

**Zeitschrift:** Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau = Revue suisse de numismatique = Rivista svizzera di numismatica  
**Herausgeber:** Schweizerische Numismatische Gesellschaft  
**Band:** 72 (1993)

**Buchbesprechung:** Glaux 8-10 [Rudolfo Martini]

**Autor:** Walker, Alan S.

#### **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

#### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

#### **Terms of use**

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

**Download PDF:** 11.02.2026

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

*Rodolfo Martini & Novella Vismara*, Glaux 8. Monetazione provinciale romana II, Collezione Winsemann Falghera (da Octavianus Augustus ad Aurelianus). Volumes 1 (Augustus–Vitellius) – 6 (Indici-tabelle bibliografiche). Milan, 1992. 1589 pp., map, 51 illus., 314 pls. Hard covers, 24,5 x 17,5 cm. No ISBN number.

*Rodolfo Martini*, Glaux 9. Monetazione provinciale romana III, Bibliografia generale (fino al 1991) ed indici bibliografici. Volumes 1–2. Milan, 1992. 675 pp., Hard covers, 24,5 x 17,5 cm. No ISBN number.

*Rodolfo Martini*, Glaux 10. Monetazione provinciale romana IV, Prontuario delle zecche imperiali romane provinciali. Milan, 1992. 327 pp., 32 tables, 17 graphs, 21 maps. Hard covers, 24,5 x 17,5 cm. No ISBN number.  
sFr. 690.– for the set (Glaux 8–10 are available individually).

Glaux 8–10 consists of three separate but closely related works on Roman Provincial Coinage (often termed «Greek Imperials»). Glaux 8, in six volumes, catalogues the approximately 3000 coins of the Winsemann Falghera family collection (hereafter CWF) and provides the inspiration for: Glaux 9, in two volumes, a specialized bibliography devoted to Roman Provincial Coinage and Glaux 10, a gazetteer of all the provincial mints which struck for each emperor. The books certainly *look* impressive: they are all in matching glossy black bindings, they take up 26 cm of horizontal shelf space, and they weigh altogether over 10 kg.

Alas, the exterior is the best part of these books. Never previously have I had the misfortune to review a work so pretentious and so incompetent as Glaux 8–10. There is no evidence that anyone involved in this exercise gave the needs of students, professionals, libraries or collectors even the slightest thought, nor did anyone with any expertise in economical book design, or typesetting, or lay out, or the preparation of bibliographies, or cartography, or *numismatics*, come anywhere near this project. These books are an affront for those numismatists and institutions who, on often very limited budgets, try to keep up with all pertinent publications, only to receive at the very high price of sFr. 690.– (or \$ 585.–/£ 320.–) something like this.

Let us turn first to the CWF. Volume 1 begins with a preface by Professor Giovanni Gorini in Italian, English and German. While it was thoughtful to include these translations, the least that the publishers of this expensive work could have done is to have proof-read the English section. There are innumerable typographical mistakes (i.e., *imagines* for images, p. 16), and the English itself often mistranslates the Italian to such an extent that it becomes decidedly gnomic, viz., p. 13, «*This data may then be pondered with ease given the wealth of the events and to study them from all different points of view*». Throughout Glaux 8–10, the English continues in the same vein, and also contains some spectacular neologisms (see below, *passim*). Then M&V contribute their own introduction (again trilingual), primarily concerned with the history of the collection itself. In this they explain (clearly in Italian and German, pp. 29/33, and more opaquely in English, p. 31) that as many records of the collection were lost during World War II, it was decided not to include any provenances for any of the coins, *even if known*.

This is followed by *abbreviazioni bibliografiche* and *bibliografia essenziale*. The organization is somewhat curious: should one wish to find out what AMANDRY means one discovers in the first list that it is the abbreviation for a second abbreviation, AMANDRY, 1988. To find out what *that* means we have to turn to the following bibliography. After this comes a list of simple abbreviations, a description of the format used for each catalogue entry (*Rules for the filing*) and a section on the conventions used to describe the inscriptions on the coins (*Epigraphic rules*).

Next we have the somewhat complicated system by which coins within the CWF are given references to other published sources (*Bibliographical rules*). Basically, and not unexpectedly, M&V first utilize standard works such as the BMC or the various SNGs, sometimes replaced by specialized corpora or supplemented through use of more general catalogues. They then point out that if no exact parallel for the coin in question is known they will note similar pieces with the same reverse type, the same magistrate, the same imperial titles, or the same city name or civic ethnic (termed *ethnic citizen* [!], p. 51).

Finally we have *Rules for consultation*. These tell us that the catalogue is organized chronologically by emperor, with his coins arranged west to east in Roman provincial order; rather than in the hitherto standard arrangement by Greek regions with each city's issues given in chronological order. M&V's arrangement has its merits, since it allows us to see all the coins of each ruler in one place, but it also makes it very difficult to see the extent of the coinage of a single city. I would think that the arrangement proposed by the RPC (A. Burnett, M. Amandry and P.P. Ripollès, *Roman Provincial Coinage, Volume I From the death of Caesar to the death of Vitellius, 44 BC-AD 69*. London/Paris 1992), of all the coins of a specific group of emperors (viz., the Julio-Claudians, the Flavians, Nerva-Hadrian, etc.) being listed together in relevant geographic areas, is likely to be preferred in the future, though M&V's is certainly not wrong. In volume 1 this section is followed by a small map of all the provinces (spelled *provinces*, p. 57) of the empire, though only giving the names of those which had provincial mints, and a short discussion of each of these provinces. This gives the date of the province's establishment, a description of the geographic area it comprises, any changes in its status or borders, a very short list of its principal mints, and a note on any factors which M&V consider important or interesting.

At the ends of each of volumes 1–5 there are two indices: the first, *autorità emittenti*, is by emperor and provides a geographic list of all the cities issuing coins in his reign; and the second, *zecche*, lists all the mints by province, and the emperors for whom they struck. A very annoying drawback of the *autorità* index is the lack of any of the other members of the imperial family within it. For example, should one wish to quickly find all the appearances of Livia, Britannicus or Nero Caesar in volume 1, one has to go to the final index in volume 6, rather than flip to the end of volume 1 itself (of course, they are *there* in volume 1's index, but only as anonymous mentions under Augustus, Tiberius or Claudius).

The strange way the indices are handled leads to the overwhelming problem the CWF has with duplication and waste of space. All the indices in volumes 1–5 reappear, *in toto*, in those of volume 6, the index volume. Other than Gorini's and M&V's prefaces, and the introduction to the provinces, all the other prefatory information in volume 1 reappears, again *in toto*, in volumes 2–5 (in addition to the reprinting, in each succeeding

volume, of the tables of contents of all the preceding volumes). Since the volumes of CWF in no way stand alone, and are all part of a closed set, this duplication of information is senseless. It also amounts to approximately 180 pages, or nearly an entire volume of text. In fact, a reader who carefully looks through the CWF can easily envision it being a 3 volume work.

As another example, under each emperor city names are repeated for nearly every coin of the same city; for 25 coins of Alexandria struck under Hadrian (871–895) the name *Alexandria* appears 23 times (!) instead of once, the way we would expect it to do. This may seem minor, but over the 5 volumes we have 1297 duplicate city names, the equivalent of 27 pages of blank paper.

As a general observation, the format of the catalogue is that of a series of preliminary file cards reproduced as is, rather than being edited to make a proper text. One should therefore not be surprised to find that M&V can only manage to record from 3 to 5 coins per page, as compared to Lindgren's 11–15 (while Lindgren is physically larger than the CWF, the space available for text is virtually the same). In fact, the amount of empty white paper within the CWF can easily induce snow blindness.

When we turn to the actual catalogue entries the situation becomes even more bizarre. After the city name comes the description of the coin with full obverse and reverse inscriptions. Since, however, the inscriptions given are what *should appear*, but not what necessarily can be read on the piece in the CWF, the *actual* inscriptions on the coin then reappear on one or two lines below. Often this means that all the inscriptions previously printed in the descriptions are simply reprinted with a few strategically placed brackets to indicate what letters are illegible (as 2682). Or it is merely noted that on the coin in question no letters can be seen at all (cf. 142 *passim*, *tracce delle lettere*). M&V also have a remarkable way of recording the inscriptions: *cserviliofprimo-mantoniohipparchoiivir* (143/144), *c.var.ruf.sex.iwl.pol.ii.vir.q.* (76–78) and *αυτοκρατωρ-καισαρτραιανοσαδριανοσσεβαστος* (868–870) are typical examples. All are in modern lower case Latin or Greek without stops or breaks unless they appear clearly on the coin. The printing of legends without breaks is done in the BMC and in a number of other scholarly catalogues (Winterthur, for example) but there the legends are reproduced in facsimile, as they appear on the coins, and not transliterated. Thus, those works clearly record ligatures (which can only be shown via notes in the CWF) and the kinds of epigraphic variants (square or lunate epsilon and sigmas, open and closed omegas, etc.) which can have a chronological importance. However, since there is no mention of such epigraphic factors in the CWF, it is very likely that M&V are unaware of their significance.

One might note that references which do print the legends in modern cursives, as the SNG von Aulock, do so as follows, *A ΚΛ Αιλ Ανρ Κομ Ηρακλης Ρωμ* (468) with the breaks between words made plain as a service to the reader. One might be tempted to assume that M&V simply do not know how to divide up legends which are not provided with punctuation, but, in fact, they get them right in the legend index in volume 6.

What next appears in the catalogue entry are any references there may be to other published examples. These references are given via a complicated series of rules (the *Bibliographical rules*, as noted above). When the coin does not appear in one, or more, of the standard works this is also noted, as p. 216, 506, a coin of Nero from Miletus,

«Bibl.: BMC, ---; SNDan., ---; SNGAul., 2103var. (243)». The inclusion of what might be termed negative references is normal in auction catalogues or fixed price lists where the point is to show how scarce or valuable a coin may be, but it is simply not needed in scholarly publications because it is of little importance. After all, the BMC, all the SNGs, and collections like Lindgren, McClean, or Weber are not corpora, nor do they pretend to be, so the fact that a coin is, or is not, in one of those references has no relevance. But the references for each coin do not *just* appear in the catalogue, most reappear on 94 pages of tables (the *tabelle bibliografiche*) at the end of volume 6, pp. 1479–1572. Looking up the same 506, we learn that it is Mionnet 779 and Tübingen 3084; that it does not appear in BMC, Hunter, McClean, Weber or Copenhagen; that the Munich sylloge has yet to reach Ionia, and that Levante and Ziegler also do not contain coins from there; that it is somehow related to Lindgren 517 (which it isn't, since that piece is a completely different coin); that it is RPC 2713 (wrong again, it's 2712); and, finally, is supposedly a variant of SNG von Aulock 2103. Should you look up the von Aulock coin it is immediately apparent that the CWF piece is not a variant at all, but is exactly the same. The only difference, as M&V indicate in their note 243, is that the reverse inscription as recorded in von Aulock lacks the civic ethnic; understandably so since it is illegible on that coin (as it is on the CWF piece for that matter). Why on earth do we need all these references to where a coin is not? Why do the references for a single coin have to appear in two different places? And why do three out of five references given for a single coin have to be wrong?

I had always learnt that footnotes were designed to provide references for statements or quotes, or to provide a venue for extensive digressions. Unfortunately, the approximately 1700 footnotes which appear in the CWF seem to exist primarily as a kind of pseudo-scholarly decoration to the catalogue, and virtually all of them are of no importance. There are several types of footnotes in the CWF.

One gives us information about the city's administrative status within its province, or if there are any variant Latin names for the city. This is the kind of information which belongs in an annotated index under the city's name: in footnotes, scattered over 5 volumes, it is worse than useless. For example, coins of Berytus in Phoenicia appear in the CWF under 13 emperors: we have no footnote under Augustus; under Tiberius we learn it was a free city from AD 20; under Claudius, again that it was freed in AD 20 but also that it was administratively dependent on the Prefect of Syria; under Titus, we have a similar note, and an additional one informing us that the city was also known as *Berythus*, *Bititon* and *Berytos*; under Trajan, only that it was a free city, administratively dependent on the Prefect of Syria; under Hadrian, exactly the same, but divided into two notes; under both Marcus Aurelius and Commodus, the same as Hadrian but as single notes; under Septimius Severus, we learn that Berytus was now part of Syria Phoenicia and was that province's metropolis; under Macrinus, Elagabalus, Gordianus Pius and Gallienus there are no notes at all.

A second group of notes exists only to point out that various letters in the inscription are in ligatures.

By far the most common note, however, is one which remarks upon a supposed difference between the legend on the CWF coin and that given for a similar coin in one of the references. Thus we learn that the comparable piece in the BMC, AMNG, SNG, etc. has differing legend breaks or variant spellings. *So what?* Roman Provincial issues

were often struck from many obverse and reverse dies, each of which with its own slightly idiosyncratic legend arrangement. In a corpus we need to know all these variants, but not in a collection catalogue. I have the strong suspicion that M&V have put in these notes solely to impress the collection's owner with their thoroughness. And a tremendous number of these notes are actually *wrong*.

Here is a typical example: p. 1150, 2689 is a coin of Gallienus from Side. In note 1549 we learn that an  $\in$  countermark on the obverse has obliterated the *A* of the denomination mark *IA* which had previously appeared there. Since both the *I* and the *A* are still visible in the photograph of 2689 (pl. 281), that's incorrect. In note 1548 M&V tell us that while they describe the obverse legend as *αυτκαιπουλιγαλλιηνοσσεβ*, it appears in von Aulock (4844) as *Αυτκαι Που Λι Γαλλιηνος Σε*. Interestingly enough, when one checks, it turns out that both coins are struck from the same obverse die, and that, of course, the von Aulock reading, without the final *B*, is the right one.

Here's another typical example: on p. 1148 we have two coins of Gallienus from Perge, 2676 and 2677. They are restored as having the obverse legend *αυτκαιπολι γαλλιηνοσσεβ*, though M&V indicate that 2677 has the slightly differing legend *αυτκαιπολι γαλληνοσσεβ*. Notes 1543–1544 state that BMC 74 and von Aulock 4720 are variants because both describe the obverse as reading *αυτκαι πολιγαλλιηνοσσεβ*. In the first place, 2676 and 2677 are struck from the same obverse die, so the difference in legends between them is illusionary (2677 has been thoroughly tooled in modern times). In fact, von Aulock 4720 is also from the same obverse die, and clearly shows (as do the photographs in the CWF) that M&V's reading of the obverse legend of 2676 is the one that's wrong (there is no final  $\zeta$  in *γαλλιηνος*). Going further, since 2676–2677 have Elpis walking 1. on the reverse, it turns out that the *entire* von Aulock reference is wrong, since 4720 has Nike on its reverse (perhaps M&V meant 4728 which has the right reverse but comes from a different obverse die, though with the same legend?).

Some notes even enter the world of fantasy. On p. 1105, n. 1468 (to 2529, a coin of Valerian from Kasai), suggests that SNG Levante 309–310 has incorrectly recorded the obverse legend through typographical error. Perhaps the SNG Levante M&V are using is not the same as the one I have, because the legend they ascribe to it isn't there; and what is printed in the SNG Levante is absolutely correct. Notes 1476–1478 and 1489 (coins 2543, 2546, 2548 and 2567) seem also to refer to some *other* SNG Levante. On p. 163, n. 163 proudly states that coin 352, a coin of Tiberius from Corinth, is an unknown *type*, lacking in Amandry: it is merely a new die combination.

What never appears in M&V's notes is any indication of die linkage, either between coins within the CWF, or between CWF coins and those in other collections. Not only do M&V seemingly have no knowledge of K. Kraft's «Das System der kaiserzeitlichen Münzprägung in Kleinasiens» (Berlin 1972), they also seem not to realize that die links actually exist within the Roman Provincial series. How else could they have overlooked a fascinating obverse die link like that between Mostene and Acmoneia (2880 and 2933)? Or the fact that three coins of Septimius Severus from Marcianopolis, p. 581, 1242–1244, to which are ascribed two differing obverse and reverse legends, are all struck by the same pair of dies?(!) Or that since 1465 and 1466 share the same obverse die, they are unlikely to have differing legend breaks? Or that 647 shares the same obverse die with SNG Levante 1372 so that it can not be a variant? This list could go on for pages.

At the time M&V were writing the CWF the RPC was just about to come out, so they were unable to refer to it in volume 1. V was, however, able to utilize it for her *tabelle bibliografiche* at the end of volume 6, thus giving us RPC numbers for CWF 1–581. I decided to check two small groups of coins: 1. those which, according to V's list, are not in the RPC; and 2. all the coins of Caligula.

Here are the rather unsatisfactory results:

1. 1 is actually RPC 51; 2–4 are not considered provincial by the RPC; 24 is almost certainly not Spanish, it is surely new though not what M&V think it is; 101–120, the Lugdunum issues, are not considered provincial by the RPC; 140, a large coin of Nicopolis in Epirus bearing the head of Augustus, is not in the RPC because it was struck under Antoninus Pius; 186 is RPC 2612 (the last two letters of the magistrate's name are visible to 1.); 236 is not of Chalcis, it is a rare issue of the Tetrarch Philip, RPC 4938; 362 is RPC 2368; 376 is RPC 3391; 377 is actually unknown; 427, see below under Caligula; 511 truly does not appear in the RPC under Halicarnassus, but it *does* under Cos since it was minted there, RPC 2742; 518 seems a normal RPC 2546 (519 is not 2547 but is 2550); 529–530 are RPC 2381.
2. Caligula. 408–411, RPC references as given; 412–413, no RPC reference given, but both described as Campo XXI – 413 is correctly described and is RPC 480, but 412 is a coin of Claudius, Campo XXIII, RPC 482, and is so drastically tooled it may well be false; 414–415, RPC references as given; 416, RPC 477 rather than 476; 417–418, Amandry XVII (RPC 1172) as given; 419–421, two different types, 420–421 are RPC 996, but 419 is RPC 992; 422–425, correct as given; 426, RPC 3023; 427, probably RPC 3022; 428–433, correct as given; 434, RPC 4034 rather than the misprinted 4044; 435, correct; 436, RPC 5112 rather than the misprinted 5122.

The vast majority of errors in the CWF, and there are an immense number, are primarily incorrect or incomplete references (as 2625, a coin of Gallienus from Smyrna described loosely as Klose LXXV, 15–16; it is Klose LXXV, 25.4 [this specimen], and was bought by the owner at Münz Zentrum Sale 48 in 1983: provenances are often useful). Some coins are merely misplaced in the catalogue: as 605–608, 612–615 which were all struck when Titus was *Caesar* under Vespasian, yet are inexplicably catalogued under Titus as Augustus. Misread legends are common, especially given M&V's habit of not noticing any die links.

Unfortunately, some identifications are totally wrong. Here are a few:

- 236 As noted above, of the Tetrarch Philip, not of Chalcis.
- 488 Ascalon, but of Hadrian rather than Claudius (note the traces of beard and of drapery).
- 511 As noted above, actually from Cos, rather than Halicarnassus.
- 574 Actually of Galba, but of Olba (RPC 3741) rather than Ilium.

833 Titiopolis, Surely either Domitian or Trajan rather than Hadrian (there is no beard).

1020 Thessaly, Hadrian rather than Marcus Aurelius.

1031 Cyzicus, Caracalla, not Marcus Aurelius.

1045 Magnesia, Commodus, not Marcus Aurelius.

1104 Perinthus, M. Aurelius Caesar, not Lucius Verus.

1111 Byzantium, Commodus, not Lucius Verus.

1144 Cyrrhus, not Lucius Verus, since the portrait is beardless, but Commodus. It is possibly even the same obverse die as 1091, a Commodus from Cyrrhus.

The plates, which illustrate every coin in the CWF, are basically as good as can be given the material (they are occasionally misnumbered as pls. 60–61, coins 612–619 which should be 616–619, 612–615; and pls. 79–80, 799–805 which should be 802–805, 799–801). However, many coins in the CWF are in very poor condition, often nearly totally illegible (i.e., 4, 7, 9, 16–17, 27, 39, 59, 90–91, 95, 100, 109, 121–123, 138, 149, 180, 229, 240–241, 250, etc.) and in other collections they would surely have been noted, but not photographed. Such coins deserve to be illustrated only when they come from an excavated context, since they then have some archaeological importance. Without any provenance other than a dealer's «junk box» they have little or no relevance, and can not even be used for a die study: 357 may well be rare, but not only is it 95% illegible, what is visible is completely recut.

There are the following indices: Greek, Latin and Punic legends (the last taking the equivalent of two pages to display 8 entries); Egyptian style dates; imperial family members, magistrates and kings; countermarks; monograms (by emperor, so that the same Gaza sign reappears 6 times); our old friends *Autorità emittenti* (by emperor and divided into geographic area) and *Zecche* (by geographic area); types; and Homonoia issues. There is no simple, alphabetical index to the cities included in the CWF.

Glaux 9 contains an extensive bibliography devoted to Roman Provincial numismatics as well as a number of indices.

M begins with a short, bilingual preface which presents excuses for his own shortcomings, and acknowledges the help he has received from the scientific editors of the *Edizioni ennerre* and from a number of colleagues. This is followed by a tetralingual introduction in Italian, English, French and German (each of 6 pages) which is meant to explain how this book works. It might have been slightly more helpful if the English, French or German had been proof-read.

We begin with the *Bibliographical Rules* which first inform us that all publications will be included, but primarily those published since 1850 (the English text in fact says that books published *only* in the second half of the nineteenth century will be included); and then tell us that the arrangement is a «... *list per author of bibliographic items, organized and numbered progressively in alphabetical order*». This is actually incorrect. While the authors are listed alphabetically, for some unknown reason their works are listed by date of publication. This type of bibliography is normally used in conjunction with simplified references in order to avoid large numbers of abbreviations: as in MEC 1 where articles

and books are referred to as Grierson 1963a, 1963b, 1963c, 1963d, etc. I personally find a chronological order inappropriate for a major bibliography, especially since each work is given a consecutive number. M explains that he has produced a plan which will allow this book to be successively updated (more about this threat below). At present a number of works have not been included, but may well be in the future (as the LIMC, auction catalogues, non-numismatic works, etc.).

This is followed by the four main areas which have been chosen as the major elements for the analytical indices which follow the bibliography: «imperial authorities or members of the imperial family; the mints, divided per region; the typology of the issues; city, magistrates, etc.» (p. xv). Of course, by typology M means the representations which appear on the coins rather than their development or shapes. He then points out that only illustrated material is included in the indices (with some exceptions).

We now come to a section which seems to me to be totally incomprehensible in any language. This explains the six different symbols which can accompany each entry number in the bibliography. Here is what I think they mean:

- 1211. {\*} the work has been read and everything in it is included in the indices.
- 1211. [\*] whatever information there is in the indices is probably incomplete since M actually hasn't seen it and is relying on previous bibliographies for his information.
- 1211. <\*> some information is in the indices, but since M has not seen the work, nor is it in earlier bibliographies, it is uncertain how this information has been obtained.
- 1211. (\*) no one has looked at this work, only whatever information appears in its title appears in the indices.
- 1211. |\*| the work is in the bibliography but not in the indices.
- 1211. || no one knows if the work in question actually exists or is about Roman Provincial coins.

In other words, in only one case has the work in question been completely read and indexed; all the others indicate varying levels of inaccuracy (the German version leaves out numerous negatives and makes even less sense). This is one of the most complicated systems ever devised for saying nothing. Perhaps they should have added such symbols as: ((\*)) the book is bound in leather; {{\*}} a colleague says he read this work but we can not vouch for his accuracy; |o| eaten by our dog so no information available; etc.

Then we come to something called *Updating criteria* which explains (?) how this whole work will be updated and republished in the future, and provides examples of the types of new listings we might expect to see. The examples given make no sense whatsoever (in any language).

Our next section is entitled *Criteria for the compilation of bibliographic items* and very exhaustively explains how one records entries in a bibliography. One can only assume that M has never done one before, and thinks no one else has either.

The last section is entitled *Bibliographic items*. It indicates that some coins, which are not universally agreed to be Roman Provincial issues, have been included in the bibliography. They are: issues of Lugdunum and Nemausus, the Rhenish issues of Germanus Indutilli, «semi-autonomous» coins, the African issues of Sittius, and the coinage of the *reges clientes*. These last, Italian *re clienti*, French *rois clients* and German

*königlichen clientes*, are given the stupefying English translation, p. xix, of *customer kings*(!) evoking visions of maharajahs strolling through Harrod's.

For an unstated reason cistophori have not been included within this bibliography.

The remainder of *Glaux 9/1* is taken up by the bibliography, which consists of 3776 titles (with an addenda arriving at 3959 in the following volume) published up to 1991. This is, in fact, quite useful: its only real drawback is the way those works fully read (ie., those marked {\*}) after their number) have their contents listed. Each city appears, presumably in the order it occurs in the work cited, followed by the emperors or members of the imperial family it struck for (as well as by any pseudo-autonomous issues). This is done in very small print without any spacing and is extremely difficult to see (as 400, Bernhart's *Dionysios und seine Familie auf griechischen Münzen*, which is followed by nearly 2<sup>1/2</sup> pages of small print). Specialists will probably find works which are missing from this bibliography, as O. Picard's «Chalcis et la Confédération Eubéenne». BEFAR 234 (Paris 1979) or J. Svoronos and B. Pick's «Les monnaies d'Athènes» (Munich, 1923–1926), but that is inevitable in a project like this.

*Glaux 9/2* begins with the addenda and corrigenda to 9/1 and then proceeds to the author index. This seems to be complete and relatively free of errors (though S. Bendall appears both under his real name, 3802, and under a *nom de plume*, S. Beldall, 300). We see the usual space-wasting tendencies of the CWF here too: the three entries of the letter *U* and the five for *Y* each get a whole page.

The real problem begins with the mint index which is organized by Greek region. As M noted in his introduction, the only works which appear in the index are those which are more or less fully read. Thus all entries are basically incomplete. For example, there are 17 works listed for Athens and this would seem to indicate a fairly extensive bibliography. Yet it lacks Imhoof-Blumer & Gardner's «Numismatic Commentaries on Pausanius» (1583), Svoronos/Pick, Svoronos' publication of the Eleusis hoard (3323), all SNGs and others. This means that in every case we can have no idea how complete or incomplete each index entry may be. The same problem continues through a number of smaller indices: bibliographies, types, kings (of the *customer* variety), countermarks, fakes, analyses, magistrates, and finds. The final index is that by emperor; again by Greek region, and again we have no way of knowing how complete it actually is. What we basically have is a useful book, but with indices which only cover an unknowable fraction of the contents.

As noted, M expects to constantly be receiving updates and corrections from concerned colleagues in order to be able to issue supplements or a revised edition of *Glaux 9* at various times in the future. I would be interested in knowing whether the publishers will accept old copies in trade for the new editions. Had M waited another five years to publish, he might have been nearly finished and we could all be most grateful. Right now it is merely the record of a work in progress, and I would question whether it is actually worth paying for in that state.

As we have seen, both the CWF and *Glaux 9* have their values, though seriously flawed. *Glaux 10*, however, is not just seriously flawed, it's absolutely worthless.

M's aim in this book is to update A. Florange's «Tableaux synoptiques des ethniques des villes et peuples grecs» (Paris 1903: there is an English reprint, Chicago 1966, with

the title: «A Geographic Lexicon of Greek Coin Inscriptions») and to provide an accurate and informative listing of every Roman Provincial mint which struck for each emperor. The utility of such a volume would be incalculable: both numismatists and historians would find it a convenient and invaluable source. If, of course, one could trust any of the information it contains.

The book begins with a bilingual introduction which attempts to explain M's philosophy in producing this index. He wishes to include every possible coin, especially those he has discovered in early numismatic works, since, p. xii, «... the author hastens to underline what may become a serious methodological error: various numismatic works ... do not take into account, or at least do so only to a very limited extent, previous bibliographies, differently from a «recent» which is chronologically closer to present times and is in general welcomed with less doubts». He goes on to emphasize, «... in this Index, the author has deemed it necessary to recall also the outdated elements of anterior bibliographies ...», though this has its problems: «obviously this index includes some series which arise many doubts concerning their existence and some which are certainly inexistant ... some will be naturally discarded with work carried out on the different classifications, while others will remain as non-verified indications (and perhaps remain unverifiable).» M's complaint that many scholars either do not use, or are unaware of, elements of the *anterior bibliography* is justified; one rarely ever sees references to Mionnet or Eckhel, much less to *anterior* writers like Rouille, de Strada or Patin.

However, there is one serious problem when some of these *anterior* references are used. Despite the immense erudition of many of the *anterior* scholars involved, they easily could make errors of identification. A coin bearing a pair of Julio-Claudian portraits with fragmentary legends could be assigned to Caius and Lucius, Caligula and Germanicus, Augustus and Tiberius, or Tiberius and Drusus, all with equal plausibility. It is only with the help of large collections of casts or card files of photographs that scholars have been able systematically to weed out all those false attributions. The uncritical use of early works merely perpetuates early mistakes, and this is exactly what M has done.

The scholars who wrote RPC 1 gained a remarkable understanding of the coinage of the Julio-Claudian period by use of the immense amount of material made available to them. They were able to perceive regional trends and fashions of portraiture and design which then allowed them to confidently identify hitherto uncertain issues. And they were also able to see how the issues of the imperial mint in Rome influenced those of the provinces. In fact, this overview even allowed them to correct attributions within the corpus of a single mint: the portraits of an emperor and empress on an issue of Aphrodisias are so unlike ones expected for Nero and Agrippina II that the coins have been assigned to Domitian and Domitia (p. 466; *pace* D. MacDonald, The Coinage of Aphrodisias (London 1992), type 47 where the type hesitantly retains the earlier attribution: yet the male portrait is clearly Flavian). This huge collection also made earlier wrong identifications very obvious, such as the innumerable confusions between Agrippinas I and II.

Turning to Glaux 10, I was highly disconcerted to discover the constant repetition of «[RPC, ---]» after numerous entries in the lists of issues for Augustus to Vitellius. Was it conceivable that the RPC could have missed so many coins? In Glaux 10 there are 353 coins listed for Claudius, struck in 156 mints (the list includes 157 but Nicaea has two numbers, 40 and 41). These figures change radically when all those listed are checked carefully (the following page references are to the RPC).

*Amphipolis*: no coin of Agrippina II exists and the Antonia appears on p. 305 as doubtful.

*Thessalonica*: coins of Claudius and Nero, Claudius and Agrippina I, and Nero and Britannicus do not exist; Agrippina II is RPC 1604.

*Koinon of Thessaly*: no coins exist.

*Magnetes*: Claudius is RPC 1421.

*Corcyra*: the coin of Messalina is a forgery, p. 274.

*Nicopolis*: no coins exist.

*Abdera*: the coin of Claudius and Nero is really of Nero and Divus Augustus.

*Deultum*: no coinage exists under the Julio-Claudians.

*Perinthus*: the coin of Agrippina I is actually of Agrippina II and was struck under Nero, p. 318.

*Bosporus*: a coin of Claudius and Germanicus seems extremely unlikely.

*Chalcis, Euboea*: no coin exists.

*Corinth*: the coins of Agrippina II, and of Agrippina II with Nero and Britannicus are the same.

*Cythnos*: no coin exists, the one described is from somewhere else.

*Gortyna*: no coins of Claudius and Nero, Messalina and Britannicus, Agrippina I, or of Britannicus seem to exist.

*Cnossus*: the coins of Claudius and of Claudius and Nero were probably not issued in Cnossus.

*Byzantium*: the only Claudian issues are countermarks, p. 321.

*Neocaesarea*: no coins exist.

*Sinope*: the coin of Claudius and Agrippina I is actually of Claudius and Agrippina II.

*Koinon of Bithynia*: this coinage is attributed to Nicomedia, p. 340, and the Claudius and Agrippina II does not exist.

*Apamea*: no coinage exists under Claudius, the coin of Agrippina I was struck under Caligula.

*Bithynium*: no coins exist.

*Caesarea Germanica*: no coin exists.

*Nicaea*: neither the coins of Claudius and Agrippina II nor those of Messalina and Britannicus exist, that of Agrippina II alone is from Nicomedia.

*Nicomedia*: the coins of Claudius and Messalina, and of Messalina and Britannicus do not exist, p. 354; that of Germanicus was struck under Tiberius, 2064.

*Lampsacus*: no coin exists, p. 387.

*Pergamum*: the coin of Claudius and Agrippina II is from an uncertain Bithynian mint, 2101.

*Pitane*: no coinage under Claudius, this piece struck under Nero, 2395.

*Aegae*: no issue of Claudius and Agrippina II exists.

*Elaea*: the coin of Agrippina II was struck under Nero, p. 407, 3.

*Assos*: the coin of Britannicus and Nero does not exist.

*Ilium*: no coins exist of Claudius alone, Germanicus and Britannicus (!), or of Britannicus; the Britannicus and Nero is a fake, p. 391, 1.

*Chios*: «pseudo-autonomous» and Neronic at best.

*Clazomenae*: the coins of Agrippina I and II are the same.

*Ephesus*: no coins of Claudius alone, or Claudius, Messalina and Britannicus (p. 434,

6), or Messalina, or Britannicus, or Britannicus and Nero.

*Erythrae*: no coins exist.

*Methymna*: not Agrippina I and Germanicus but Caligula and Agrippina I, 2340.

*Miletus*: the coins of Claudius and Messalina, and Agrippina II alone are the same, and the Nero does not exist.

*Mytilene*: no coins exist, the Claudius alone is from Hierapolis, p. 396, 12; and the other two are both of Caligula.

*Phocaea*: Agrippina II was struck under Nero.

*Priene*: no coinage under Claudius, p. 447.

*Samos*: as noted by M, yet retained in his list, the Claudius and Agrippina II is actually Nero and Agrippina II.

*Smyrna*: the coin of Claudius is 2475; the coin of Agrippina I does not exist; the coin of Britannicus is clearly reattributed, p. 418 and 2476, to Nero Caesar; the coin of Germanicus does not exist and the coin of Nero and Agrippina II is of Claudius and Agrippina II.

*Teos*: not Agrippina I, but II and under Nero, 2517.

*Alabanda*: the Nero, and Britannicus and Nero do not exist, p. 463, and the Agrippina II, 2823, was struck under Nero.

*Aphrodisias*: no coin exists.

*Cos*: no coins exist, the Agrippina II is I and struck under Caligula.

*Euromus*: non-existent.

*Halicarnassus*: no coins, Agrippina II struck under Nero.

*Heraclea Salbace*: either non-existent or struck under Nero.

*Rhodes*: there is no coinage which can be dated any more securely than c. 31 BC–60 AD; the coin of Claudius and Agrippina II is a fantasy.

*Aninetus*: does not exist, actually from Cyme, p. 445.

*Blaundus*: clearly struck under Nero.

*Hierocaesarea*: either non-existent or struck under Nero.

*Hypaepa*: no coinage under Claudius.

*Magnesia ad Sipylum*: non-existent.

*Mostene*: no coin of Claudius alone exists.

*Philadelphia*: Agrippina II under Nero.

*Sardis*: Agrippina II struck under Nero.

*Thyatira*: no coins of Claudius alone, or Claudius, Agrippina I and Britannicus, or Britannicus, or Messalina exist; the coin of Claudius and Agrippina I is, of course, of Agrippina II.

*Tralles*: only known with Claudius, Messalina and Britannicus; all the other five types cited by M do not exist.

*Acmonea*: no coins, the Claudius and Agrippina II is from Thyatira, p. 512, and the Agrippina II was struck under Nero.

*Aezani*: both the Agrippina I and the Agrippina I with Germanicus were struck by Caligula.

*Ancyra*: no coins under Claudius.

*Apamea*: probably no coins under Claudius, the possible one is the Britannicus which may well be false, p. 506.

*Colossae*: no evidence of this coin's existence.

*Docimeum*: Agrippina II, under Nero.

*Eumenea*: no coinage under Claudius.

*Hierapolis*: the Claudius and Agrippina I is actually Agrippina II and was struck under Nero.

*Iulia*: no coins under Claudius, or non-existent (Claudius and Messalina).

*Laodicea ad Lycum and Smyrna*: actually 2912.

*Peltae*: does not exist.

*Prymnessus*: apparently all non-existent or struck under Tiberius.

*Sebaste*: struck under Nero.

*Ancyra*: no evidence for this coin.

*Ariassus*: struck by Augustus.

*Iconium*: the coin of Agrippina II alone does not exist.

*Aegeae*: the Messalina alone does not seem to exist.

*Tarsus*: actually Rhosus, p. 590.

*Caesarea*: at least four of the types cited do not exist.

*Chalcis*: the coin of Claudius, Agrippina II and Herod is actually of Claudius, king Agrippa (!) and Herod.

*Antioch*: the coin of Claudius and Agrippina II is probably Nero and Agrippina II.

*Ptolemais*: Claudius and Divus Augustus seems not to exist.

*Tripolis*: no coins, actually of Caligula, p. 646.

*Armenia in genere*: presumably of Nero.

*Philadelphia in Decapolis*: no coinage under the Julio-Claudians.

*Judea in genere*: these are almost impossible to sort out, most are 4970–4971, struck by Antonius Felix in the names of Claudius and Agrippina II (not I) and of Nero and Britannicus; everything else is either misdescribed or non-existent.

*Ascalon*: coins of Claudius and Messalina and of Messalina alone do not exist; the first is surely a typical misdescription of the standard issue bearing Claudius on the obverse and a standing Tyche-Astarte on the reverse.

*Gaza*: no coins from Augustus to Vespasian.

*Alexandria*: no coins of Agrippina I, or Antonia, or Germanicus, or Messalina alone exist; nor does Agrippina II with Nero; there is a coin of Claudius with Messalina, Octavia and Britannicus and not with Antonia as described.

Quite frankly, this is unbelievable. In M's listing for Claudius 147 out of 353 coins apparently do not exist, and 43 out of 156 mints cited as having struck for him did not do so. Thus 41% of the coins and 27% of the mints are incorrectly attributed. In fact, the whole section from Augustus to the combined listings of the rulers in 68/69 is equally disastrous. In this last group, containing 33 coins from 25 mints, we find that more than 50% of the coins (17) and nearly 50% of the mints (12) do not exist. This includes the absurd attribution of an issue to Clodius Macer from Priene. As usual, M indicates that this coin is not in the RPC but, as usual, it actually appears as 2687 and in a note on pp. 446–447 which points out that long ago Dressel and Regling had disposed of the attribution to Macer, and the name is that of an Augustan magistrate.

Obviously, having the RPC makes it very easy to see how totally wrong M is for the Julio-Claudian period. Can we dare to hope that the remainder is any better?

Unfortunately we can not. Turning to the coins of some of the rarer rulers, which are relatively easy to check, we find a supposed Titiana from Thessalonica; a Pertinax from Corcyra (ex SNG Evelpides, clearly a tooled Septimius Severus); a non-existent Clodius Albinus from the Koinon of Thessaly (we also find an imaginary Balbinus from there too, as well as one from Nicopolis); another Titiana, this time from Mytilene; and a Didia Clara from Cyprus that, in the BMC, Hill long ago showed was a misread Julia Domna. There are also a number of non-existent coins of the trans-Jordanian mints which ceased striking under Elagabalus, as those listed of Gordian III from Adraa and Rabbath Moba in Arabia. And what about the typical confusions one expects to find between Caracalla and Elagabalus (as described by A. Johnston, *Caracalla or Elagabalus? A Case of Unnecessarily Mistaken Identity*. ANSMN 27, 1982); or between Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus? And does M really think there are coins in the names of Macrianus and Macrianus Minor?

The long lists for each emperor are followed by a number of additional «scholarly aids». First come the *Tabelle cronologiche*: these are tables by region which set out all the cities and all the emperors for whom they minted. The far west has not been included since there is nothing struck there after Claudius, and Crete and the Aegean islands have seemingly been forgotten. The occasional mint is noted which struck no coins in the imperial period, as Eretria, Cisthene or Eleusis; some mints appear under two names, like Elis «and» Olympia; and some mints which are noted as definite in the main lists, here appear as uncertain, as with various issues of Philadelphia in Arabia. The basic problem is that these ostensibly useful tables are based on M's clearly unreliable data and are, thus, equally untrustworthy. This is followed by a selection of bar graphs which are of equally dubious accuracy (like ascribing a mint to Domitian in Mesopotamia [!] on the basis of a possible coin from Anthemusias which, in 1922 Hill, BMC Arabia etc., p. lxxxvii, n. 3, pointed out was from Anemurium).

Finally we come to the 23 maps, normally a useful adjunct to any gazetteer of cities. All are on a full-page, each for a different province (surprisingly, no general map of the empire is included, even though they could have reprinted the one used in the CWF). But, of course, they *do* want the reader to know where, exactly, the relevant province is, so they helpfully include some of its surroundings (rather than just the province itself the way most people would have done). Turning to Achaia (map 11), we find it easy to realize that *this Achaia* is the one in the NE Mediterranean since we are shown all of the southern Balkans, Crete and much of western Asia Minor. But out of over 55 mints we only see 4: Athens, Corinth, Sparta and Patras! In Thrace (map 10) with 27 mints, we get to see 2; for Epirus and Acarnania (map 8), which only had 7 mints and is on the usual full page, M's brilliant cartographer could only fit in 3; of the 174 mints in Asia (map 14) we have 18; of the 47 mints of Cilicia (map 18), 17; and of the 50 mints of Syria and Phoenicia (map 20), 12. Impressively they have managed to find 2 out of the 3 mints of Cappadocia (map 19).

By the way, and I am not making this up, there is no simple alphabetical list of all the mints of the empire in this *gazetteer* volume.

To me it is unthinkable that two academics, curators in the museums of Pavia and Milan, could have written a work of such remarkable ineptitude, nor can I understand how Edizioni ennerre could have published *Glaux* 8–10 in such a manner. Is it that they just don't care? All the faults present in this set of books are to be found in other

Glaux volumes, and, especially, in the new SNG Milan. This last has already had its layout criticized in reviews (NC 1991, p. 237) and has the lowest number of coins per plate of any Sylloge ever printed (averaging from 9–12, but often with just 3, 2 or even 1). The same publishers and authors are involved. Perhaps it is really unfair to compare them with the RPC, or the new SNG BM, or Lindgren, or Ziegler, or the SNG Levante since those works were written and produced by professionals, but what other choice do we have? Works written by cranks, «vanity press» editions and «coffee table» books can be ignored if need be, but what are scholars from other disciplines going to think of numismatics when they see Glaux 8–10? It's very sad, but this simply won't do.

Alan S. Walker  
c/o Leu Numismatik  
Zürich

