

Zeitschrift: Schweizer Münzblätter = Gazette numismatique suisse = Gazzetta numismatica svizzera

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Numismatische Gesellschaft

Band: 18-22 (1968-1972)

Heft: 75

Artikel: The sequence of issues in the long T/F series of Constantinian folles minted at Trier, A.D. 309-315

Autor: Cope, Lawrence H.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-170894>

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: 05.07.2025

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

los wären, wie Pink es meinte ¹², sei dahingestellt. Sie, die bisher nur durch Notizen erfaßt waren, der Forschung in gedruckter Fassung zugänglich zu machen, halte ich in jedem Fall geboten.

Den Herren H. Jungwirth (Wien), C. H. V. Sutherland (Oxford), H. Lanz und U. Barth (Basel) habe ich Auskünfte und Gipsabgüsse zu verdanken.

¹² Vgl. oben, Anm. 5.

THE SEQUENCE OF ISSUES IN THE LONG T/F SERIES OF CONSTANTINIAN FOLLES MINTED AT TRIER, A.D. 309–315

Lawrence H. Cope

While studying the alloy compositions of the weight-reduced folles, as the sequel to an earlier work ¹ on the argentiferous bronze alloys of the large tetrarchic folles, I have encountered difficulties with the identification and dating of Treveran folles in the long $\frac{T|F}{PTR}$ series which bridges the purely political division between volumes VI and VII of *The Roman Imperial Coinage* ^{2, 3}. By the application, however, of some simple metallurgical concepts concerning the most economic route for the fabrication of the pieces, I find it possible to distinguish a sequence of issues in this series which allows a reasonable chronological order to be established and explains the nature of the changes within the series in the context of the historical events affecting the issues. This sequence, and its detailed construction, is offered here as a means of resolving a number of doubts which the existing standard works of reference leave unsolved. The principles adopted might now be applied with advantage to the issues of other Imperial mints during the period of enormous coinage complexity between A.D. 307 and 318.

First, although the Constantinian folles are generally classified as *aes*, they should, in fact, be regarded — like the earlier large tetrarchic folles — as being a true «silver» denomination ¹. The alloys are of much lower fineness than the «*denarii argentei*» but, nevertheless, they are found to contain controlled proportions of silver ⁴ as well as revealing frequent visible evidence of superficial silvering. Consequently, their not-inconsiderable intrinsic worths ⁵ would have warranted fairly careful mint-control of their weights as well as precise control of alloy composition; but their values would not have been such as to justify the weighing of individual mass-produced pieces.

Consideration of practical metallurgical solutions to the problems of weight and fineness control (which had to be solved by the moneyers of the day) leads me to the

¹ The author, *The Argentiferous Bronze Alloys of the Large Tetrarchic Folles of A.D. 294–307*, NC, 1968.

² C. V. H. Sutherland, *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, VI, 1967.

³ P. Bruun, *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, VII, 1966.

⁴ Current (unpublished) assays reveal silver proportions of between 1 and 2 per cent, concentrated near values which correspond with the addition of 4 or 5 scrupula of silver per libra melt of bronze base metal.

⁵ The presence of 1% of silver in its alloy must have doubled the intrinsic worth of a bronze coin, since silver was about 100 times the value of copper.

conclusion that the simplest combined production route and accounting procedure, for the silver allocation and the resultant coinage — accurate over a large output even though allowing variations within batches — would have been to cast the folles alloys, from one-libra melts of controlled composition, in the form of long strips. Despite some strip-length variations in practice, these could have been then sub-divided — estimating weight-division by eye — into fairly uniform fractional pieces for re-melting into individual sessile drops for the final coin-striking operation. It is not difficult to divide a metal strip into simple length fractions in this manner. It is convenient to halve, and halve again, to produce an exact number of metal pieces (of approximately the same weight) representing chosen binary fractions of each libra of alloy. Combinations of dichotomy and trichotomy could have been used to prepare other convenient fractional pieces, based on the duodecimal Roman system of weights, without having to resort to individual weighings. It will be noted that decimal fractions, which involve at least one division of a length, by eye, into five pieces, do not lend themselves in practice to the preparation of such equal-sized pieces.

I believe that the «strip-subdivision» practice was that which was actually adopted for the fabrication of the folles, and that the technique is evidenced both by the breadth of the statistical distributions of the observed coin weights and by the occurrence of peak weights close to the simple fractions generated by length-dividing techniques. The coin weights are sufficiently displaced on the low side of the theoretical norms, however, to be explained as being the result of oxidation losses arising at the initial alloy melting stage for strip manufacture and in the subsequent re-melting operation for individual coin-button preparation. The radial macrostructures of sections of the resultant folles, and the lateral distributions of insoluble lead segregates and minor internal laminations, further testify to the adoption of a button-melting stage before the final striking.

From these basic metal-fabrication concepts, which match the observed weights and metallurgical structures of the coinage, it is possible to deduce, with reasonable certainty, that the large tetrarchic folles of c. 10 g were minted intentionally at 32 per libra of original coinage alloy; and that, similarly, the so-called «6,5 g», «4,5 g» and «3,5 g» weight-reduced folles were minted, respectively, at 48, 72 and 96 pieces per libra ⁶.

Secondly, the lateral spread of metal possible with a single blow with open coining dies is limited by the force which can be applied and by the plastic deformation properties of the coin alloy structure in impact-compression. The former limit was set by the size of hammer which a man could lift and wield; the latter is characteristic of the coinage alloys — which do not appear to have been altered substantially throughout this period of weight reduction ⁷. Therefore, as coin dimensions were reduced (and mint outputs were also increased) I suggest that it would have been necessary for the responsible mint officials to have sought permission for a reduction in overall die dimensions, in association with each decreed weight reduction, to ensure that it would be possible to contain the important obverse and reverse legends within the extremities of the resultant coins.

⁶ These theoretical norms would equate with: 6,78 g, 4,52 g, and 3,39 g, respectively.

⁷ There is a tendency for slight increases in the proportions of lead in the alloys of the smaller coins; but these could have been made to facilitate and cheapen the casting operations rather than to improve the coining characteristics (Analyses to be published).

By the simple measurement of the diameters of circles which just enclose the engraved borders of the type designs⁸, it is now possible to distinguish between similar issues whose weight distributions (for extant coins) tend to merge and so prevent the separation of issues on the basis of weight alone. The die measurements reveal — indirectly but with greater precision — the weight standards to which such issues belong; they can also be used to distinguish between different issues of coins minted within a single (but broadly maintained) weight standard⁹.

In RIC vol. VI Dr. Sutherland distinguishes: (i) «heavier» $\frac{T|F}{PTR}$ folles, of 7,0—5,9 g, minted c. 309; (ii) subsequent «reduced weight» $\frac{T|F}{PTR}$ folles, of 5,0—4,0 g; and (iii) an «unmarked» series, of 5,0—3,5 g, of Treveran portrait style, of which the 5,0—4,0 g pieces were probably the accompaniment of the reduced folles of group (ii). Although recognising that examples of the «unmarked» issues — those of lower weight — may fall after Maximinus' defeat in May A. D. 313, Sutherland lists them together, as one group¹⁰, without distinguishing two different die-sizes.

In RIC vol. VII Professor Bruun draws an uneasy division between «heavy» and «light» T/F coins on the basis of length of imperial legend¹¹. (These legends bear, incidentally, an approximate relationship to die module but lack the same precision of definition.) Bruun concludes that it is impossible to speak of two distinctly different weight classes¹². Unfortunately he dismisses the considerable evidence advanced by Carson and Kent¹³ and by Kent¹⁴, for a «6,5 g» series followed by two successive reductions — to «4,50 g» and «3,50 g», respectively — and suggests that «the development was one of gradual lowering of weight standard without any clearly defined steps on the way down». It must reject this, as being a most improbable Roman metallurgical practice where materials of enhanced intrinsic worth — such as the relevant argentiferous bronze folles alloys — are concerned¹⁵.

Furthermore, in an abortive attempt to lessen the confusion which they appear to create, Bruun omits from his lists the two groups of «unmarked» Treveran coins — even those with the smaller module — although remarking that «the imaginary chronological dividing line would have cut these groups into two parts»¹⁶. Consequently the Treveran series in RIC vol. VII begin artificially with the small 3,5 g T/F issues, known to have been minted later than May 313 because they lack any obverse inscriptions for Daza. But the lack of any precise definition of either the weight or module of these pieces — which in reality comprise a third T/F group — makes it quite possible for a reader consulting the two RIC volumes to confuse some of these lightest issues in RIC VII with the lighter of the two issues listed in RIC vol. VI; and

⁸ I term this measurement the «die-module».

⁹ There are no instances of this latter situation in the coin issues considered here, but I suspect the die measurements will be useful also for closer studies of the larger (and the initial weight-reduced) folles.

¹⁰ C. H. V. Sutherland, *op. cit.* 161, 162, and 225—227.

¹¹ P. Bruun, *op. cit.* 149, 150 and 167—168.

¹² *Ibid.* footnote 1 on p. 150.

¹³ R. A. G. Carson and J. P. C. Kent, *Constantinian Hoards and other studies in the Later Roman Bronze Coinage*, NC, 1956.

¹⁴ J. P. C. Kent, *The Pattern of Bronze Coinage under Constantine I*, NC 1957.

¹⁵ I have already accumulated nearly 60 assays of pieces of the coinage of the period A. D. 307—318. All genuine folles pieces contain a proportion of silver, carefully controlled, which at least doubled the intrinsic worth compared with plain bronze. (Work to be published.)

¹⁶ P. Bruun, *op. cit.* 150.

RIC vol. VII, in its present form, allows no certain attribution of the smaller of the two «unmarked» issues to the post-May 313 period to which they could possibly belong.

Detailed measurements made of the entire T/F series of Treveran folles (and the «unmarked» issues) in the British Museum Collection, have revealed that they can be classified into three distinct die-module groups: the first — in reality a continuation of the weight-standard and module of the previous S/A series — is 25 mm; the second — comprising a lighter group of T/F folles, and the first series of unmarked issues of identical weight-standard — vary between 21 and 22 mm; the third — comprising the smaller of the «unmarked» series and the lightest T/F folles, both of the lowest weight-standard — vary between 19 and 20 mm. The corresponding coin weight-standards can now be identified and separated, in chronological sequence, as: 48, 72 and 96 per libra.

These die measurements and the present conclusions are believed to be of considerable numismatic importance, as evidence educed for two distinct Constantinian coinage reforms, both involving deliberate adjustments in coinage dimensions and intrinsic worth; the first, in late-A. D. 309 or early-A. D. 310; the second, in early-A. D. 313. A determination of the full extent of the reductions in intrinsic worth — to provide a real measure of the devaluations involved — will not be possible until assays of coins belonging to each separate issue can be made ¹⁷. For the present, it would seem that the silver fineness standard of the coinage alloy was not substantially altered; the devaluation appears to have been effected merely by weight reduction. If so, the Constantinian follis can be judged to have suffered an overall depreciation — between A. D. 309 and 313 — by a factor of two, i. e. the intrinsic worth of the follis minted in late-313 was intentionally reduced to exactly one half of that of the coinage minted in early 309. Some exploratory die-measurements and assays ¹⁸ provide evidence that it remained at the same nominal level from late-313 until c. A. D. 318 ¹⁹.

The proposed sequence of definitive issues of the full-weight bronze pieces (ignoring the fractions) thus becomes that given in the Table overleaf.

This sequence, and the dimension- and weight-changes, can be understood and further verified by reference to the historical events of A. D. 308—315 which had profound economic consequences for Constantine.

Having assumed the title of «Augustus» in mid-307 — and having publicly expressed himself as such on his coinage from that time — Constantine's pride must have been deeply wounded by the decision of the Conference of Carnuntum, in November A. D. 308, to recognise him only in the rank of Caesar. Thus the first T/F folles, issued entirely with his own superscription as an Augustus (but without any change in weight, size, or alloy, from the coinage of his preceding series honouring other rulers) can be regarded as one of his immediate calculated reactions to uphold his claim to the highest rank, in his own territories, in open defiance of the Senior Augustus and of the Carnuntum decision. It is a short issue which might well have commenced in late November A. D. 308 and extended only partly into A. D. 309, to

¹⁷ Some are extremely rare, so one can hardly hope to obtain anything but representative samples of the more common issues for destructive assay.

¹⁸ Assays of the later issues of the Constantinian mints show a fairly consistent silver content in folles minted to the close of the Sol coinage era, c. A. D. 317. (Work to be published.)

¹⁹ In terms of the large tetrarchic follis (in the west) the intrinsic value of the reduced follis fell to almost exactly one third between A. D. 306 and 314, and remained there until A. D. 318.

Series	Mintmark	Dates of issue (A. D.)	Weight range (grams)	Coin weight- standard (No. minted per libra)	Reverse Type	Die module (mm)
I. <i>Post-Carnuntum issues:</i>						
	T F PTR	309	c. 7,0—5,0 (6,5)	48	Marti Patri Conservatori Marti Patri Propugnatori Principi Iuventutis	25
II. <i>Issues associated with the «solidus» Reform:</i>						
(a)	T F PTR	310 to early 313	c. 5,0—4,0 (4,5)	72	Marti Conservatori Soli Invicto Comiti Genio Pop. Rom.	21,5—22 21—22
(b)	— —	310—313 (possibly Summer 312 to Spring 313)	c. 5,0—3,5 (4,5)	72	(Bust of Mars) (Bust of Sol)	22
III. <i>Reformed issues of mid-313</i>						
(a)	— —	Spring 313	c. 3,5	96	(Bust of Mars) (Bust of Sol)	19 not measured, probably 19
(b)	T F PTR	Post-May 313—315	c. 3,5	96	Marti Conservatori Soli Invicto Comiti Genio Pop. Rom.	19—19,5

the point where a complete coinage reform — independent of the rest of the divided Empire — began to occupy the mind of Constantine in consequence of his undoubted heavy military expenditure in the successful campaign of A. D. 309 against the Franks and in his expedition — later the same year — into southern Gaul against the plotting Herculius.

I consider it probable that the idea of the new gold solidus was conceived by Constantine late in 309, and that he made it fully effective, by mid-310, in a comprehensive coinage reform which marked his deliberate independence of the crumbling system in use in the rest of the Empire. The reform undoubtedly related the new $\frac{1}{72}$ libra gold piece to a new follis of identical weight-standard — the latter being the most practical silver denomination for the time being. Perhaps the first T/F folles issued in this second series were those minted only in his own name, with his preferred Mars and Sol reverses. The seemingly contemporaneous GENIO POP ROM issues are of slightly smaller module, and so these might have been introduced a little later, in mid-310, after Galerius' begrudging official recognition of Maximinus and Constantine as Augusti — since the GENIO POP ROM issues mark the first recognition, on Constantine's Treveran coinage, of both Maximinus and Licinius as Augusti. It would seem reasonable to assume that Constantine established the solidus-follis reform on the occasion of his victorious return to Trier, from Marseilles, and in time for the celebration of his quinquennial year which began with his *dies imperii* on 25 July A.D. 310. It was on that return journey that he is supposed to have had the vision portending his victorious future under the special protection of Apollo-Sol; and so the first Sol coinage, on the new $\frac{1}{72}$ libra standard, most probably dates from the time of his return to Trier in the spring of A. D. 310. Not surprisingly, we find that it was issued with Constantine's superscription only.

The solidus-follis reform spelled the doom of the lingering «*denarius-argenteus*» which had no real place in the new Western coinage system of A. D. 310 — the argentiferous bronze follis being then regarded as the major silver denomination, except for scarce «half-pieces» (really of unknown denomination) in higher quality but debased silver. As a consequence of the Reform, which had no parallel in the Central and Eastern dominions, Constantine was able to meet the heavy expenses of his quinquennial year (July A. D. 310—July A. D. 311), with a distinctive and acceptable coinage, within his limited bullion resources; and then to launch his successful Italian campaign, in the autumn of A. D. 312, after Maxentius had formally declared war. I suggest that the larger of the «unmarked» Mars and Sol issues (of 22 mm module) belong principally to the period of Constantine's Italian campaign, perhaps commencing in the summer of A. D. 312. Some of them might have been coined *en route*, by a detachment from the Treveran mint — in which case the omission of the mint signature would have been appropriate to the circumstances.

With the capture of the Maxentian mints in the autumn of A. D. 312 it seems that Constantine used their facilities almost immediately for the fabrication of solidi and folles to his own reduced Treveran weight standard of 72 per libra. But heavy military and civil expenses in conquered Rome in the winter of A. D. 312—313, and the consequent heavy drain on funds (which is revealed also by a great diminution in the minting of Treveran gold pieces after A. D. 312) seem to have forced yet another coinage reform upon Constantine while away from Trier. This involved the lowering of the follis weight-standard to 96 to the libra and the reduction of the die size to $19/20$ mm²⁰. Intimation of the chosen re-adjustments may have been sent on to Trier in advance of Constantine's imminent return — which could provide one explanation of the size-reduction effected in the last Treveran «unmarked» issues. Alternatively the reduced «unmarked» issues (of 96 per libra) might have been first produced by moneyers accompanying Constantine in Italy late in A. D. 312. Either situation would harmonise with the evident short period of issue, and the known scarcity of these pieces. On the grounds of short obverse forms, and the single Mars piece of reduced module in the British Museum, Carson and Kent²² have previously recognised «a late date in the T/F period» for the smaller «unmarked» coins; this accords with my present detailed arrangement of the series but the date for the commencement need not be quite so late (A. D. 314) as Carson and Kent thought, although the coinage could have extended to that date.

It is probable that Constantine was back in Trier by late-May A. D. 313, and that one of his immediate acts would have been the initiation of the third T/F series to consolidate and continue the folles reform which he had already begun. Significantly, Constantine struck his favoured Mars and Sol types. The GENIO POP ROM issue in this particular series, coined entirely in the name of Licinius, would have been quite in accord with the recently-formed alliance with Licinius²¹. The absence of any coinage for Maximinus in the third T/F series accords with Constantine's existing sentiments towards Maximinus, and with the news of Maximinus' sudden defeat by Licinius in May A. D. 313. Constantine would have been made aware of this either during his return journey or shortly after his arrival at Trier in late May.

During the two years of Constantine's sojourn at Trier from mid-313 to A. D. 315 there were no further changes in the dimensions of the follis coinage. In A. D. 315

²⁰ Evidenced at Ostia shortly after Constantine's possession of that mint in late A. D. 312.

²¹ Constantine's meeting with Licinius in Milan in early spring A. D. 313; the marriage of Constantia to Licinius; the promulgation of the edict of religious toleration.

²² R. A. G. Carson and J. P. C. Kent, *op. cit.* 100.

the mint of Trier was expanded to two officinae for the A/S issues which succeeded the last in the T/F series — presumably to provide a much larger output — but the standards for weight, die size (and perhaps for the coinage alloy) appear to have been continued. Earlier, c. A. D. 309—310, Constantine had re-opened the mint of Lyon to produce folles to the established Treveran standards; but he appears to have closed it again in A. D. 316 when Aquileia was reopened. The personnel of the mint of Ostia were transferred to Arles early in A. D. 313. After the initial issues Arles worked to the $\frac{1}{96}$ libra weight standard which had been formulated at Ostia before Ostia was closed. It is interesting that the mint-workers took their preferred alloying practices with them ²³.

In A. D. 315 Constantine was in effective control of the mints of London, Trier, Lyon, Arles, Ticinum and Rome; by the middle of A. D. 317 he had also acquired Siscia and Thessalonica from Licinius, by conquest. It is reasonable to assume that thereby he enriched himself substantially, and so he had no further need to reform his coinage until his decision to introduce the *Victoriae Laetae Princ. Perp.* coinage c. A. D. 318. This coinage is of lower weight and module than any earlier issue of weight-reduced folles, but of much superior fineness ²⁴; it marks the next major phase in the development of the Constantinian follis coinage, and this is evident from the number of hoards for which the *Victoriae Laetae Princ. Perp.* coinage marks the beginning — or the preceding Sol coinage the end.

*La chronologie des émissions dans la longue série des folles avec T/F
frappées à Trèves par Constantin, de 309 à 315*

Résumé

En étudiant la séquence des folles de poids réduit, de la longue série $\frac{T \mid F}{PTR}$ selon leur titre, l'auteur a constaté que la chronologie ne correspondait pas à celle établie par le RIC. En d'autres termes, la classification établie par lui, fondée sur le titre, donc sur la valeur intrinsèque des folles, ne recouvrait pas celle donnée par le RIC, dont la division entre les volumes VI et VII est purement historique (mort de Maximinus). Présupposant que ces folles ont été frappés selon les méthodes les plus simples de la métallurgie, l'auteur a réussi à expliquer à la fois les différences de poids et celles du titre. Il en a tiré une chronologie originale et résoud, ce faisant, diverses difficultés rencontrées par les auteurs, il élimine les indéterminations que tant C. H. V. Sutherland que P. Bruun ont eu du mal à expliquer.

Les folles de Constantin sont généralement classés comme bronze, alors qu'ils entrent dans la série des pièces d'argent: leur titre est élevé, ce qui permet d'en déduire la valeur intrinsèque. Réexaminant attentivement le mode de préparation des flans monétaires, l'auteur démontre que les grands folles de la Tétrarchie, de poids d'environ 10 g étaient frappés à raison de 32 à la livre, et que les réductions de 6,5 g, 4,5 g et 3,5 g le furent à raison de 48, 72 et 96 à la livre. Ces réductions furent exécutées sans baisse du titre mais par diminution du diamètre, ce qui entraînait une

²³ A preference for more highly-leaded bronzes than normally used by the Gallic mints of Trier and Lyon. (Analyses to be published by the author.)

²⁴ A fineness similar to that of the XXI folles of c. A. D. 300 quoted in Ref. 1. (Analyses to be published by the author.)

réduction des effigies. Mesurant attentivement le cercle perlé des monnaies, l'auteur a pu les classer comme dit ci-dessus: les trois modules 25 mm, 21/22 mm et 19/20 mm correspondent aux frappes à 48, 72 et 96 à la livre. L'auteur rapproche ces dévaluations des événements historiques, et résume sa chronologie en un tableau.

Colin Martin

ALTES UND NEUES – NOUVELLES D'HIER ET D'AUJOURD'HUI

Parthische und sasanidische Münzen im Bernischen Historischen Museum

Der letzte Band des Jahrbuches des Bernischen Historischen Museums enthält neben anderen numismatischen Beiträgen¹ den von Robert Göbl verfaßten Katalog *«Eine neuerworbene Sammlung mittelasiatischer Münzen»* (S. 185—223, 16 Taf.) von 704 Exemplaren, wobei die Prägungen der Sasaniden und iranischer Hunnen überwiegen. Damit ist nunmehr ein Teil des Bestandes im Münzkabinett der Forschung zugänglich gemacht. Den Grundstock der Orientalia überhaupt bildeten jene 1030 Münzen aus Persien und Zentralasien, die 1914 mit der großen ethnographischen Sammlung von Henri Moser-Charlottenfels nach Bern gekommen sind². Im Laufe der Zeit gelang es dem damaligen Direktor, Rudolf Wegeli, dieses Gebiet systematisch auszubauen, das ihm offenbar besonders am Herzen lag. Leider enthielten die jeweiligen Zuwachsverzeichnisse in den Jahrbüchern nur summarische Angaben³. 1966 wurde die oben genannte, von R. Göbl bearbeitete Sammlung angekauft, worauf zwei Jahre später die Erwerbung einer ähnlichen, noch größeren Privatsammlung folgte.

Es besteht die Absicht, den ganzen Bestand zu publizieren, analog dem von R. Göbl verwendeten Verfahren. Das Manuskript des Kataloges der Parther- und Sasanidenmünzen ist bereits nahezu abgeschlossen, es führt 813, bzw. 1252 Exemplare auf. Weitere Gebiete sollten später folgen.

Schließlich seien hier zwei sasanidische Bronzemünzen des Königs Sapur II. veröffentlicht, die R. Göbl kürzlich dem Münzkabinett schenkte. In seinem Handbuch *«Sasani-*

dische Numismatik» (1968)⁴ sind beide Typen nicht aufgeführt.

1. AE/Unit, 9,193 g, Typ Ib/5 var., Vs. seitenverkehrt, der König blickt nach links.

2. AE/Unit, 8,735 g, gelocht. Typ Ib/7.

Beide Münzen sind sehr stark abgegriffen und so zur Abbildung nicht geeignet.

Balázs Kapossy

⁴ Vgl. die Besprechung in SM 18, 1968, 54—55.

Bemerkungen zu einem Berner Beuterodel von der Murtenschlacht

Während der Vorbereitungen zur Jubiläumsausstellung des 75jährigen Bernischen Historischen Museums *«Die Burgunderbeute und Werke burgundischer Hofkunst»* machte mich H. U. Geiger auf einen Beuterodel im Staatsarchiv von Bern (Ratsmanual Nr. 28, 18. Januar 1480) aufmerksam¹. Die Liste zählt eine ganze Reihe von Kostbarkeiten auf und schließt mit der Beschreibung eines wahren Münzschatzes, die folgendermaßen lautet:

Ann gold oder guldin Tusig und xxv utersguldin (= Gulden der Bischöfe von Utrecht), *franckenrycher schillt Sechshundert xiiij* (= écu d'or au soleil), *Item fünffhundert und viij katzen gulden* (= Gulden von Kurpfalz), *Item ij cc und xix duggaten* (= Dukaten von Venedig), *Item fünff und sibentzig der guilermischen gulden* (= Gulden des Landgrafen Wilhelm von Hessen-Kassel?), *Item xiiij Rosen nobell* (= englische Goldmünze), *Item zwölff engelsch* (= entweder Frankreich, ange d'or, Philipp VI. 1341/1342, oder Frankreich, angelot, Heinrich VI. von England 1427 oder England, Angel, Heinrich VI. 1470/1471), *Item zehen avignioner gulden* (= Gulden der Päpste in Avignon), *Item dryhundert Rinsch gulden* (= rheinische Gulden), *Item iiij ganntz gulden kettenen die wegent vij marckt und iiij untzia, und ij quart einer untz*, *Item sechtzehnhundert plancken pam-*

¹ B. Kapossy, Rara, Unica, Inedita I. Augustus-Geta. S. 225—248. B. Kapossy, H. A. Stettler: Zuwachsverzeichnis. S. 579—590. — Sonderdrucke sind, solange vorrätig, durch das Sekretariat des Museums zu beziehen.

² Zur Geschichte der Orientalia vgl. H. A. Stettler, SNR 45, 1966, 141—142; zur Islamica G. C. Miles, ebenda, 131.

³ Ein Tetradrachmon des Tiridates II. (?) von Parthien veröffentlichte Ph. Lederer, SNR 30, 1943, 81, Nr. 95.

¹ Ausführlich beschrieben von H. P. Trenchel im Ausstellungskatalog *«Die Burgunderbeute und Werke burgundischer Hofkunst»*, Nr. 39.