

**„BABEȘ-BOLYAI” UNIVERSITY – CLUJ-NAPOCA
FACULTY OF HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY**

RAOUL MARIUS ȘEPTILICI

**THE “BARBAROUS” COINAGE IN THE FORMER DACIAN
PROVINCES AND THEIR WESTWARD TERRITORIES IN
THE 4th CENTURY A.D.**

DOCTORAL THESIS ABSTRACT

**SCIENTIFIC COORDINATOR:
PROF. UNIV. DR. NICOLAE GUDEA**

2013

CONTENTS

Chapter I. INTRODUCTION.....	3
1. The subject argument	3
2. The historical and geographical context	7
3. Overview of the current researches	23
4. The approached methodology	32
Chapter II. REPERTOIRE OF “BARBAROUS” COINAGE DISCOVERIES ...	37
Chapter III. THE TYPOLOGY OF THE PIECES	57
1. Types of imitation coins	59
2. The catalogue of the types of imitation	64
Chapter IV. THE LOCATION OF SUCH ISSUES IN THE COINAGE CIRCULATION AS WELL AS WITHIN THE COINAGE ACCUMULATIONS (HOARDS)	169
1. The frequency of pieces in isolated discoveries	170
2. The frequency of the pieces in hoards	175
3. The area of distribution	179
4. Attempts to determine places of coinage issuing	181
5. The motivation for issuing such pieces	214
Chapter V. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	217
ANNEXES	228
Bibliographical abbreviations	229
Bibliography	231
Abbreviations of issuers	242
Other abbreviations	244
The codes of places of discovery	246
List of barbarized coinage discoveries.....	249
Pictures and tables	264

Key words: “barbarous” coin, former Dacian provinces, their westward territories, 4th century, Danube, bronze coins, gold coins, imitations, barbarized coins, Pannonia, Moesia, Dobruja, hoard, isolated discovery, coin mould, follis, aureus, solidus, Sarmatians.

Chapter I. INTRODUCTION

1. The subject argument

The “barbarous” coins from the former Dacian provinces and their westward territories in the 4th century A.D. raise three fundamental issues: the subject in question (the “barbarous” coin), its location (the former Dacian provinces and their westward territories) and the period (4th century A.D.).

a. The subject – the „barbarous” coin

For this subject we had in mind those coins which imitate Roman coins, but fall off their standard in terms of appearance. Practically we shall refer to those pieces which copy, in a more or less successful manner, contemporary Roman coins, the so-called imitations or counterfeits. Maybe it would be fairer to say “barbarous” coin of Roman origin, its style and especially its legend being the determining criteria.

b. The location – the former Dacian provinces and their westward territories

When we say the former Dacian provinces, we shall essentially refer to the territory of Trajan’s Dacia. Their westward territories refer to the area starting from the left shore of the Middle Danube until the former Dacian provinces. Specifically we refer to the plain between the Danube, the Tisa and the territory East from Tisa, moving down South until to its conjunction with the Mures, to the East until it reaches the former Dacian provinces and to the North until the springs of Tisa. However, we shall also

inevitably refer to the territory situated in its near vicinity, South of the Danube and West of it (i.e. the right shore of the Danube).

The area initially taken into account is not an isolated territory. It is part of a larger area and is submitted to influences from the neighbouring territories. If we would only limit ourselves to the study of the “barbarous” coin within the territory mentioned in the title of the paper, we would have a case study which is out of the historical and geographic context, which would lead us to unrealistic conclusions of a larger or smaller degree of error. This is the reason why we shall study the pieces and the provinces from the right shore of the Middle Danube.

c. The studied period – 4th century A.D.

Since a century is a conventional rigid mark, which extends between two fixed dates, we have modified a little the time interval of the study. We established two important events in the history of the Roman Empire, studying the time interval between 275 and 395. We refer to the end of the reign of emperor Aurelianus, who leaves the Dacian provinces (275) and the end of the reign of Theodosius I, who shall divide (definitively) the empire between his two sons (395). We shall analyse the coin discoveries containing issues starting with Aurelianus and his wife and finishing with Theodosius I, his wife and his two sons (as long as they are associated with their father in reign).

2. The historical and geographical context

The withdrawal of the Roman ruling in Dacia did not mean leaving it completely. The archaeological vestiges demonstrate a local continuity, despite the silence of contemporary literary sources. It is even talked about a Roman presence on the left shore of the Danube at the beginning of Constantinus I reign, presence which is chiefly archaeologically documented, especially in Banat where objects of late Roman origin are still being found in all ancient Roman localities, sometimes even in old buildings. The same is valid for Oltenia. In fact, right after leaving Dacia, it is here that are maintained the bridge heads from Dierna, Drobeta, Hinova, Desa and Sucidava and probably even others. Through these were watched the moves of the “barbarians”, therewith

guaranteeing the free sailing on the Danube. It seems that the beneficiaries of these territories were essentially the Carpi and the Goths. No sooner than during the tetrarchy that the Sarmatians and the Germans arise West of Olt.

a. The locals and the barbarians

The Aurelian retreat has led to the disappearance of the North of the Danube borders, which were intended to stop other people, of other ancestry, to enter the Empire (in our case in the Dacian provinces, part of the Roman Empire). These people were generically named barbarians. In the first place there were the free Dacians. Among them the Costoboci are to be noted, who were defeated by Marcus Aurelius (174), their trace being nearly definitively lost. They were the bearers of the Lipita culture from the North of the current border of Romania, on the Superior Dniester and in the Transcarpathian Ukraine.

The *free Dacians* are sparsely mentioned, but the Dacicus Maximus title born by some emperors (Maximinus, Decius, Gallienus, Aurelianus and Constantinus I) lead us to believe that they had conflicts with the Dacians outside the Empire and have even defeated them. However, after Constantinus I, the historiographical evocation of the Dacians stops. For the Muntenia area, the free Dacians are the bearers of the Chilia-Militari cultural group, which is fairly unspectacular, just like the one in the Western part of Romania.

Another barbarian people was the Carpic people, who in 238, together with the Goths, have crossed the Danube and robbed Moesia Inferior. Very probably, they were a Northern-Thracian people. Philippus Arabs shall conduct a triumphant military campaign (244-247) against the latter, the Goths and the Sarmatians. However, the Carpi together with the Goths shall continue to attack Dacia, as well as Moesia, which shall lead to the Romans abandoning the provinces North of the Danube, despite of the reputed victory of Aurelianus in 272. Subsequently the Carpi shall be repeatedly defeated by the Romans (Diocletianus, Galerius) and finally they moved to Moesia and even in Pannonia and some part of them remained under the ruling of the Goths. The last mention regarding them is ambiguous, it refers to Carpo-Dacians (*Καρποδάκαι*), who along with the Scirii and the Huns are defeated by Theodosius I (379-395). The Poienești-Vîrteșcoiu culture of

some communities of free Dacians, in its late stage, is very probable to have been integrated to the Carpi's sphere of influence.

Another barbarian people who made contact with the territories of the Dacian provinces are the Vandals. They were an East Germanic tribe. Around 271 the Roman emperor Aurelianus was forced to protect the middle course of the Danube against them. They made peace and settled in the West of Dacia and Pannonia. They shall leave the territory of Dacia in 336, migrating in Pannonia, where they receive lands on the right shore of the Danube from Constantine the Great. Later on they shall be headed for the West of Europe and then for the North of Africa, where they shall build their kingdom. The Vandals, after leaving the territory of the former Dacian provinces shall issue their own small coin of Roman inspiration.

The Sarmatians are a barbarian people who appeared on the history scene long before the Dacians, the Carpi and the Vandals. They were a confederation of tribes of horsemen, of Iranian origin, being mentioned for the first time in historical sources in 513 B.C. They were much like the Scythians and at the end of the 4th century B.C. they were living in the Eastern extremity of the Northern Pontic steppes. In the 1st century A.D., one of their branches, the Iazyges enter the Tisa basin, where they remain until the end of the 4th century. Their identity disintegrates in the context of the migration of the Goths and the Huns. Another one of their tribes, the Roxolani are identified ever since the 1st century A.D. North of the Danube, from where they often plundered Moesia. The Sarmatian type discoveries can especially be found in the West of Romania (Sântana – Arad County, Cicir, Badon, Vizejdia, Cherestur, Timișoara, Șimand, Săcuieni) and they mark out the relationships between them and the free Dacians. The Sarmatians were concentrated particularly in the plains.

The Goths culture (Sântana de Mureș - Černjahov) forced itself upon these cultures, as well as over the Roman authority. At the beginning of the Christian era they lived on the shores of Vistula. They left for the South-East around 200, reaching the Northern Pontic steppes. In the first half of the 3rd century they occupied their territory between Dniester and Prut. In 238, together with the Carpi, they made the first incursion in the Danubian provinces. At the end of the 3rd century, they are divided between two branches: the Eastern one – the Ostrogoths and the Western one – the Visigoths. The

invasion of the Huns in 376 shall put an end to the domination of the Visigoths at the Lower Danube. Their culture (Sântana de Mureş - Černjahov) imposed itself in the Dacian territory, reaching from East to Olt.

The Huns are the last barbarians who appear in the studied territory for the period in question. As a nomad people arrived from Asia, by the middle of the 4th century they lived between Don and Volga, by 375-376 they appear in Ukraine where they shall end the Ostrogoth kingdom ruled by Ermanaric. In 395 they crossed the Caucasus ravaging the Roman and Persian territories between Antiochia and Ktesiphon. At the same time, the chief Hun Uldis was setting on fire the Roman fortresses on the left shore of the Danube. In the '20s of the 5th century A.D. they settle in the Plain of Tisa, where they reach their high under King Attila, but after his death (in 453), their feared but ephemeral kingdom falls to pieces.

The Huns' vestiges are quite conspicuous. Their graves are to be noted, some are very sumptuous, emphasizing the high rank of the deceased.

Together with the Huns, the Gepids also participated to the South-Danubian incursions. They were an East-German people related to the Goths, who in the first centuries of the Christian era were located at the mouths of Vistula. They are defeated in the 290-291 by the Goths at Galtis, probably on the superior course of the Pruth. They probably enter the superior course of Tisa. Their history is quite unclear, being defeated in 418 by the Ostrogoths and incorporated in the Huns' confederation. They were probably the owners of the two sumptuous treasures from Şimleul Silvaniei.

b. Brief history of the situation of coins and mints

The reign of Aurelianus (from a numismatic point of view) remarks itself by following up the old coin series which are issued in **Rome, Siscia, Mediolanum, Ticinium, Lugdunum, Serdica, Antiochia** and **Kyzicus**; there were also colonial mints.

As a result of the reform of Diocletian (year 294), the relatively rare coin in the former Dacian provinces becomes more frequent. It is a period when the colonial mints continue to produce, but there is a standardized coin for the entire imperial territory, thereby simplifying the process of the coinage circulation. At this time there are 14 mints which issue coins.

Diocletian creates an aureus with a mass equal to 1/60 of Roman Libra and a silver coin – argenetus – representing 1/96 part of the same weight unit. He created at least two types of bronze coins, one with the radiated effigy of the emperor, a piece that reminded of the old antonians and bearing the name of follis. The second bronze piece has the laurated effigy, it is a bronze denar. The value of a bronze denar represented the fifty thousand part of a Roman Libra of gold. The reform was completed by Constantine I, of whom coinage system persist largely also in the Byzantine Empire.

Constantine I creates a new gold coin – solidus, representing 1/72 of a Libra of gold (4.54 gr). He also created two silver coins: siliqua representing 1/144 of a Libra of silver (2.27 gr) and miliarensis, actually a double siliqua of 4.54 gr (representing 1/72 of a Libra of silver). This piece was worth the thousand part of a Roman Libra of gold. The bronze coin, follis, which kept on shrinking in size, weighted around three grams and received the name nummus centenionalis and it represented 1/100 of a siliqua. Thereby results that a solidus was equal to 14 miliarensis or 28 siliqua or 2800 nummus.

3. Overview of the current researches

The subject of the barbarous pieces from the studied territory has been very little approached. The oldest study is an article signed by W. Knechtel, which appeared in 1913 in the *Romanian National Numismatic Society*. It deals with “barbarous” coins in general, discovered on Romanian territory, containing also pieces of the 4th century. Then, follows George Severeanu in 1925, who deals with a much larger lot of barbarized pieces made after issues of Constantine I. In 1945, Dumitru Tudor also approaches the issue of some pieces from Sucidava.

After 1950 the interest for this type of coins is less intense. Barbarized pieces are mentioned in the specialty works dealing with some coin discoveries. Among these works, those signed by Eugen Chirilă and Nicolae Gudea are to be noted, and later on also by Alexandru Sășianu or Radu Ardevan.

It is only in 2003 that an ample article signed by Nicolae Gudea and Cristian Găzdac, that deals with the barbarized coins from the hoards of Banat, appears in the *Ephemeris Napocensis* magazine (in English) and then in 2004 in *Revista Bistriței* magazine (in Romanian). It is the first article to reach pertinent conclusions. For Dobruja,

the issue is approached by Dima and Talmačhi, but it refers to imitations obtained by casting.

Initiating in 1997 this doctoral thesis, it is natural that our scientific preoccupations were drawn towards such coinage issues. Thus, we have written a number of articles on this topic, most of them dealing with such coinage issues, but also trying to elucidate the matter.

Specialty literature abroad is more abundant in such works. For the territory in near vicinity the works of Gohl Ödön, Alföldi András, Biróné Sey Katalin, Miloje R. Vasić, Claude Brenot and Ž. Demo are to be noted.

In the West of Europe, more important studies are written by H. Mattingly, P. V. Hill, P. Bastien, G. Jawor, without limiting the list of researchers.

4. The approached methodology

For the matter in question we studied the “barbarous” coins from both shores of the Danube, up to the Eastern border of the former Dacian provinces. Where we felt necessary we also referred to other territories.

A repertoire of the localities with such discoveries has been drawn up, as well as a catalogue of the pieces, according to their style. This helped us note certain influences in the execution of the pieces, sometimes even helped us intuit that some barbarized pieces had been done by the same persons or at least by the same mint. More by token, we discovered pieces executed with the same moulds. By correlating these facts with their place of discovery and based on some natural presuppositions, we could form an opinion regarding the areas where such were issued. Also, we drew up a map illustrating the discoveries of such pieces, separating (by the chromatic of the symbols) the discoveries in the territory directly under question from those in the right shore of the Danube.

Chapter II. REPERTOIRE OF “BARBAROUS” COINAGE DISCOVERIES

The repertoire of “barbarous” coinage discoveries has been drawn up according to geographic areas, by separating hoards from isolated discoveries. A number of 85 points

and areas with such numismatic discoveries have been listed: 19 in Banat, 2 in Oltenia and West of Muntenia, 15 in Northern and Western Transylvania and East of the Pannonian Plain and 49 in the territories on the right shore of the Danube.

III. THE TYPOLOGY OF THE PIECES

1. The types of imitation coins

Beside a few scattered coins at the end of the 3rd century and the beginning of the 4th, the most important types of bronze imitation coins are IOVI CONSERVATORI, VICTORIAE LAETAE PRINCIP PERP, VOTA, VIRTVS EXERCIT, PROVIDENTIAE, GLORIA EXERCITVS, CONSTANTINOPOLIS, CONCORDIA MILITVM and FEL TEMP REPARATIO.

Golden coins do not have a specific typology.

2. The catalogue of types of imitation

The catalogue contains all barbarized pieces from the area we studied, with as much data as possible and where possible even with an illustration. The number of the catalogue is the same as that of the illustration (which is not complete). For coins minted with the same moulds, a single number of catalogue has been given, with a subnumber for each separate piece. It contains 466 coins (427 bronze and 39 gold). First the bronze pieces have been listed, then the gold ones, according to issuers (of originals) and types of coinage. We have bronze coins from Tetricus I and Tetricus II (2), Probus (1), Diocletianus (1 – IOVI CONSERVATORI), Maximianus Herculius (3), Constantius I Chlorus (1 - CONCORDIA MILITVM), Constantinus, (248: IOVI CONSERVATORI – 1, CONCORDIA MILITVM – 1, VICTORIA LAET PRINC PERP – 169, VOT XX MVLT XXX V/XX/M/XXX – Thessalonica – 9, VIRTVS EXERCIT – 23, VOTA – 40, PROVIDENTIAE AVGG – 5), Licinius I (17: VICTORIAELAETAE PRINCIP PERP – 14, VIRTUS EXERCIT – 1, VOTA – 1, PROVIDENTIAE AVGG – 1), Licinius II (4: VICTORIAELAETAE PRINCIP PERP – 2, VIRTUS EXERCIT – 1, PROVIDENTIA CAESS – 1), Crispus (33: VICTORIAELAETAE PRINCIP PERP – 18, VIRTUS EXERCIT – 13, VOTA – 2), Constantinus II (39: VICTORIAELAETAE PRINCIP

PERP – 13, VIRTVS EXERCIT – 2, VOTA – 23, PROVIDENTIAE CAESS – 1), one coin of the VICTORIAELAETAE PRINCIP PERP type (with unidentified issuer), CONSTANTINOPOLIS type (2), Constans (1 – GLORIA EXERCITVS), Constantius II (53: CONCORDIA MILITVM – 2, FEL TEMP REPARATIO – 51 of which 48 FH variant), Delmatius (1 – GLORIA EXERCITVS – mint error), Constantius Gallus (15: CONCORDIA MILITVM – 3, FEL TEMP REPARATIO – 12 of which 11 FH variant), Iulianus II Apostata (2 – FEL TEMP REPARATIO with FH), one imitation of FEL TEMP REPARATIO type with FH with unidentified issuer, Arcadius (1 – VOTA) and one undetermined imitation.

Of the 39 gold coins we have (1) after Probus, one from the end of the 3rd century, Diocletianus (2), Galeria Valeria (1), Maximianus Herculius (1), Severus II (1), Constantinus I (19), Helena (1), Licinius I (2), Crispus (3), Constantinus II (6) and Teodosius I (1).

IV. THE PLACE OF SUCH ISSUES IN THE COINAGE CIRCULATION AS WELL AS WITHIN THE COINAGE ACCUMULATIONS (HOARDS)

1. The frequency of pieces in isolated discoveries

In order to form an opinion regarding the frequency of these pieces in isolated discoveries, we had to review the coinage circulation of that period. For the right shore of the Danube we reviewed the same areas as for the repertoire. Thus, in Banat (see *Table I* in *Annexes*) we know 22 gold coins, 12 silver coins, over 1039 bronze coins, at least 56 unspecified metal coins, all discovered in 128 localities. The gold coins are from Probus until Theodosius I, with two imitations which would represent 9.09 % of the total gold coins. It is a high percentage, which we consider relevant since we are working with a small number of pieces.

The silver coins are from Probus until Valentinianus II, but we have no imitation of this kind.

The bronze coins are from Aurelianus until Theodosius; of the 881 coins with known issuer, there are 21 barbarized pieces which represent 2.38% of the total number of pieces with known issuer. We believe that this percentage is much more realistic than that of the gold coins.

The coinage circulation in this region is continuous, bronze coins being most prevalent, with a climax in the Constantinian era. We believe this is because of the relations of the region with the Empire and even because of the reintegration of this territory in the Empire for a certain period (Constantinian).

In Oltenia and the West of Muntenia we have 10 gold coins, more than 42 silver coins, over 2222 bronze coins, over 117 of unspecified metal and two golden medallions, from 85 localities from the entire territory, less from the Southern Carpathians.

The gold pieces are Aurelianus until Theodosius I. The silver ones are from Aurelianus until Procopius. For these two categories we do not have imitations.

Of the 2222 bronze coins we know the issuer of 1925 (86.71 % of the total number). These are pieces from Aurelianus until Theodosius I and Aelia Flaccilla, here being also included the three barbarized coins and which represent only 0.16% of the bronze coins with known issuer. It is a negligible percentage since such pieces are not characteristic for this area. They come from two urban centres (Sucidava and Drobeta) which were still under Roman ruling (in fact, it is very likely that the coinage circulation in such centres is very similar to the South Danubian coinage circulation).

The coinage circulation in this area decreases substantially after the retreat from the Dacian provinces. In the Constantinian period the bronze coinage circulation increases considerably (there are at least two reasons for this: these territories fall under Roman ruling or at least under Roman control and the coinage of the Empire becomes official; the coinage reform of Constantinus I, as well as the following ones of that era result in an invigoration of the economy), but in the last period studied the circulation of the bronze coinage decreases, presenting a lesser interest, but without suffering a crisis similar to that of the pre-Constantinian period. For the Constantinus I period, a very important factor is the existence of a new bridge over the Danube, at Sucidava. This is an additional argument regarding the Roman ruling or control North of the Danube.

For this area the strong presence of coinage in the former Roman centres is to be noted, in some cases it continues until Tiberius Mauricius (582-602) and is interrupted by Slavonian elements. The same can be noted in Transylvania but on a smaller scale.

We have no knowledge of barbarized coins for the Transylvanian provincial territory. For this territory we know of 6 gold coins, at least 36 silver coins, a minimum

of 484 bronze coins, over 137 of unspecified metal and six golden medallions, coming from 97 localities, distributed all over the Transylvanian plateau and very little in the mountain side.

The gold coins are from Constantinus II, Constantius II, Valens, Gratianus, Theodosius I and Theodosius I or II. The 36 silver coins, 34 (94.44%) of which we know the issuer, are from Aurelianus until Theodosius I, but most of them are from the Constantinian period – 61.11%.

Of the 484 bronze coins we know of, there are 466 with known issuer (96.28%) from Aurelianus until Theodosius I. In this case too, most pieces are from the dynasty of Constantinus I – 66.74 %.

Also from Transylvania there are six medallions of gold from Licinius (1), Constantinus I (2), Constantius II (1), Valentinianus I (1), Valentinianus II (1), all from Gherla.

We had no data available for comparison for the territory on the right shore of the Danube.

2. The frequency of pieces in hoards

To determine the frequency of the pieces in hoards we referred to the entirely known discoveries, comparing the two shores of the Danube. To the South we have the hoards from Bikić-Do and Boljetin.

The Bikić-Do hoard (Srem district – Serbia) contains a number of 10590 coins from the time of the reign of Constantinus I, 32 pieces (0.3%) are imitations of VLPP, VIRTVS EXERCITVS and VOTA type.

The Boljetin hoard (Bor district – Serbia) contains a number of 1803 bronze pieces of the 4th century, a few of these belonging to the former century. There are a number of 1418 coins of the 4th century from Galerius until Iulianus Apostata, most of which are from Constantinus II. In addition to these coins there are also 13 imitations from Constantius II and Constantius Gallus, FEL TEMP REPARATIO and CONCORDIA MILITVM type. We have a percentage of 0.72% of barbarized coinage.

There is also a third hoard discovered in Serbia, in the collection of the National Museum of Belgrade, which contains 34 coins, imitations of the 3rd, 4th and 5th century

and with original pieces of the 5th century. There are only eight original coins. The exact provenance of this hoard is unknown. The pieces from the period under study are imitation after Tetricus I (1), Tetricus II (1), Constantinus I (6), Constantius II (1) and Constantius Gallus (1). It is a special hoard, as far as the period, size and the number of barbarized pieces are concerned. We cannot refer to it.

From the former Dacian provinces and their westward territories we have hoards containing bronze barbarized pieces. Most of them can be taken into account (having quite decisive data). They come mainly from Banat.

The Dalboșeț hoard (Caraș-Severin County), contained around 100 bronze pieces, most of them from the 4th century and of which 74 are known, most from the 4th century and also two barbarized pieces one from Constantius II and one from Constantius Gallus – 2.7%.

From the Jupa hoard (Tibiscum – Caraș-Severin County) we know 971 pieces, most of them from the 4th century, especially FTR of FH type, and also an imitation after Constantius Gallus with FH reverse – 0.1%.

From one of the hoards from Moldova Nouă (Caraș-Severin County) which consists of approx. 900 bronze pieces from the 4th century, most of them of FTR type with FH, 750 of them are kept at the Museum of Banat. Among these there is also an imitation after Constantius II, which results in a percentage of barbarized coinage of 0.13%.

There is another hoard of 4th century coinage from the same locality, partially recovered in several stages (Moldova Nouă IV). There are 740 pieces by now, most of them folles from the period of Constantius II and his coregents (especially Constantius Gallus). They are mostly FTR type coins, the majority of which are FH. Among these pieces there is also an FTR imitation, resulting in a percentage of 0.14%.

In Moldova Veche (Caraș-Severin County), in Flotații point, a hoard of around 4000 4th century coins was discovered. The predominating coins are pieces with FTR and FH from Constantius II, Constantius Gallus and Iulianus Apostata Caesar (with which it ends). It also contains “barbarous” coins of FTR type, copied after Constantius II (11) and Iulianus II Apostata (1) – 0.3%.

The Orșova hoard (Dierna – Mehedinți County) contains a number of 1222 coins,

most of them of the 4th century (especially FTR with FH), ending with Arcadius. In addition to these there is also an FTR with FH imitation after Constantius Gallus – 0.08%.

The Radimna I hoard, of approx. 1860 known pieces (most of them FTR with FH) also contains six coins which imitate pieces from Constantius II (6) – 0.32%.

The Radimna II hoard, with around 800-1000 coins (most of them FTR with FH), from 399 coins 5 are imitations, 4 after Constantius II and 1 after Iulianus II Apostata (Caesar), all FTR with FH – 1.25%.

We have a single hoard from Oltenia and the West of Muntenia, from Celeiu (Sucidava) – Olt County, containing 849 bronze coins from Constantinus I until Theodosius II. However this has two “barbarous” coins of which one after Constantius II, FTR type. This would mean 0.12%. But if we also take into account the second barbarization (from the 5th century), the percentage raises to 0.24%. Because it contains the coins from the 5th century, this hoard would not qualify for comparison with the other accounted hoards (it is however contemporary with the third hoard from Serbia).

We have eight hoards presenting the following situation: Dalboșeț – 2.7%, Jupa – 0.1%, Moldova Nouă I – 0.13%, Moldova Nouă II – 0.14%, Moldova Veche – Flotații – 0.3%, Orșova – 0.08%, Radimna I – 0.32% and Radimna II – 1.25%. The percentages are between 0.08% (Orșova) and 2.7% (Dalboșeț). However, except for Dalboșeț and Radimna II (1.25%), the other six hoards have a maximum of 0.32%.

For the South-Danubian hoards the percentage of barbarized coinage is 0.3% at Bikić-Do and 0.72% at Boljetin. There too few hoards for us to make a precise opinion. Moreover, the hoard of Bikić-Do is from the period of Constantinus I, and the one from Boljetin ends with Iulianus II Apostata. We note that in Banat we only have hoards contemporary with the hoard of Boljetin. This means that the hoard from Bikić-Do does not qualify for comparison with those from the North of the Danube, since it belongs to a different period.

In default of other data we can say that the hoards North and South of the Danube, which contain barbarized coinage, have a similar small percentage. Interestingly these bronze coinage hoards come from the shores of the Danube or from their near vicinity (even the hoard from Oltenia – Sucidava).

3. The area of distribution

If we follow the map of the discoveries of coinage at the end of the paper we shall note that the majority of the places where barbarized coins have been discovered are along the Danube, on both shores, from Celeiul (Sucidava) until the South of Slovakia at Hetény (Chotin). The large majority of the localities are old Roman centres lying on the Roman road alongside the Danube, on one side from Viminacium until outfall, and in the other direction through Singidunum (Belgrade), going down on Sava, until Sirmium (Sremska Mitrovica). On this road or in its immediate vicinity lay Kupinovo, Hrtkovci and Mačvanska Mitrovica (over Sava, in front of Sirmium). The same Danubian road goes up the river through Aquincum, Brigetio, Carnuntum, Vindabona, reaching further Augusta Vindelicorum and forwards towards North, West or South.

Other localities are near the Danube, but not right on its shore or in its immediate vicinity (at very little reach from the Danubian shore).

On Drava there is Osijek (Mursa)

Between the Danube and Balaton there are Pécs (Sopianae), the area of the city of Szigetvar, Baranyajenő, Szalacska mountains, Kaposvár, the area of the Balaton lake (the area also has Roman sites) and right up North Veszprém. We have no knowledge of big roads in this area, however at North of the Balaton lake there was a road leaving from Aquincum and making a connection with the road that linked Carnuntum and Vindabona de Poetovio.

Also, Archan (Ratisaria) and Niš (Naissus) are on the Istro-Adriatic road (which links the Danube with the Adriatic Sea). Little to the South there is Leskovac (a Roman site) lying near the trans-dardanic road. It leaves the istro-adriatic road near Naissus and end at Thessalonica.

There are also localities lying on the roads from the former Dacian provinces – Orşova (Dierna), Mehadia (Pretorium), Jupa (Tibiscum) and which went up to North-East through Ulpia Traiana Sarmisegetuza until Porolisum, at some point reaching the Mureş along which there was the “salt road” on Mureş, which transported the precious goods in Pannonia and Moesia. It seems that this road crossed the Tisa plain and reached Lugio.

Quite close to the Ulpia Traiana Sarmisegetuza – Porolisum road there are Sâniob, Săcuieni and Marghita, and on the road on Mureş there are Pesac and Sâmpetru Mare. Continuing on this road (Partiscum – Lugio) there lay Hajós, Kiskunfélegyháza (archaeological Roman site) and Kiskúnhalas.

There are few localities which are not on the old Roman roads or near them.

4. Attempts to determine the places of issue

Another very important clue besides the area of distribution of these pieces is that there are some coins issued by the same mould. These are of great help to us, in default of the location of workshops.

Among over 500 barbarized bronze coins discovered in the area of Middle and Inferior Danube (we have also introduced 95 coins we know, discovered in Dobruja since here we have a few coins with moulds identical to some from the area under study), there are 62 pieces issued with the same moulds. The coins copy pieces from Constantinus I, Licinius I, Crispus, Constantinus II and Constantius II, of different types. They were discovered from Nagytétény (currently incorporated to Budapest), going down the Danube, through Croatia, Serbia, Romania and Bulgaria, until Dobruja, in the Negru Vodă area and they come from isolated discoveries or from hoards.

We reckoned that one mould would have been used for approx. 50-200 copper coins, maybe double for gold coins (with less hardness).

We can say that coins issued with the same mould and found together must have been hidden (or lost) at a time relatively recent to the moment of their production or that they have been placed in hoards ever since the beginning and hidden at a later time. If not, they would have dissipated in the large coin supply.

Among the gold pieces there are also coins minted with the same moulds. They are made especially after Constantinus I. We have 11 of which one with the reverse identical to barbarized pieces after Crispus and after Constantius II. There are also two pieces after Constantinus II.

5. The motivation for issuing such pieces

We have two types of pieces, bronze ones and gold ones, separately dealt with.

Bronze coins have very little value. They keep the characteristics of the originals and we cannot say that they were made with the purpose of deceit. If we observe existing models and especially their circulation period, we can see that such coins appear especially when the coin supply is large.

We believe that such coins were issued by monetizing copper reserves. These came from copper extractions, from reusing the material in different types of objects or even by remonetizing older out of circulation coins of larger dimension.

There were copper deposits on both shores of the Danube, both in the mountains of Banat as well as to the South in Serbia, in the Bor mountains, but also in Bulgaria.

If we analyse the gold coin, we can see that very many pieces are drilled (or have handle) and are transformed into adornments.

Chapter V. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Finally, by studying 466 coins, of which 427 bronze and 39 gold, distributed in the former Dacian provinces and their westward territories, as well as in Pannonias and Moesia Superior and based on the map of the coin discoveries we can draw several general conclusions.

As far as the bronze coin is concerned, we noticed that it is most prevalent inside the Roman Empire (even if many times towards the border) and in what we today know under the name of Banat. As for the rest of the territory (the other regions which were part of the former Dacian provinces and the barbaricum at their West) such coins only appear sporadically. Very often it can be found in old urban or Roman living centres, even more frequent along ancient roads. That is exactly where the commercial activity was stronger and where a larger quantity of money circulated. We believe that these coins were mere counterfeits issued by persons inside the empire or in its immediate vicinity, of whose ethnic origins cannot be determined. Most probably they were Roman citizens, but it is also possible that they were tolerated barbarians in Roman communities. We believe that from the many terms we used, the term “barbarous” coin is not the most proper. A much more adequate term would be barbarized coin – in the sense that we are talking about a coin with distorted, uncharacteristic representations.

It is possible that pre-constantinian pieces are imports. From the period of Constantinus I, most coins come from the Empire, a small number from Banat, the rest are insignificant. By following the repetition of the moulds, we can say that such pieces are minted exclusively on the right shore of the Danube. There are a few distinguishable centres where these coins are abundant (in comparison with the other localities): Niš (Naissus – 6), Veliko Gradište (Pincum – 5), Novi Banovci (6), Krčedin (6), Sremska Mitrovica (Sirmium – 4), Bikić-Do (32), Sotin (7), Vinkovci (Colonia Aurelia Cibalae – 8), Dalj (4), Osijek (4), Sisak (Siscia – 7), Nagytétény (17). In addition to these there are also other neighbouring localities. If we look on the map we shall note see that in the area of Serbia and Croatia there is a large concentration of localities with discoveries of barbarized coins, especially between the Danube at East, Drava at North and Sava in the South. If we analyse the Bikić-Do hoard, with its large number of barbarized coins (even if they represent a small percentage of the entire hoard), but mostly the large number of pieces issued with the same moulds or in similar style, we believe that in the area there must have been at least one workshop that minted barbarized coins.

Also, in Leskovac there are two coins issued with the same moulds and a third one seems to be minted in the same workshop. At Naissus, close-by, more barbarized coins were found. We believe that it is also possible for such a workshop to have existed here, since copper mining was undertaken nearby.

It is possible that such workshops existed also on the current territory of Hungary (on the right side of the Danube).

We must not forget the circulation area of these coins. We have shown above that similar pieces (issued with the same moulds) also appear in Dobruja. Studying the Dobruja pieces, we have concluded that, based on the coin moulds, it is possible that there such a workshop existed at Isaccea (or close-by). We do not know exactly where The Dobruja pieces similar to those we studied come from, but they demonstrate that such barbarized pieces can be found at great distances from the area where such were minted. We are certain that similar pieces can be found in other regions as well. A proof for this would be the two coins discovered at Vinkovci (the Aurelia Cibalae colony) and Mitrovica (in Kosovo), which have been minted with the same mould for obverse and with very similar reverse moulds.

For the third period, characterized by imitations after Constantius II and his associates, the matters are similar, but there is a change in the gravity centre of the circulation of such coins. The localities with more such coins are: Moldova Veche (12), Radimna (11), Timișoara (5) and Boljezin (13). Except for Timișoara, the rest of the localities only have coins from hoards. The localities which have a larger number of imitations are only in Banat and immediately South of the Danube (Boljezin). In fact, except for Timișoara, the localities in Banat are also close to the Danube. It is an area about which most researchers accept that the local Dacian-Romans lived. For this period we have an even more indicative case. It is about no. 23-24 group of coins (after Constantius II, FTR type with FH). It consists of 10 pieces with the same obverse and nine of them also have the same reverse. The coins with different reverse (no. 23) comes from Serbia, no specified location, but the others are from Moldova Veche – Flotații (4 – hoard), Radimna (4 – I hoard) and Timișoara (1). The fact that we have 10 coins from the same workshop in four different locations is a strong argument in favour of placing a minting workshop in the area, probably in the Moldova Veche – Radimna area.

It is very likely that an illegal workshop might have existed also over the Danube, in the confluence area of the river with Morava (to the South there was a cupriferous area) or toward Boljezin (which is nearby); possibly in both places.

For the last period we only have one piece, which is very likely to be an import.

If we follow the catalogue of the bronze barbarized pieces, we notice that in principle such disappear upon the death of Constantius II and the taking over of the power by Iulianus II Apostata. The truth is that in the area directly under study, upon the death of Constantius II, the coinage circulation decreases, the last notable appearance is the Valentinian period, after which the coin is much rarer.

We believe that these barbarized bronze coins are mere counterfeits. The opinion is also shared by the researchers Nicolae Gudea and Cristian Găzduc. Moreover, we believe that these coins have nothing to do with the barbarous world, they pertaining to the Roman world. They are mere coin counterfeits, produced within the Empire or in its immediate vicinity by people who were also using it. These pieces back up the idea that a part of Banat and Oltenia have re-entered in the possession of the Roman Empire ever since the period of Constantinus I (confirmed also by the inauguration of the new bridge

at Sucidava or the meeting of June 338 of the three emperors – Constantinus II, Constantius II and Constans at Viminacium, on the right shore of the Danube; if the left shore of the Danube would not have been safe, the meeting would have been held in a location further inside the Empire).

The gold coin raises other issues. The few coins (13) with a known place of discovery are from Banat (Veliko Središte – 1, Starčevo – 2, Sânpetru Mare – 1), to its North or North-West or from Transylvania (Orosháza – 1, Bihor – 1, Marghita – 1, Transylvania – 2 Hajós – 2, Kiskunfélegyháza – 1) and few from the right shore of the Danube (from the Roman Empire) – Negotin (1) and the Dunántúl area (2). If we follow the catalogue of the coins we shall notice that most of the pieces are transformed into pendants (21 are pierced or have a handle, 13 are not pierced, we have no information regarding 5 of them). Among the 21 pieces there are also 3 from the right shore of the Danube. Except for the *subaeratus* piece which we believe to have been made in the Empire, we believe that the other 38 coins are produced in the barbarian world. The existence of more coins issued with identical or similar moulds, indicates that it is possible that there was a workshop in the plain side of Banat (barbaricum). We also believe that the 23 coins which the bibliography locate in Hungary are mostly from East of the Danube, when most researchers believe that the Sarmatians were those living in the plain side.

Finally we can say that the barbarized coinage from the studied territory is mainly locally minted, the bronze pieces being from the Roman Empire or in its immediate vicinity, in the territories controlled by Romans and the gold coins are minted in the barbarous environment, most probably in Sarmathian environment. The problem is similar in the entire Roman Empire, at least as far as the bronze coinage is concerned. There is no knowledge of silver barbarized coinage in the studied territory for the period in question.

The annexes consist of bibliographic abbreviations and bibliography, abbreviations of issuers, other abbreviations, codes of places of discovery, list of discoveries, pictures (27) and tables regarding the circulation of coinage (3) in the former Dacian provinces.