antiochene tetradrachm, AD 13/14, 14.67 g, RPC I 4162
Gemini LLC, auction IX, lot 259, 08.01.2012

Fig. 44. *As*, AT CA on reverse, 9.27 g, ø 22 mm, RPC I 4106
Classical Numismatic Group LLC, electronic auction 181, lot 223, 06.02.2008

Fig. 45. *As*, AT CA on reverse, 10 g, ø 24 mm, RPC I 4106
Numismatik Naumann, auction 84, lot 179, 01.12.2019

Fig. 46. *Dupondius*, AVGVST on reverse, 15.79 g, ø 30 mm, RPC I 3914
Numismatica Ars Classica NAC AG, auction 38, lot 8, 21.03.2007

Fig. 47. *Dupondius*, SC on reverse, 11.06 g, RPC I 3915
Classical Numismatic Group LLC, mail bid sale 78, lot 1394, 14.05.2008

PLATE 6

Fig. 48. *As*, bust of Caius Caesar on reverse, 9.34 g, RPC I, 3910
Classical Numismatic Group LLC, mail bid sale 78, lot 1403, 14.05.2008

Fig. 49. *Denarius* of Emerita, trophy on reverse, 4 g, 18 mm, RIC I 4b
Roma Numismatics Ltd, e-sale 63, lot 687, 07.11.2019

Fig. 50. *Denarius* of Emerita, trophy of arms on rev., 3.86 g, 19 mm, RIC 5 var. (obv. leg.)
Roma Numismatics Ltd, Auction XX Day 2, lot 505, 30.10.2020

Fig. 51. *Aureus*, bull on reverse, 7.9 g, RIC I 475 (denarius)
Numismatica Ars Classica NAC AG, auction 51, lot 144, 05.03.2009

Fig. 52. *Aureus*, cow on reverse, 7.88 g, ø 22 mm, RIC I 538 (for obverse)
Numismatica Ars Classica NAC AG, auction 41, lot 37, 20.11.2007

Fig. 53. *Aureus*, cow on reverse, 7.89 g, RIC I 538
Bertolami Fine Arts, auction 12, lot 603, 29.10.2014

Fig. 54. *Aureus*, cow on reverse, 7.90 g, RIC I 536
Numismatica Ars Classica NAC AG, auction 45, lot 61, 02.04.2008

Fig. 55. *Denarius*, bull on reverse, 4.08 g, ø 19 mm, RIC I 475
Roma Numismatics Ltd, auction 8, lot 913, 28.09.2014

Fig. 56. *Denarius*, bull on reverse, 3.80 g, ø 19 mm, RIC I 475
Nomos AG, auction 21, lot 291, 21.11.2020

Fig. 57. *Denarius*, IOVI OLUM on reverse, 3.60 g, RIC 472
Nomos AG, auction Nomos 2, lot 165, 18.05.2010

Fig. 58. *Denarius*, IOVI OLUM on reverse, 3.73 g, ø 20 mm, RIC I 472
Roma Numismatics Ltd, e-sale 103, lot 931, 24.11.2022

Fig. 59. *Denarius*, wreath on reverse, 3.84 g, ø 18 mm, RIC I 473
Classical Numismatic Group LLC, mail bid sale 84, lot 964, 05.05.2010

Fig. 60. *Denarius*, wreath on reverse, 3.18 g, ø 19 mm, RIC I 473
Bertolami Fine Arts, auction 5, lot 493, 14.05.2012

Fig. 61. Cistophore of Sutherland's VII group, COM ASIA on reverse, 11.90 g, RIC I 2217
Nomos auction 1, lot 139, 06.05.2009



1a



1b



1c



1d



2



3



4



5



6



7





8



9



10



11



12



13



14



15



16





17



18



19



20



21



22



23



24



25



26



27



28



29



30



31



32



33



34



35



36





37



38



39



40



41



42



43



44



45



46



47





48



49



50



51



52



53



54



55



56



57



58



59



60



61

