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THE IMPERIAL PROPAGANDA AND HISTORICAL TRADITION ACCORDING TO A SELECTION OF COINS FROM THE COLLECTION OF AUGUSTINE CZARTORYSKI
Part I: The Fides-Concordia Group

The collection of ancient coins of A. Czartoryski in the Czartoryski Museum, Kraków, consists of nearly 600 pieces ranging from the archaic beginnings up till the early Byzantine period. However little of it looks to have been carefully collected, judging by its well-balanced chronological dispersal and artistic beauty of many pieces. A selection of the best preserved republican coins has been already presented in the Catalogue by L. Morawiecki¹. What regards the imperial pieces (about a half of the set) they have been so far only roughly dated and introductory read by S. Skowronek.

The imperial set records a broad range of historical problems. I have chosen solely one of them, as a matter of fact a fragment from the vast field of studies on the imperial propaganda, the subject having been more recently treated by N. Hannestad². In this narrow field of numismatics as related to propaganda the recent decades have been witnessing a very essential discussion concerning the proper interpretation of the message conveyed by the types and legends³. C. H. V. Sutherland’s analysis of the julio-claudian coinage has become, in a sense, a medium of the discussion and the aim of

² N. Hannestad, Roman Art and Imperial Policy, Aarhus 1986.
³ I am very grateful to Dr. Christopher Howgego, The Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford, for a very inspiring discussion and exhaustive professional consultation. This paper and the next one, I am going to submit, owe to him a considerable number of improvements.
criticism. I would like to give some room to his opinion. "The real significance of the imperial coinage (...) should become sufficiently clear when it is once regarded as an instrument of policy, always in action, always assured of an audience, capable of both loud and soft tones in the language of achievement or promise". On the management of the mints: "the princeps exercised over the aes coinage a control no less close and efficient than that of the gold and silver". Of the years 52–54 A.D.: "At no other time is the possibility of manipulating the imperial mint-officials more remarkably displayed". On reflecting the power-struggle by the coinage from the last years of Claudius and the first of Nero, which "showed immediately in which direction the balance of power was swinging... The fundamental change which these types show can have been due only to the transmission of a new set of orders to the mint". The passage from p. 32 may be employed to serve as his final conclusion: "There is no place any longer for easy theories of the leisurely choice of types by individual mints, whether central or local: for any coinage of importance the theme of its message, and even its detailed presentation, was prescribed without the possibility of error". Turning to the other side I would not say that A. H. M. Jones expressed an "incisive critique of this approach". Jones as a matter of fact admitted that "some of the legends and types have a fairly obvious propaganda value... No doubt they were intended to be vehicles of propaganda, though their importance can be exaggerated". Jones' criticism consists of actually essential argument that "Latin legends meant nothing to the eastern half of the empire, where any one who was literate could read Greek only. In the western provinces the great bulk of the population, who spoke Celtic, Iberian etc... would be unaffected". The other essential point is that "the educated classes had something better to read than two or three words on a denarius". But not so much the critique itself is the essence of his paper as rather the wise and inspiring suggestion directed to the numismatists that they should "pay less attention to the political interpretation of the coins" as "they could do an immensely valuable work for the economic historian". The series of questions concerning the economic aspects compose the most essential part of the paper. Next M. H. Crawford developed one of the main objections expressed by Jones: the lack of convincing literary evidence regarding propaganda on coins. In my opinion both sides may regard the literary
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5 Ibidem, p. 28.

6 Ibidem, p. 176.

7 Ibidem, p. 147.


10 Jones, p. 62.

11 Ibidem, p. 80.

data quoted and commented by M. H. Crawford to be of great value for their argumentation. One side, because they are scantly, the other because they are very meaningful. He argued that "there is little evidence for official interest in coin types and even less evidence that in the Greco-Roman world coin types which may be called programmatic had much impact", and added the new points to the debate: "The vast majority of the inhabitants of the Roman Empire, if they saw coins at all, saw new issues as a tiny part of a mass of issues covering a century or more". The most radical attack against C. H. V. Sutherland, M. Grant and their follow came from B. Levick: "This view of Roman coinage was influenced by contemporary events. It came into being when printing, radio, and cinema had made communication with the masses easier than ever before, in particular when totalitarian governments had begun to exploit these media to the utmost in their own interest; it was natural to see the Prinçeps exploiting the coinage in a similar way". Having explained the sense of the word "propaganda" following the Oxford English Dictionary she argued that "there is something objectionable in talking of coins as a means of «propaganda», or even of their having a 'propaganda value' ... 'Publicity' and 'publicize' are the terms to be preferred". Next having strongly stressed the argumentation put forward by the earlier critics (the sporadic nature of the coinage, the indifference of the masses, the actual contempt of the upper classes) she developed her idea: "the coinage of a reign can be seen to make up a composite portrait of the ruler as he liked to think of himself, intended not as publicity but for internal, domestic, Palace consumption...". Personally I must say that the longer I was reading the book by C. H. V. Sutherland the more strongly I found myself convinced to his way of analysis. I would like to return to the point in the next paper I am going to submit and add some comments to C. H. V. Sutherland's argumentation.

I have employed a formal classification of the types and legends arranging them for reasons of convenience under two general headings: 'The Fides-Concordia Group (part I)' and 'The Image od Success in the Interior and Foreign Policy of the Emperor (part II)'. The first section will be considered in three aspects: the loyalty of the army, the Imperial House and "familiar harmony". The historical tradition itself can only be briefly reviewed here because of the necessary limitations.

Maximin I, Philip I and Probus placed FIDES MILITUM on their reverses (Nos. 8, 10, 11). This group representing the separate class of types is symptomatic for the III cent. All three of them, the short-lived military rulers came to power by way of military coup, assumed the purple from hands of revolted legionaries, had to fight the repeating revolts, finally all of them were
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13 Crawford, p. 57 f.
14 Levick, p. 104.
15 Ibidem, p. 105 f.
16 Ibidem, p. 108.
overthrown and murdered by their own soldiers (in case Philip it is not clear). Formal and standardized the type as it is, it hides some meaning, because it was struck in the period of dramatic political upheavals. Fides militum was not an empty slogan for the emperors themselves. They were simply entirely dependent on the loyalty of the guard and main legions. Their coinage was designed to gain fidem militum, who were paid with those very pieces and convince an ordinary citizen that the state was stable, what must have been constantly doubted in that period. The picture given by the historians essentially differs from the official image. At the very beginning of his rule Maximin had to face a series of military conspiracies and revolts\(^\text{18}\) and finally 'a suis (scil. militibus) occideretur', as it is epigrammatically stated by the author of HA (Max. et Balb. XI, 2)\(^\text{19}\). Philip follows the same pattern\(^\text{20}\). After a series of military mutinies fortunately suppressed, he was finally defeated by his most confident officer. The conclusion is given by Eutropius: *Philippi duo ... ob exercitu interfici sunt* (IX, 3, 1)\(^\text{21}\). The list of rivals of Probus is again very much the same: probably almost all of them came from the military circles\(^\text{22}\). Probus himself eventually 'cum per Illyricum iter faceret a militibus suis per insidias interemptus est' (Prob. XX, 1)\(^\text{23}\). H. Mattingly stressed "the almost uninterrupted sequence of similar types in the IIIrd cent." when "military loyalty, the basic virtue of the soldier, was chiefly conspicuous by its absence"\(^\text{24}\).

Continuing the motive of Fides-Concordia we are coming to the second section: the Imperial House in face of the problem of succession, that incurable illness of the Principate. Here we are going to review the propaganda of adoption, dynasty and coregency.

Hadrian came to power in August 117. Both the course of events and their actors are matters commonly treated. They will be only briefly reviewed here when references to the coins are clear. From the very beginning the serious doubts were raised as to the legitimacy of the succession and immediately came out the issues of coins in order to convince the subjects to the official version\(^\text{25}\).


\(^{19}\) Eutrop. Brev. IX, 1, 1: occisos est deserentibus eum militibus suis cum filio adhuc puero.


\(^{21}\) The version related by Aurel. Caes. 28, 10 — 11 is slightly different. Philip died in the battle of Verona while his son "Rome apud castra praetoria interficitur".


\(^{23}\) Crees, p. 125—127: "circumstances of his death are most obscure"; SHA, Prob. XXI, 3: milities confugientem cum... interemurunt; Aurel. Caes. 37, 4; Eutrop. Brev. IX, 17, 3: interfectus... tumultu militari; Zosimos I, 71, 4 — 5; Zonaras XII, 29.

\(^{24}\) Mattingly, RC, p. 154.

W. Weber carried out a thorough, in a sense judicial, investigation into the case. The results are damaging to Hadrian. Then when it became clear that Hadrian was determined to change radically the State’s policy and remove the closest collaborators of Trajan from the political stage, the doubts must have been replaced by anger in the army. The conflict came to the point of crisis. It finds indirect mention on the denarius (No. 1) under the guise of CONCORD (ia) and a stress laid on: Divi Traiani Filii. This aspect of Hadrian’s propaganda cannot be explained solely by a wish to procure a title to legitimacy. His persistent stressing the act of Adoptio, his veneration to his “adoptive parents”, the slogans of Concordia or Fides Exercituum look “freudian”, as if they were expressing a complex of guilt and rising fear. His own propaganda speaks against him. As a matter of fact his contemporaries’ information was defective, but noone could expect clear evidence in case of the conspiracy of only a few of the most influential persons. The case was unclear. Yet it must have been certain for many men. The official version was not accepted by the public. The propaganda proved to be ineffective. In addition, ironically, as history likes irony, it was probably Sura who was represented close at the side of Trajan on the reliefs of the famous column, for sure not Hadrian.

That Hadrian’s “Adoptio” was a deceit, was a fact beyond dispute for the future generations of historians. Here historical tradition is strongly unanimous. It follows generally the pattern employed by Dio (LXIX, 1 f.). Dio called the authority of his well-informed father of senatorial rank and by that he wished his testimony to be suggestive and convincing (LXIX, 1, 2–4). The author of HA went even further and named Trajan’s candidate. It was Neratius Priscus “multis amicis in hoc consentientibus” (Hadr. IV, 8). The same did Themistius (Or. XVI, 250). His candidate was Quietus.

Now I would like to touch a more general problem of Hadrian’s image, the actual object of controversy, starting from the sestertius struck in thirties among the issue of the Imperial Virtues, that is a definite reference to Edictum Perpetuum (Ab. 2). Is CLEMENTIA solely an allusion to the judicial achievement? It cannot be that. Marius Maximus dicit eum natura crudelum
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27 H. Hannestad, p. 191.
28 Ibidem, p. 145: “Concordia Exercituum... a motive which will return regularly when military anarchy threatens”.
29 E.g. in case of the four consulars Henderson rightfully asks if “there was really any conspiracy at all”, p. 49, as they were put to death at widely separated places, p. 48.
30 Weber, p. 303 and SHA, Hadr. VII, 3 on the extraordinary bounties to buy the favour of the people; Mattingly, RC, p. 148 on money largesses to the legionaries.
32 Henderson, p. 38: the dutiful son accepts the local story.
33 Dio’s version repeated: Aurel. Caes. 13, 13; Eutrop. Brev. VIII, 6, 1;
34 BMC, III, p. CXLIII.
achievement? It cannot be that. Marius Maximus dicit eum natura crudelém fusisse (SHA, Hadr. XX, 3); multis aliis interfecit vel aperte vel per insidias (ibid. XXIII, 8). R. Syme wrote about Vita Hadriani that "it is all fiction, «Vopiscus» at the peak of this performance"\(^{35}\), while F. Millar devalued the testimony of Dio on Hadrian: "it is clear that Dio is using his material with hostile intent"\(^{36}\). E. L. Bowie followed this reasoning and presented actually very inspiring material from Pausanias, Marcellus of Side, the poet, Athenaeus, Philostratus and epigraphy in order to show that Hadrian's repressive policy is a later fake\(^{37}\). He quoted the disputable case of Favorinus. It does not look to be the best choice. In the light of evidence collected by E. Mensching\(^{38}\) Favorinus was banished (Fav. ex. 11, 8), next his portraits were removed from public places (Dio, LXIX, 3, 3f.). E. L. Bowie's choice from the HA might have been completed by a number of passages like the following one: me (Favorinum) illum (Hadrianum) doctorem omnium credere qui habet triginta legiones (Hadr. XV, 13). Supposedly this opinion is more convincing for the historian from Eastern Europe than one from England. Dio's comments and factual evidence is comprehensive: ὃ φθόνος οὗτος δεινότατος ἐς πάντας τοὺς τινὶ προέχοντας ἢν πολλοὺς μὲν κατέθηκε συχνὰς δὲ καὶ ἀπώλεσε (LXIX, 3,3). Then Dio gave a list of victims (LXIX, 2,5), including Favorinus, Dionysius (3, 5) and Apollodorus (4, 1–6). Besides it would be naïve to believe that the execution of four men of the highest rank, as Palma or Quietus, did not cause a heavier loss of life among the ordinary men and minor figures from the circles of the executed generals. Consequently there may be some value in a statement by the author of HA: libertos denique et nonnullos milites insecutus est (Hadr. XV, 9). Moreover we should not forget that at the very time when the coins with Virtues (including CLEMENTIA) were being struck, Judea became a stage of extermination and devastation in a very modern sense of the words. E. L. Bowie based on the evidence taken mainly from the area of epigraphy and sophistic against historiography. It is a matter of understanding the nature of political conflicts. As regards epigraphy I cannot imagine an officially, as it was, erected monument that might have been critical over the contemporary Emperor. Quite contrary, the imperial epigraphy provides innumerable examples of repulsive servility. In my opinion if one is to make choice between declamatory and panegyric Second Sophistic on the one hand and Dio, Herodian or even HA on the other, there cannot be place for doubt in matters of political history. Dio himself was an experienced state's functionary with apparent feeling for politics, a quality generally lacking in sophists, poets and antiquarians. Certainly it is a matter of personal judgement. Hadrian's case was an undisguised absolutism. As a follower
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\(^{37}\) A lecture said in Kraków in 1989.
of autocratic conceptions expressed by Plato in Politeia he aimed at exercising an unrestricted power. Therefore he must have had his political opponents and victims. It doesn’t seem his CLEMENTIA (No. 2) was a testimony of the counter-propaganda directed against the opposition, intellectual, military and popular accusing him of cruelty?

Next we are coming to S. Severus and his dynastic policy. What came out of his ambitious plans is well known. The As (No. 7) testifies his efforts to establish a new dynasty. The more striking the evidence of No. 7 is that those coins were issued very late, when the final ruin was imminent. Yet the hopes were still cherished by Julia, represented here as Venus Gentrix Mother of the Dynasty. The coin was issued after the murder of Geta and Plautilla. One can only imagine derisive comments resulting from such a propaganda. Here the coin is only its representative. The means were different. Fatally wounded Geta was to call μήτερ, μήτερ, τεκόσσα, τεκόσσα (i.e. Genetrix!) (Dio, LXXVIII, 2, 3—4). Is this only an accidental parallel or an echo of the Severian dynastic propaganda bitterly alluded to? We cannot suspect Dio to have been derisive in this case. Undoubtedly others were. A comparison to Polynices and Eteocles must have been immediately suggesting itself to a Greek mind. This version was next even more elaborated along the Theban parallel. The author of HA has preserved a piquant story on Caracalla’s intimate relations with his mother (Carac. 10, 1; Geta, 7, 3). Following him were the other gossip writers of the IVth cent. Those were the injuriosi Alexandrians who attached the sequel to the whole story: καὶ τὴν πρεσβυτὴν ἱοκάστην καλούντων (Herod. IV, 9, 3). Apparent hatred of antiseverian Herodian who poured out all his resentments after the final fall of the dynasty and the cynism of the author of HA make of Julia even a more tragic heroine. Touching this problem we seem to face the Gordian knot of mutual distrust, injuries and vengeance, entangling the rulers and the public opinion. The “theory of opposites” is no longer valid. Dio seems to be the most acceptable of all in describing that independent, intelligent and tragic woman. The pathetic tone he struck at the moment of Geta’s murder does not sound altogether baseless: τὸν τε ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἐκσυντὸς κάλτος ... ἐκλήγην ἐπεὶδὲ ... καὶ γὰρ τοῦ ἀδοτοῦ πάσα ἐπλῆσθη (LXXVIII, 2, 4,) (LXXVII, 2, 3—4). It looks hardly believable that the coin (No. 7) was struck after the murder of her children and soon before the assassination of Caracalla. The suicide was to complete the story of Venus Genetrix.

40 Hannestad, p. 256—262 on his dynastic propaganda.
41 Other relevant coins: AEternit IMPERI, RIC 339 b with the family portrait; similar RIC 540; MATER AVGG, RIC 562; SAECVLI FELICITAS, Isis with infant Horus, RIC 577; VENVS FELIX, RIC 580.
42 Eutrop. Brev. VIII, XX, 2; Aurel. Caes. 21, 3.
43 "The scandalous stories about Caracalla’s ‘marriage’ to his mother may safely be put down to the invention of malice and hatred”, BMC, V, p. CXCVI.
44 Compare: Herod. IV, 4, 3; SHA, Sev. XXI, 7.
45 Dio LXXIX, 24, 1; Herod. IV, 13, 8 suggests her murder: εἶτε ἐχοναὶ ἐἶτε χειλεναγεῖα ἀπεχαρτήρησε.
The achievement of Julia’s and Septimius’ common goal, the establishment of the new dynasty, proved to be unattainable not because of their lack of political abilities, but because of the fatal conflicts within the family, standing in a striking contrast to the official image of the loving and united family. The portrait from Antikensammlung in Berlin showing Domus Divina in perfect unity, closely corresponds with the above bucolic tranquility radiating from the coins.

The third section of this account deals with coregency. The collection gives us opportunity to look at the case of Balbinus and Pupienus. Dio warns that "two or three men, who hold power together are not likely to agree" (XLVIII, 1, 2). A model of propaganda employed by the principes attests to this prediction. Strange to say, but in the course of solely 3 months they managed to strike a number of issues expressing in fact the same message as it is represented on the reverse of the silver coin No. 9: their hands clasped in unity and the legend FIDES MVTVS AVGAVG. Mutual distrust and conflicts soon brought a disaster. The author of HA laid stress on their incurable ambitions: et erant quidem discordiae inter Balbinum et Maximum etc. (XIV, 1). Curious but the biographer made use of the opposite word to their slogan (Concordia), as if he wanted to show hostile forces in a propaganda war. Herodan as if he deliberately liked to complete the above quoted passage from Dio, revealed the actual cause of their disaster with his characteristic feeling for politics: ἐκ ἐπιθυμίας μοναρχίας ἔπειθεν. ὅπερ δυτοῖς καὶ μάλιστα γέγονεν ἱππολείας αἵτιον (VIII, 8, 4).

Next is the class of coins with the imperial women. I mean here a specific group regarding "familiar harmony". On the one hand, the idea of familiar unity had been exploited in clearly political purposes by the court, on the other it happened to be in many cases a subject of persistent malicious gossip of the public. We are approaching the area of intimate relations of what we almost always know next to nothing.

Sabina represented on denarius (No. 3) with the reverse legend: CONCORDIA AVGAVG was to give an edifying example of marital love and unity. The tradition hostile to Hadrian submitted to us an appendix to both of his marriages. The case of Antinous could be enough to throw light on his marital relations. Strange to say, but that intelligent ruler fanned the flame of
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46 Th. Kraus, Das Römische Weltreich, Berlin 1967, Taf. 156.
47 Other slogans from coins: CONCORDIA AVGSTORUM, PIETAS MVTVS, CARITAS MVTVS; Ensslin, p. 80.
48 SHA, Hadr. XI, 7; XIV, 5–7; Aurel. Caes. 14, 7; Millar, p. 61 ff.
49 R. Lambert, Beloved and God. The Story of Hadrian and Antinous, London 1984, on Hadrian’s relations with Sabina, p. 73: "Antinous and his sweetness, sensitivity and skill, may have been a cohesive and emollient factor". A curious attitude I must say; on Sabina taken on the voyage to the East, included on Hadrian’s private expeditions in Egypt, ibidem: "The mention of ‘concord’ and ‘harmony’ on the coins may have reference to this temporary matrimonial amity"; Compare: Henderson, p. 130 ff.
gossip by intriguing treatment of the case, politically damaging, morally discrediting for the public image of his marriage. Every handbook of classical art illustrates the story. Neither coins nor the Hadrian’s diary could help his reputation (Dio, LXIX, 11, 2).

Next we have the sestertius of an exceptional fineness (No. 4): Faustina the Younger represented as a Vestal Virgine, a personification of modesty and loyalty to her husband\textsuperscript{50}. A study by K. Fittschen makes possible to grasp a scale of the official propaganda on her behalf\textsuperscript{51}. Here we have no facts. We can only repeat after the historians that her reputation was very controversial. The author of HA never disappoints our expectations if there is someone appropriate for calumny or derision. Telling the story of Faustina he does his best to make an impression on the reader and becomes actually destructive in his hatred (Ant. Phil. 19, 1–2; 19, 7). The testimony given more than two centuries later reveals the temperature of feelings of Faustina’s contemporaries and the atmosphere of intrigue so characteristic for the court of a despotic ruler or possibly for some opposition circles, frustrated because strengthless against the true authority of the two Antonines. Frustrated hence inclined to produce gossip. The real problem regards the very coin No 4. It is too early for the evidence of HA. One of the passages of HA regards Commodus, borne as late as 161. Other fragments give no name and no chronology. Hence it may well be a purely formal type showing the Empress—Pudicitia who ”as consort of the Pontifex Maximus, shares in the honours of the Vestal Virgins”\textsuperscript{52}. The story of Commodus and Caracalla and their wives are even more scandalous and hypocritic. After Commodus had come to power a nice denarius with Crispina as Concordia was issued (No. 5)\textsuperscript{53}. One more model marriage for the subjects and a clear message of stability directed to the opponents, as the beginnings were not easy for Commodus. The author of HA, that master of invective, is here very talkative and informative while describing a way of living of Crispina’s husband (Comm. I, 3; I, 7). He takes pleasure in long descriptions of Commodus’ sexual excesses (e. g. Comm. II, 8; V, 4 etc.). Herodion adds to the picture the conflict between Crispina and Lucilla (8, 4). The marital happiness of Crispina did not last for long (Comm. V, 9)\textsuperscript{54}.

\textsuperscript{50} The coin fits the broader context: Faustina-CONCORDIA with a dove, RIC 503; Iuno with children, RIC 504; PVDICITIA standing, RIC 507 (a) and sacrificing, RIC 508; VENVS, a graceful image, RIC 515 a; VENERI GENETRICI, RIC 1407;

\textsuperscript{51} K. Fittschen, Die Bildnirstypen der Faustina minor und die Fecunditas Augustae, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Nr 126, Göttingen 1982; the coins, p. 82–88, Taf. 7; the sculptures, Taf. 48–56.

\textsuperscript{52} Mattingly, RC, p. 163; in A. Czartoryski’s collection the type is represented by Etruscilla (463), Marcia Otacilia Severa (437) and Julia Maesa (432).

\textsuperscript{53} Crispina-CONCORDIA, RIC 278; clasped hands, RIC 279; as Venus, RIC 286; Venus Felix with charming obverse portrait on aureus, RIC 287, strikingly superior to the portrait from denarius, RIC 288; Carson, Coins of the Roman Empire, London 1990, p. 54.

\textsuperscript{54} Dio LXXIII, 4, 6 is here very laconic.
It is likely that she was not murdered in connection with Lucilla’s conspiracy, but after 185 A.D., however not later than 187\textsuperscript{55}. She must have lived for longer in disfavour, removed from the court. One day Crispina—Concordia became an obstacle and had to give way to the other.

The story of Caracalla and Plautilla is strikingly similar. The denarius that was issued on the occasion of their marriage (Dio tells us about their fabulous wedding: LXXVI, 1, 1ff) shows them clasping hands, while the reverse legends laid emphasis not only on their love and unity (Concordia) but on the dynastic future as well (Aeterna) (No. 6). The marriage was not a success. The bridegroom was only fourteen at the time of the ceremony\textsuperscript{56}. Either Dio or Herodien leave no illusions\textsuperscript{57}. While the moneyers were striking the denarii with the slogan CONCORDIAE AETERNAE the conflict was heading its climax\textsuperscript{58}. Septimius managed to save her life for the time being, nevertheless she had to live for several years on exile in humiliating conditions\textsuperscript{59}. Eventually executed after the fall of Geta (Herod. IV, 6, 3). The official marital propaganda proved to be short—sighted in the every above case. In the long run it must have proved discrediting to the royal husbands of Crispina and Plautilla, as their coins were circulating for long reminding of the beloved wives and celebrated consorts who were no longer alive.

A SHORTENED CATALOGUE OF THE QUOTED COINS FROM THE COLLECTION OF AUGUSTINE CZARTORYSKI

Part I


\textsuperscript{55} BMC, IV, p. CLIV; CIL, III, 12487; CIL, VIII 16530; Weber., p. 303.


\textsuperscript{57} Dio LXXVII, 3, 1; Herod. III, 10, 8: ο ό δε Αντονίνος ον παν τι ηδομενος τω γαμω, αναγι θε μελλων η προαρεει συνεξεγεμνους απεχως παν την χορην διεχευο ... ος μητε ενηνη υπε χαιτια χαιωνειν χαιρην διεχευο ... ος μητε ενηνη μητε εαυτια χαιωνειν χαιρην χαιωνειν. Τη.

\textsuperscript{58} Dio LXXVII, 2, 5; 3, 1; on the plot of Caracalla, Birley, p. 161 ff.

\textsuperscript{59} Dio LXXVII, 6, 3; 7, 1; Herod. III, 13, 2 ff.


5. Denarius, Commodus: Obv. CRISPINA AVGVSTA. Rev. CONCORDIA. Concordia holding patera and cornucopiae; A.D. 180–183 (or later?); BMC, IV, 36; M-N-414.


8. Sestertius, Maximin I: Obv. IMP MAXIMINVS PIUS AVG. Rev. FIDES MILITVM. SC. Fides holding standard in each hand; March A.D. 235-early 236; RIC, IV, 43; BMC, VI, 63—64; XI-N-440.


10. Sestertius, Philip I: Obv. IMP M IVL PHILIPPVS AVG. Rev. FIDES MILITVM SC. Fides holding standard in each hand; undated A.D. 244—247; RIC, 172 a; Robertson, III, 63; XI-N-453.

11. Antonianus, Probus: Obv. IMP PROBVS PF AVG. Rev. FIDES MILIT. egz. VI XXT. Fides standing with two ensigns; A.D. 276-beginning 280; RIC, V, 363; XI-N-484.