THE COINAGE OF ALLECTUS: CHRONOLOGY AND INTERPRETATION

ANDREW BURNETT

The dates of Allectus’s reign

Contemporary Romans had little good to say of either Carausius or Allectus, and even when English antiquarians like Stukeley rehabilitated Carausius, out of chauvinism and because he rebelled against an emperor who persecuted Christians,1 Allectus was left in moral disgrace, remembered only as the friend who had treacherously killed his emperor. Morality apart, however, the sources give us very little information about Allectus. A ‘satelles’ of Carausius is how the contemporary panegyric of Constantius described him;2 Aurelius Victor was more specific, saying that Allectus was in charge of Carausius’s financial department, ‘summae rei praeesset’.3 The implication that he was Carausius’s rationalis summae rei seems clear, although some modern writers have preferred to regard him as Carausius’s praetorian prefect.4

This is the sum of our information about Allectus before he became emperor. The paucity of our historical sources of information can also be seen from the uncertainty about the length of his reign, and the dates of his accession and death. His accession is generally dated by the date of the elevation of Constantius I to Caesar, since it is presumed that Carausius was assassinated shortly after the siege of Boulogne, which fell ‘immediately’ after Constantius became Caesar (1 March 293).5 Recently, however, Huvelin and Loriot6 have pointed out that the panegyric does not name Carausius as the defender of Boulogne, and that it is possible that the siege took place after Allectus had already become emperor. A certain amount of doubt therefore exists about the date of Allectus’s proclamation and of the siege of Boulogne, but there are coins which provide useful evidence for both. First, the fall of Boulogne. This is, I think, symbolically represented on the first issue of the pre-reform antoniniani of Trier, dated by a consular obverse of Constantius to 294.7 The reverse has the legend PIETAS AVGG, like some of the later gold medallions celebrating the recapture of Britain by Constantius, and the design shows the emperor raising – the iconography of restoration – a female figure (Plate 1, No.1). This female figure has been identified as Respublica8 or Gallia,9 but as she wears a mural crown she should be a city, and Boulogne is the obvious choice. Boulogne, then, had been recovered before 294. Secondly, we can be sure that Carausius’s reign continued into 293, since among the coins

---

1 For Stukeley’s hostile attitude to Maximian and especially Diocletian, see his The Medallic History of Carausius (London, 1757), VII, 56, 65 and 59, where he uses the phrases ‘aera martyrum’ and ‘Diocletian’s aera’ synonymously.

2 Pan. Lat. IV (8), 12.

3 Caez. 39, 41.

4 P. H. Webb, The Coinage of Allectus, NC (1906), 127; T. D. Barnes The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine (Cambridge and London, 1982), p. 136 (but see p. 111). But Aurelius Victor is very specific, and one can find a sort of parallel for his position in the events surrounding the usurpation of Magnentius, which was masterminded by another financial officer, Marcellinus the comes rei privae.

5 Pan. Lat. IV (8), 6: statim.

6 H. Huvelin and X. Loriot, Quelques arguments nouveaux en faveur de la localisation de l’atelier “continental” de Carausius à Rouen, BSNV (1983), 72.

7 H. A. Cahn, Die Trierer Antoniniani der Tetrarchen, Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau (1955), no. 5, cf. 23–9, 42–4. Cahn dated the first issue to 293, since it refers to Diocletian’s decennalia, but, as Bastien has pointed out (Le Monnayage de l’Atelier de Lyon, 294–316 (Wetteren, 1980), p. 36 note 3), the consular bust for Constantius (Cahn no. 3, see also Schweizer Miinzblatter 1965 p. 121 no. 13A) is inexplicable before 294.

8 O. Vetter, Die Münzen von Diocletianus bis Romulus, Katalog Paul Gerin (Vienna, 1921), p. 354 no. 11.

9 Cahn, p 15.
Carausius minted in the names of Diocletian and Maximian is an unpublished piece in Oxford\textsuperscript{16} which shows Maximian as consul, i.e. of 293 (Plate 1, No. 2).

If Boulogne was recaptured before the end of 293 and Carausius’s reign continued into that year, then there seems little room for doubt, either on the traditional or on Loriot’s interpretation of the siege of Boulogne, that Allectus became emperor sometime in that year. Greater uncertainty, however, attaches to the date of his death. Generally this is dated to 296,\textsuperscript{17} but there have been a few dissenters, who have preferred either 295\textsuperscript{18} or 297,\textsuperscript{19} and I would like to argue that, in fact, the evidence suggests that the date of 295 is the most likely.

There are a variety of sources for the end of the reign, some of which are more useful than others, although all are fairly meagre. Potentially the most important is the epigraphic evidence for the adoption by the tetrarchs of the acclamation Britannicus Maximus. Unfortunately, however, there are few relevant inscriptions: one shows the acclamation was not used in 293/4,\textsuperscript{20} while its first dated occurrence appears to be an African inscription of 296/7.\textsuperscript{21} Thus inscriptions do not at the moment help decide on the date of Allectus’s death, although if the acclamation was taken on Diocletian’s dies imperii, his death must have preceded November 296. Secondly, there is the literary evidence. Aurelius’s Victor says of Allectus that he was defeated ‘brevi’ after his assassination of Carausius;\textsuperscript{22} Eutropius that he held the Britains ‘triennio;’\textsuperscript{7} Orosius that Carausius reigned ‘per septem annos’ and that Britain was recaptured ‘post decem annos,’\textsuperscript{18} a recapture that Eutropius placed ‘decimo anno’. We seem, then, to have a unanimous view of a three-year reign, but this unanimity is not so impressive when it is recalled that it arises from the use by all three epitomators (of the fourth and fifth centuries) of a common lost source, the so-called ‘Kaisergeschichte’ of about 337.\textsuperscript{19} And we cannot press the detail of what this source may have said, since it may have been inaccurate and it is only sloppily represented by the epitomators. For instance, Aurelius Victor can date Carausius’s death ‘sexennio’,\textsuperscript{2}\textsuperscript{2} whereas Eutropius places it ‘post septennium,’\textsuperscript{23} and, similarly, a discrepancy of a year can be observed between Eutropius’s date of the recapture of Britain (decimo anno) and Orosius’s (post decem annos). I think, therefore, that these sources can be used as no more than a guide, and that it would be unwise to press them beyond showing that Allectus probably reigned for more than two and less than four years.

Thirdly, there is numismatic evidence, and I wish to look at three aspects: the gold victory medallions of Constantius, the billon ‘folles’ of Gaul, and the Alexandrian coinage of Egypt. The most famous gold medallion, from the Arras hoard, depicts the reception by Victory and restoring Britannia (Plate 1, No. 3).\textsuperscript{24} This reverse is coupled with a number of known pieces. One has the inscription PIETAS AVGG and shows the emperor crowned by Victory and restoring Britannia (Plate 1, No. 3).\textsuperscript{25} The further significance of the coin is, of course, that it demonstrates that Maximian’s consulship was recognised in Britain. No doubt a similar piece will turn up for Diocletian.

\textsuperscript{16} With reverse PROVID AVGGG and mini-mark SOG (not included in his catalogue of these coins by R. A. G. Carson, ‘Carausius et Fratres Sui: a Reconsideration’, in Studia P. Naster Oblata, edited by S. Scheers (Leuven, 1982), pp. 245-261). The further significance of the coin is, of course, that it demonstrates that Maximian’s consulship was recognised in Britain. No doubt a similar piece will turn up for Diocletian.


\textsuperscript{18} J. Schwartz, Domitius Dominicus (1975), pp. 98-100.


\textsuperscript{20} ILS 641, dated to TR P X

\textsuperscript{21} CIL VIII, 21550, dated to TR P XII.

\textsuperscript{22} Caes. 39, 42.

\textsuperscript{23} Brev. 9, 22, 2: atque ipse post eum (sc. Carausum) Britannias triennio tenuit.

\textsuperscript{24} Hist. adv. pag. 7, 25, 6: Allectus postea cæptam Carausi insulam per triennium tenuit; quem Asclepiodotus praefectus praetorio oppressit Britanniamque decem annos recept.


\textsuperscript{26} Caes. 39, 40.

\textsuperscript{27} Brev. 9, 22, 2.

\textsuperscript{28} RIC VII Trier no. 34.

\textsuperscript{29} RIC 32–3.
obverses, one of which shows Constantius as consul, an office he held in 296. Despite this, the medallion is usually dated to 297. I can see, however, no parallel to or sense in using the consular obverse only in the year after the consulship, and so, like Gricourt, I would date the medallion to 296. Consequently, one can at least discard 297 as a possible date for the end of the British usurpation.

Next, the evidence of the contemporary Gallic billon coinage. Diocletian’s coinage reform (late 294) introduced simple heroic heads of the tetrarchs at all mints of the empire, including Trier and Lyon, the mints in Constantius’s command in Gaul. But in about 296 the Gallic mints, alone in the empire, introduced new sorts of obverse busts, some of which depict the emperor in military dress, wearing a helmet and holding a spear and shield. It seems very likely that these new military busts are a reflection of Constantius’s British campaign. Bastien has suggested that in general busts with spear and shield may refer to imperial victory, and this is demonstrated by some very rare Trier coins of Constantius alone, which show the shield decorated with a small figure of victory (Plate 1, No. 4). At Lyon the change in busts take place in 296, since it occurs during an issue with a consular obverse of Constantius; at Trier, however, the change may take place slightly earlier, in the mint-mark A/r//TR, which precedes an issue, A/*//TR, with consular busts of Diocletian and Galerius (presumably 296–7).

Finally, the Alexandrian coinage of Constantius. It may seem strange to look at contemporary Egyptian tetradrachms to illuminate events at the other end of the Empire, but the Alexandrian coinage is a greatly neglected source for dating historical events, and, often refers, for instance, to the various campaigns conducted in Britain during the second century. In this context I shall concentrate on coins dated to year three of Constantius (i.e. minted between September 294 and the end of August 295), and I would emphasise that the very rare types I shall describe occur for Constantius alone of the tetrarchs and only in year three; they stand apart from the common run of ‘hope’ or ‘victory’, generally and universally applied to all the tetradrachms, and invite one to attach special significance to them.

One coin depicts the emperor on campaign (Plate 1, No. 5); another, now known only from a written description, may have shown the emperor in military dress. There are also two coins showing a victory of Constantius: one shows a bust, probably of Constantius, wearing a helmet decorated with a small figure of Victory and holding a trophy and a shield (Plate 1, No. 6); the other shows the emperor standing holding a victory on globe with two captives (Plate 1, No. 7). These four coins attest a campaign of and a victory for Constantius before the end of August 295. I think that this victory is his British victory, as no other victory is recorded for Constantius on the abundant Alexandrian coinage of the

---

24 RIC 33.
25 Even by P. Bastien, ‘Multiples d’or, adventus et panégyrique de Constance Chlorè’, CENB (1978), 3. Nevertheless the importance of coins with consular busts for chronology is a common theme of all Bastien’s works; much of this article is consequently indebted to his approach.
27 For Trier, see RIC VI p. 131; for Lyon, P. Bastien Le Monnayage de l’Aiché de Lyon 294–316 (Wetteren, 1980) no. 35 and following.
30 Bastien, no. 41.
31 RIC nos. 303 and 365. And what of the T (= 3) in the mint-mark? It might mean the third issue of reformed coins from Trier (so RIC), but it could also refer to the third regnal or tribunician year of Constantius (a similar usage occurs on the CASS XIII COSS V medallions of 305: RIC Trier no. 25).
33 G. Dattari, Nuovi Attag. Alexandrini (Cairo, 1901), no. 6034.
34 Dattari no. 6030 (with tav. VII). Another example is cited from Berlin by J. Vogt, Die Alexandrinischen Münzen (Stuttgart, 1924), p. 175.
next year. It must be admitted, however, that this is not certain, and that it is possible that the coins refer to Constantius's victory over the barbarians at the mouth of the Rhine, the victory for which the tetrarchs took an acclamation Germanicus maximus. This victory is usually dated to late 293, but, as Lippold has recently pointed out, we know only that it took place after the recapture of Boulogne and before the British campaign, i.e. a date in 294, or even 295 rather than 293, cannot be excluded. It remains, therefore, a possibility (in my opinion, an unlikely one) that the Alexandrian coins refer to this victory. It is unfortunate that this uncertainty remains. It is, however, fair to say that the only reason to date the British victory to 296 is a strong interpretation of the literary sources. But if, as I believe, these are not particularly compelling, then the case for 295 becomes sufficiently attractive to allow its adoption at least as a working hypothesis.

Allectus's gold coinage

A surprising number of aurei have survived, and new ones regularly come to light, two for instance having been found at Bath during the last five years. The total is greater than that which survives for Carausius's reign of two or three times as many years. All specimens were minted at London; in Appendix I record all specimens known to me.

Only one interpretation has been made of these coins, according to which (i) they were minted to pay an accession donative in 293, and (ii) they were not a very extensive issue, since there is a certain amount of die linkage, suggesting that the number of dies used to produce the coinage was relatively restricted. I disagree with both these views. First, the size of the issue: of the twenty coins of which I have been able to get casts or good photographs there are no less than nineteen obverse dies. Every new specimen is likely to be from a new die, as were, for instance, the two Bath coins. These figures imply a very substantial coinage; the twenty-eight aurei which survive from the reign of Julian of Pannonia, another third-century usurper, were struck from only eight obverse dies, and the statistics for the gold of the Gallic usurpers from Postumus to Tetricus are very analogous. In comparison, Allectus's gold was minted on a large scale; no doubt comparatively few specimens have survived because the coins may have been demonetized after Allectus's defeat. Secondly, the chronology. Although most coins have the mint-mark ML (or sometimes the enigmatic D/-/ML) one coin has MSL, which can hardly be divorced from S/A/MSL, the last mint-mark on London antoniniani (see below). For the start of the reign there are three coins whose obverse legend lacks the imperatorial praenomen ALLECTVS P F AVG. This legend links with the latest aurei of Carausius which have a similarly short legend (CARAVSIVS P F AVG), and suggests that the coins were minted at the very start of the reign (for what it is worth, the peculiar portrait which occurs with the short legend is reminiscent of Carausius's). So it seems that the gold coinage started at the beginning of the reign and continued until the end, and that throughout it was minted on a large scale.

Antoniniani; interpretation of types, relative chronology and mints

In the case of Allectus's billon coinage we are luckier than in that of Carausius, as there are
few barbarous or ‘semi-barbarous’ coins to confuse us. The few forgeries, ancient or modern, can be detected relatively easily; for instance, the alleged ‘denarius’ of Allectus (in fact a silver forgery of a denarius, probably dating to the eighteenth century), the notorious legionario antoninianus of Allectus or the occasional piece with AVG AVG AVG AVG, all of which are hybrid imitations (with Carausius), as indeed are the rare coins with dated reverses, for instance the S M TR P P COS II P P, copied from coins of Postumus.

It is not, however, only barbarous coins which copy earlier prototypes: the adoption or adaptation of coin designs from earlier reigns is a feature of virtually all the Allectan coinage. Most of the types are, unsurprisingly, taken over from Carausius (e.g. PAX or LAETITIA), but some come from further afield; for instance, DIANAE REDVCI, Diana leading a stag, is copied from coins of Postumus (Plate 1, Nos. 8–9), or VICTORI GER, trophy and captives, is copied from Probus’s coinage (Plate 1, Nos. 10–11), which incidentally provides a number of prototypes for Allectus. The fact of this copying, however, raises a serious – and unanswerable – problem of interpretation. Are the types merely copied and so devoid of any further historical significance, or were the prototypes chosen as particularly appropriate to the circumstances or events of Allectus’s reign? To take the case of the VICTORI GER type: can we infer that Allectus claimed a German victory (otherwise unknown), or does the type appear merely because Allectus or his die engravers happened to come across it and like it? Another example is provided by the representation of a temple identified as ROMAE AETER at both of Allectus’s mints (Plate 1, No. 12): do these coins attest the existence (likely enough) of one or more such temples in Britain, or is it, once more, just a question of copying earlier coins, in this case again of Probus (Plate 1, No. 13)? I can see no way of deciding between these possibilities, and therefore urge caution and restraint from using Allectus’s coin types to supplement our tiny knowledge of Allectan Britain.

Although quite a large number of such types are known for the antoniniani, hoards like Colchester or Burton Latimer show that the vast majority of the coinage was struck with the unexciting PAX, LAETITIA or PROVIDENTIA; the only exception is the ‘C’ mint, where FIDES MILITVM was also minted relatively abundantly. The parallelism between the two mints is particularly striking for PROVIDENTIA AVG: both mints have the same three varieties of type with this legend, and at both the legend lengthens from PROVID AVG to PROVIDENTIA AVG as the reign progresses, a development which allows us to determine that the order of mint marks is at London, S/P/ML, S/A/ML, then S/A/MSL, and, at the other mint, S/P/CL. Similarly both mints show a change in their preference in obverse bust types from draped to cuirassed.

One might, perhaps, use these similarities between the two mints to support Shiel’s thesis that there was, in fact, only one mint, but I cannot accept his view. There were
certainly different engravers for the L and C coins. Laffranchi pointed out the differences in letter forms, for instance M or A, and one can add a number of other differences. For instance, only L coins have unusual (left facing, armoured or consular) busts, and only L coins have the draped bust seen from the rear. Virtually all L coins have the legend IMP C ALECTVS P F AVG, but C coins often shorten or lengthen the PF to PI FE, PI FEL or just P. As well as these differences of style, there is also one important physical difference in the way the two groups of coins were made. L coins have a die axis which is either 12 o’clock or, more normally, 6 o’clock, but C coins always have a 6 o’clock die axis. This physical difference in minting practice indicates that the coins were made at two different places. Clearly, one of these places was London. As for the other, I would like to make only two points. First, I would stress that its name should include an L either as the second letter or as the start of the second syllable, a point which to my mind effectively removes Camulodunum (Colchester) from consideration. Secondly, I would question whether C really is C at all: could it not be G? Roman die engravers frequently failed to distinguish clearly between the two letters, and certainly those at the C mint did not, as can be seen on any coin with a reverse legend ending... AVC (sic). One could, perhaps, find a number of candidates beginning G or GL; an obvious one would be Glevum (Gloucester). I should stress, however, that this is only a guess. My point is that the search for the location of the second mint should be widened.

The absolute chronology of the ‘antoniniani’ and the ‘quinarii’

One can make a certain amount of progress in assigning absolute dates to the relative sequence of mint marks on the basis of some rare coins which depict Allectus as consul, facing left wearing a trabea and holding an eagle-tipped sceptre. Two such coins, from the same obverse die, have the first mint-mark, S/P/ML (Plate 1, No. 14), while two others have the second, S/A/ML (Plate 1, No. 15). The consulship should date to 294, since it was normal for an emperor to take the office in the year after his accession. The first mint-mark then would have remained current until 294, which also saw the introduction of the second. It would be possible to spread out the rest of the ‘antoniniani’ to cover the remaining year or so of the reign, but it would be premature to do this before a consideration of the so-called ‘quinarii’, as it is generally thought that these are all later than the ‘antoniniani’. Yet there is no obvious reason why the two denominations should not be contemporary, or at least overlap. The ‘quinarii’ raise all sorts of other problems as well, such as their denominational relationship (if any) with Diocletian’s coinage reform, or whether they are reduced ‘antoniniani’, implying that Allectus was running out of money and forced to debase his coinage by reducing its weight. Yet all these other problems can only be clearly tackled if we know when the ‘quinarii’ were introduced, both in relative and absolute terms.

I regret that I can see no decisive evidence to resolve this chronological problem one way or the other and hence leave the other questions unanswered, but it may perhaps be of use to set out the considerations which seem most relevant and helpful to their dating. First, a clear description of the coins. They were produced at both mints, but unlike the ‘antoniniani’ they are characterised by the sole use of a galley for the reverse type. The C
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62 L. Laffranchi, ‘Notes on the Coinage of Roman Britain under the first Tetrarchy’, NC (1927), 238.
63 This remark is based on a consideration of the abbreviations used on coins of the late third and early fourth centuries.
64 Both in the BM.
65 Glasgow (HCC 23), Oxford (PROVIDENTIA AVG, wand on globe and cornucopia).
66 I continue to use this term for convenience, although it seems clear that, whatever the coins were, they were not ‘quinarii’, for which the abbreviation was V.
67 This view seems to go back to J. Evans, ‘On a small hoard of Roman coins found at Amiens’, NC (1890), 267.
68 The absence of “issue marks” like those on the ‘antoniniani’ is not significant. Such marks were absent also from the gold, and often absent from smaller denominations of third century coinage.
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mint produced two varieties, one with the legend LAETITIA AVG and a galley sailing right, the other with the legend VIRTVS AVG and a different sort of galley sailing left. London has only one legend, VIRTVS AVG, accompanied by the same sort of galley as appears on the C mint VIRTVS AVG coins, which nearly always is also sailing left. There are, however, frequent minor variations at London. Some galleys sail right, some have no mast or rigging, or sometimes the mast is replaced with a figure of Victory or a reclining figure holding (apparently) a baton and a branch. London VIRTVS AVG coins can also be distinguished from their C mint counterparts by the presence of waves below the galley.

The coins, although they have a radiate bust, have a smaller diameter and a lighter weight than the antoniniani (3g as opposed to 4½g). This weight is the same as that used by Diocletian for his post-reform antoniniani, minted in Italy and further east after 294, but I hesitate to see a direct connection because of the different alloys of the two coins. Diocletian's post-reform radiates contained no silver, whereas the 'quinarii' of Allectus had 1–2 per cent silver, not very much indeed, but apparently as much as his 'antoniniani' ever contained. The weight relationship of ½ to 1 does, however, suggest that the 'quinarii', despite the radiate portrait, were intended to be (in some sense) half-antoniniani, since it was normal in the third century for half pieces to weigh two thirds of their whole. The fact that they were a smaller denomination led to a different pattern of hoarding from that of the antoniniani. Apart from the quinarii two main sorts of coin are found in hoards of the late third century, both of which we call 'antoniniani' today. Preferable, however, as labels of convenience, are the terms 'antoniniani', referring only to the mass of poor quality coinage produced by Gallienus, Claudius II, and the Gallic emperors, and 'aureliani', referring to the larger coins containing five per cent silver minted by Aurelian and his successors. Most of the coins of Carausius and Allectus were 'aureliani', and to some extent this explains their behaviour in contemporary hoards. These hoards (to oversimplify) tend to contain either 'aureliani' or 'antoniniani', but rarely both; the 'quinarii' behave in this context as 'antoniniani' rather than 'aureliani'. Thus hoards of the first type (e.g. Linchmere, 73 Colchester, Burton Latimer) contain 'aureliani', but few 'antoniniani' or 'quinarii'. Hoards of the second type (e.g. Blackmoor, 74 Ewelme) contain large quantities of 'antoniniani', few 'aureliani', and often a lot of 'quinarii'. Sometimes a hoard, like that from Old Ford, London, might contain only 'quinarii'.

This interpretation of hoards has several implications. First, it appears that the 'quinarii' were regarded as of equivalent value to 'antoniniani' (as opposed to 'aureliani'), in both cases half an 'aurelian'. Secondly, it means that one should not use hoard evidence for the chronology of the 'quinarii'. Their absence from hoards of Allectan coins does not show that they were minted at the end of the reign. A related point is that the absence of 'quinarii' from the Amiens hoard, which discriminates against 'antoniniani', does not demonstrate an Allectan withdrawal from Gaul in the middle of his reign. But it is arguable that this may result from the incompatibility of 'quinarii' with denominations in use on the continent.

If hoards cannot help with the chronology of the 'quinarii', then one can only fall back on stylistic considerations, but none of these appear to me to be conclusive. For example,
at London most 'quinarii' have cuirassed busts, and the latest 'antoniniani' (with S/A/MSL) have, almost always, cuirassed busts. A few 'quinarii' have draped busts, as do a few S/A/MSL 'antoniniani', but one cannot quantify the relative number of draped 'quinarii' precisely enough to estimate whether or not they may be contemporaneous with S/A/MSL. Again, all London 'quinarii' have Allectus's hair combed forwards over his forehead, whereas early 'antoniniani' split between this hairstyle and one with the hair combed sideways. All S/A/MSL 'antoniniani', however, have the hair sideways: does this imply that the 'quinarii' must be earlier, or that the different hairstyles were merely the work of different engravers, who may or may not have worked contemporaneously on 'quinarii' and S/A/MSL and 'antoniniani' respectively? Several such inconsequential considerations can be raised, based on the shape of the wreath ties at London or the form of obverse legend at the C mint, but I have found only one feature which definitely suggests to me that the 'quinarii' began to be minted no later than the S/A/MSL 'antoniniani' (presumably therefore in late 294). An apparently unique London 'quinarius' has a left facing bust of the emperor with spear and shield, a bust otherwise known only on S/A/MSL coins (Plate 1, No. 16). But it must be accepted that this is a fairly fragile argument, and it would be unwise for the moment to build any further speculation on such a basis.8

It is always unsatisfactory to conclude on a note of uncertainty. But I think that the recognition that there is a problem in the relative chronology of the 'quinarii' is itself a step forward, albeit a very small one.81

APPENDIX 1

Aurei of Allectus

(Plate 2, Nos. 1–24)

The following list of aurei differs in a number of respects from that given by Shiel.82 Rather than merely list the necessary corrigenda and addenda, I give for the sake of clarity, a full new list. The most important changes are the addition of new specimens and a different view of die identities. My list is chronological in the sense that 1–3 are clearly the earliest, and 24 the latest. I have no view as to whether 20–23, with D in field, are later than or contemporary with ML aurei. As with the billon there is tendency from draped to cuirassed busts, but this is gradual and does not therefore allow one to regard the draped aurei as a group which precedes a group with cuirassed busts.

The following bust abbreviations are used.
B1 : cuirassed.
D1 : draped (seen from front).
D2 : draped (seen from rear).

1. (Shiel -).
   ALLECT-VS P F AVG, D1
   PAX AVG, ML, Pax with transverse sceptre.
   4.56g, die axis: 5.

2. (Shiel -)
   ALLECT-VS P F AVG, D1
   PAX AVG, ML, Pax with transverse sceptre.
   Same reverse die as 1. 4.44g, die axis: 6.

81 HCC 35.
82 If correct it would be striking that the 'quinarii' began to be minted at the time of Diocletian's coinage reform.
83 I should like to thank Roger Bland for help with and criticism of this article.
3. (Shiel 16)
   **ALECTUS P F AVG**
   **SPES AVG. ML.** Spes advancing left.
   Bibliothèque Nationale, until the robbery of 1831. The coin is known from the engraving in *Monumenta Historica Britannica* (1848) pl. XV.5, which was based on a cast then in the possession of Mr Doubleday of the British Museum (p.clii). It has not proved possible to find such a cast in the British Museum today (see also no. 19).

4. (Shiel 1 = Shiel 2)
   **IMP C ALECTUS P F AVG, D1**
   **AVENTVS AVG. ML.** Emperor advancing left on horseback, with raised arm.
   6.85g (including mount).
   Found at Minden, Germany, and in the collection of the Count d’Erceville (see *PMRD* VI.80. 183b for earlier references).

5. (Shiel 3)
   **IMP ALECTUS P F AVG, D1**
   **COMES AVG. ML.** Minerva standing left holding up branch and resting arm on spear and shield.
   Same reverse die as 6.
   4.52g, die axis: 6.
   Glasgow (*HCC* 1)

6. (Shiel 4)
   **IMP C ALECTUS P F AVG, B1**
   **COMES AVG. ML.** as No. 5.
   Same reverse die as 5, obverse die as 17. 4.34g.
   ANS (Annual Report 1973, 15); originally found at Chitterden, Kent (*NC* 1868, 231), then Huth collection, Lockett (Glendining June 1959) lot 183, Norweb collection (*SCBI* 40). The find-spot of this coin and No. 7 have often been confused.

7. (Shiel 5)
   **IMP C ALECTUS P F AVG, D1**
   **COMES AVG. ML.** Victory standing right holding wreath and palm.
   4.40g., die axis: 6.
   Oxford; originally found at Cynwyl Elvet, Camarthen (*Archaeologia Cambrensis* VII (1876), 57. It passed to the Evans Collection in 1877 from Francis Green, and was acquired by Oxford in 1941 (*NC* 1944, 25 no. 248).

8. (Shiel 6)
   **IMP C ALECTUS P F AVG, D2**
   **ORIENS AVG. ML.** Sol holding globe, between two captives.
   4.45g, die axis: 6.
   British Museum; found at Silchester (G. C. Boon, *Silchester* (1974), p. 70), then Meade collection (1755) lot 110, duke of Devonshire (Christie’s March 1844) lot 1239, Carl and E. Wigan (*NC* 1865, 106).

9. (Shiel 7)
   **IMP C ALECTUS P F AVG, D2**
   **ORIENS AVG. ML.** Sol holding globe, captive to right.
   4.60g, (pierced).
   Vienna.

10. (Shiel 8)
    **IMP C ALECTUS P F AVG, B1**
    **PAX AVG. ML.** Pax with vertical sceptre.
    4.39g.
    Paris; formerly Pembroke (1848), lot 989.

11. (Shiel -)
    **IMP C ALECTUS P F AVG, B1**
    **PAX AVG. ML.** Pax with vertical sceptre.
    Found in the excavations at Bath.
12. (Shiel -)
   IMP C ALLE-CTVS P F AVG, D1
   PAX AVG, ML, Pax with vertical sceptre.
   4.63g, die axis: 12.
   Found in the excavations at Bath (1979).

13. (Shiel 9)
   IMP C ALLE-CTVS P F AVG, D1
   PAX AVG, ML, Pax with transverse sceptre.
   4.12g
   Turin, Museo Civico. Apparently found at Reading (so Brown sale, Stevenson's Dictionary 183). Higgs (Sotheby, April 1830) lot 39, Brummell (Sotheby, 1850) lot 796, Brown (Sotheby, July 1869) lot 271, Ponton d'Amecourt (Rollin & Fauerdent, 1887) lot 631, de Quelen (Rollin and Fauerdent, May 1888) lot 1957, Weber (Hirsch XXIV, 1909) lot 2501, Jameson 327, Mazzini tav. LXXXVIII. A.S. Fava, L. Sachero and V. Viale, II Medaglire delle raccolte numismatiche torinesi, 104, no. 43.

14. (Shiel 10).
   IMP C ALLE-CTVS P F AVG, B1
   PAX AVG, ML, Pax with transverse sceptre.
   4.56g, die axis: 6.

15. (Shiel 11).
   IMP C ALLE-CTVS P F AVG, B1
   PAX AVG, ML, Pax in biga to left.
   4.40g, die axis: 12.

16. (Shiel 12)
   IMP C ALLE-CTVS P F AVG, B1
   PROVID AVG, ML, Providentia with baton on globe, and cornucopia.
   4.61g.
   Paris. Found at Tingry (not Tingy), near Boulogne.

17. (Shiel 13)
   IMP C ALLE-CTVS P F AVG, B1
   SALVS AVG, ML, Salus feeding snake in arms.
   Same obverse die as 6. 4.30g, die axis: 6.
   British Museum (from George III collection). There exist silver forgeries of this coin (e.g. BM), which are the basis for the so-called denarii of Allectus (e.g. RIC 15).

18. (Shiel 14).
   IMP C ALLE-CTVS P F AVG, D2
   SALVS AVG, Salus feeding snake in arms.
   3.82g, die axis: 6.
   British Museum (1864, from Wigan collection: NC 1865, 106).

19. (Shiel 15)
   IMP C ALLE-CTVS P F AVG, B1
   SPES AVG, ML, Spes advancing left.
   Bibliothèque Nationale, until the robbery of 1831. Like no. 3, it is known from Monumenta Historica Britannica (1848) pl. XV.

20. (Shiel 17)
   IMP C ALLE-CTVS P F AVG, B1
   ORIENS AVG, D/ML, Sol holding globe.
   4.14g
   Berlin (69/1883).
21. (Shiel 18)
IMPC ALLE-CTVS P F AVG, B1
PAX AVG D//-ML, Pax with vertical sceptre
4.31g
Musee Puig, Perpignan (from the Puig collection).

22. (Shiel 19)
IMP C ALLE-CTVS P F AVG, D1
PAX AVG D//-ML, Pax with vertical sceptre.
4.07g

23. (Shiel 20)
IMP C ALLE-CTVS P F AVG, B1
VIRTVS AVG. D//--. emperor on horseback spearing prostrate enemy.
4.37g, die axis: 6.
Glasgow (HCC 2).

24. (Shiel 21)
IMP C ALLE-CTVS P F AVG, B1
VIRTVS AVG, MSL, Soldier with spear and shield.
4.17g, die axis: 6.
British Museum (1867, Due de Blacas collection). Trattle (Sotheby, 1832) lot 3105.

APPENDIX 2

Allectus's Billon

The following list of types is based on specimens which I have seen (either the coins themselves, or photographs or casts). I have consulted the collections of the British Museum (abbreviated to L), the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (O), the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge (C), Manchester Museum (M), the Staatliche Museen, Berlin (B) and the American Numismatic Society, New York. I have also used the catalogue of the Hunterian Museum, Glasgow (G), a manuscript catalogue of the Cabinet des Médailles, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (P) by H. Huvelin (supplemented by casts kindly sent by M. Amandry), the British Museum cast collection and photo file. The two most important hoards for additional material are the Burton Latimer hoard (BL), published elsewhere in this volume, the Blackmoor Hoard (R. Bland, The Blackmoor Hoard (1982)), and the Colchester hoard (NC 1930, 173); many of the coins from this hoard passed to Evans and are now in the Ashmolean, and a number were acquired by the British Museum. I have only cited the publication ('Colch') where I have not been able to trace the present whereabouts of a given piece. I have also been shown a number of pieces in private hands, and I would like to thank C. J. Bailey and P. Montgomery for their help. I am quite aware that some additions to my list are inevitable, but I am confident that these will not be very numerous.

The catalogue is arranged by mint and mint-mark. It can be seen from the three hoards already mentioned which were the most important issues and most abundant types.

For each entry I give a catalogue number, its *RIC* reference (note that some of the pieces in *RIC* probably do not exist; more important, however, is the fact that often as many as five or six different varieties lurk in a single *RIC* entry), its reverse legend, an abbreviated description (if necessary), abbreviations denoting obverse legend and bust type (according to the key below), and a collection where a specimen can be found.

**Abbreviations**

Bust varieties:
- B1: radiate, cuirassed, right (=F in *RIC*).
- D1: radiate, draped and cuirassed, right (seen from front) (=C in *RIC*).
- D2: radiate, draped, right (seen from behind) (=A in *RIC*).
- consular: radiate, wearing trabea, left, and holding eagle-tipped sceptre.
- trabea: radiate, wearing trabea, left.
- spear and shield: radiate, cuirassed, left, holding spear over shoulder and shield.
helmeted, spear and shield: radiate and helmeted, left, holding spear over shoulder and shield. half-length bust, helmeted, right, with spear over shoulder: also radiate.

B1 and D1 are normal at both mints. D2 is frequent at London, but only occurs on a single specimen of the C mint (No. 159). The armoured, helmeted, consular and trabeate busts occur only at London.

Legends:
The normal legend at both mints is IMP C ALLECTVS P F AVG, and this is the legend for all catalogue entries, except where indicated. Both mints occasionally have:

(PF) IMP C ALLECTVS P F I AVG

At the C mint alone a number of other variants occur:

(P) IMP C ALLECTVS P AVG
(PFEL) IMP C ALLECTVS PI FEL AVG
(PFIEL) IMP C ALLECTVS PI FIEL AVG
(PFIFEL) IMP C ALLECTVS PIV FEL AVG (to be confirmed)
(PFIFELIX) IMP C ALLECTVS PIVS FELIX AVG
(PFIN) IMP C ALLECTVS P F IN AVG
(PFINV) IMP C ALLECTUS P F INV AVG

Additionally, on C mint "quinarii" one also finds:

(-) IMP c ALLECTVS AVG

Some London coins have VIRTVS ALLECTI AVG, and this is so rare that it has been included in full in the catalogue.

RIC

1. – COMES AVG Minerva l. with branch, and spear and shield D1 L
2. – as No. 1 B1 O
3. 20 HILARITAS AVG standing l. with branch and cornucopia B1 L
4. – IOVI CONSERVATORI Jupiter with fulmen and sceptre B1 G
5. 22 LAETITIA AVG with wreath and anchor B1 P
6. – as No. 5 B1 L
7. 22 as No. 5 D1 O
8. 22 as No. 5 D2 L
9. 26 ORIENS AVG hand raised and globe B1 B
10. 26 as No. 9 D1 G
11. 33 PAX AVG transverse sceptre B1 L
12. 33 as No. 11 D1 L
13. 33 as No. 11 D2 L
14. – as No. 11 consular l. L
15. 28 PAX AVG vertical sceptre B1 O
16. 28 as No. 15 D1 L
17. 28 as No. 15 D2 L
18. 36 PROVID AVG globe and cornucopia D1 G
19. 35 PROVID AVG wand on globe and cornucopia B1 BL
19a. 35 as No. 19 D1 M
20. 41 SAECVLI FELICITAS emperor with transverse spear and globe D1 G
21. 42 SALVS AVG snake in arms D2 L
22. 43 SALVS AVG snake on altar ?D1 see note
23. 45 SPES AVG advancing l. D1 Colch
24. 45 as No. 23 B1 O
25. – SPES PVBLICA as No. 23 B1 G
26. 48 VICTORIA AVG standing l. with wreath and palm D1 O
27. 48 VICTORIA AVG running r. with wreath and palm D2 O
28. 49 VIRTVS AVG standing l. with spear and shield B1 L
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIC</th>
<th>S/A/ML</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. 16</td>
<td>AEGVITAS AVG scales and cornucopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. -</td>
<td>COMES AVG as no. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. 18</td>
<td>FELICITAS SEC long caduceus and cornucopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. 20</td>
<td>HILARITAS AVG branch and cornucopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. -</td>
<td>IOVI AVG seated l. with victory on globe and sceptre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. 21</td>
<td>IOVI CONSERVATORI standing l. with fulmen and sceptre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. -</td>
<td>IOVI CONSERVA standing l. with victory on globe and sceptre; to l., eagle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. 22</td>
<td>LAETITIA AVG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. 22</td>
<td>as No. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. 22</td>
<td>as No. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. -</td>
<td>as No. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. -</td>
<td>as No. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. 22</td>
<td>as No. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. 25</td>
<td>MONETA AVG scales and cornucopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. -</td>
<td>as No. 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43a. 26</td>
<td>ORIENS AVG globe and raised hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. 33</td>
<td>PAX AVG transverse sceptre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. 33</td>
<td>as No. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. 33</td>
<td>as No. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. 32</td>
<td>as No. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. 33</td>
<td>as No. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. -</td>
<td>as No. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. 33</td>
<td>as No. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. 28</td>
<td>PAX AVG vertical sceptre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. 28</td>
<td>as No. 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. 28</td>
<td>as No. 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. -</td>
<td>as No. 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. -</td>
<td>as No. 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. 31</td>
<td>as No. 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. 34</td>
<td>PIETAS AVG patera over altar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. 34</td>
<td>as No. 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. 36</td>
<td>PROVID AVG globe and cornucopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. 36</td>
<td>as No. 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. 35</td>
<td>PROVID AVG wand on globe and cornucopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. 35</td>
<td>as No. 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. 38</td>
<td>PROVID AVG globe and transverse sceptre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. 36</td>
<td>PROVIDENTIA AVG globe and cornucopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. 36</td>
<td>as No. 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. 36</td>
<td>as No. 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. 36</td>
<td>as No. 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. -</td>
<td>as No. 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. 35</td>
<td>PROVIDENTIA AVG wand on globe and cornucopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. 35</td>
<td>as No. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. 35</td>
<td>as No. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. 37</td>
<td>as No. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. 35</td>
<td>as No. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. 38</td>
<td>PROVIDENTIA AVG globe and transverse sceptre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. 40</td>
<td>ROMAE AETER Temple of Roma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. 42</td>
<td>SALVS AVG snake in arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76a. 42</td>
<td>as No. 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. 42</td>
<td>as No. 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. 43</td>
<td>SALVS AVG snake on altar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. -</td>
<td>as No. 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. 44</td>
<td>SALVS AVG seated l. with snake on altar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. -</td>
<td>SECVRITAS AVG leaning on column l.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE COINAGE OF ALLECTUS

RIC

82. 45 SPES AVG D1 L
83. 47 TEMPORI| FELICITAS caduceus and sceptre B1 G
84. - VICTORIA AVG standing l. D2 L
85. 50 VIRTUS AVG Emperor with globe and transverse spear B1 L
86. 49 VIRTUS AVG Virtus r. with spear and shield B1 L
87. 49 as No. 86 D1 L
88. 49 as No. 86 D2 G
89. 51 VIRTUS AVG Hercules with club and lionskin B1 O

90. - LAETITIA AVG B1 G
91. - VIRTUS AVG Temple of Virtus B1 L
92. 52 VIRTUS AVG Temple of Hercules D2 O

S/P/ML

93. 22 LAETITIA AVG B1 L
94. - as No. 93 (PFI) B1 O
95. 22 as No. 93 D1 O
96. 22 as No. 93 D2 BL
97. 25 MONETA AVG B1 C
98. 33 PAX AVG transverse sceptre B1 L
99. 28 PAX AVG vertical sceptre B1 L
100. 36 PROVIDENTIA AVG globe and cornucopia B1 L
101. 35 PROVIDENTIA AVG wand on globe and cornucopia B1 L
102. 38 PROVIDENTIA AVG globe and transverse sceptre B1 L
103. - SALVS AVG snake in arms B1 L
104. - SALVS AVG snake on altar D1 C
105. 47 TEMPORVM FELICITAS long caduceus and cornucopia B1 O
105a. - as 105, but short caduceus B1 B

S/P/OL

106. 59 VIRTUS AVG galley l. with god reclining B1 L
107. 58 " " galley l. with Victory B1 L
108. 55 " " galley l. (no mast) B1 L
109. 56 " " galley l. (no mast) spear and shield G
110. 55 " " galley r. (no mast) B1 L
111. 55 " " galley l. B1 L
112. 55 " " galley l. D1 L
113. 55 " " galley l. D2 L
114. 55 " " galley r. D2 L

S/P/IC

115. 61 ABUNDANTIA AVG emptying cornucopia over altar D1 L
116. - as No. 115 (PFI) D1 L
117. 62 ADOVENTVS AVG emperor on horseback, l. captive B1 L
118. 63 AEOVITAS AVG scales and cornucopia B1 L
119. - as No. 118 (PFI) B1 O
120. 65 DIANAe REDVCI Diana leading stag, r. B1 O
121. - FELICIT TEMPO short caduceus and sceptre (PFI) B1 L
122. 66 FELICITAS SAECVLI patera over altar and caduceus B1 G
123. 68 FIDES EXERCITVS four standards D1 L
124. 67 FIDES EXERCIT four standards (PFI) D1 O
125. – FIDES MILITVM as No. 125
126. – FIDES MILITVM as No. 125
127. 70 as No. 126 (P) B1 L
128. 71 HILARITAS AVG branch and cornucopia B1 O
129. – IOVI CONSER standing l. with fulmen and sceptre D1 C
130. 73 as No. 129 (PIFE) D1 O
131. – IOVI CONSER standing l. with fulmen and sceptre D1 BL
132. 81 LAETITIA AVGSTI (PFI?) B1 G
133. 79 LAETITIA AVG
134. – as No. 133 (PFI) B1 P
135. 79 as No. 133 (PFI) D1 L
136. – as No. 133 (PFI) D1 L
137. – as No. 133 (PFIN) D1 L
138. 77 LAETITIA AVG
139. 76 LAETITIA AVG
140. 75 as No. 139 (PFIN) D1 L
141. – MARS VICTOR advancing r., with spear and trophy over shoulder B1 L
142. – MARTI ?[ACIF] standing l., raising hand and holding spear D1 see note
143. 83 MONETA AVG B1 L
144. 84 ORIENS AVG captive(?) B1 L
145. – ORIENS AVG one captive D1 Colch
146. 91 PAX AVG transverse sceptre B1 L
147. 91 as No. 146 D1 L
148. 90 as No. 146 (PFIN) D1 L
149. – as No. 146 (PIFEL) D1 O
150. – as No. 146 (PIFSFEL) D1 L
151. 86 PAX AVG vertical sceptre B1 Colch
152. – as No. 151 (P) B1 L
153. 86 as No. 151 D1 L
154. 87 as No. 151 (P) D1 O
155. 85 as No. 151 (PFI) D1 O
156. – as No. 151 (PIFSFEL) D1 L
157. – as No. 151 (PIFSFEL) D1 L
158. 89 as No. 151 (PFIN) D1 Colch
159. – as No. 151 (P) D2 L
160. 94 PROVID AVG globe and cornucopia B1 L
161. – as No. 160 (P) D1 L
162. 97 PROVID AVG wand on globe and cornucopia D1 BL
163. 98 as No. 162 (P) D1 BL
164. 99 as No. 162 (PIFEL) D1 L
165. – PROVID AVG globe and transverse sceptre (PIFE) D1 L
166. 103 PROVID AVG globe and transverse sceptre D1 O
167. – PROVIDENTIA AVG wand on globe and cornucopia (PFI) D1 L
168. 108 PROVIDENTIA AVG globe and cornucopia B1 L
169. 107 as No. 168 B1 C
170. 109 as No. 168 (P) B1 C
171. 108 as No. 168 D1 B
172. – as No. 168 B1 L
173. 111 PROVIDENTIA AVG wand on globe and cornucopia B1 L
174. 110 as No. 173 (PFI) B1 Colch
175. 112 as No. 173 (P) B1 L
176. 111 as No. 173 D1 see note
177. – as No. 173 (PFI) D1 L
178. 105 PROVIDENTIA AVG globe and transverse sceptre B1 G
179. 106 as No. 178 (P) B1 L
180. – as No. 178 D1 L
181. ?113 ROMAE AETERN Temple of Roma B1 G
182. 114 SALVS AVG snake on altar D1 L
RIC

183. – as No. 183
184. – as No. 183
185. – SALVS AVG snake in arms
186. 115 SPES PVBL
187. 116 as No. 186
188. 115 SPES PVBLICA
189. – as No. 188
190. 116 as No. 188
191. 117 TEMPORVM FELICI long caduceus and sceptre
192. 118 as No. 191
193. 117 TEMPORVM FELICIT long caduceus and sceptre
194. 117 TEMPORVM FELICIT long caduceus and sceptre
195. – as No. 194
196. 139 VICTORIA AVG advancing r.
197. 120 VICTORI GER trophy between captives
198. – VIRTVS AVG Emperor r. with globe and transverse spear
199. 122 as No. 198
200. 121 VIRTVS AVG Virtus standing r. with spear and shield
201. 121 as No. 200

S/P//CL

202. 69 FIDES MILITVM Fides and 2 standards
203. 79 LAETITIA AVG
204. 108 PROVIDENTIA AVG globe and cornucopia
205. 111 PROVIDENTIA AVG wand on globe and cornucopia
206. 105 PROVIDENTIA AVG globe and transverse sceptre
207. 104 as No. 206
208. 117 TEMPORVM FELIC long caduceus and sceptre
209. 117 TEMPORVM FELICIT long caduceus and sceptre

-/-VOC

210. 124 LAETITIA AVG galley r.
211. – as No. 210
212. 125 as No. 210
213. 126 as No. 210
214. 124 as No. 210, but galley l.
215. 128 VIRTVS AVG galley l.
216. – as No. 215
217. 129 as No. 215
218. 128 as No. 215
219. 136 as No. 215, but small Victory on prow
220. – as No. 219

Notes to the Catalogue

22. BM photo-file.
23. Roman collection (Bourgey, 1913), lot 636.
25. F. Baldwin lot 334.
26. F. Baldwin lot 336 ex Colchester hoard (NC 1930, pl. XIII.8).
27. Formerly F. Baldwin lot 336.
29. Note in BM copy of RIC.
30. NC 1930, 171.
31. Montgomery collection (BM photo-file); also N Circ 1983, no. 1764.
32. Perhaps only a decorated cuirass.
33. BM cast collection.
34. ArS Classica XVII (Oct. 1934), lot 1843.
35. Hamburger 96 (Oct. 1932), lot 986.
Additional Material

A certain number of other varieties were listed by Webb in RIC; some of these are more plausible than others. I have divided them into two groups. First, I list the additional varieties, which may well exist, although I have not actually seen them. Secondly, I list the varieties which I think are non-existent, irregular or confusions.

(i) Plausible additions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIC</th>
<th>S/P//ML</th>
<th>S/A//ML</th>
<th>S/A//MSL</th>
<th>S/P//C</th>
<th>S/P//OC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>PAX AVG vertical sceptre</td>
<td>(PIVSFELIX) B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>PROVID DEOR with baton and sceptre</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>TEMPOR (VM) FELICI (TAS)</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>SPES PBLICA</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>VIRTVS AVG Trophy and captives</td>
<td>B1, D1, D2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>COMES AVG Minerva</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>HILARITAS AVG</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>ABVND AVG</td>
<td>(PFI) B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>COMES AVG Minerva</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>IOVI CONSER with fulmen and sceptre</td>
<td>(PFI) B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>LAETITIA AVG</td>
<td>(PFE) D2</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>MONETA AVG</td>
<td>(PFI) B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>PAX AVG vertical sceptre</td>
<td>(PIVSFELIX) D2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>as 88</td>
<td>(PFINV) D2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>PROVID AVG globe and cornucopia</td>
<td>(PFI) D2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; wand on globe and cornucopia</td>
<td>(PFI) B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; globe and transverse sceptre</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>VIRTVS EXERCIT four standards</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>LAETITIA AVG galley</td>
<td>(PFE) B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Implausible additions

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | FORTVNA AVG: mint-mark suggests irregular. | | | |
| 23 | same as 22 | | | |
| 24 | LEG II: barbarous | | | |
| 27 | probably irregular, as the obverse legend does not occur at London | | | |
| 30 | irregular: impossible mint-marks | | | |
| 54 | irregular: impossible mint-marks | | | |
| 74 | probably confusion with London, with ML in exergue | | | |
| 77 | LAETITIA AVG is unlikely as late as the second mint-mark | | | |
| 80 | irregular: all coins have the C after IMP | | | |
| 92 | irregular hybrid of Pax and Providentia | | | |
| 93 | PAX AVG: barbarous | | | |
| 101 | impossible mint-mark | | | |
| 132 | false (specimen in BM) | | | |
The following analyses are from L. H. Cope’s unpublished thesis ‘The Metallurgical Development of the Roman Imperial Coinage during the First Five Centuries AD’ (CNAA 1974), 186:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIC</th>
<th>Cu%</th>
<th>Sn%</th>
<th>Ag%</th>
<th>Pb%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. S/A|ML|   PAX AVG</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>91.81</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. S/P|JC|   LAETITIA AVG</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>94.01</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. -|Q|OL|   VIRTVS AVG</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. -|Q|OC|   VIRTVS AVG</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>91.72</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. -|Q|OC|   LAETITIA AVG</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>93.30</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. -|Q|OC|   LAETITIA AVG</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>94.23</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>