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Why are “coins in context” important?

- *Chronology (of a feature, site, or of coins themselves)
- Economic Conditions, Coin Circulation and Supply
- Demographic Movement and Military Dispositions
- Iconography
- Object Biography
Chronology (Close contexts vs find series)

• Coin finds in the 1950s/1960s vs today
• Example of Vindonissa: (list 1) and (list 2)
• Close contexts (von Kaenel, C/C pp. 9-15)
• Find series (Wigg-Wolf, C/C pp. 109-125)
Site chronology: the example of the Roman auxiliary fort at Yotvata, Israel

- Foundation of the site: inscription vs coins
- Abandonment of the site and (numismatic, archaeological and comparative evidence)
- Implications for ceramic chronologies
Coin Circulation and Coin Supply/
Mobility and Immobility of Coin

• Richard Duncan-Jones
• F. Kemmers
• Movement of Denominations
• Supply Mechanisms
Demographic Movement/Military Dispositions


• The movement of Constantinian bronze coinage from West to East, but not East to West. (Noeske – Egypt; and at Yotvata).
Iconography


Architectural Types and Audience Targeting

Sample Area and Size: 13,563 Total Coins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Germany (FMRD)</th>
<th>Austria (FMRÖ)</th>
<th>Slovenia (FMRSi)</th>
<th>Rome (SSO I, SSO II)</th>
<th>Italy (RMR Ve)</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vespasian</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>3042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>1223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td>2207</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>4454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trajan</td>
<td>2487</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>4844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6800</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>2312</td>
<td>1365</td>
<td>13563</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Vespasianic Ara Providentiae Asses from Sample Area

Proportional Geographic Distribution of Ara Providentiae Types for Vespasian, n=72

Germany (FMRD, n=61/1770)
Austria (FMRÖ, n=0/278)
Slovenia (FMRSL, n=1/305)
Rome (SSO I and SSO II, n=10/469)
Italy (Veneto = 0/220)

References
Tiberian Type for Divus Augustus
Number of Titus' Ara Providentiae Asses from Sample Area, n=22

Proportional Geographic Distribution of Titus' Ara Providentia Types for Divus Augustus, n=22

- Germany (FMRD, n=5/336)
- Austria (FMRÖ, n=0/170)
- Slovenia (FMRSI, n=0/102)
- Rome (SSO I and SSO II, n=17/274)
- Italy (RMR Ve, n=0/341)

Copies Tiberian Type for Divus Augustus
Proportional Geographic Distribution of Domitianic Victimless Sacrifice As, n=36

- Germany (FMRD, n=14/2207)
- Austria (FMRÖ, n=5/541)
- Slovenia (FMRSI = n2/339)
- Rome (SSO I and SSO II, n=11/996)
- Italy (Veneto, n=4/371)

* n from excavations only
Proportional Geographic Distribution of Trajanic Bronzes with the Column of Trajan, n=27

- Germany (FMRD, n=15/2487)
- Austria (FMRÖ, n=8/857)
- Slovenia (FMRSI, n=1/494)
- Rome (SSO I and SSO II, n=3/573)
- Italy (Veneto, n=0/433)
Proportional Geographic Distribution of Trajanic Bronzes with the Danubian Bridge, n=25

- Germany (FMRD, n=12/2487)
- Austria (FMRÖ, n=6/857)
- Slovenia (FMRSI, n=2/494)
- Rome (SSO I and SSO II, n=1/573)
- Italy (Veneto, n=4/433)
Proportional Geographic Distribution of Trajanic Bronzes of the Aqua Traiana, n=14

- Germany (FMRD, n=3/2487)
- Austria (FMRÖ, n=2/857)
- Slovenia (FMRSI, n=0/494)
- Rome (SSO I and SSO II, n=8/573)
- Italy (Veneto, n=1/433)
Trends and Conclusions:

- Denotative types (usually celebrating the construction/reconstruction of a monument in Rome) are uncommon and therefore difficult to assess. Modern selection processes may explain their lack of appearance in the sottosuolo finds where we would most expect to see them. Many denotative types, for what it is worth, are frequent in Italian museum collections.

- In spite of the lack of a large sample for many denotative types, the evidence from the sottosuolo finds for the Aqua Traiana types does indicate that, at least as regards this type, audience targeting was geared towards the Roman capital.

- Quantifiably, the most common architectural types are those which connoted broader ideas or concepts.
Trends and Conclusions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vespasian</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Architectural Types</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trier</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domitian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Architectural Types</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trier</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trajan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Architectural Types</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trier</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>