

## The Imperial Mints during the Reign of Claudius II. Gothicus and their Issues

by Andreas Markl, k. k. Major i. P.

Translated from the original German, in Numismatische Zeitschrift No. 16, Anno 1894  
by Dane Kurth

### Notes from the translator:

1) For clarity, I have used "IMP" for the "I IIIIP" used on the Rome issues

2) The way that the Cohen references were given in the original article was a little confusing:

a) Cohen references for **Claudius** coins with Gallienus reverses are Cohen refs for **Gallienus**,

b) the Cohen references below **only refer to the basic type** and not to the varieties of fieldmarks, mintmarks etc. listed below. e.g. IMP CLAVDIVS AVG/LIBERITAS AVG of Siscia, with S in the right field is described as Cohen 115. However, Cohen 115 gives the obverse legend as IMP **C** CLAVDIVS AVG and makes no mention of the field mark S. So the Cohen references in the following pages cannot be taken as "gospel".

c) because a couple of Cohen references appear to be incorrect (possibly type-setters errors)

d) the RIC author appears to have been using a different version (numbers in RIC do not correspond to the appropriate coin(s) in my edition of Cohen) I have, where possible used "modern" known references including RIC, Cunetio hoard, Normanby Hoard, Venera = La Venera Hoard, IARCW = Roman Coin Hoards of Wales, Cardiff University.

The Cohen volumes: Gallienus (Cohen vol. IV) and Claudius (Cohen vol. V) can be viewed on <http://www.inumis.com/rome/index.html>

3) Coins described below, which were not already in my RIC list of Claudius II coins, have been added to that list. Some of them were already present as being in the Normanby Hoard or other hoards.

4) I didn't have time to check all the Cohen refs, but the types that I noticed were different from the Cohen description have been given a "v" for var.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Introduction**

During the short period his reign, almost constantly under pressure to resist the enemies threatening the empire along the borders, and to save the empire from the precarious position it was in, Claudius was unable to spend much time repairing the financial mismanagement caused to such a shocking extent by his predecessor. The financial position was desolate. Money had become scarce, there hadn't been any silver for a long time because during Gallienus's sole reign, almost the entire stock of silver used to make billon and antoniniani coins, had disappeared so that, since then, only "silver washed" (using tin or little silver) copper coins (Denarii aerei) - purely coins of credit with a fixed exchange rate - had been used to replace their value.

In the same manner, the quinarius had been devalued and reduced to base copper, albeit "silver washed" to give it the appearance of a more valuable metal.

For this exceptional use of copper, which doubtlessly also led to a significant price increase for this metal, the senate, who until now had the right to allow or deny permission to strike base metal coins, either voluntarily renounced this right or had it taken away from them, because the base metal coins of this emperor no longer display the letters SC (Senatus Consulto).

The relatively low number of copper coins struck in the period following the reign of Trajan Decius and up to Gallienus, which have since been discovered in hoards etc.,

leads us to conclude that a partial recall of such coins may have occurred during Claudius' reign, in order to fill the demand for copper to strike what we can call his "white copper coinage". This conclusion gains probability in view of the knowledge that the copper coinage of numerous provinces and of mint cities, extremely active under Gallienus, were henceforth struck only in one province and four mint cities. (Cohen V, 457 lists 17 Provinces minting using Latin legends and 80 Greek mint cities active under Gallienus.)

Copper had become a valuable resource and private speculators knew how to benefit from it. Just as silver had previously been removed from circulation by people burying and hoarding it, copper was now subject to the same fate. There was a profit to be made in collecting copper coins, melting them down and selling the metal to the State at a high price. In order to stretch the quantities as cheaply as possible, copper was mixed with other base metals such as tin, lead etc.

The people who made most use of this financial misery were counterfeiters. The unclear imagery on coins caused by the deterioration of the metal simplified their work of copying them, and the large profits to be gained from placing tin-washed copper coins into circulation as silver, led to fakes being produced in quantities never experienced before, without there seemingly being any effective way of stopping it. Many such forgers were locals, but it is probable that former imperial mint staff carried on their unsavoury trade in hidden corners of the Rhatian mountains, or Gallic forgers who felt utterly safe from the hand of justice. Roman money, a global coinage, guaranteed them a place to spread even the most miserable of their products.

Because not even the base metal coinage issued by Claudius was safe from such speculative misuse and the State could only continue issuing them at great cost to itself, it is understandable that the coinage was limited to as narrow a sphere as necessary. This is the reason why Sestertii and Ases of this emperor are so scarce (described in Cohen as "Petit Medallions" and "Moyen bronze"). The type of coins issued under Claudius comprised of

In circulation within the Empire	1. Imperial coinage
In circulation within the Provinces	2. Provincial coinage
	3. Greek City coinage
	4. Alexandrian Tetradrachms

### **In circulation within the Empire: Imperial coinage**

- a) Gold
  - Aureii with laurel wreath
- b) Silver
  - 1. Antoniniani with radiate crown (devalued)
  - 2. Quinarii with laurel wreath (devalued)
- c) AEs
  - 1. Sestertius with laurel wreath (large bronze, previously described as "small medallion" in error), yellow metal.
  - 2. As with laurel wreath (mid-bronze, red metal)
- d) Medallions (in the sense used today)

Striking of State Coinage took place in six places, which we will call mints, as opposed to Officinae (individual workshops of mints), namely in

- I. Italy: Rome as main mint with 12 officinae
- II. Hispania: Tarraco with 3 officinae

- III. Pannonia: Siscia, first with 2, later with 4 officinae
- IV. Thrace: Serdica with 3 officinae, for a short time only
- V. Asia Minor: Cyzicus with 3 officinae
- VI. Syria: Antioch with 8 officinae

The officina mark, be they letters, figures or dots, is usually on the reverse of coins. The exceptions are dots on the obverse (usually under the bust). Coins marked in this way can easily be attributed to the correct mint and officina. It is a different matter for the large majority of unmarked issues, of which every mint produced one of more.

In order to determine which examples of these coins came from which mint, one must look at the characteristics on the obverse of the coins, points which are typical for each mint. This is absolutely indispensable for unmarked coins whose reverses and legends were used identically by several mints. An example of this is "**AEQVITAS AVG**" because we only have the characteristics of the obverse and the manner of engraving the lettering as a means of differentiating between the mints which struck them. The various characteristics which need to be checked in order to attribute a coin to the correct mint, are noted in the following descriptions of the individual mints

At Rome, Tarraco, Siscia and Cyzicus, special Consecration coins were struck after Claudius's death by his brother Quintillus. These coins also have their own special characteristics and thanks to them, they can usually be correctly attributed. These coins were not struck in Serdica or Antioch because Serdica was no longer in use when Claudius died, and at the time Syria (and thus Antioch) was already fully in the hands of Zenobia, who had occupied Antioch with her own troops and with those of Vaballathus.

Although we do not have any original information about the true numbers of Imperial coins from the above mints, it is possible, thanks to the enthusiastic combinations of my honoured friends Dr. A. Missong, Notary in Vienna and Joseph v. Kolb, k. k. the Conservator in Urfahr, to deduce the numbers from symbols and marks found on coins of the post-Aurelian coin period. Such marks were not found on coins of Claudius, except those struck in Cyzicus, instead marking the coins only with the appropriate officina mark. Because of this the attribution of such coins to their mints is more difficult.

Some help is given on this subject by the coins of Aurelian, especially those which were struck before the coinage reform, which, from the aspects of character and lettering, are comparable with those of Claudius, even though Aurelian's coins are not common enough to be used as an easy source of information.

My attempts then led me to try to reach the same goal using other methods. One principle solution was to compare Claudius' coins with those of Gallienus and Postumus, as well as considering historical events to prove that the above named mints were either already in use when Claudius came to power, or were newly founded. I was supported in my efforts by my two friends named above, to whom I repeat my most heartfelt thanks here for their numerous valuable items of information.

However, collectors and numismatists who may own coins of Claudius with markings not listed below will receive my gratitude if they could inform me of the same.

Note: If one were to use the same system of cataloging as is applied to Greek coins, the first mint described here should be Tarraco (Hispania). However, because this mint did not exist when Claudius came to power, but was founded shortly thereafter and is generally not as interesting overall as that of Rome, which unites the most varied types amongst its coins, it was decided for reasons of practicality to overlook the geographical order of mints and begin with Rome.

## I. The Mint of Rome

Rome, as the principle mint of the entire Roman Empire, minted more coins than any other. More than half of the coins which have been discovered over the past few hundred years, were struck here. The great majority of them is unmarked. Marked coins display the letters A, B, Gamma, Delta, Epsilon, S, Z, H, N, X, XI, XII as marks. These marks appear only on the reverses, to the left or the right of the figure depicted, on coins with the obverse legend **IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG**. However, on coins with the shortened legend **IMP CLAVDIVS AVG**, they can be in the field or in the exergue.

Some of the marks are poorly engraved and appear instead of

instead of	shown as
A	II, H, N or retrograde N
Γ	T
Δ	A or U
ζ	Γ
Z	Ξ, = or retrograde Z
H	M or N
N	III, IV or VI
X	+
XII	IIX

Some also combine two symbols or letters in error, e.g. retrograde epsilon X, XS, etc.

Sometimes, the way that a letter has been engraved can be found on both sides of the coin, especially the A of CLAVDIVS often resembles as N.

**The most characteristic feature of coins minted in Rome is the way that the M of IMP is engraved, namely as IIII.** Even medallions, made with great care, and all of which were struck in Rome, often have IIII for an M. The letter engraved in this way always appears, and only from this mint, as four parallel lines of equal length.

That these coins were really minted in Rome is demonstrated by the coin **ADVENTVS AVG**, struck in Rome - the only city at which Claudius "arrived" in. But also in other ways it is no difficult thing to prove that the coins of this series originated in Rome.

Under Philip I Rome marked some of their silver coins (antoniniani) with

Philip I	with I II	U (V) UI (VI)
Philip II	III	
Otacilla	IIII	

or the same arrangement as appropriate

Philip I	with A B	Epsilon ζ
Philip II	Γ	
Otacilla	Δ	

These marked coins were without doubt struck in Rome and refer, with their reverse legend "**SAEVLARES AVGG**" to the Secular Games in Rome.

This marking of the coins appears to have been introduced in 1001 U.C. (1001 after the founding of Rome = 248 AD) because besides the Philip I coin from officina A with the legend "**P M TR P V COS III P P**" (Cohen 62) noting the fifth year of his reign (248 AD) which uses letters as marks, and as well as those marked with symbols, all refer to the same year in which the Secular Games were held.

Whether the Rome mint already had 12 officinae, of which half marked their work with letters and the other half with symbols, is a moot point. But in any case, that system did not extend beyond Philip.

Coins with letters as marks reappeared under Valerian during his Joint Reign with Gallienus (Cohen 35 etc.). On the other hand, Gallienus' own coins, especially those from his Sole Reign, display entire sets of different marks to denote the individual mints, including those with the markings of Claudius coins - coins with identical markings from A to XII, which, because of their fully corresponding characteristics with the coins of Claudius that we are discussing, so clearly come from one and the same mint, namely from Rome.

But even coins struck during the early period of Aurelian's reign display the same characteristics, and the same reverse legends with officina marks A bis XII also fully correspond with those struck under Claudius II and subsequently under Quintillus. These facts thus lead to the conclusion that as a result of Aurelian's coinage reform, these mints were restricted to 6 officinae which continued to use the marks A to S, and that coins requiring the additional letter R (for Rome) and the value mark XXI were thus given the marks **A XXI R** to **S XXI R**.

Under Claudius this mint made 5 issues (the 6th issue, the Consecration coins were actually made during the reign of Quintillus), and struck Aurei, Sestertii, Ases, Quinarii and devalued Antoniniani.

### I. Issue (with reverses of Gallienus).

This issue was very irregular and comprised of both marked and unmarked reverse dies previously used by Gallienus. Of these coins, the following are known to the author:

<b>IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG</b>	AETERNITAS AVG (Shilling Bath hoard 267)	unmarked
	CONSERVAT PIETAT (RIC 28)	unmarked
	DIANAE CONS AVG (unlisted)	Epsilon in exergue
	DIANAE CONS AVG (RIC 29)	Γ in exergue
	DIANE ( <i>sic</i> ) CONS AVG (unlisted)	unclear in exergue
	DIANAE CONS AVG (unlisted)	XII in exergue
	FECVNDITAS AVG (RIC 30 var)	unmarked
	FID MILITVM (RIC 37)	E in right field
	FORTVNA REDVX (RIC 41 var)	unmarked
	FORTVNA REDVX (RIC 41 var)	ζ in right field
	IOVI FVLGERAT (RIC 51)	unmarked
	IOVI PROPVGNAT (unlisted)	XI in left field
	LAETITIA AVG (RIC 56 var)	unmarked
	MARTI PACIFERO (RIC 71)	unmarked
	ORIENS AVG (Normanby 822)	unmarked
	PAX AVG (RIC 79)	unmarked
	PROVID AVG (RIC 88)	unmarked
	SECVRIT PERPET (Normanby 590 var)	unmarked
	SOLI CONS AVG (unlisted)	A in exergue
	VBERITAS AVG (Normanby hoard 588)	Epsilon in right field
	VICTORIA AET (unlisted)	retrogr. Z in left field
	VICTORIA AVG (RIC 104)	unmarked
	VIRTVS AVGVSTI (RIC 113 var)	X in left field
<b>IMP CLAVDIVS AVG</b>	AEQVITAS AVG (RIC 15 var)	VI in left field
	AETERNITAS AVG (RIC 17 var)	Γ in left field

CONSERVAT PIETAT (RIC 28 var)	unmarked
FECVNDITAS AVG (RIC 30 var)	unmarked
FORTVNA REDVX (RIC 41)	ζ in right field
LIBERO? CONS AVG (RIC 64 var)	B in exergue
ORIENS AVG (RIC 78)	unmarked
PAX AVG (RIC 80 var)	V in left field
PVDICITIA (unlisted)	unmarked
SALVS AVG (RIC 99)	unmarked
SALVS AVGG (RIC 99 var)	unmarked
VIRTVS AVGVSTI (RIC 113 var)	X in left field

The images on these coins are absolutely **identical** to the corresponding reverses of Gallienus.

These coins show that they used reverse dies of various Gallienus issues, because we see not only dies which used marks from the twelve officina period in the reverse fields and exergue, but also those of earlier issues with the fieldmarks P to V. These marks had already been used under Valerian and was retained for the 1st issue of coins struck during the sole reign of Gallienus.

Amongst these coins are those with the obverse legend **IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG** (doubtlessly the first issue), whereby on those with the obverse legend **IMP CLAVDIVS AVG**, it may have been an error on the part of a worker at the mint, who, even during a later issue, accidentally used a Gallienus die, thus producing what we call a hybrid. This is the case on a coin in Banduri:

**IMP CLAVDIVS PF AVG / DIANAE CONS AVG** with **X** in the exergue which is wrongly described under Cohen 106 as having the obv. legend **IMP C CLAVDIVS PF AVG**. (*Note: This sentence of the authors is confusing. Cohen 106 for Claudius has an IVNO REGINA reverse. Cohen 106 for Gallienus is a Dianae Cons Avg but has a Gallienus legend*).

## II. Issue

Only 6 officinae were active for this issue. These used the obverse legend

<b>IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG</b>	ADVENTVS AVG (RIC 13)	unmarked
	CONCOR EXERCI (RIC 26)	unmarked
	IOVI STATORI (RIC 52)	unmarked
	LIBERALITAS AVG (RIC 57)	unmarked
	SALVS AVG (RIC 98)	unmarked
	SPES PVBLICA (RIC 102)	unmarked
<b>IMP C CLAVDIVS PF AVG</b>	SPES PVBLICA (RIC 102 var)	unmarked
<b>IMP CLAVDIVS PF AVG</b>	IOVI STATORI (Normanby 583)	unmarked
	SALVS AVG (RIC 102 var)	unmarked
<b>IMP CLAVDIVS AVG</b>	LIBERALITAS AVG (RIC 58)	unmarked
	SALVS AVG (RIC 99)	unmarked
	SPES PVBLICA (RIC 102 var)	unmarked

Of the above six principle reverse types, the ADVENTVS and CONCOR were struck in low numbers, the last four (Iovi, Liberalitas, Salus, Spes) in very great quantities.

To these we can add

<b>IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG</b>	VICTORIA GM (as GIIII) (RIC 108)	unmarked
---------------------------	----------------------------------	----------

IOVI VICTORI (RIC 54 & Banduri) unmarked  
(Jupiter standing as on the IOVI STATORI coins.)

These two coins were issued for a very short time to celebrate the triumph over the Germans (Aurelius Victor XXXIV), but for which not Claudius himself was responsible, but his general, Aurelianus in 268 AD. The issue was stopped shortly afterwards, because it was considered embarrassing for an emperor to attempt to win acclaim for the success of another person. (See Numismatische Zeitschrift, Wien, 1884, and the article "Ueber die Bedeutung der Siegesmünzen VICTORIA G IIII und VICTOR GERMAN von Claudius II" by the same author).

**III. Issue**

**1. IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG**

	VICTORIA AVG (RIC 104)	unmarked
	FELICITAS AVG (RIC 32)	unmarked
	GENIVS AVG (RIC 45)	unmarked
	ANNONA AVG (RIC 18)	unmarked
	VIRTVS AVG (RIC 109)	unmarked
	AEQVITAS AVG (RIC 14)	unmarked
	GENIVS EXERCI (RIC 48)	unmarked
	MARS VLTOR (IIII for M) (RIC 66)	unmarked
	IOVI VICTORI (RIC 54)	unmarked
	LIBERT AVG (RIC 62)	unmarked
	FIDES EXERCI (RIC 34/36)	unmarked
	PROVIDENT AVG (RIC 91)	unmarked
	VICTORIA AVG (Cunetio 1949)	A in left field
	FELICITAS AVG (RIC 32)	B in right field
	FELICITAS AVG (Cunetio 1953)	B in left field
	GENIVS AVG (RIC 45)	Γ in right field
	ANNONA AVG (RIC 18)	Δ in right field
	VIRTVS AVG (RIC 109)	E in right field
	AEQVITAS AVG (RIC 14)	ζ in right field
	GENIVS EXERCI (RIC 48)	Z in right field
	GENIVS EXERCI (RIC 48)	Z in left field
	MARS VLTOR (IIII for M) (RIC 66)	H in r. field
	MARS VLTOR (IIII for M) (unlisted)	H in l. field
	IOVI VICTORI (unlisted)	N in left field
	IOVI VICTORI (RIC 54)	N in right field
	LIBERT AVG (RIC 62)	X in right field
	FIDES EXERCI (RIC 34/36)	XI in right field
	PROVIDENT AVG (RIC 91)	XII in right field
	PROVIDENT AVG (RIC 91)	XII in left field
additionally	LIBERTAS AVG (Tanini, RIC 60)	unmarked
additionally	PM TRP II COS PP (M as IIII) (RIC 10)	unmarked
additionally	PM TRP II COS PP (M as IIII) (RIC 10)	Δ in left field
additionally	PROVID AVG (RIC 88)	unmarked
additionally	PROVID AVG (RIC 88 var, Banduri)	A in right field
additionally	PROVID EXERCI (unlisted)	unmarked

**ditto, with engravers errors**

	GENIVS AVG (RIC 45)	Z in right field
	ANNONA AVG (RIC 18 var)	A in right field
	ANNONA AVG (Banduri, RIC 18 var)	A in right field
	VIRTVS AVG (Banduri, RIC 109 var)	retr. E right field
	VIRTVS AVG (Banduri, RIC 109 var)	retr. E right/X right
	VIRTVS AVG (Banduri, RIC 109 var)	B in right field
	AEQVITAS AVG (Banduri, RIC-)	S in right field

AEQVITAS AVG (Banduri, RIC-)	S in exergue
GENIVS EXERCI (Banduri, RIC-)	retr. Z right field
GENIVS EXERCI (Banduri, RIC-)	Ξ in right field
MARS VLTOR (IIII for M) (Banduri)	II in right field
MARS VLTOR (IIII for M) (Banduri)	M in right field
IOVI VICTORI (Banduri, RIC-)	III in right field
IOVI VICTORI (Banduri, RIC-)	IV in right field
IOVI VICTORI (Banduri, RIC-)	S-N across fields
IOVI VICTORI (Banduri, RIC-)	S in left field
LIBERT AVG (unlisted)	+ in right field

**2. IMP C CLAUDIVS PF AVG** ANNONA AVG (Venera?, RIC -) unmarked

**3. IMP CLAUDIVS PF AVG** VIRTVS AVG (unlisted) unmarked  
GENIVS EXERCI (Venera hoard p. 35) unmarked  
MARS VLTOR (IIII for M) (Venera 135) unmarked  
FIDES EXERCI (Normanby hoard 0585) unmarked  
PROVIDENT AVG (Vienna 49783) unmarked  
FIDES EXERC (unlisted rev legend) unmarked  
FIDES EXERC (unlisted rev legend) XI in right field  
GENIVS EXERC (unlisted rev legend) unmarked  
GENIVS EXERCITI (unlisted rev legend) unmarked

#### IV Issue

**IMP CLAUDIVS AVG** VICTORIA AVG (IARCW 656/152) unmarked  
FELICITAS AVG (IARCW 1091/67) unmarked  
GENIVS AVG (RIC 46) unmarked  
ANNONA AVG (RIC 19) unmarked  
VIRTVS AVG (Cunetio 2135) unmarked  
AEQVITAS AVG (RIC 15) unmarked  
GENIVS EXERCI (IARCW 318/44) unmarked  
MARS VLTOR (IIII for M) (RIC 67) unmarked  
IOVI VICTORI (RIC 55) unmarked  
LIBERT AVG (RIC 63 var (bust type)) unmarked  
FIDES EXERCI (RIC 35 var) unmarked  
PROVIDENT AVG (RIC 92) unmarked  
VICTORIA AVG (RIC 105) A in left field  
FELICITAS AVG (RIC 33) B in left field  
FELICITAS AVG (RIC 33) B in right field  
GENIVS AVG (RIC 46 var) Γ in left field  
GENIVS AVG (RIC 46) Γ in right field  
ANNONA AVG (RIC 19) Δ in right field  
VIRTVS AVG (RIC 110) E in left field  
VIRTVS AVG (RIC 110) E in right field  
AEQVITAS AVG (RIC 15 var) ζ in right field  
GENIVS EXERCI (RIC 49 var) Z in left field  
GENIVS EXERCI (RIC 49) Z in right field  
MARS VLTOR (IIII for M) (RIC 67) H in right field  
MARS VLTOR (IIII for M) (RIC 67) H in left field  
IOVI VICTORI (RIC 55) N in right field  
IOVI VICTORI (RIC 55 var) N in left field  
LIBERT AVG (RIC 63) X in right field  
FIDES EXERCI (RIC 35) XI in right field  
FIDES EXERCI (RIC 35 var) XI in left field



	PROVIDENT AVG (RIC 92)	XII in right field
	PROVIDENT AVG (RIC 92 var)	XII in left field
	PROVIDENT AVG (RIC 92 var)	XII in exergue
<b>ditto with engravers errors</b>	FELICITAS AVG (RIC 33)	A in left field
	GENIVS AVG (RIC 46 var)	T in right field
	ANNONA AVG (RIC 19)	A in right field
	VIRTVS AVG (IARCW 319/208) retr.	E in right field
	AEQVITAS AVG (RIC 15 var)	Γ in right field
	AEQVITAS AVG (RIC 15 var)	XS in right field
	AEQVITAS AVG (RIC 15 var)	S in right field
	GENIVS EXERCI (RIC 49 var)	retr. Z in left field
	GENIVS EXERCI (RIC 49 var)	Ξ in right field
	GENIVS EXERCI (RIC 49 var)	= in right field
	MARS VLTOR (M as IIII) (RIC 67)	N in right field
	MARS VLTOR (M as IIII) (RIC 67 var)	II in right field
	MARS VLTOR (M as IIII) (RIC 67 var)	M in right field
	MARS VLTOR (M as IIII) (RIC 67)	ret. N in left field
	IOVI VICTORI (RIC 55)	III in right field
	IOVI VICTORI (RIC 55 var)	IV in right field
	IOVI VICTORI (RIC 55 var)	VI in right field
	IOVI VICTORI (RIC 55 var)	III in left field
	LIBERT AVG (RIC 63 var)	+ in right field
	PROVIDENT AVG (RIC 92)	ζ in right field
additionally	FIDES EXERC (RIC 35)	unmarked
additionally	PM TR P II COS PP (M as IIII) (RIC 11)	unmarked
additionally	PM TR P II COS PP (M as IIII) (RIC 11)	Δ in right field
<b>and with engraver's error</b>	PM TR P II COS PP (M as IIII) (RIC 11 var)	XII in exerg.
	PM TR P II COS PP (M as IIII) (RIC 11 var)	IIX in exerg.

## V. Issue

### 1. IMP CLAVDIVS AVG

	AETERNIT AVG (RIC 16 var)	N in right field
	AETERNIT AVG (RIC 16)	N in exergue
	AETERNIT AVG (RIC 16)	N in left field
	AETERNIT AVG (RIC 16)	unmarked
additionally	AETERNITAS AVG (Cohen 35)	IV in right field
additionally	AETERNITAS AVG (RIC 17)	unmarked
	APOLLINI CONS (Cunetio 2239 var)	H in exergue
	APOLLINI CONS (Cunetio 2239)	H in right field
	APOLLINI CONS (IARCW 440/5)	unmarked
additionally	CONCORDIA AVG (RIC 27)	unmarked
additionally	CONCORDIA AVG (RIC 27 var)	Δ in right field
	FIDES MILITVM (M as IIII) (Cunetio 2206 var)	E in ex.
	FIDES MILITVM (M as IIII) (Cunetio 2206)	E in right f.
	FIDES MILITVM (M as IIII) (RIC 38)	unmarked
	FORTVNA REDVX (IARCW 319/161)	Z in left field
	FORTVNA REDVX (RIC 41)	Z in exergue
	FORTVNA REDVX (RIC 41)	Z in right field
	FORTVNA REDVX (RIC 41)	unmarked
additionally	FORTVNAE REDVCI (Coh. 35, doubtful)	unmarked
	LAETITIA AVG (Cunetio 2235 var)	XII in left field
	LAETITIA AVG (Cunetio 2235 var)	X left, II right
	LAETITIA AVG (Cunetio 2236)	unmarked
	LAETITIA AVG (Cunetio hoard 2235)	XII in exergue
	LAETITIA AVG (RIC 56)	XII in right field

	MARTI PACIF(M as IIII) (RIC 68 var)	X in left field
	MARTI PACIF(M as IIII) (RIC 68 var)	X in exergue
	MARTI PACIF(M as IIII) (RIC 68)	X in right field
additionally	MARTI PACIF(M as IIII) (RIC 70)	unmarked
additionally	MARTI PACIF(M as IIII) (RIC 72)	X in right field
	MARTI PACIF(M as IIII) (RIC 72 var)	X in left field
	PAX AVGVSTI (RIC 81 var)	A in left field
	PAX AVGVSTI (RIC 81 var)	unmarked
	PAX AVGVSTI (RIC 81)	A in right field
	PM TR P II COS PP (M as IIII) (RIC 11)	unmarked
	PM TR P II COS PP (M as IIII) (RIC 11)	Δ in exergue
	PM TR P II COS PP (M as IIII) (RIC 11)	Δ in left field
additionally	PM TR P II COS PP (M as IIII) (RIC 11)	Δ in right field
	PROVID AVG (Normanby 950)	unmarked
	PROVIDENT AVG (Cunetio 2212)	ζ in exergue
	PROVIDENT AVG (RIC 92)	ζ in right field
	PROVIDENT AVG (RIC 92)	unmarked
	SECVRIT AVG (Cunetio 2228)	XI in right field
	SECVRIT AVG (Cunetio 2229)	XI in left field
	SECVRIT AVG (Cunetio 2230)	unmarked
	SECVRIT AVG (Cunetio 2231)	XI in exergue
	VICTORIA AVG (IARCW 656/152)	unmarked
	VICTORIA AVG (RIC 107 var)	Γ in left field
	VICTORIA AVG (RIC 107)	Γ in exergue
	VICTORIA AVG (RIC 107)	Γ in right field
	VIRTVS AVG (IARCW 319/211)	unmarked
	VIRTVS AVG (RIC 111)	B in right field
<b>ditto with engraver's errors</b>	AETERNIT AVG (RIC 16 var)	III in exergue
	AETERNIT AVG (RIC 16 var)	III in left field
	AETERNIT AVG (RIC 16 var)	IV in exergue
	AETERNIT AVG (RIC 16 var)	IV in left field
	AETERNIT AVG (RIC 16 var)	IV in right field
	AETERNIT AVG (RIC 16 var)	retr. N in right field
	AETERNIT AVG (RIC 16)	III in right field
	APOLLINI CONS (RIC 22 var)	A in exergue
	APOLLINI CONS (RIC 22 var)	II in exergue
	APOLLINI CONS (RIC 22 var)	II in right field
	APOLLINI CONS (RIC 22 var)	M in exergue
	APOLLINI CONS (RIC 22 var)	N in right field
	APOLLINI CONS (RIC 22)	M in right field
	FIDES MILITVM (M as IIII) (RIC 38 var)	retr. E in l. field
	FORTVNA REDVX (RIC 41 var)	Ξ in right field
	FORTVNA REDVX (RIC 41 var)	= in right field
	FORTVNA REDVX (RIC 41 var)	retr. Z in exergue
	FORTVNA REDVX (RIC 41 var)	retr. Z in right field
	MARTI PACIF(M as IIII) (RIC 70)	+ in left field
	MARTI PACIF(M as IIII) (RIC 72 var)	+ in left field
	PAX AVGVSTI (RIC 81 var)	Δ in left field
	PM TR P II COS PP (M as IIII) (RIC 11 var)	A in l. field
	PM TR P II COS PP (M as IIII) (RIC 11 var)	II in l. field
	PROVIDENT AVG (RIC 94)	Γ in right field
	VICTORIA AVG (RIC 107 var)	ζ in exergue
	VICTORIA AVG (RIC 107 var)	C left, III right, G in ex.
	VICTORIA AVG (RIC 107 var)	S in exergue

	VICTORIA AVG (RIC 107 var)	T in exergue
<b>2. IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG</b>	PAX AVGVSTI (RIC 79 var)	A in left field
	PM TR P II COS PP (M as IIII) (RIC 10)	Δ in left field
	FORTVNA REDVX (RIC 41 var)	Z in right field
	APOLLINI CONS (Normanby 1003)	H in right field
	APOLLINI CONS (Normanby 1003 var)	H in exergue
	SECVRIT AVG (RIC 101 var, Tanini)	XI in right field
additionally	MARTI PACIFERO (M as IIII) (RIC 71 var)	X in left field
additionally	PROVID AVG (RIC 88 var)	unmarked
<b>ditto with engraver's errors</b>	APOLLINI CONS (Normanby 1003)	M in right field
	APOLLINI CONS (Normanby 1003 var)	M in exergue
	AETERNIT AVG (Olivers Orchard 645 var)	III in ex.
<b>3. IMP CLAVDIVS PF AVG</b>	PROVID AVG (RIC 88 var)	XII in exergue

The obverse legends 2 and 3 above may be the result of using the obverse dies from an earlier issue, because the V. issue was only subject to the short version of the legend, IMP CLAVDIVS AVG (M as IIII).

## VI. Issue (Consecration Coinage)

**DIVO CLAVDIO**, exceptionally **IMP CLAVDIVS AVG** (M as IIII) or **IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG** (M as IIII).

These coins have an altar with various decoration on the reverse, or an eagle standing in various positions, and all with the reverse legend **CONSECRATIO**.

The reverses added to the individual issues were soon stopped again, whilst others, such as PM TR P II COS PP (M as IIII) continued to be struck for a long time parallel to the other two main types.

It is notable that during the II. issue, only half of the officinae were striking coins, whereas during the III. issue, all 12 officinae were in use. The reason for this noticeable ruling can be deduced in the following manner from the coins themselves.

We often note that when a new ruler came to power, the last reverse dies in use were used for the first coins of the new emperor. An example of this is Quintillus, whose I. issue from the various mints used the same reverses as the last issue struck by his brother Claudius. Especially the author's own coins from the Tarraco mint:

**DIANA LVCIF**, Markl 949, struck by Claudius

**DIANA LVCIF**, Markl 24, struck by Quintillus

as well as the coins from Cyzicus:

**FORTVNA REDVX**, Markl 1419, struck by Claudius

**FORTVNA REDVX**, Markl 388, struck by Quintillus

whose reverses are die matches having been struck using one and the same die.

The reason for using the predecessor's dies was to speed up the issuing of coins for the new emperor, at a time when all the most important events of the Empire were publicized by the circulation of coins.

It had been different when Claudius came to power, because the last issues of Gallienus, those with animal reverses and prayers to their associated deities for assistance, was apparently not viewed as being suitable for a new issue by Claudius. So he did not only

need to have new obverse dies made, but new reverse dies as well, which took longer. In order to shorten this time the engraving of new obverses took priority, for which all officinae were probably put to work at first, and then, using some Gallienus reverse dies from his earlier issues which were still available, they were able to put Claudius coins into circulation in order to inform the world that a new emperor had come to power.

So whilst six officinae were busy striking coins as well as preparing new obverse dies, the other six officinae were probably working on the new reverse dies, until they had enough to continue work in their usual manner.

Because, as already noted, the I. issue did not use all the marked reverse dies of Gallienus, they changed the direction, so to speak, of the markings used by him and could not use them in the II. issue - which included only six different reverses - either. This was to avoid any public sign that the mint had been reduced to six officinae.

The III. issue also comprises of a majority of unmarked coins and yet sporadically, one comes across coins which have identical legends and depictions, but do have marks from the mints.

The VI. issue which marked the death and deification of Claudius is noted for the same characteristics as we have noted in the I. issue. They didn't wait until enough new obverse and reverse dies were ready before starting the regular striking of the Consecration coins, instead using the new obverse dies which were finished first and using them together with second dies used during Claudius' lifetime, for example: **DIVO CLAVDIO** with the reverse **AEQVITAS AVG** (RIC 269), **IMP CLAVDIVS AVG** with the reverse **CONSECRATIO** (Normanby hoard 1140 and 1145 for eagle types, RIC 259 for altar type) in order to double the productivity in striking these coins.

A note on page 86 of Cohen describes these coins as hybrids, but adds that in view of the large number of these coins, it is possible that their production was deliberate. Based on the information given above, these types must have been deliberate and in view of the thus disturbed workings of the officinae, some of which were striking coins, others busy engraving new dies, it is reasonable that these coin issues were unmarked.

At this point, we would also note that Quintillus struck these coins for his deceased brother before issuing his own coins in any great quantities. Having the support and sympathies of the Romans only in his position as Claudius' brother and being disliked by the army because of his modest, peaceful nature, it was possibly a political act to spread the news about Claudius' death and his elevation to the gods before the publication of his own accession, in order to gain the support of the troops stationed outside Rome, with the support of the Senate.

**The image of Claudius on the early issues has very striking features, a full face, protruding forehead with smoothly parted hair, whilst the IV and V issues show a sterner look, bonier face with marked cheekbones, a more visible Adam's apple and often short, disheveled hair.**

When one makes a close study of this emperor's coins closely, which is practically only possible from a special collection, such as the one on which this article was based, one comes to the overwhelming conclusion that there was a definite system applied to the use of the various dies. In its turn, this would suggest that every single mint in the empire must have been under a common "coinage commission" which told mints which types they should strike and the marks they must use to identify the officina which struck the coin, and which monitored all this with admirable precision.

Even though this suggestion may seem far-fetched, the reason for it is that **not a single coin type of this emperor exists, struck in two different mints, with the same obverse and the same reverse, without having some kind of differentiating characteristic**. The difference between coins using the same legends was either made using a different depiction on the obverse and/or reverse, or used a different legend, or - on coins using identical legends and depictions - the officina was identified by the addition of a mark. To these characteristics we must also count the different engraving styles for the legends themselves.

In order to better demonstrate this systematically operated institution, the table on the next page will show all known die variations of a coins known to have been struck by several mints. But even though some coins use identical reverse legends but with a differently depicted figure, e.g. on the coins with **SALVS AVG, PAX AVG, VICTORIA AVG**, etc. we have, for the following exercise, deliberately selected one coin whose reverse depiction is always the same, namely **AEQVITAS AVG**. Such coins of Claudius with this reverse legend always show the goddess of equality in the same way: scales in her right hand and a cornucopiae in her left. Combinations and differences were therefore very limited and varying characteristics of this type needed to be made on the obverse or through the addition and placement of a mintmark / officina mark.

The list comprises only of official State coins. Ancient counterfeits and barbaric copies are not included. Coins without a given source are in the collection of the author.

Mint	Obv. legend	Head only	Drapery	Cuirass	Head	Note	Right field	Exergue
Taracco	IMP CLAVDIVS PF AVG	1			right	unclear. Heusinger 1790 with globe & sceptre Cabinet de France		S
Taracco	IMP CLAVDIVS PF AVG		rounded		left	unclear. Cohen VII (Supp), 4		S
Taracco	IMP CLAVDIVS PF AVG		angular		right			
Taracco	IMP CLAVDIVS PF AVG		angular		right			S
Rome	IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG	1			right			
Rome	IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG	1			right		ζ	
Rome	IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG		rounded		right		ζ	
Rome	IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG		rounded		right		ζ	
Rome	IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG		rounded		left	with spear & shield		
Rome	IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG		angular		right			
Rome	IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG		angular		right		ζ	
Rome	IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG			cuirass	right			
Rome	IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG			cuirass	right		ζ	
Rome	IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG			scaled mail	right			
Rome	IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG			scaled mail	left			
Rome	IMP CLAVDIVS AVG	1			right			
Rome	IMP CLAVDIVS AVG	1			right		ζ	
Rome	IMP CLAVDIVS AVG		rounded		right		ζ	
Rome	IMP CLAVDIVS AVG		angular		right		ζ	
Rome	IMP CLAVDIVS AVG			cuirass	right			
Rome	IMP CLAVDIVS AVG			cuirass	right		ζ	

Rome	IMP CLAUDIVS AVG			scaled mail	right		ζ	
Rome	DIVO CLAUDIO	1			right			
Siscia	IMP CLAUDIVS CAES AVG		angular		right			
Siscia	IMP CLAUDIVS PF AVG		angular		right			
Siscia	IMP CLAUDIVS PF AVG		angular		right		P	
Siscia	IMP CLAUDIVS AVG	1			right	Cohen 31	P	
Siscia	IMP CLAUDIVS AVG		rounded		right			
Siscia	IMP CLAUDIVS AVG		rounded		left			
Siscia	IMP CLAUDIVS AVG		angular		right			
Siscia	IMP CLAUDIVS AVG		angular		right		I	
Siscia	IMP CLAUDIVS AVG			cuirass	right	obv. M different to Rome's IIII M		
Siscia	IMP CLAUDIVS AVG		rounded		right		II	
Siscia	IMP CLAUDIVS AVG			cuirass	right		II	
Serdica	CLAUDIVS AVG		angular		right			SPQR
Serdica	IMP CM AVR CLAUDIVS AVG		angular		right	dot below bust Roumeguere 378-384, very doubtful		SPQR
Serdica	IMP CM AVR CLAUDIVS AVG	1			right			
Antioch	IMP C CLAUDIVS AVG	1			left			
Antioch	IMP C CLAUDIVS AVG		angular		right	obv. M different to Rome's IIII M		
Antioch	IMP C CLAUDIVS AVG		angular		right	dot in ex.		
Antioch	IMP C CLAUDIVS AVG		angular		right			H

Looking closely at this list, you can see that every single one of the coins listed is different to all the others in a significant way. This is by no means a coincidence. Similar characteristics are seen on other coins having similar obverse / reverse combinations. So it **must** have been that every officina was told which of the various obverse types they should use for which reverse die, in order to enable similar reverse dies to be used in other mints. Special directives to be adhered to were probably issued in relation to the obverse designs. So there is no doubt whatsoever that this system must have been based on a thoroughly well planned organisation, in order to avoid absolutely identical coins being produced in two different mints which would - amongst other things - have impaired a coinage control which was poor and badly wanting at the very best.

This seems to have been less the fault of the moneyers who had actually been responsible for the mismanagement under the auspices of Felicissimus (who had been in charge of coinage under Valerian and Gallienus, according to p. 67 of Bernhardt's history and based on the common character of their coinage, and later under Claudius), but more that of the mint workers, if a scapegoat needs be found.

This is demonstrated by the coins themselves. Whereas the silver had previously been stolen, the same fate now awaited copper, as is proved by the deficient and arbitrarily varying weight of the coins. In addition there is poorly executed and shoddy striking, engraving and die errors, variations of all kinds caused by poor workmanship of mint staff who appear to have been neither criticised nor punished. This terrible situation could only be solved by the use of comprehensive controls, which had to be established in such a way that every coin could be positively traced to its originating mint and officina, in order - where necessary - to discover the guilty party.

The most effective method for this was to use mint marks. Because this did not begin until the beginning of the III issue, one could suppose that, up to this time, the officinae were not working at full strength.

Shortly after reinstating the marking system, the IV. issue appeared. The coins of both this and the following V. issue are - with very few exceptions which may have been simply an oversight on the part of the engraver - all marked.

That the V. issue was the last one, ending with Claudius' death in 270 AD, is proved by the coins issued from the same mint by Quintillus. Every reverse of this issue, including the marks, were also used for Quintillus' I. issue, with the exception of one type from the 4th officina: PM TR P II COS P P (with M written as IIII), which is incorrect for the year 270 AD, and the reverse of which Claudius changed to CONCORDIA AVG and which was also used by Quintillus.

On the reverses of some coins, one can see weakly struck negative images of the obverse image, without the reverse image being greatly impaired. This is an important sign of the coin being genuine, and was possibly caused by the die, which had become hot from constant use on a long working day, accidentally being struck onto the opposite die, without a blank in place. The surface would have thus taken on light contours of its opposite die which would have then been transferred to future coins struck with the now damaged die.

Some other coins have the same image on both sides but not just lightly, as above, but fully visible, one side showing the original positive image, the other side the negative image. Such incuse coins can only have occurred when a struck coin accidentally stuck to the upper die and the striking had been continued without noticing the problem. So of course the underside of such a stuck coin would act as a die itself and its image would be struck in negative form onto the next blank which would then have an original underside and a negative image of the underside on the upper side.

This probably usually happened with new dies and the ones which were not cleanly engraved. It is usually the obverse which is on both sides of the coin. Coins with two reverses are very scarce.

Other error coins occurred by slipping dies, or double strikes, which can have very amusing effects on legends and the obverse and reverse depictions. The conclusion to be made from this is that the lower (fixed) die held the obverse image and the upper (mobile) die held the reverse image, for it is more likely to overlook a coin stuck in the upper die, than one which was stuck in a die before the very eyes of the mint worker when he placed the next blank onto it.

Although these error coins occurred mainly in Rome, they were also made by other mints, although in lesser quantities.

## II. The Mint of Tarraco

The coins of this mint (*described in RIC as "Gaul mint"*) usually have the officina letters P, S or T in the exergue. Coins without a mark were probably the result of an oversight on the part of the engraver.

There is a noticeable sequence in the striking of these coins, which display not only the stereotype obverse legend **IMP CLAVDIVS P F AVG** which is often interspersed with dots: **IMP•CLAVDIVS•P•F•AVG** but also for the beautiful, regular lettering.

**The emperor's expression is serious with a small, sometimes overly hooked "Roman" nose and usually a pointed chin.**  
**The coins of this series are usually smaller in diameter but thicker than those struck in Rome.**  
**The legend's letter P sometimes looks like a D, the E often appears as a rounded epsilon and sometimes the S is retrograde.**

In order to pinpoint the source of these coins, we must look closer at the coins of Gallienus and Postumus.

If one compares the coins of Gallienus which have the mintmarks MP, MS or MT in the exergue, i.e.

**FIDES MILIT** with MP in the ex. (Cohen 151, attributed as RIC Milan 481, sole reign)

**PROVID AVG** with MP in the ex. (Cohen 464, attributed as RIC 508, sole reign)

**PROVID AVG** with MT in the ex. (Cohen supp. 49, attributed as RIC 509, sole reign)

**SALVS AVG** with MP in the ex. (Cohen 500, attributed as RIC 511, sole reign, *plus several variations since found in hoards*)

with the appropriate versions struck by Claudius, i.e.

**FIDES MILIT** with S in the ex. (Cohen 75, attributed as RIC Milan 149)

**PROVID AVG** with P in the ex. (Cohen 158, attributed as RIC 162)

**PROVID AVG** with T in the ex. (Cohen 162, attributed as RIC 162)

**SALVS AVG** with P in the ex. (Cohen 183, attributed as RIC 165)

one notes a remarkable similarity not only in the engraving of the lettering but also, with the exception of the **FIDES MILIT**, that other coins with identical reverse legends appear to have been produced in the same officinae.

An even more compelling argument for it being the same mint is given by the coins:

**SECVR TENPO** (sic) of Gallienus (with MS in ex.) (Coh. 519, not in RIC, RIC 513 var, but in Cunetio hoard 1777) and Cohen 520 (with MC in ex., not in RIC, different reverse than 513)

and

**FELIC TENPO** (sic) of Claudius, (Coh. 8 Suppl., RIC 145 Milan var. (Felicitas standing), resp. Morgat-en-Crozon hoard 759 (Felicitas walking)

whose unusual spelling is unlikely to have happened at two entirely different mints.

These types, from both Gallienus and Claudius are by no means rare, in fact they even used the spelling on new dies, which for me is the proof that this spelling was deliberate.

We can also attribute to this mint Gallienus' **GALLIENVS AVG / PM TR P VII COS** with MP in the exergue, (259 AD) (Cohen 437, RIC 309 attributed in RIC to Milan).

No other coins of Gallienus with earlier tribunal dates are known from this mint. So it seems that Gallienus first began to strike coins after his father set off for the East and left Gallienus to protect the European provinces. This presumption is strengthened by the fact that all Gallienus coins of this series have the short obverse legend GALLIENVS AVG, and, on the reverse, display only ...**AVG**, instead of the **AVGG** which denoted the joint reign with his father, Valerian.

In the same manner, we know of no coins from this mint with tribunal dates for the years 260 AD or later, despite the fact that these were struck in other provinces, such as Italy and Syria.

It is exactly these notable points which point us to a Spanish mint and thus explain why this mint could not have issued any coins dated 260 AD, because it was in that year that



Postumus siezed Gaul and Spain. According to ancient sources, the Germans overran Gaul in 255/256, continued on to the Pyrenees and invaded Spain in a most devastating manner, during which Tarraco and its mint suffered great damage. There is no doubt that this mint was founded by Gallienus to strike his imperial coinage, also suggested by the T used as a mintmark by Aurelian.

If one can therefore accept so far, that these coins of Gallienus and then also those of Claudius came from the same mint, then the presumption is even more credible when we look closer at coins of Postumus.

The number of coins of Postumus marked with the letters P, S, T in the exergue is very low compared to the number of his unmarked coins. According to De Witte's "*Recherches sur les empereurs qui ont régné dans les Gaules etc.*" the following coins are known:

**CONCORD EQVIT** oder **CONCORD EQVITVM** (S in ex.) (RIC 370-374, attributed to Milan)

**FIDES EQVIT** (P or T in ex.) (RIC 376 and 377, attributed to Milan)

**PAX EQVITVM** (T in ex.) (RIC 381, attributed to Milan)

**SALVS AVG** (P in ex.) (RIC 382, attributed to Milan)

**SPES PVBLICA** (P in ex.) (RIC 384, attributed to Milan)

**VIRTVS EQVIT** (T in ex.) (RIC 385, attributed to Milan)

**VIRTVS EQVITVM** (S in ex.) (RIC 389, attributed to Milan)

Apart from the mintmark, these coins differ greatly in style as well as in the smaller, neater inscriptions from the unmarked coinage of Postumus.

Because the great majority of Postumus' coins are unmarked and are in the majority and were incontestably struck in Gaul, we must presume that the striking of coins with a mark in exergue and whose appearance so obviously denote another mint, must have been done in Spain. This claim is also supported by a comparison of the coins of Claudius discussed here, for both series show exactly the same characteristics in style and lettering.

Even more convincing proof that these coins came from one and the same mint is demonstrated when you compare the Postumus coins

**PAX EQVITVM** (T in ex.) RIC V-II 381 attributed to Milan, De Witte 193

**SALVS AVG** (P in ex.) RIC V-II 382 attributed to Milan, De Witte 279

**SPES PVBLICA** (P in ex.) RIC V-II 384 attributed to Milan, De Witte 299

**VIRTVS EQVIT** (T in ex.) RIC V-II 387 attributed to Milan, de Witte 363

with the Claudius equivalents

**PAX EXERC** (T in ex.) Cohen 150 in error as ..**EXERCI** (not in RIC but Cardiff IARCW 319/221 and Normanby hoard)

**SALVS AVG** (P in ex.) Cohen 183, RIC V-1, 166 attributed to Milan

**SPES PVBLICA** (P in ex.) Cohen 203 (P overlooked), RIC V-1, 169 attributed to Milan

**VIRTVS AVG** (P in ex.) Cohen 224, RIC V-1, 172 attributed to Milan

On these the depictions of the reverses of the PAX and SALVS types are absolutely identical, whilst those with SPES and VIRTVS show only insignificant differences, and the coins with PAX, SALVS and SPES even have the same officina letters.

Because Claudius could not have struck coins in Gaul during his reign, (as he had lost it to Tetricus, who ruled over Gaul until after Claudius' death), then the obvious conclusion to be made is that - in view of the similarities and indeed of the identical characteristics

of these issues of Claudius' coins with those of the above examples of Gallienus and Postumus - these could only have been minted in Spain.

This is also confirmed by those coins of Aurelian of the same character of this mint and which are marked in the exergue with P, S or T, for, following the coinage reform, these were given the updated markings of a star in the centre and PXXT to QXXT in the exergue, with the first letter denoting the officina and the last letter, T, denoting Tarraco. This information is given to us by Rohde, a specialist of the coinage of Aurelian and Severina.

Even coins of Probus offer criteria which attest to the correct identification of this mint. How long the characteristics of the various mints continued for can be seen from the Probus coins of this mint, a fact which also leads back to Postumus. Under Postumus there are coins with absolutely identical depictions and legends, but with different forms of spelling, for example

**CONCORD AEQVIT**, de Witte 19 (RIC 370/371, attributed to Milan)

and

**CONCORD EQVIT**, de Witte 20 (RIC 372/373, attributed to Milan)

or

**FIDES AEQVIT**, de Witte 49 (RIC 376, attributed to Milan)

**FIDES EQVIT**, de Witte 50 (RIC 377, attributed to Milan, vars in diverse hoards)

or

**VIRTVS AEQVIT**, de Witte 362 (RIC 385/386, attributed to Milan)

**VIRTVS EQVIT**, de Witte 363 (RIC 387, attributed to Milan)

etc.

The same kind of liberal spelling of these similarly sounding words, whether they be the result of lack of knowledge or simply a mix-up relating to their derivation from the words AEQVITAS and EQVES, can also be found on coins of Probus, although the latter appear to be deliberate.

So, if the above information demonstrates that, during the reign of Claudius, Spain had fallen to Tetricus and had then rejoined the Roman Empire, the obvious deduction from a large number of Claudius coins from this mint is that Tetricus must have himself fallen in 268 AD and the activities of this mint must have begun shortly afterwards, because here too, as we shall see, we meet up with a coin from the I. issue, namely, the extremely rare reverse type with **VICTORIA AVG**, (Cohen 211, *not in RIC with the reference Cohen 211, but under RIC 170 attributed to Milan with the reference Cohen 298.*) which definitely refers to the victory over the Germans. This coin was struck for a very short time before being stopped.

Tarraco struck Aurei, Ases, Quinari and devalued Antoniniani, the latter of which, including the Consecration coins, appeared in four issues.

As Dr. Missonig notes in an interesting article in the Num. Zeitschrift, Vienna, 1873, page 102, Claudius' coins of the six officinae of the Spanish mint of Tarraco were given the following marks for the IV. issue (*called the Aequiti Series*):

A in centre, PXXI in exergue

E in centre, SXXI in exergue

Q in centre, TXXI in exergue

V in centre, QXXI in exergue

I in centre, VXXI in exergue

T in centre, VIXXI in exergue

and, for the V. issue, in similar fashion

E in centre, PXXI in exergue  
 Q in centre, SXXI in exergue  
 V in centre, TXXI in exergue  
 I in centre, QXXI in exergue  
 T in centre, VXXI in exergue  
 I in centre, VIXXI in exergue.

As we can see the field marks form the word AEQVIT for the IV. issue and EQVITI for the V. issue - the same dual spelling of similarly sounding words that was used under Postumus, and used in both forms, specifically only by this mint.

### I. Issue

(Note: all RIC references are attributed to Milan)

#### IMP CLAVDIVS PF AVG (sometimes IMP•CLAVDIVS•P•F•AVG)

	SPES PVBLICA (Cohen 203v, RIC -)	unmarked
	SPES PVBLICA (Cohen 203, RIC 218)	P in exergue
	(note: RIC also lists officina S)	
	SALVS AVG (Cohen 183v)	unmarked
	SALVS AVG (Cohen 183, RIC 166)	P in exergue
	FIDES MILIT (Cohen 75, RIC 149)	unmarked
	FIDES MILIT (Cohen 75, RIC 149)	S in exergue
	AEQVITAS AVG (Cohen -, RIC -)	unmarked
	AEQVITAS AVG (Cohen -, RIC 137)	S in exergue
	FELIC TEMPO (Cohen 71, RIC 415)	T in exergue
	PAX EXERC (Cohen 150, IARCW 319/221)	T in exergue
	FELIC TENPO (Cohen supp., RIC 145v, Morgat-en-Crozon hoard 759)	T in exergue
Engravers error (P for T) additionally additionally	FELIC TENPO (Cohen supp., RIC -)	P in exergue
	VICTORIA AVG (Cohen 211, RIC 170?)	unmarked
	PROVID AVG (Cohen 158, RIC 162)	P in exergue

### II. Issue

(Note: all RIC references are attributed to Milan)

#### IMP CLAVDIVS PF AVG (sometimes IMP•CLAVDIVS•P•F•AVG)

	VIRTVS AVG (Banduri, RIC 172)	unmarked
	VIRTVS AVG (Cohen 224, RIC 172)	P in exergue
	ORIENS AVG (Tanini, RIC 153v)	unmarked
	ORIENS AVG (Cohen 138, RIC 153v)	P in exergue
	VICTORIA AVG (Cohen 213, RIC 171v)	unmarked
	VICTORIA AVG (Cohen 213, RIC 171)	S in exergue
	(Cardiff, IARCW 319/227 also lists officina P, and RIC 171 also lists officina T)	
	VICTORIA AVG (Cohen -, Cunetio 2246)	S in exergue
	(Victory walking left)	
	PAX AVG (Cohen 146, RIC 157v)	unmarked
	PAX AVG (Cohen 146, RIC 157)	T in exergue
	PAX AVGVSTI (Cohen 149, RIC 158v)	unmarked
	PAX AVGVSTI (Cohen 149, RIC 158)	T in exergue
<b>Engravers errors</b>	VIRTVS AVG	D in exergue
	VIRTVS AVG	S in exergue
	VICTORIA AVG (second type) retrogr.	S in exergue
	PAX AVG (RIC 157)	P in exergue

PAX AVG

Γ in exergue

### III. Issue

#### IMP CLAVDIVS PF AVG

	DIANA LVCIF (Banduri coll)	unmarked
	DIANA LVCIF (Cohen 65, RIC 144)	P in exergue
	PAX AVG (Pax standing, RIC 156)	P in exergue
	FORTVNA RED (Cohen-, RIC 150)	S in exergue
(pictured)	PROVID AVG (Cohen 162, RIC 163)	T in exergue
	CONCOR EXER (Cohen-, RIC 140)	T in exergue
additionally	MARTI PAC (Cohen-, RIC -)	P in exergue
additionally	MARTI PACI (Cohen-, RIC -)	P in exergue
<b>ditto with engraver's errors</b>	DIANA LVCIF	D in exergue
	PAX AVG (Pax standing, RIC 156)	D in exergue
	CONCOR EXER (Cohen-, RIC 140)	Γ in exergue

It is not unlikely that the reverse **FIDES MILIT**, which we see under Quintillus, was also struck as part of the III. issue. In addition, Banduri gives the obverse legend of the **ORIENS AVG** (officina P), **PROVID AVG** (officina T) and **SALVS AVG** (officina P) in the three above issues erroneously as **IMP C CLAVDIVS PF AVG**.

The similarity of the depictions and legends of individual coins of the I. and II. issues to those of Postumus (as noted earlier: PAX EXERC, SALVS AVG, SPES PVBLICA which must belong to the I. issue because these reverses do not appear on coins of Quintillus, but those of the III. issue do) seems to indicate that depicting the same deities as those which Postumus had used, and whom the Spanish population still held in faithful memory, was aimed at flattering the national pride of the regained province.

The coins with larger lettering on the reverses appear to have been struck with great regularity.

### IV Issue (Consecration Coins)

Obverse: **DIVO CLAVDIO GOTHICO**, exceptionally **DIVO CLAVDIO**

(The author knows of only two coins with the short legend from Tarraco, one with T in the exergue, the other unmarked. They are both in his and must be seen as error coins because in Siscia, the Consecration coins with the altar reverse have the same marks and obverse legend. Even though the depiction of the altars of Siscia and these of Tarraco are different, they selected a special obverse legend for Tarraco in order to avoid any confusion between the mints.

The Consecration coins were struck only in the third officina and were marked with a T in the exergue. It is likely that this officina made the dies for the other two officinae. They are the only coins on which the emperor's name Gothicus is glorified. **Their reverses always show the legend CONSECRATIO around the same altar with high flames, on the front of which are four sections with a large dot in each section.** The author has a very scarce variation, namely a coin with an eagle instead of an altar. The coin does not have any mintmark or fieldmarks.

### III. The Mint of Siscia

This mint used the letters I and II but also the letters P, S, T, Q as mint and field marks. As a rule these letters only appear in the fields, whilst the II sometimes appears with a star. This star only occurs on a single coin, VIRTVS AVG and must have a special, separate meaning, because it also appears on this coin without the II.

Mintmarks in the exergue are very scarce on Claudius coins of Siscia - the Consecration coins are an exception - these always have mintmarks in the exergue. The different markings, some with Roman numerals, some with letters may suggest that these coins were made by two different mints. However, this contradicts their utterly identical character. But it is strange that two different kinds of markings were used by one and the same mint even though this could be explained.

If you make a comparison with the coins of Quintillus struck in Siscia, you will not see any Roman numerals at all on his coins, only letters and these on the same reverses which were marked with letters on Claudius' issues. So the conclusion would be that the Claudius coins marked with a letter belonged to a later issue als those which used Roman numerals.

In the war against the Goths, when unusually large demands were made on the Siscia mint because of the huge numbers of troops stationed in Pannonia and Moesia, it is highly probably that their two officinae simply could not cope with the extra work and the mint had two more officina added to it, to make four in all.

At the end of the chapter about the Rome mint, above, we saw how careful the coinage commission (*to use a modern term*) was to ensure that each mint had its own differentiating characteristics in order to enable that the production source of every coin could be identified as a means of supporting the control system.

If one had wanted these two additional Siscia officinae to use Roman numerals in the correct order, they would have been issued the numerals III and IV. However, these would have caused confusion with the marks of the ninth officina of Rome, who often wrote the letter N as III or IV and thus led to misunderstandings.

So they seem to have found it more sensible to introduce letters for the new officinae. We know that the two new officinae were not closed down again after the end of the war against the Goths, but remained open because not only coins of Quintillus but also coins from Aurelian's early reign show the same markings - only letters and no Roman numerals.

**The characteristic points of recognition for the unmarked coins from this mint are:**

- 1. The V in the otherwise regular lettering does not end below in a point but has a short flat base between the two sides: \\_/\_**
- 2. The ties of the radiate crown fall down towards the rear and are much wider than from other mints. In addition, on the right-facing bust types, the ties take on the form and width of points on the radiate crown:**



- 3. The head of the emperor generally shows a somewhat stupid or foolish face and a thin, pointed nose.**

This mint had already struck coins in two officinae under Gallienus, whose coins show the marks **SI** and **II** (some coins were marked with a II alone, others with the II and a star). It is clear that **I** and **II** refer to the order of the officinae whilst the S, which was not only used as **SI** but sometimes also as **S-I** spread across both left and right fields apparently had a special significance. The same letter appears for Aurelian in quite a remarkable manner. Whilst he used the markings of Quintillus, **P**, **S**, **T**, **Q** as fieldmarks for the early part of his reign, after the coinage reform Aurelius' coins were then marked with **S** in right field, **XXIP** in exergue, **S** in right field, **XXIS** in exergue.... to **S** in right field, **XXIVI** in exergue, where **XXI** is the value and **P** to **VI** the officinae identification.

So the S in the field had a special significance here, too.

In similar fashion, on coins struck by this emperor after the coinage reform we see certain letters which are constantly being repeated, with or without the value mark, and which are found together with the minting officina's mark, for example  
a **T** on marks such as **PXXT** to **QXXT**  
an **R** on marks such as **AXXIR** to **SXXIR**  
an **L** on marks such as **AL** to **DL**  
a **C** on marks such as **C\*P** to **C\*T** etc

The only thing that can be read into these letters which are repeated in entire series of types is that they are the initial letters of the mints which struck the coins.

One could then conclude that the **S** in the Gallienus mark **SI** and the **S** in the central mark of Aurelian's coins must have been a mark of the "matching" mint. There is no doubt at all that different marks - more in the form of names - was planned for mints during the coinage reform, as demonstrated by the **SERD** used by Aurelian to denote Serdica. But it is remarkable that this is the only mint which used this relatively descriptive mintmark, however, in view of the fact that one mint, as described above, used the letter S, then it is reasonable that, in order to avoid misunderstandings and confusion, which would have made controls more difficult, Serdica would have required a mintmark having a different configuration than usual.

We already mentioned that a lot of coins had to be minted for the troops amassed in Pannonia. Under these circumstances it would have been unpractical to have to rely on distant mints, providing instead a secure source of coinage from the near vicinity. So we would be looking for a city in Pannonia itself whose name began with S. In this context the Gallienus reverse with **SISCIA AVG** (Coh. IV, 521, RIC 582) and Probus coin **SISCIA PROBI AVG** (Coh. V, 497, RIC 764 & 765) which glorify the town of Siscia would appear to be pointing the finger in the right direction.

However, it is not only the legends of these coins which are clues to their source, but the communal character of the way they are struck, as this is the only way of avoiding errors based on legends or markings alone.

Examples of these are :

Gallienus with **SISCIA AVG**

Quintillus with **PANNONIAE**

Aurelianus with **PANNONIAE** and **DACIA FELIX** (see note)

The name of Dacia used in this way was to gain friendship and support. Siscia can be seen as a town with particular preferential status.

(An exception to the "look for the characteristics" rule is the Probus coin "SISCIA PROBI AVG", which has SIS in the exergue, clearly identifying it as a coin from Siscia).

Despite the legends, the characteristics of these coins absolutely and without any doubt are those of Tarraco. And they serve to prove that the central management who were responsible for striking coins for Pannonia saw Siscia, which lay on the main Roman transit route through Pannonia, had a protected position beyond the Savus River, as having obvious advantages for hosting a mint.

Another point is that, counting Siscia as a mint town, the mint towns under Claudius were all about the same distance from each other. (This statement disregards the Serdica mint, which had been transferred to Cyzicus as a result of the war against the Goths). This distancing reflects the regulated situation of the time, so that one can say with fair certainty that the Claudius coins mentioned here, whose source was one and

the same with the mentioned coins of Gallienus and Aurelianus, must have come from the Siscia mint, with their own characteristics just as unique as the mintmark SIS.

The coins struck here were Aurei and devalued Antoniniani. The latter, including the Consecration coins, were struck in five issues.

### I. Issue

<b>IMP CLAVDIVS CAES AVG</b>	AEQVITAS AVG (Cohen -. Cunetio 2270)	unmarked
	FELICITAS SAECVLI (Cohen -. Normanby 1048)	unmarked
	FORTVNA RED (Cohen 168*)	unmarked
	RESTITVTOR ORBIS (Cohen -, RIC 189 var)	unmarked
	SALVS AVG (Cohen 504*, Normanby 1050)	unmarked
	VICTORIA AVG (Cohen 587*, Normanby 1051)	unmarked
	SALVS AVG (Cohen 504, Normanby 1050)	I in left field
<b>IMP CLAVDIVS PF AVG</b>	FORTVNA RED (Cohen 168*, RIC 150 <u>Milan</u> var)	unmarked
<b>IMP CLAVDIVS AVG</b>	AETERNITAS AVG (Saturn) (Cohen 37, RIC 199 <u>Antioch</u> )	dto
	ANNONA AVG (Cohen 16, Normanby 1055)	unmarked
	FIDES MILITVM (Cohen 156*, RIC -)	unmarked
	FORTVNA RED (Cohen 168*, RIC 150 <u>Milan</u> var)	unmarked
	MARS VLTOR (Cohen 349*, Morgat-en-Crozon714)	unmarked
	ORIENS AVG (Cohen 373*, RIC 77/78 <u>Rome</u> )	unmarked
	TEMPORVM FELICITAS (Cohen 135*, Cunetio 2307)	unmarked
	ROMAE AETERNAE (Cohen 491*; RIC 241 Cyzicus var)	ditto
	ANNONA AVG (Cohen 16, Cunetio 2282)	I in right field

\* The Cohen reference numbers given in the last section are partially those of Valerian, partially those of Gallienus, as the dies used were originally used by those emperors and used for Claudius in order to accelerate the issue of the new coins. Coins with "Cohen -" are partially unlisted types made specially for Claudius, or are wrongly described in Cohen.

No marked coins are known from the second officina in this issue.

### II. Issue (very short period)

<b>IMP CLAVDIVS AVG</b>	FIDES MILITVM (Cohen-, Normanby 1072 & 1073)	II in r. field
	LAETITIA AVG (Cohen -, RIC 182)	I in right field
	LIBERALITAS AVG (Cohen -, RIC 184 var)	I in right field
	MARS VLTOR (Cohen -, RIC -)	I in right field
	VIRTVS AVG (Cohen -, RIC -)	II in exergue
	VOTA ORBIS (Cohen 233, RIC 196 Siscia var)	II in exergue
additionally	VICTORIA AVG (runn. left) (Cohen -, RIC 194)	I in left field
	PAX AVG (runn. left) (Cohen -, RIC 186 var)	I in right field

### III. Issue

<b>IMP CLAVDIVS AVG</b>	AEQVITAS AVG (Cohen 31?v, RIC-)	unmarked
	AEQVITAS AVG (Cohen 31?, , Cunetio 2281)	I in right field
	AEQVITAS AVG (Cohen 31?, , Cunetio 2301)	II in right field
	LAETITIA AVG (Cohen 109, RIC 181)	unmarked
	LAETITIA AVG (Cohen 109, RIC 181)	I in right field
	PAX AVG (Cohen 144, RIC 186)	unmarked
	PAX AVG (Cohen 144, RIC 181)	II in right field
	PAX AVG (Cohen 144, Cunetio 2300)	II in left field
	PROVIDEN AVG (Cohen 165, RIC 187)	unmarked

PROVIDEN AVG (Cohen 165, RIC 187)	II in right field
SPES AVG (Cohen 199, RIC 191)	I in left field
SPES AVG (Cohen 199v, RIC 191)	II in left field
SPES AVG (Cohen 199v, RIC 191)	II in right field
SPES AVG (Cohen 199v, RIC-)	I in right field
VIRTVS AVG (Cohen 227, Alföldi I V.5)	unmarked
VIRTVS AVG (Cohen 227, RIC 195)	* left II right
VIRTVS AVG (Cohen 227v, RIC -)	* in left field
VIRTVS AVG (Cohen 227v, RIC -)	II in right field

#### IV. Issue

IMP CLAVDIVS AVG	AEQVITAS AVG (Cohen 31?, RIC-)	P in right field
	LAETITIA AVG (Cohen 109v, RIC 181)	P in right field
	LAETITIA AVG (Cohen 109, RIC 181)	S in right field
	LIBERITAS AVG (Cohen 115v, RIC 184v)	unmarked
	LIBERITAS AVG (Cohen 115v, RIC 184v)	S in right field
	PAX AVG (Cohen 144v, RIC -)	P in right field
	PAX AVG (Cohen 144v, RIC 186)	S in right field
	PROVIDEN AVG (Cohen 165, RIC 187)	S in right field
	PROVIDEN AVG (Cohen 165, RIC 187)	T in right field
	TEMPORVM FELI (Cohen 204, Minster 272)	P in right field
	VBERITAS AVG (Cohen 205, RIC 193)	T in right field
	VBERITAS AVG (Cohen 205, RIC 193)	Q in right field
	PM TRP COS PP (emp seated left, unlisted)	P in exergue
	PAX AET (Cohen -, RIC 185)	Q in exergue
	MARS VLTOR (Tanini)	unmarked
TEMPORVM FELIC (Cohen 204, RIC 192)	P in right field	
IMP CLAVDIVS PF AVG	AEQVITAS AVG (Cohen 31?, RIC-)	P in right field

#### IV. Issue (Consecration coins with Altar reverses)

DIVO CLAVDIO	CONSACRATIO (Cohen -, Normanby 1142)	P in exergue
	CONSACRATIO (Cohen -, Normanby 1142v)	S in exergue
	CONSACRATIO (Cohen -, Normanby 1143)	T in exergue
	CONSACRATIO (Cohen -, Normanby 1142v)	Q in exergue
	CONSAECRATIO (C. Supp,5, RIC 257 as <b>Milan</b> )	P in exergue
	CONSAECRATIO (Cohen -, Normanby 1143)	T in exergue
	CONSAECRATIO (Cohen -, Normanby 1142v)	Q in exergue
	CONSECRATIO (Cohen 51, RIC 261 as <b>Milan</b> )	P in exergue
	CONSECRATIO (Cohen 51, RIC 261 as <b>Milan</b> )	S in exergue
	CONSECRATIO (Cohen 51, RIC 261 as <b>Milan</b> )	T in exergue
Engravers's error	CONSECRATIO (Cohen 51, RIC 261 as <b>Milan</b> )	Q in exergue
	CONSAECRATIO (Cohen -, ) sideways	S in exergue

These coins always have an altar on the reverse from whose flames a pair of serpents arise. The different spelling of the word CONSECRATIO is not an engraver's error but is deliberate, as it appears in all four officinae.

#### IV. The Mint of Serdica

*Note: RIC attributes all the SPQR coins to Cyzicus*

There are coins of Claudius which have the letters **S P Q R** in the exergue. Their mint marks are one to three dots, but - in contrast to the marks of other mints - are not on



the coins' reverses, but **beneath the bust on the obverse**. Although these coins, from the character of their style and lettering, appear to be the work of one single engraver, they were struck in two different mints.

A part of these coins can definitely and with absolute certainty be attributed to Cyzicus, but the others - admittedly a very small number, whose legends were found in an identical manner as well as having the SPQR in the exergue, can also be seen on coins of Gallienus and so this makes it highly probable that these could also have been struck in Cyzicus. Because this city struck provincial coins for Gallienus and even for Claudius II which proves that the striking continued under Claudius and also that the mint would not have been striking imperial coins for Gallienus as well. So the coins in question must definitely have been produced at another mint which was already working during the reign of Gallienus.

The mints of Tarraco, Rome, Siscia and a Gallic mint can be discounted for reasons given above, so the only other option to consider, is one of the so-called Syrian mints. In notes no 7 and 8 in his Volume IV, p. 348, Cohen attributes all Gallienus coins, with VIIC, CVI PP, SPQR or a branch in the exergue to a mint in Syria. In addition he also attributes to the same region all Gallienus coins with two figures on the reverse, which is however only partially correct, as there are also Gallienus coins from Gallic sources with two standing figures on the reverse.

In general, the latter types generally come from the same Syrian mint, which was later lost to Macrianus and Quietus and, thanks to the **C P LIC** in the obverse legend, prove that they were struck during the joint reign of Gallienus and Valerian, so for this reason these must be disregarded for the purpose of our reasoning.

However, Gallienus' coins with **VII C, CVI PP** or a branch in the exergue always have the same short obverse legend: **GALLIENVS AVG**, so they were struck during his sole reign, namely in Antioch in Syria, as will be explained in the appropriate section further below.

Because Gallienus coins with **SPQR** also use the short obverse legend, have numerous characteristics of style and fine, neat lettering in common with the coins from Antioch, one would feel tempted to also attribute these coins to Antioch. (The mint from which these Gallienus coins come was not founded until after 260 AD, as we shall later see. So it is plausible that some of the mint staff from Antioch were transferred here when this mint was founded, which would account for the similarity of styles from both mints.)

But if we take into consideration that the equivalent Claudius coins with the dot markings were only apparently made in three officinae, whilst Claudius coins from Antioch are marked with Greek letters and were made in eight officinae, then it is fairly safe to say that those of the "dot" series must have been struck in a mint other than Antioch.

So although we have not yet come to any conclusions about any other mints under Gallienus which issued his **SPQR** marked coins, coins struck under Aurelian may point the correct way.

Amongst coins of Aurelian we come across those with **SERD** in the exergue. There is no proof that the imperial mint of Serdica (modern day Sofia in Bulgaria) was founded by Aurelian and the question is therefore, did Serdica already have a mint ?. All signs indicate that the mint of Serdica was founded under Gallienus, namely as a replacement for the Syrian mint lost to Macrianus and Quietus in 260 AD, and from which the troops based in Thrace and Asia Minor would have received their pay, because the usual markings of coins with dots from the mint in war seem to have appeared in the new

mint as well. (A Gallienus coin in the Lepaullo Collection in Lyons with **VENVS AVG** on the obverse, **SPQR** in the exergue clearly shows a dot beneath the bust.)

In the same vein, the fact that we mentioned above, i.e. that the Claudius coins discussed here show doubtless signs of having been engraved by the same hand who engraved those from Cyzicus, can only have the single explanation that, at some time, the location of this mint was moved.

Referring to the historical events of the time, this is totally logical when applied to the mint of Serdica during Claudius' reign, for the enormous and rapid development in the strength of the Goths, whose insurgence into the Danube provinces was expected at any moment, would have resulted in the loss of security of a mint in the centre of the potential war region.

We would therefore be correct in supposing that this mint (which, from the few coins that have survived, was not active for very long and which - as did other mints - partially used the reverse dies of previous emperors), was moved to fortified Cyzicus before the outbreak of the war against the Goths and that the activities of the provincial mint there were ended.

Totally supporting this theory is the fact that there are so few provincial coins of Claudius struck in Cyzicus, in fact only two types are known, whereas other provincial mints, such as Antioch in Pisidia and Sagalassus appear - from their numbers - to have continued striking coins even during the Goth Wars.

Under Claudius Serdica struck in three officinae and marked their coins, as mentioned above, with 1, 2, or 3 dots •, ••, ••• beneath the bust, although unmarked coins are known to exist. However, whether a coin really is unmarked can only be checked on really well preserved, unworn coins, as the dot was very small and could be worn away fairly quickly.

We will also point out that the letters **SPQR** in the exergue are not really a mintmark but the continuation i.e. the end of the reverse legend.

**The lettering is usually small and quite regular, apart from the letter A whose legs are not as sloping as usual, but more vertical and often not joined using the usual short horizontal line in the centre, but with a horizontal line across the top, making the letter A look rather like the Greek Π. The often idealised image of the emperor usually shows a narrow, longish head with stiffly falling crown ties.**

So on the base of the supposition that Claudius coins were struck here and later in Cyzicus and that these were engraved by the same hand, but just made at different periods, and which - especially the early ones of which - show very minimal differences in style, then it is only by comparing the Gallienus coins struck in Serdica with the coins of Claudius positively known to have been struck in Cyzicus that one can attribute the coins correctly to their appropriate mints and to index them accordingly.

The following information shall only attribute to the Serdica mint those Claudius coins with the obverse legend **IMP C M AVR CLAVDIVS AVG**, and whose reverse legend and depiction absolutely correspond with those Gallienus coins with **SPQR** in the exergue. Thanks to my own comprehensive research I have been able to discover a not insignificant number of Gallienus coins from this mint, which are not in Cohen, and which have enabled me to disregard the Claudius coins not from the same mint. I have therefore only considered those Claudius coins which are known to have the same

reverses as Gallienus or whose other characteristics clearly and incontrovertionally speak for this mint. **The former are marked in the list below with an asterisk.**

But an exception concerning the obverse legend is one single coin in in my own collection with **AEQVITAS AVG / SPQR** in the exergue but the obverse legend **CLAVDIVS AVG** (without IMP....). But it is precisely this short legend, noticeably coinciding with Gallienus' short legend **GALLIENVS AVG**, and the unique appearance of this coin that speaks more for its attribution to this mint than the same coin with the longer obverse legend and **AEQVITAS AVG / SPQR** which was also struck by Gallienus.

This mint only made one issue and that comprised entirely of devalued Antoniniani.  
(Note: the dots referred to in the following list, are seen below the bust)

## I. Issue

### IMP CM AVR CLAUDIVS AVG

AEQVITAS AVG* (Cohen-, RIC 228 Cyzicus)	SPQR in exergue
CONSERVAT AVG (Cohen 59v, RIC 229 Cyzicus)	SPQR in exergue
FORTVNA AVG* (Cohen-, RIC 231 Cyzicus)	SPQR in exergue
MINERVA AVG* (Cohen-, RIC 236 Cyzicus)	SPQR in exergue
PM TRP PO PP* (Cohen-, RIC -)	SPQR in exergue
PROVIDENTIA AVG* (Cohen-, RIC -)	SPQR in exergue
SALVS AVG* (Cohen-, RIC 242 Cyzicus)	SPQR in exergue
VENVS AVG* (Cohen 207, RIC -)	SPQR in exergue
VICTORIA AVG* (Cohen-, RIC 246 Cyzicus)	SPQR in exergue
VIRTVTI AVG* (Cohen-, RIC 255)	SPQR in exergue
VIRTIVTI AVG* (Cohen 232, RIC -)	SPQR in exergue
CONSERVAT AVG (Cohen 59v, RIC 229v)	unmarked
MINERVA AVG* (Cohen-, RIC 236v)	unmarked
PM TRP PO PP* (Cohen-, RIC -)	unmarked
PROVIDENTIA AVG* (Cohen-, RIC -)	unmarked
SALVS AVG* (Cohen-, RIC 242)	unmarked
VENVS AVG* (Cohen 207v, RIC 245)	unmarked
VICTORIA AVG* (Cohen-, RIC 246)	unmarked
VIRTIVTI AVG* (Cohen 232, RIC -)	unmarked
FORTVNA AVG (Cohen Supp. 9v, RIC -)	unmarked
ROMAE AETERNAE (Cohen Supp 17, RIC 241)	unmarked
AEQVITAS AVG* (Cohen-, RIC 228 Cyzicus)	SPQR/1 dot
FORTVNA AVG (Cohen Supp. 9v, RIC -)	SPQR/2 dots
MINERVA AVG* (Cohen-, RIC 236v)	SPQR/1 dot
SALVS AVG* (Cohen-, RIC 242)	SPQR/1 dot
SALVS AVG* (Cohen-, RIC 242)	SPQR/2 dots
VENVS AVG* (Cohen 207v, RIC 245)	SPQR/2 dots
VICTORIA AVG* (Cohen-, RIC 246)	SPQR/3 dots
VIRTVTI AVG* (Cohen 232, RIC -)	SPQR/1 dot
VIRTIVTI AVG* (Cohen 232, RIC -)	SPQR/1 dot
VIRTIVTI AVG* (Cohen 232, RIC -)	SPQR/2 dots

The two coins with Fortuna and Roma without SPQR also belong to this mint. They already show the improved portrait of the emperor, so obviously they had made new dies without adding the SPQR.

## V. The Mint of Cyzicus

The mint moved here from Serdica retained the dots as mintmarks for the three officinae. In addition, some coins from this mint used the mark **M-C** across the reverse fields.

Unusual exceptions are two such coins in my own collection which also have the letter P in the exergue, whose meaning I have not yet determined. The P cannot be the officina letter because one of these coins has just one dot beneath the bust, but the other has two dots, so they are from two different officinae.

The obverse legends of the coins from this mint are

**IMP C M AVR CLAVDIVS AVG, IMP CLAVDIVS P F AVG** and **IMP CLAVDIVS AVG**

and one additional coin in my possession has the flattering obverse legend  
**VIRTVS CLAVDI AVG**

Though the dot marks with the longer legend are often missing, those of the shorter legends are almost all marked in this way.

**The lettering of the long legend have the same character as the coins struck in Serdica, with the exception of the L which is often characterised by the vertical line of the L ending in a curve below the line of lettering: (L). On the coins with the shorter obverse legend (s), there is another characteristic in the letter V whose lower point is often noticeably curved to the right and extended: (V).**

Special attention should be paid to the mark **M-C**. We already mentioned in the section about the mint in Siscia the Gallienus coin marked **SI** and showed that the S was actually independent of the I (officina) and was used as an initial letter to identify the mint. The mintmark MC should be seen in the same way and interpreted as M(oneta) C(yzicena), thus naming Cyzicus as the mint, from which the following coins came. (Note: In the description of the most important examples of his collection of Roman coins, Dr. Elberling on page 230 described a Claudius coin **LAETITIA AVG N** with **M-C** across the fields auf, which he explains in a note, with no reasoning whatsoever, as meaning the somewhat doubtful "AgrippinaColonia" or "Moguntia Colonia".)

These scarce coins with the **M-C** mark have the following reverse legends:

**FELICIT TEMP**  
**FORTVNA REDVX AVG**  
**LAETITIA AVG N**  
**SECVRITAS PERPETVA**  
**VIRTVTI AVGVSTI** (Hercules)

All these are deities who express joy and happiness in the future and which glorify the courage of the Emperor. In addition there is the nominal term **M AVR** in the obverse legend and this also points to them being the earliest issue after the mint had been moved to Cyzicus.

Although all other mints used the reverse dies of Gallienus in order to speed up the minting of the first Claudius coins, this did not occur at all in Cyzicus, certain proof that no imperial mint existed in Cyzicus before Claudius, so no old dies were available.

If one takes into consideration the careful measures taken to ensure that coins' sources could be identified precisely, then one will understand why the first coins struck in Cyzicus were given a special marking system (M-C) beside using the dots in order to

differentiate it from the coins produced shortly before in Serdica, in order to avoid public confusion.

*(Note, in the author following statement "Cohen V" is an error - the correct volume is **IV**) .... Coh. V. p, 413 Nr. 520 also cites a Gallienus coin with **MC** in the exergue, in the British Museum collection. However, after checking the coin, it turned out to be **MS** in the exergue, not MC.*

*(One of these with MS is in Marcy's fabulous Gallienus collection; <http://mk.shahrazad.net/gallienus/images/gall-0421-obv.jpg> and <http://mk.shahrazad.net/gallienus/images/gall-0421-rev.jpg>).*

The provincial coinage which had been struck in Cyzicus to this date provides us with arguments which support the correct interpretation of the mark MC.

After the death of Claudius, both Quintillus and Aurelian continued striking coins in this mint, and continued to use the dot marks. Following Aurelian's coinage reform, the dots disappeared and were replaced as mint and officina identifiers with the letter C \*, either on their own, or with the addition of the officina letter, e.g. **C \* P**, **C \* S** on the reverse, Retaining the mint letter C for this mint prove that these coins were made in Cyzicus.

It is also interesting that in this mint, under Maximinus Daza, so many years later, dots once again appeared on this emperor's coins e.g. on "**GENIO IMPERATORIS**", Coh. VI. 72, which used three vertical dots in the right field.

*(Note: RIC also lists these marks under RIC VI Cyzicus 68, 69 and 70 for Galerius and Licinius I as well as for Maximinus.)*

The Consecration coins for Claudius produced by this mint are also marked with dots on the obverse. They usually show the reverse legend **CONSACRATIO** (instead of CONSECRATIO) and an eagle, a burning altar with diverse forms of decoration, or a funeral pyre as reverse image.

This mint also apparently only struck Aurei and devalued Antoniniani. The latter, including the Consecration coins, were struck in four issues.

## I. Issue

### 1. **IMP C M AVR CLAVDIVS AVG**

FELICIT TEMP (Cohen -, RIC -)	M-C across fields or unmarked
LAETITIA AVG N (Cohen Supp 12v, RIC 235)	M-C across fields or unmarked
SECVRITAS PERPETVA (Cohen Supp 129, RIC 243)	M-C across fields or unmarked
VIRTVTI AVGVSTI (Hercules) (Triton Sale III, lot 1163)	M-C across fields or unmarked
FORTVNA REDVX AVG (Cohen -, RIC-)	M-C across fields, P in ex, 1 dot below bust
FORTVNA REDVX AVG (Cohen -, RIC-)	M-C across fields, P in ex, 2 dots below bust
FORTVNA REDVX AVG (Cohen -, RIC-)	SPQR in exergue, 2 dots below bust
VICTORIA AVG (Cohen -, RIC 246)	SPQR in exergue
VICTORIA GVTTICA AVG (Cohen -, Jean Elsen Auction, Dec. 2006, lot 308)	SPQR in exergue
VICTORIA GVTTICA AVG (Cohen -, RIC-)	SPQR in exergue, 2 dots below bust
VIRTVTI AVG (Cohen -, RIC -)	SPQR in exergue, 1 dot below bust

The two VICTORIA coins could refer to the victory over the Goths and Byzantium and Pelagonia which preceded the great victory at Naissis.

2. <b>VIRTVS CLAVDI AVG</b>	VIRTVTI AVGVSTI (Markl coll.)	M-C across fields
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------

## II. Issue

### 1. IMP C M AVR CLAVDIVS AVG

FORTVNA REDVX (Cohen Supp. 10v, RIC -)	SPQR in exergue
FORTVNA REDVX (Cohen Supp. 10v, RIC -)	SPQR in exergue, 1 dot
FORTVNA REDVX (Cohen Supp. 10v, RIC -)	SPQR in exergue, 2 dots
PAX AETERNA (Cohen Supp. 14, RIC 237)	SPQR in exergue
PAX AETERNA (Cohen Supp. 14v, RIC 237v)	SPQR in exergue, 2 dots
PAX AETERNA (Cohen Supp. 14v, RIC 237)	SPQR in exergue, 3 dots
VICTORIAE GOTHIC (Cohen Supp. 24, RIC 251)	SPQR in exergue
VICTORIAE GOTHIC (Cohen Supp. 24v, RIC 251)	SPQR in exergue, 2 dots
VIRTVS AVG (Cohen 228, RIC 253)	SPQR in exergue

### 2. IMP CLAVDIVS PF AVG

FORTVNA REDVX (Cohen Supp. 10v, RIC 234)	SPQR in exergue
FORTVNA REDVX (Cohen Supp. 10v, RIC 234)	SPQR in exergue, 1 dot
PAX AETERNA (Cohen Supp. 14v, RIC 238)	SPQR in exergue
PAX AETERNA (Cohen Supp. 14v, RIC 238v)	SPQR in exergue, 1 dot
PAX AETERNA (Cohen Supp. 14v, RIC 238v) (pictured)	SPQR in exergue, 3 dots
VICTORIAE GOTHIC (Cohen Supp. 24v, RIC 251)	SPQR in exergue
VICTORIAE GOTHIC (Cohen Supp. 24v, RIC 251)	SPQR in exergue, 2 dots
VIRTVS AVG (Cohen 228, RIC 254)	SPQR in exergue
VIRTVS AVG (Cohen 228, RIC 254)	SPQR in exergue, 2 dots
VIRTVS AVG (Cohen 228, RIC 254)	SPQR in exergue, 3 dots

### 3. IMP CLAVDIVS AVG

FORTVNA REDVX (Cohen Supp. 10v, RIC 234v)	SPQR in exergue
FORTVNA REDVX (Cohen Supp. 10v, RIC 234v)	SPQR in exergue, 1 dot
FORTVNA REDVX (Cohen Supp. 10v, RIC 234v)	SPQR in exergue, 2 dots
PAX AETERNA (Cohen Supp. 14v, RIC 238v)	SPQR in exergue, 3 dots
VICTORIAE GOTHIC (Cohen Supp. 24v, RIC 252v)	SPQR in exergue
VICTORIAE GOTHIC (Cohen Supp. 24v, RIC 252v)	SPQR in exergue, 2 dots

## III. Issue

### 1. IMP CLAVDIVS PF AVG

FELICIT TEMP (Alföldi32 /8)	3 dots below bust
FIDES MILITVM (RIC 230)	2 dots below bust
FORTVNA REDVX (C 10 Sup, RIC 234)	1 dot below bust
IOVI CONSERVATORI (C 11 Sup)	3 dots below bust
VICTOR GERMAN (RIC 247v)	1 dots below bust
VICTOR GERMAN (RIC 247v)	2 dots below bust
VICTOR GERMAN (RIC 247)	3 dots below bust
VICTORIAE GOTHIC (RIC 252)	2 dots below bust
VIRTVS AVG (RIC 254)	2 dots below bust
VIRTVS AVG (RIC 254)	3 dots below bust
VICTORIA AVG (with captives, RIC-)	2 dots below bust

(The last coin was probably struck to mark the success over the Gothic hoards in the Rhodope mountains in early 270 AD).

## IV Issue (Consecration issue)

### DIVO CLAVDIO

CONSACRATIO (eagle left)	1 dot below bust
CONSACRATIO (eagle left)	2 dots below bust
CONSACRATIO (eagle right)	1 dot below bust
CONSACRATIO (eagle right)	2 dots below bust
CONSACRATIO (altar)	1 dot below bust
CONSACRATIO (altar)	2 dots below bust

CONSACRATIO (funeral pyre)	1 dot below bust
CONSACRATIO (funeral pyre)	2 dots below bust
CONSACRATIO (funeral pyre)	3 dots below bust
CONSECRATIO (eagle right)	2 dots below bust
CONSECRATIO (altar)	1 dot below bust
CONSECRATIO (funeral pyre)	3 dots below bust

## VI. The Mint of Antioch

This mint comprised of eight officinae which marked their coins with the Greek letters **A, B, Γ, Δ, Epsilon, S, Z** and **I**.

These officina letters are only ever in the exergue, however one does come across coins with a dot in the exergue and some without any officina mark at all, which appear to only signify different minting runs of the same issues.

The coins of this mint have the stereotype obverse legend **IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG** in neat, regular, generally small lettering. Although these coins have the same obverse legend and mintmark in common with those of Rome, the Antioch coins differ from those of Rome principally by the mark in the exergue, which, in Rome was only used on coins with the obverse legend **IMP CLAVDIVS AVG** but with the M of IMP depicted as IIII).

However, one coin in the author's collection with the reverse AETERNIT AVG (N written as III) with III in the exergue also has the IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG (with IIII for M) on the obverse, but this appears to have been an error on the part of the mint worker, who used a faulty obverse die, as this coin was part of the V. Issue of Rome, for which the obverse legend of IMP CLAVDIVS AVG (IIII for M) should have been used.

**Even unmarked coins of both mints, even though they have the same reverse legend and same depictions on both reverse and obverse, can be attributed to the correct mint by the letter M of IMP. On the coins of the Syrian Antioch mint, this usually appears as an M, seldomly as IVI, whereas those of the Rome mint always appears as four parallel lines IIII. Also characteristic is the letter G, which is often written resembling a 6 but with the loop not quite closed.**

The coins of Antioch are usually nice and circular, made from a better quality billon than that from other mints and are more often found with their silver coating, than are those from all the other mints.

In general this seems to point not only to a more careful production, but also to better striking standards, under better management and by better monitoring of the mint staff, than was the case at most other mints, because there have been far fewer error coins discovered from Antioch.

That the following coins did have their source in a Syrian mint can be in no doubt when one compares them with the Gallienus coins struck in Syria, which have CVIPP, VIIC and PXV marks and which were not issued until he began his sole rule, whilst, as we have seen above, those issued in Syria during the joint reign with his father, certainly came from a different mint, notably the mint which struck the coins **IOVI CONSERVATORI, ORIENS AVG, RESTITVT ORIENTIS, VICTORIA AVG**, with two figures on the reverse, but the lettering on these Gallienus coins is not so neat. Some of these Gallienus coins are marked with dots on the reverse, such as **ORIENS AVG** (Coh. IV, 379 Var; RIC -) (woman presenting wreath to emperor), with a dot beneath the bust, then there is **VICTORIA AVG** (Coh. IV, 594; Gökyildirim hoard 2323 and 2344), with a dot on the obverse beneath the bust. And yet another of the same type, (Göbl 1702b,

Antioch, Gökyildirim hoard 2327 & 2348) with dots both beneath the bust and in the exergue of the reverse. Both coins are in the Vienna museum. The former does not show Sol, but a woman presenting a wreath to the emperor. The Gallienus coin **RESTITVT ORIENTIS** (Coh. IV, 490, RIC V-1, Antioch 448 (J); Cunetio hoard 1914, Göbl 1685m, Asian mint (J), Gökyildirim hoard 1814 (J), (depending on exactly which obv. legend and bust type is referred to) has two dots in the exergue whilst the same coin of Valerian in the author's collection has two dots beneath the bust on the obverse.

These apparently come from the mint which was lost to Macrianus and Quietus in 260 AD. The proof for this supposition is given to us by the coins of Quietus which display exactly the same style as this mint, as well as having the marking dots. The loss of this mint had, as we saw above, forced Gallienus to establish the mint in Serdica in order to ensure the supply of coinage for the troops stationed in Asia Minor.

But the establishment of a mint in Syria was also to supply coinage to the troops under the leadership of Odaenath who had been given the duty of holding off the might of the Persians whose power had increased quite alarmingly, after Macrianus and Quietus had been defeated. This supposition is supported, as we shall see, by the Gallienus coins mentioned above, marked with **CVIPP, VIIC, PXV** or a palm branch, and which, in view of the events of the time, point a clear finger to Antioch in Syria as their source.

Even in previous times Antioch had been one of the most important mints in the ancient world. The Seleucids had minted coins there during their entire reigns. Since the beginning of Roman Imperial times under Augustus Antioch had been used for striking provincial coins, and continued to do so until Valerian's reign.

Badly damaged and partially destroyed by the Persians in 255 AD, the city of Antioch was then, following Valerian's capture and imprisonment, so under the sole reign of Gallienus, attacked and plundered for the second time, during which attack the city's most beautiful and important buildings were reduced to ashes and rubble.

In view of the fact that no provincial coins from Antioch are known of Gallienus, although his father had struck coins there, then one must presume that the provincial mint was amongst the buildings destroyed by fire and whose very destruction was in the interests of the enemy who had wreaked such havoc. (Quote from Bernhardt, p. 48): *"The Persians, being pursued by Odaenath and pushed back to the far shores of the Euphrates, sent messengers to Edessa, where the Romans still had the upper hand, and asked to be permitted to pass the town unharmed and promised that they would give (back) all the Syrian coinage which they had with them."* Here we are to understand that this money was the very large booty which they had stolen when they plundered the mint in order to exchange it for free passage past Edessa.)

The strategically excellent position of Antioch close to the sea and at the crossroads of routes to Asia Minor, Mesopotamia and Syria may, under the prevailing circumstances, have influenced Gallienus to establish the new mint for Imperial coinage in this city, to replace the destroyed provincial mint.

If we have come to this conclusion based on Gallienus' coinage then we receive further support by comparing these and the Syrian coins of Claudius with the coins of Vaballathus which we know were minted in Antioch (Cohen V p. 159). There is also a marked issue of these coins which correspond to the marking of Claudius' coins from this mint. As examples we can cite the Vaballathus coin in the Lavy Museum in Turin: **AETERNITAS AVG** with A in the exergue, and a coin in the St Florian Foundation Collection in Upper Austria: **IOVI STATORI** with lower case sigma in the exergue. Furthermore, the unmarked coins of Vaballathus with depictions and legends identical to



those of Claudius' coins, e.g. **AEQVITAS AVG** and **VICTORIA AVG**, the **IVENVS AVG** (Rohde Collection) with the barbarised version of Claudius' **IVVENTVS AVG**, as well as the **VIRTVS AVG** (Hercules) coin, struck using the same die as used for Antioch coins of Gallienus, all point to a common mint.

Besides all that, this supposition of their source being Antioch is strengthened by the fact that - whether by chance or by accident - Vaballathus's minters used obverse dies of Claudius with no legend, of the type discovered in the mint buildings of Antioch when Zenobia (Vaballathus's mother) captured Antioch.

So all in all, we have to accept that, after Valerian's capture, the provincial mint of Antioch stopped minting because of the damage sustained at the hands of the Persians and, in its place, an imperial mint was established during Gallienus' sole reign which struck coins (e.g. those with **CVIPP** with or without a palm branch in the exergue) with the legend **P M TR P XIII** (e.g. RIC V-1, Asian Mint 602). This legend pinpoints the date as 265 AD which means that Antioch was definitely already striking coins in that year as it also was when Claudius came to power in 268 AD.

Zenobia was already ruler of all Syria before the death of Claudius and probably even when the main thrust against the Goths in Moesia was taking place. She occupied Antioch and brought the Roman East up to Ancyra in Galatia under her control. This also explains why neither Claudius Consecration coins, nor coins of Quintillus have been thus far discovered from this mint, because when Quintillus aquired the purple, Syria had already been lost.

Only the usual devalued Antoniniani were produced by this mint during this time and these were struck in two issues.

### I. Issue

<b>IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG</b>	AETER AVG (Coh. 34; RIC 198)	unmarked
	CONCOR AVG (Coh. 44; RIC 200)	unmarked
	CONSECR AVG (Coh. 56; RIC 258)	unmarked
	CONSER AVG (Coh. 58; RIC 202)	unmarked
	CONSERVATORES AVG (Tanini Coll, RIC 203)	unmarked
	FELIC AVG (Coh. 69; RIC 206)	unmarked
	FELI AVG (Coh. 69 var; RIC 206 var)	unmarked
	SALVS AVG (Coh. 188; RIC 219)	unmarked
	SPES PVBLIC (Coh. 201; RIC 222)	unmarked
	VIRT AVG (Cohen 229 corr., RIC 224)	unmarked

All these coins of the 1st emission have two figures on the reverse and are unmarked. This is why the coin described by Banduri as "**IOVI CONSERV AVG**" with A in the exergue seems very dubious, and probably a misread coin of Aurelian.

### II. Issue

<b>IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG</b>	NEPTVN AVG (Cohen 136, RIC 214v)	unmarked
	NEPTVN AVG (Cohen 136, RIC 214v)	1 dot beneath bust
	NEPTVN AVG (Cohen 136, RIC 214v)	A in exergue
	IVNO REGINA (Cohen 104, RIC 212)	unmarked
	IVNO REGINA (Cohen 104, RIC 212)	1 dot beneath bust
	IVNO REGINA (Cohen 104, RIC 212)	B in exergue
	SALVS AVG (Apollo) (Coh. 181, RIC 216)	unmarked
	SALVS AVG (Apollo) (Coh. 181, RIC 216)	1 dot beneath bust
	CONSER AVG (Coh. 57, RIC 201)	Γ in exergue
	IVVENTVS AVG (Coh. 107, RIC 213)	unmarked

	IVVENTVS AVG (Coh. 107, RIC 213)	1 dot beneath bust
	IVVENTVS AVG (Coh. 107, RIC 213)	Δ in exergue
	SALVS AVG (Isis) (Coh. 185, RIC 217)	unmarked
	SALVS AVG (Isis) (Coh. 185, RIC 217)	Epsilon in exergue
	SOL AVG (Coh. 197, RIC 221)	unmarked
	SOL AVG (Coh. 197, RIC 221)	1 dot beneath bust
	VIRTVS AVG (Coh. 225, RIC 225)	unmarked
	VIRTVS AVG (Coh. 225, RIC 225)	1 dot beneath bust
	VIRTVS AVG (Coh. 225, RIC 225)	ζ in exergue
	FIDES AVG (Coh. 73, RIC 207)	unmarked
	FIDES AVG (Coh. 73, RIC 207)	Z in exergue
	REGI ARTIS (Coh. 175, RIC 215)	unmarked
	REGI ARTIS (Coh. 175, RIC 215)	Z in exergue
	DIANAE VICTR (Coh. 64, RIC 205)	unmarked
	DIANAE VICTR (Coh. 64, RIC 205)	H in exergue
	AEQVITAS AVG (Coh. 29, RIC 197)	unmarked
	AEQVITAS AVG (Coh. 29, RIC 197)	1 dot beneath bust
	AEQVITAS AVG (Coh. 29, RIC 197)	H in exergue
<b>Striking errors</b>	SALVS AVG (Isis) (Coh. 185, RIC 217)	Δ in exergue
	VIRTVS AVG (Coh. 225, RIC 225)	S in exergue
	FIDES AVG (Coh. 73, RIC 207)	retrograde Z in exergue
<b>In addition</b>	SECVRIT AVG (Sec. hldg caduceus) (Banduri)	unmarked
	VICTORIA AVG (RIC 106 as Rome)	unmarked
	(This coin must have been struck at the start of the II issue because it is unmarked, and can therefore only refer to the success over the Germans.)	

The coins **DEO CABIRO** (with Z in the exergue) (RIC 204; Cohen 65 who for his part cites Banduri) and **INVICTVS AVG** (no mintmark, RIC 50 as Rome, citing Cohen who cites Banduri) are very dubious and may have been made from modified dies of the **REGI ARTIS** and **IVVENTVS AVG** reverses.

The legend of the coin **IVVENTAS AVG** (Cohen 108 citing d'Ennery, RIC 213, RN 1965 no 7, p.6, (d), Syria hoard) is clearly an engraver's error who misread **IVVENTVS AVG**. The same applies to **NEPTVNO AVG**, **NEPTVS AVG**, **SOLVS AVG** etc.

It is quite remarkable that - in contrast to other mints - Antioch apparently did not use reverse dies of Gallienus for Claudius' first issue. It is not until the end of the II. issue that the types of Gallienus' coins returned.

That there are absolutely no Antioch coins which celebrate and publicize military triumph over the Goths does not only tell us that minting in Antioch was interrupted towards the end of the II. issue but also that this interruption must have occurred after the battle of Naissus and the news of the triumph could not reach Antioch which was in the hands of Zenobia.

## Summary and Final Observations

Collecting and studying the coins of this emperor for many years, as well as examining rubbings and images from numerous state and private collections has enabled me to put together this extensive information about the issues of these coins.

Despite this, the reader will note that some coins which, are listed e.g. in Cohen, Banduri, Tanini etc. are omitted here because I am convinced that these :

a) do not exist, for example:

- **MARTI VICTORI** (Coh. Supp., 13 citing British Museum; RIC V-1, 74 Rome, citing incorrect Cohen reference)
- **VICTORIA GERMANIC** (Coh. 218 corr. citing Vienna museum; RIC V-1, 252 Cyzicus citing Cohen 308) (*Note from translator: One of these definitely exists, in Pierre Petersson's collection!*)

b) are incorrectly described, for example:

- **CONCOR EXER** with T in exergue (Cohen 45; RIC V-1, 140 Milan var) instead of **CONCORD EXER** with T in exergue (Cohen 216, citing Banduri; RIC V-1, 141 Milan)
- **VICTORIA GERMAN** (Cohen 216 citing Banduri; RIC V-1, 249 Cyzicus citing Cohen), or **VICTOR GERMANICA** (Köhne, NZ 1844; RIC V-1, 250 Cyzicus var), instead of **VICTOR GERMAN**.

c) are partially incorrectly attributed, or legends partially off-plan, for example:

- **CONCORD LEGI** (Cohen 48 citing Banduri; RIC V-1, 142 Milan) - probably a pre-monetary reform Aurelian with incomplete legends or the work of a counterfeiter.
- **PIETAS AVG** (Z in exergue), Mercury type, (Cohen 151 citing Banduri; RIC V-1, 84 Rome), cut from a Syrian die of **FIDES AVG** with Z in exergue.

d) are uncontestably of barbaric origin, for example:

- **SALVS AVG** (II in exergue) (Cohen 192; RIC-)
- **PROVIDENTIA AVG** (Cohen 174)

\*\*\*\*\*

Following pictures are from wildwinds.com except where marked



IMP CLAVDIVS PF AVG, three dots under neck / PAX AETERNA, SPQR in ex.  
RIC 238 var (dots). Cyzicus mint.

\*\*\*\*\*



IMP CLAVDIVS P F AVG / PROVID AVG, T in ex.  
Tarraco, Spain mint (listed in RIC as no. 163 of Milan (on wildwinds erroneously as RIC 162 at time of writing)

\*\*\*\*\*



An excellent example of the Rome mint's M engraved as IIII in the legend  
IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG

\*\*\*\*\*



IMP C CLAVDIVS AVG / FIDES EXERCII ( Fides standing left, head right, holding vertical standard and transverse standard). RIC V-1, 34 Rome, III. Issue, again with IIII for M.

*"The image of Claudius on the early issues has very striking features, a full face, protruding forehead with smoothly parted hair".....*

\*\*\*\*\*



*"...whilst the IV and V issues show a sterner look, bonier face with marked cheekbones, a more visible Adam's apple and often short, disheveled hair."*

IMP CLAVDIVS AVG / FIDES MILITVM. RIC V-1, 38 Rome. V. Issue

Note here the IIII also forming the M of MILITVM

\*\*\*\*\*