

**Zeitschrift:** Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau = Revue suisse de numismatique = Rivista svizzera di numismatica  
**Herausgeber:** Schweizerische Numismatische Gesellschaft  
**Band:** 90 (2011)

**Buchbesprechung:** Kommentare zu numismatischer Literatur

### **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:** 07.08.2025

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

---

F. Catalli et al. (edd.)

*Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. Italia. Firenze, Museo Archeologico Nazionale.  
Volume II. Etruria*

Rome, Istituto Centrale per il Catalogo e la Documentazione;  
Florence, Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici della Toscana;  
Zurich, Numismatica Ars Classica, n.d. [2010], pp. 3–8, 9–222, 66 pls.  
ISBN 978-88-8341-340-7

Uniquely among SNG volumes, Firenze II includes a long Introduction, of which pp. 23–57 describe in chronological order of discovery and/or acquisition the ‘Nuclei di monete etrusche nel Monetiere’ (by M. De Benetti and F. Guidi); as such, the volume makes available what is probably the single most important body of new material for the study of the Etruscan coinage since Sambon. Although some of the archival material has already been published, the contribution of De Benetti and Guidi is enormous. It is a pleasure to see the material available and a different regime in force in Florence from that of the beginning of my career, during which numerous attempts to see the Republican and Etruscan coins in the Medagliere were frustrated by a *consegnatario* who had been captured by the British in North Africa (by contrast, the contemporary *consegnatario* in Naples had nothing but happy memories of his time as a prisoner-of-war of the British in East Africa, where he had acted as chauffeur to a high-ranking officer, and produced punch whenever I visited, perhaps not always conducive to clarity of eye).

The highlights of the collection are perhaps cat. 70 and 71, which seem to have entirely escaped notice hitherto and which probably form a ten-unit issue to go with HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 123; cat. 75 is simply a variant of HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 123, compare 163 and 183. Cat. 15, from Ponte Gini, is a five-unit piece to go with HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 97, with the weight-standard halved, that appeared too late for inclusion in HN<sup>3</sup> Italy (it could be numbered HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 97 bis; for the chronological implications of these and other finds, see below). A fraction bearing Bucranium / Blank, weighing 0.29 g, also from Ponte Gini (Studi Etruschi 62 (1998) p. 209, no. 4 (whence p. 57)), could belong with HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 97 or 97 bis.

The volume could, however, have been more user-friendly: the Introduction contains not only discussions of provenances, but also discussions of authenticity; it is true that if a user of the catalogue follows up the source of a coin, s/he will find these discussions, but they should have been explicitly cross-referenced. Thus p. 52 offers a long and important account of the arguments in 1907 over the authenticity of cat. 94; this has in general been accepted as authentic (= HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 138), despite its rather malodorous provenance and the implausible story of a supposed finding later attached to it. But p. 52 also has discussions of cat. 102 and cat. 103, which have forgery written all over them, and which should not have been included in the catalogue without explicit warning; and of cat. 1173, which should certainly have a question-mark attached to it. And it is simply irresponsible to present cat.

893, the gold forgery with *vatl*, without a cross-reference to p. 49, nn. 248–250 (the catalogue entry includes bibliography not cited on p. 49, and one has the strong impression of the right hand not knowing what the left hand is doing).

En passant, it is not clear why cat. 104 has been included, which has neither obverse nor reverse type. It is unfortunate that a small gold piece with ·|· seems to have disappeared (p. 50, n. 261). And p. 49, n. 246, on an alleged ‘quinario in argento con testa di leone a destra’, should have referred to HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 192, note.

Cat. 1172, with p. 51, n. 267, is from the Strozzi collection (Haeberlin, p. 279 = pl. 97, 15, a much better picture), bearing Mark of value of uncia / Mark of value of uncia, and 5 or so uprights near the edge of the coin on one side, allegedly from Telamon; it merits discussion along with the Bonci Casuccini piece, no. 59 (the catalogue of M. Bergamini, *La collezione numismatica di Emilio Bonci Casuccini* (Rome 2001) is not in the Bibliography), bearing Caduceus / Mark of value of uncia, surrounded by what can only be described as four blobs, that do not in any way resemble letters: there is no reason to suppose that either specimen bears the legend *tlam*. Haeberlin rejected all attempts at reading a legend on the Strozzi specimen, compare R. Bianchi Bandinelli, *Memorie della Classe di Scienze morali e storiche dell'Accademia dei Lincei* 30, col. 539, rejecting any legend on the Bonci Casuccini specimen, M. Cristofani, *AIIN* 22 Supp., p. 356, rejecting any legend on the Strozzi specimen. The two pieces are not flat, like most Etruscan *aes graue*, and may not be Etruscan at all: note HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 385, one from Chiusi (Haeberlin, not noted in HN<sup>3</sup> Italy) and one from Pietrabbondante; and BMC Italy, p. 61, nos. 50–51 = HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 396, Caduceus / Blank.

Cat. 511–514 = HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 170, 515 = 173, 516–542 = 175–180, 543–549 = 181–182; cat. 892 = HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 205; cat. 1170 = HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 172 (see also below on cat. 18; cat. 548; cat. 1163–1164).

Unfortunately also, not all the provenances mentioned in the Introduction are taken up in the catalogue (to which also there is idiosyncratically no index of legends; and the authors have not understood the principles according to which minute variants are conflated under a single number in HN<sup>3</sup> Italy) and there are provenances mentioned in the Introduction of material not acquired by the museum or not identified in the museum, to which there is no cross-reference in the catalogue under the specimens which were acquired by the museum: thus p. 42, n. 182, records a Gorgoneion didrachm from Vetulonia, inv. 75985 (not mentioned in the Concordance), perhaps lost in the flood.

What I propose to do therefore is to list and sometimes analyse, in the order of HN<sup>3</sup> Italy, broadly followed by Firenze II (Firenze I is presumably intended one day to cover the Greek coins coming before Etruria in the traditional Eckhel order), the new evidence for provenance and occasionally chronology, with a number of exceptions. (1) There is a full account on pp. 35, 37–39, 50, of the vicissitudes of the Volterra 1868 hoard, with reference to HN<sup>3</sup> Italy, pp. 23, 29, over the doubts as



to whether any of the coins in the hoard are Etruscan. (2) Pp. 39–42 deal with the acquisitions from Isidoro Falchi of Vetulonia (see also p. 45, n. 205). (3) Pp. 42–43 deal with the acquisition of the original Mazzolini collection, ‘(monete) rinvenute quasi tutte sporadicamente, tra Cecina e la Cornia, nel territorio dell’antica Populonia; pochi pezzi provengono da Vetulonia e due dalla collezione Maffei di Volterra’; the collection contained part of the Pianali di Castagneto hoard (HN<sup>3</sup> Italy, p. 25). (4) For the excavations of Telamon, see pp. 44–45. (5) On p. 49 there is a mention of 8 coins securely attributed to Populonia, found there. (6) One drachm from the Sovana 1885 hoard (HN<sup>3</sup> Italy, p. 25) is identified on p. 51, cat. 468. (7) On p. 54, M. De Benetti rather gives up on trying to identify the pieces from the 1923–1926 Antonio Minto excavations at Populonia (see below). (8) On pp. 54–55 there is an account of the Populonia 1939 hoard. (9) The sextans of Volaterrae from the Badia 60/D tomb is identified as cat. 905 (p. 56). (10) The discussion of the Stagnaccio hoard on p. 57, nn. 325–326, which includes an uncia of Vetulonia, correctly states that it goes down to the Roman post-semilibril period and then oddly says that the bronze of Vetulonia may be associated with the Roman sextantal period.

On p. 47 there is a mention of the discovery of a bronze of Cosa (cat. 4), not an Etruscan issue at all, at Chiusi; it is not clear why the bronze of Cosa from the Populonia 1939 hoard (p. 55, n. 315, inv. 34442) is not included in the catalogue. The reader is also kept on her or his toes by the fact that pp. 61–65, ‘Per una storia degli studi sulle monete etrusche’, also contains information on provenances: p. 63, n. 14, complements p. 54, n. 295, again the right hand not knowing what the left hand is doing. Much more evidence is needed before it is possible to tell whether the find of a sextans on Elba (p. 63, n. 15) provides any useful chronological information. And p. 63, n. 16, on the Casa di Ricci, Rivotorto, find is much less incisive than HN<sup>3</sup> Italy, p. 24.

HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 56, f, Wheel / Wheel uncia, cat. 964, from Chiusi (p. 47)

HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 57, a, Wheel / Crater as, cat. 974, given by the Signori Mancini, of Città di Castello (p. 36)

HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 57, b, Wheel / Crater semis, cat. 975, found between Cetona and Sarteano, south-west of Chiusi (p. 46, n. 215)

HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 57, c, Wheel / Crater quadrans, cat. 976, found ‘dentro la città di Chiusi’ (p. 47, nn. 229–230)

HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 57, d, Wheel / Crater sextans, cat. 977, found ‘fuori porta della città di Chiusi’ (p. 47)

HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 57, e, Wheel / Crater uncia, cat. 983, from Chiusi (p. 47, nn. 231–232)

HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 58, b, Wheel / Bipennis semis, cat. 993, ‘trovato ad Alleronia’ just north of Orvieto (p. 36)

HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 52, c, Wheel / Amphora quadrans, cat. 1075, found in the territory of Chiusi (p. 47); cat. 1076, ‘found dentro la città di Chiusi’ (p. 47, nn. 229–230); cat. 1078, found at Arezzo (p. 56)

HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 64, d, Archaic wheel / Three crescents, cat. 1094, from ‘si crede, verso Città di Castello’ (p. 34)

HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 65, a, Wheel / Anchor quincussis, cat. 1038, from Monte Falterona (pp. 31–32)

- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 65, c, Wheel / Anchor as, cat. 1040, found in Arezzo (p. 35); cat. 1043, found near Valiano, between Cortona and Chiusi (p. 35)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 65, d, Wheel / Anchor semis, cat. 1044, found in Arezzo (p. 35)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 67, Wheel with pellet / Anchor uncia, cat. 1055, 1064, from Chiusi (p. 47); cat. 1060, found 'dentro la città di Chiusi' (p. 47, nn. 229–30); cat. 1061, 1065, from Chiusi (p. 47, nn. 231–232); cat. 1063, from Orvieto (p. 48)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 69, Head of negro / Elephant, cat. 1127, found near Valpiana (p. 46, n. 214)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 70, Male head / Dog, cat. 1141, from near Chiusi (p. 47)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 71–73, *peithesa*, cat. 1154, 'sopra Grassina' (p. 46, n. 213)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 98 and 103, cat. 5–7 and 9–13, from the Romito di Pozzuolo hoard (p. 57: cited in HN<sup>3</sup> Italy)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 99, cat. 8, from Bora dei Frati, Pietrasanta (p. 57, n. 333: cited in HN<sup>3</sup> Italy)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 105, cat. 17, from S. Vincenzo near Cecina (p. 49)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 106 (not cited by SNG), cat. 18, from Populonia (p. 49)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 108, c, semis of Volaterrae, cat. 895, from an urn (c. 200 BC) found 'nel territorio di Massa a confine con quello di Suvereto e precisamente in vicinanza dell'imbocco del torrente Millio nel fiume Cornia' (p. 45, nn. 206–209)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 109, a, dupondius of Volaterrae, cat. 910, from an urn in the *calisna sepu* tomb, near Monteriggioni (p. 45, nn. 210–212)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 110, b, as of Volaterrae, from territory of Cecina, cat. 934 (p. 54)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 111, tridrachm of Populonia, cat. 59, from near Populonia (p. 31: cited in HN<sup>3</sup> Italy)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 112, tridrachm of Populonia, cat. 60, acquired by exchange with the Museo Civico di Grosseto, probably a local find (p. 34)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 119, cat. 69
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 122, cat. 81, 83–84
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 123, cat. 72–73
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 125, cat. 77
- all from the Cecina 1858 hoard, along with four obols of Massalia (pp. 33–34); these last were also acquired, but no attempt is made to identify them in the collections of the Monetiére, which ought to be possible; nor is reference made to the discussion of the hoard in HN<sup>3</sup> Italy, p. 25, which now needs to be corrected by the addition of HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 125.
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 128, cat. 88, found in the Maremma, bought either in Pistoia or in Lucca (p. 34)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 132, cat. 93, found near Roselle (p. 36); cat. 91, from Populonia (p. 54)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 139, not acquired, from near Populonia (p. 44, n. 199)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 143, cat. 130, from Ponte Gini (p. 57)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 152, cat. 323; cat. 405, both from Roselle (p. 56)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 163, cat. 497, from Roselle (p. 56)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 168, cat. 466, from Populonia (p. 54)
- HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 182 (not cited by SNG), cat. 548, found 'ai Leccioni a confine col convento di S. Bartolomeo' (Do the authors not know where this is or have they just not bothered to tell us?) (p. 42)



HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 185, quadrans of Populonia, cat. 563, from S. Cerbone, near Porto Baratti (p. 49, missing the publication of this unique piece in NSc 1905, pp. 55–57)

HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 186, sextans of Populonia, cat. 585, from the Monte Pitti tomb, near Populonia (HN<sup>3</sup> Italy, p. 24) (p. 44, n. 196: either side of 300 BC; p. 63, n. 13, is rather less careful)

HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 198, uncia of Vetulonia, cat. 657, from Roselle (p. 56)

HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 203, sextans of Vetulonia, not identified, found in the Maremma (p. 34)

HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 204, uncia of Vetulonia, not identified, found in the Maremma (p. 34)

HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 225, cat. 1162, found near Populonia (p. 34)

HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 226, cat. 1167, from Populonia (p. 54)

HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 228 (not cited by SNG), cat. 1163, probably from Populonia (p. 44, n. 198)

HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 239, *vercnas*, cat. 1171, found at Chiusi (p. 34: cited in HN<sup>3</sup> Italy)

Special attention must be directed to the results of recent excavations by Giulio Ciampoltrini (p. 57): the settlement at Ponte Gini not only contained the new piece described above, but also two XX didrachms of Populonia (cat. 130 = HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 143; p. 57, n. 328), both in stratified deposits of c. 250 BC. That should settle the argument over their date once and for all (see HN<sup>3</sup> Italy, p. 25: c. 300–250 BC). But with the new five-unit piece from Ponte Gini (see above), it looks as if the mint that produced HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 95–97 suffered a reduction, to half, in the weight of its unit exactly parallel to the reduction at Populonia; although the new piece was not found in a stratified deposit, it should presumably be dated to the period of the life of the settlement, earlier than c. 250 BC. The pre-reduction pieces presumably belong before c. 300 BC.

HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 98, with which belong 100 and 101, and 103, are dated by the Romito di Pozzuolo hoard to before 270 BC (p. 57, rather than 280 BC, as in HN<sup>3</sup> Italy, p. 29); HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 99, from Pietrasanta, seems to be a lighter version of HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 98 (p. 57), but may well be an emergency issue of the same period as the full weight pieces (the archaeological context included material of the late fourth and third centuries BC). Given that the mint that produced HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 95–97 go from a ten-unit piece of c. 11.00 g to one of half that, whereas HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 98 seems to have a ten-unit piece of c. 4.5 g, I should no longer want to attribute 98–103 to the same mint as 95–7 + 97 bis, but have no particular suggestion to offer. (I should also not now want to be influenced by considerations of mathematical symmetry and describe 102 as 2½ units: we do not know enough to exclude 1½ units as a possibility.)

Two other reflections. One thing that stands out is the difference of provenance for the Wheel with pellet / Anchor unciae (predominantly Chiusi) and the Wheel / Anchor series as a whole, where the list above has two provenances from Arezzo, one from between Cortona and Chiusi, and an outlier from Monte Falterona; the ‘Rivista di Epigrafia Etrusca’ in Studi Etruschi 44 (1956) no. 49, adds another from near Arezzo; the increasing dominance of Chiusi among the provenances for the other Wheel issues makes one wonder whether Clusium was not indeed the mint for all except the Wheel / Anchor series. And there are now three probable

Populonian provenances for HN<sup>3</sup> Italy 225, 226, and 228 to add to the three or four, including Elba, for 226–227, which makes one wonder whether all of 223–237 are to be fitted in where weight and style suggest in the only prolific silver coinage of Etruria that there is, of Populonia.

M.H. Crawford  
University College London  
Gower Street  
GB-London, WC1E 6BT  
imagines.italicae@sas.ac.uk

---

## THE COINAGE OF TRAJAN

Paul-André Besombes

*Monnaies de l'Empire romain IV. Trajan (98–117 après J.-C.)*

Bibliothèque Nationale de France. Paris/Strasbourg 2008. Pp. 140,  
16 plates in color, 56 + 2 plates black and white.

ISBN 978-2-7177-1304-2, ISBN BNF 978-2-7177-2392-2,  
ISBN Poinسیون Numismatique 978-2-9517-5802-5. € 99.–

Bernhard Woytek

*Die Reichsprägung des Kaisers Traianus (98–117)*

Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-Historische Klasse  
Denkschriften, vol. 387 = Veröffentlichungen der Numismatischen Kommission  
vol. 48. MIR – Moneta Imperii Romani vol. 14. Vienna 2010.

Pp. 682, 9 + 156 plates. ISBN 978-3-7001-6565-1. € 136.–

Besombes, successor to J.-B. Giard in Paris, was charged with producing vol. 3 of the Paris catalogue. He begins with a review of previous scholarship, taking into account nothing before Mattingly and ending with Beckmann (whose name he consistently misspells).<sup>1</sup>

Besombes' own chronology is made up of a number of components. While he adopts Beckmann's for the period 112–114, elsewhere he relies on a classification of portraits. This is acknowledged by Woytek to be in principle the right approach, but the dates – broken into the periods 98, 99–105, 105–107, and 108–117 – are imprecise and in some cases inaccurate. He defends his sequence with statistics showing the gradual move of COS V from the obverse in 103–104 to primarily the reverse with his portraits B3 (105–107) and B4 (108–111), but the argument is partly circular, since the date divisions are his own. He also cites the rare occurrence of busts «aux mamelons,» all of which belong with his portrait B4, and allegedly illustrate the work of his engravers A and B, who are peculiar to the two officinae. These seem to me to add little to the argument, either for separate officinae or distinct engravers. He notes, correctly, that the size of denarius issues gradually increases from 105, and accounts for this both through the opening of a second officina and the influx of Dacian gold in 107.

The officina structure – he distinguishes between his two on the basis of different disposition of legends – is not without problems, chiefly the unequal output of the two. On his construct, the second officina (COS V P P S P Q R OPTIMO PRINCIPI on reverse) strikes twice as many denarii and five times as many aurei as the first

<sup>1</sup> M. BECKMANN, The early gold coinage of Trajan's sixth consulship, *AJN* 2<sup>nd</sup> series vol. 12 (2000) 119–156; Trajan's gold coinage, A.D. 112–117, *AJN* 2<sup>nd</sup> series vol. 19 (2007) 77–129.



(COS V on obv. / S P Q R OPTIMO PRINCIPI) in 105–107, twice as many of each thereafter. In addition it leads to certain anomalies of presentation: Woytek (below) treats Paris 242 and 378, a denarius with rev. Mars, as part of his no. 229 and places it in his Group 9, Cluster 4 (ca. A.D. 107); for Besombes the two have different busts, his B3 and B4, and belong to two different «phases», 105–107 and 108–111. This example could be multiplied, and taken as a whole, together with the statistical anomalies, it undermines his whole scheme. In any case it remains true that there is no evidence of an officina structure in the later mint inscriptions.

Against the trend of recent scholarship (see below), Besombes' equivocates on the date of the famous Trajanic restorations, of which the Paris collection has 37 examples. He would date them anywhere from 105–111, with a preference for the extremities of this period. The reasoning is based on metallic analyses (though the four restorations analyzed had a particularly high copper content for the period) and on a similarity to the iconographic program of Trajan's forum (itself normally dated to 112, but here [pp. 21–22] dated back to the end of 111 on the basis of a single coin [pl. II, 15]). Woytek, for one, was not attracted by this reasoning, and I find it tendentious.

The peculiarities of arrangement and unaccustomed placement of issues will render the book uncomfortable to use for those used to relying on *RIC* or the British Museum catalogues. This is unfortunate, for the Paris collection is undeniably rich, and worthy of a systematic view.

Bernhard Woytek's long-awaited volume on Trajan appeared in 2010, and it proves to have been worth the wait. It is designated as *Moneta Imperii Romani* vol. 14, but it surpasses all its predecessors in comprehensiveness, orderliness, and ease of use. It is divided into three parts: a long analytical introduction; a catalogue of the types, which justifies the remarks in the introduction; and a summary presentation of the catalogue. The volume is rounded out by 156 splendid plates (Arabic numerals) illustrating the coins, and nine more (Roman numerals) illustrating bust and portrait varieties. Let us hope that this can be taken as a model for future productions in the MIR series.

First, the historical background and chronology are laid out (IIa, pp. 9–18; the chronology is presented in tabular form on p. 18). Here there are some refinements of Kienast's *Kaisertabelle*,<sup>2</sup> but more substantial changes from Mattingly's *BMCRE* III pp. lii–liii; for example, the first «largesse» (*congiarium*) is associated with the accession by Mattingly, but postponed into 99 by W.

Section IIb deals with «The imperial coinage system and the emperor's economic-political measures.» After a brief introduction to the monetary system of the High Empire – in which, usefully, the point is made that it is Trajan who first regularly distinguishes orichalcum dupondii from copper asses through the use of the radiate crown on the former – W. treats the metals separately, drawing in the case of the silver on very recent work, though he sees them as part of one large picture. The gold declines in weight from ca. 1/43 *libra* to 1/45 in his Group IV (A.D. 100), and at the same time the fineness of the denarii declines (though

<sup>2</sup> D. KIENAST, *Römische Kaisertabelle. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie* (Darmstadt 1996).



its weight seems to remain steady throughout the reign, p. 21). W. also notes, drawing on the work of Peter<sup>3</sup> and on the Garonne hoard, that after 100 the number of sestertii steadily outnumbers, by a growing margin, the number of asses being struck. He also observes that while Mattingly's suggestion that the sestertius weighed one *uncia* and the dupondius one-half *uncia* is valid, the standard of the as (though always distinguishable from the dupondius) is more difficult to ascertain.

Section IIc (pp. 27–38) presents «The present state of investigation of the chronology of the Trajanic coinage.» This is a thorough review of scholarship, from the time of Eckhel up to the present. The emphasis is on the individual authors' principles of organization, with special attention paid to the difficult COS V period, eight years in duration unmarked by any milestone save the brief «COS V DES VI» period. Pride of place goes, rightly, to Paul Strack, whose study might be regarded as the first modern treatment of an imperial coinage.<sup>4</sup> Strack, like W., paid careful attention to bust variation in structuring his work; one objection, raised already by Mattingly, was the rather complicated system, incorporating the Greek alphabet, of noting varieties. Though Mattingly knew the work well, he did not incorporate it completely in his *BMCRE* III, preferring instead an abbreviated bust description. In W.'s view this was a drawback. It should be said that the author's own system of analysis of bust variants is hardly less complicated, combining a system of 36 bust varieties, illustrated on Tafeln I–VII, with four «Porträttypen» presented in various denominations on Tafeln VIII–IX. But use of these volumes is rendered infinitely easier by the spelling-out of each variety against the entry in which it occurs, rather than in the fold-out tables of Strack. It should also be added that a thorough review of Besombes' approach is given on pp. 33–35, and concludes that it «war strenggenommen schon zum Zeitpunkt der Publikation des Pariser Sammlungskatalogs im April 2008 als unhaltbar entlarvt.»

Chapter III gives, in several sections, the foundations of the new «Aufbau» of the Trajanic coinage. The first criterion of chronological arrangement is the imperial titulature (41); but as is noted during the extended COS V period, which occupies most of the author's attention, the precious metals display a more clear-cut variation of legends than the base metal. Fortunately examination of the portrait types, as already seen by Strack, can help resolve this, but Strack and others who followed him made the erroneous assumption that some of the groups of precious-metal coinage were simultaneous. Here a new chronology is proposed (see below) that depends to some extent on «elasticity». A consequence is the elimination of the very concept of «emission» that characterized earlier works of the Wiener Schule. In the end even Robert Göbl, its strongest advocate in modern times, was eventually driven to the position that «What an emission is has to be determined from case to case.»<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> M. PETER, *Untersuchungen zu den Fundmünzen aus Augst und Kaiseraugst*. SMFA 17 (Berlin 2001).

<sup>4</sup> P. L. STRACK, *Untersuchungen zur römischen Reichsprägung des zweiten Jahrhunderts. Teil I: Die Reichsprägung zur Zeit des Traian* (Stuttgart 1931).

<sup>5</sup> p. 43, citing R. GÖBL, Vorwort zu Reihe MIR – *Moneta Imperii Romani* in W. SZAIVERT, *Die Münzprägung der Kaiser Tiberius und Caius (Caligula)* 14/41. *Moneta Imperii Romani* Band 2 und 3 = *Denkschriften der phil.-hist. Klasse der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 171 (Vienna 1984), 14 n. 20. The same remarks appear in R. GÖBL, *Der neue «Aufbau der römischen Reichsprägung in der Kaiserzeit»*, *LNV* 2 (1983) 189–205.



W. uses the terms «Group» and «Cluster» to refine the broad chronology suggested by the portrait types. A «Group» for him indicates all successions of types that can be set off from one another, in general by changes in legend (p. 43). A «Cluster» (p. 44) is smaller set within a Group, and is demarcated – somewhat less sharply – by its concentration of types. These can consist of a thematic group, or one associated by bust variants, or one which draws its types from a preceding issue, or indeed all three. As W. says, it is a very flexible instrument for breaking down much larger groups of types. The details are explored in Chapter IV.

To the question of officinae, W. responds on p. 53: «Die Münzeninschriften sind als hochoffizielle zeitgenössische Dokumente überdies vielleicht der beste Beweis dafür, daß etwa in der traianischen Regierung die Einteilung der Münzstätte in Offizinen keine überragende Bedeutung besaß.» He sees the need to define, not the number of workshops in operation, but a certain «characteristic structure of production,» and further posits that this structure is best seen as quinquepartite. An example comes from the coinage of Groups 11–13, late 111–early 112, encompassing issues with COS V, COS V DES VI, and COS VI, in which the five denarius reverses remain constant throughout. He also cites other examples of this kind of «Fünzfahl» (his Group 5, A.D. 100) where one of the types (Concordia), continued from Group 4, is phased out in favor of a standing figure of Hercules, which then continues into Group 6. He further cites the reviewer's own remarks regarding the possibility of a «kind of officina system» in the issues struck for Cappadocia (p. 54). Taken together this is as convincing a case as has been made for a system, be it officina-based or not. Still, W. shies away from adopting this kind of type division as a major criterion for the arrangement of his presentation, since it cannot be shown to have been universally applicable to Trajan's coinage. This in itself is an advance over earlier instances of the *Aufbau*, which tended to make the formula prescriptive rather than descriptive. It is also an advance to recognize that overwhelming stylistic consistency and the frequency of die links between the precious-metal coinages argue for shared personnel and close connections among all the coinages (which I take to imply location in the same facility and identity of authority behind them).

«The Trajanic coin portrait with special consideration of the portrait types of the COS V period» is treated on pp. 55–73. Trajan only entered the capital in the fall of 99, almost two years after his accession on 28 Jan. 98, so his early «portraits,» in which some have detected the features of Nerva (p. 56), are characterized here as «typisch soldatisch.» All previous commentators are agreed on this first type. Only with Group 4, late 98–99, characterized by the use of the title P(ater) P(atriciae) and therefore struck after Trajan's arrival at Rome, does a realistic portrait emerge.

With the COS V coinage (103–111) there is an evolution of four distinct portrait types, of which the characteristics are best apprehended in the silhouettes appearing on pp. 58–61 (and of course in the plates) and which space precludes summarizing in detail here. Their chronology is given as follows (p. 62):

Portrait type	A	ca. 99–105	
	B	105–107	<i>Profectio</i> to Moesia
	C	107–109	
	D	from 109	

This classification is novel, and compares to earlier efforts as follows (p. 67):

<i>Woytek</i>	<i>Étienne-Rachet</i> <sup>6</sup>	<i>Strack</i>	<i>Hill</i> <sup>7</sup>
A	B2	$\alpha$	Eii
B	B4	$\Delta(\delta_1)$	Lii (truncation 2)
C	B3	$\alpha$	M, Li, Liii(a)
D	B4	$\Delta(\delta_2)$	Lii (truncation 3), Liii(b)

Even without going into detail, it is easy to see that the new classification replaces one of conflicting solutions; it is carefully argued and illustrated, and should rightly replace earlier schemes. Perhaps its greatest significance is the redating of W's portrait type B to his Group 9 cluster 1, in A.D. 105 (pp. 71–72): virtually all art historians have depended on Gross's designation of this as the «decennial» type, in which he was in agreement with Strack's earlier treatment. Thus W.'s study responds to recent hopes that uncertainty would be resolved by a new study of the numismatic material.

The bust varieties (pp. 73–90) are more complicated. In principle they are described in lower-case characters running a–z; this is sometimes modified, e.g. double letters (aa, ff etc.) indicate that the bust ends in a globus, a + that it varies in some way (direction, attribute such as balteus) from the principal variety. All variants are described in detail on pp. 76–90 and very usefully described as they occur at the heading of each catalogue entry. This much simplifies the use of the catalogue when compared, for example, to Strack. The defense of the arrangement begins on p. 93; the tools marshaled to define Groups and Clusters, and thus to deal with issues of theme, bust variation and contemporaneity, are various: in no particular order, die counts, number of surviving specimens, association with contemporary events, association of types with one another. The result is a carefully reasoned arrangement of the whole Trajanic coinage; the semisses and quadrantes, the women, the restorations, hybrids with two obverses or two reverses, uniface medallions, the Latin coinage of Syria, and ancient forgeries of precious metal coins are treated separately at the end.

The question of the restorations has recently been treated by Komnick,<sup>8</sup> but even here there is new material to add. Until Komnick wrote the prevailing chronology was that of Mattingly, who argued that Trajan's recall of earlier coinage in ca. 107, reported at Dio Cassius 68.15, provided the occasion for the «reissues.»<sup>9</sup> As to the coinage for Syria, it is taken for granted that it was produced at Rome for export, which is now the *communis opinio*.

<sup>6</sup> R. ÉTIENNE, M. RACHET ET AL., *Le trésor de Garonne. Essai sur la circulation monétaire en Aquitaine à la fin du règne d'Antonin le Pieux (159–161)* (Bordeaux 1984).

<sup>7</sup> P. V. HILL, *The Dating and Arrangement of the Undated Coins of Rome* (London 1970).

<sup>8</sup> H. KOMNICK, *Die Restitutionsmünzen der frühen Kaiserzeit. Aspekte der Kaiserlegitimation* (Berlin/New York 2001).

<sup>9</sup> H. MATTINGLY, *The Restored Coins of Trajan*, NC 5<sup>th</sup> series vol. 6 (1926) 232–278; the arguments are taken over in BMCRE III lxxxvi–xciii, where (p. lxxxviii) Dio is cited and it is said, «we need have no serious doubt that we have here the occasion of these issues.»



Though the provincial coinages in silver are discussed in the introductory chapters both by W. and by Besombes, only Besombes presents the Latin-legend cistophori; he also includes the bilingual tridrachm and drachm for Cappadocia. W. includes neither, but this has been remedied in part by his discussion of the cistophori in this journal.<sup>10</sup>

The remainder of Vol. 1 is devoted to detailed presentation of the coinage in catalogue form. The old MIR format is nowhere in evidence: instead we have a clearly laid out entry for each coin, assigned to a Group (and Cluster, where appropriate). Bust varieties are described with the obverse of each entry, and representative specimens are catalogued below with the illustrated example highlighted in bold type. In Vol. 2 there is a tabular summary of the arrangement, as well as indices of legends and reverse types, and useful concordances to RIC and Strack. The former of these is slightly compromised by the inconcinnity between the simplified bust descriptions of RIC and the more detailed ones here, but it can still be used for general guidance.

The scale of illustration is unprecedented: a run-of-the-mill sestertius of Trajan with rev. Pax (MIR 200) is illustrated by no less than 23 specimens portraying all the obverse bust varieties. There is some unevenness to the plates, but they come from many sources, including a heavy representation of material from the trade, as well as collections both large (Vienna) and small (Utrecht) that have never been illustrated.

This is a splendid achievement, which sets the study of Trajan's coinage on a new footing, and sets a high standard for future volumes of *Moneta Imperii Romani*.

William E. Metcalf  
Professor (adj.) of Classics and  
Ben Lee Damsky Curator of Coins and Medals  
Yale University  
P. O. Box 208266  
New Haven, CT 06520-8266 USA  
william.metcalf@yale.edu

<sup>10</sup> B. WOYTEK, Die Cistophore der Kaiser Nerva und Traian (mit einem systematischen Anhang zu typologisch verwandtem traianischem Provinzialsilver, SNR 89 (2010) 69–125.