ISSN 0484-8942

REVUE NUMISMATIQUE

2016
(173e volume)

Revue soutenue par l'Institut National des Sciences Humaines et Sociales
du Centre national de la recherche scientifique

SOCIÉTÉ FRANÇAISE DE NUMISMATIQUE

Diffusion : Société d'édition « Les Belles Lettres »
2016

REVUE NUMISMATIQUE

La *Revue numismatique* paraît annuellement. Elle est la propriété de la Société française de numismatique qui en est l'éditeur et en assure le service à tous ses membres à jour de cotisation pour l'année concernée, lors de sa parution. La cotisation a été fixée pour 2016 à 54 € et 60 € pour les membres résidant à l'étranger.

Société Française de Numismatique
Reconnue d'utilité publique
Bibliothèque nationale de France, 58 rue de Richelieu, 75002 PARIS
http://www.sfnumismatique.org | sfnum@hotmail.fr

La *Revue numismatique* est également diffusée par
Belles Lettres Diffusion Distribution
25 rue du Général Leclerc, F-94270 LE KREMLIN-BICÊTRE
Tél. : 01 45 15 19 89 | Fax : 01 45 15 19 80

Les abonnements sont payables à la Société d'édition « Les Belles Lettres »

Le champ couvert par la *Revue numismatique* comprend la numismatique et l'histoire monétaire et s'étend à l'archéologie, l'histoire économique, l'histoire de l'art ainsi qu'à l'épigraphie, la sigillographie ou la glyptique dans leurs rapports avec l'étude des monnaies, médailles et documents monétiformes.
La *Revue* recherche des études de haut niveau et de première main, publication de documents nouveaux ou nouvelle interprétation de documents connus. Les articles sont retenus en fonction de leur qualité scientifique et de l'intérêt du document présenté. Les rubriques de la *Revue* sont indicatives et correspondent aux divisions historiques traditionnelles : numismatique celtique, grecque, romaine, byzantine, médiévale, moderne et contemporaine, orientale, médailles et jetons, histoire de la numismatique et des collections. Des notes synthétiques faisant le point sur une question ou un débat ont leur place dans les *Miscellanea* (la Société française de numismatique préférant réserver la publication des articles brefs au *Bulletin de la Société française de numismatique*).
Les langues admises sont, outre le français, l'allemand, l'anglais, l'espagnol et l'italien.
Les manuscrits complets et conformes aux instructions doivent être remis au secrétariat le 1er septembre de l'année qui précède la parution. Après avoir été confiés à plusieurs rapporteurs et examinés par le comité de lecture, ils sont définitivement retenus lorsque le conseil de gestion de la *Revue numismatique* se réunit, en février, pour adopter le budget de la *Revue* qui paraît dans l'année.
La *Revue* ne rend compte que des ouvrages qui sont adressés au secrétariat avec la mention « *Revue numismatique* ». Les ouvrages sont remis à des spécialistes proposés par les directeurs au Comité de lecture. La publication rapide dans le bulletin bibliographique ne doit pas nuire au caractère informatif et critique des comptes rendus et il est possible de rendre compte simultanément et synthétiquement de plusieurs ouvrages.
La *Revue* se réserve le droit de refuser toute publicité sans avoir à fournir de motif à sa décision.

Prépresse : Fabien TESSIER | Imprimerie France-Quercy – Mercuès

Dario CALOMINO*

Diva Paulina in Rome and in the East[1]

Summary - This paper reconsiders all the existing literary, epigraphic and numismatic evidence about Diva Caecilia Paulina, the wife of emperor Maximinus Thrax. Because this evidence is extremely poor and Paulina was almost entirely regarded by the ancient sources as a 'Diva', scholars have traditionally believed that she was already dead when Maximinus became emperor. However this assumption is almost entirely based on information gathered from Roman imperial sources. In fact the analysis of the very rare inscriptions and coins from the provinces suggests that Paulina may have been honoured as a still living Augusta in the East and that the traditional view about her cultural and social background can be challenged.

Keywords - Diva Paulina, Maximinus Thrax, Eastern Provinces, civic coinage, provincial élites.

Résumé - Cette étude propose un réexamen de l'ensemble des sources (littéraires, épigraphiques et numismatiques) disponibles à propos de Diva Caecilia Paulina, femme de l'empereur Maximin le Thrace. En raison de l'extrême rareté des sources la concernant et compte tenu du fait que les auteurs anciens l'évoquent quasi-exclusivement en tant de « *Diva* », les chercheurs ont généralement considéré que Paulina était déjà décédée au moment où Maximin prit le pouvoir. Toutefois, cette idée se fonde essentiellement sur l'étude des sources de nature impériale. Or, l'analyse de rares inscriptions et monnaies issues des provinces laisse penser qu'en Orient, Paulina a pu être honorée de son vivant en tant qu'*Augusta*, et permet de remettre en question les opinions traditionnelles quant au milieu culturel et social duquel elle est issue.

Mots clés - Diva Paulina, Maximin le Thrace, Provinces orientales, monnayage civique, élites provinciales.

* British Museum. Department of Coins and Medals.
Email: dcalomino@britishmuseum.org.

1. I am much in debt with Benet Salway (UCL), who has helped me improve this study with very valuable comments especially on the analysis of the epigraphic materials. I would also like to express my gratitude to other colleagues who provided very useful suggestions: Andrew Burnett (British Museum), Alfredo Buonopane (Università degli Studi di Verona), Richard Catling (Oxford), Antony Hostein (Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne). I am responsible for all the interpretations proposed in this article and for any possible mistakes it may contain. For the use of images, I wish to thank: E. Apostolou (Athens, Numismatic Museum = NMA), A. Dowler (London, British Museum = BM), K. Vondrovec (Vienna, Kunsthistorishes Museum = V), CNG London, Münzen und Medaillen München, NAC London, Pecunem - Gitbud & Naumann München.

Our knowledge of Diva Paulina Augusta (*PIR*[2] C 91), wife of emperor Maximinus Thrax (AD 235-238) and mother of Maximus Caesar, is still extremely poor. The empress was almost completely ignored by the literary sources; the epigraphic evidence is also surprisingly scarce and there is no surviving sculptural portrait that can be even only tentatively assigned to her.[2] Indeed the date of her consecration and whether she even lived to see her husband achieve the imperial purple remain matters of scholarly debate. The relative lack of documentation makes the still small numismatic evidence a major source of information. Accordingly, whereas general studies on Paulina have added little insight,[3] the studies on the coinage of Maximinus and Paulina have so far provided the most reliable set of data.[4] This paper aims to recapitulate and reconsider all the available pieces of information, including some new ones, in order to come to new thoughts and interpretation. Special emphasis is given to provincial inscriptions and coinage, and to the comparative analysis of mainstream imperial and civic coin issues.

1. Literary sources

Ammianus Marcellinus, Rerum gestarum libri *XIV,1,8*

Adulescebat autem obstinatum propositum erga haec et similia multa scrutandi, stimulos admovente regina, quae abrupte mariti fortunas trudebat in exitium praeceps, ***cum eum potius lenitate feminea ad veritatis humanitatisque viam reducere utilia suadendo deberet, ut*** *in Gordianorum* ***actibus factitasse Maximini truculenti illius imperatoris rettulimus coniugem****.*

'Moreover, his (of Constantius Gallus) fixed purpose of ferreting out these and many similar things increased, spurred on by the queen, who pushed her husband's fortunes headlong to sheer ruin, when she ought rather, **with womanly gentleness, to have recalled him by helpful counsel to the path of truth and mercy, after the manner of the wife of that savage emperor Maximinus**, as we have related in our account of the acts of the Gordians'.[5]

2. Varner 2004, p. 203.
3. See Bellezza 1966 and Liggi 1998. Liggi's paper provides the most complete collection of literary, epigraphic and numismatic sources, although provincial issues are not considered (p. 134, n. 12). It draws a broad picture focusing on the literary evidence, although some speculations on the prosopography are not demonstrable and the analysis of numismatic material is incomplete. Morello *et alii* 2006 also gives a broad overview of the surviving evidence on Paulina with a focus on the coins, but the analysis of the provincial issues is still incomplete.
4. Alram 1989 is an exhaustive study on the imperial coinage with cursory references to the provincial coins; Ziegler 1993 analyses the dated coins of Anazarbus with cross references to other civic coinages mentioned by Alram.
5. Translation: Loeb Edition, *Ammianus Marcellinus*, vol. 1 (1935), p. 9.

Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Maximini duo *VI,8*

Erat praeterea, ut refert Cordus, magnitudine tanta, ut octo pedes digito videretur egressus, ***pollice ita vasto, ut uxoris dextrocherio uteretur pro anulo****.*

'He was of such size, so Cordus reports, that men said he was six inches over eight feet in height; **and his thumb was so huge that he used his wife's bracelet for a ring**'.[6]

Zonaras, Ἐπιτομὴ Ἱστοριῶν *XII,16, p. 124*[7]

Αὐταρχήσας δ'οὗτος Μαξιμῖνος εὐθὺς ἐπέστειλε τῇ συγκλήτῳ, τὴν ἐκ τῶν στρατευμάτων ἀνάρρησιν ταύτῃ δηλῶν ἑαυτοῦ. οὐ μόνοις δὲ χριστιανοῖς βαρὺς ὑπῆρχε καὶ ἀπηνής, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπηκόοις. ὑβριστής τε γὰρ φόνων ἐργάτης καὶ τύραννος ἄντικρυς, χωρήσας εἰς ἁρπαγὰς καὶ ἀναιρέσεις ἀνθρώπων ἐξ οὐδεμιᾶς εὐλόγου λαβῆς, ***τοσοῦτον δ'εἰς μιαιφονίας ἐξώκειλην ὡς μηδὲ τῆς οἰκείας φείσασθαι γυναικός. κἀκείνην γὰρ ἀνεῖλε****.*

'When he had become ruler, Maximinus at once wrote to the Senate, disclosing to it his acclamation by the soldiers. He was oppressive and cruel not to Christians alone, but also to all his subjects, for he was both violent and greedy, and consequently very unjust, a perpetrator of murders, and an outright tyrant, who at any reasonable opportunity resorted to rapes and men's murders. To such a degree did he careen towards bloodguilt that **he did not even spare his own wife, for he murdered her.**'[8]

The authors refer to the wife of Maximinus Thrax without mentioning her name and giving very little information about her. Ammianus Marcellinus only indirectly refers to a passage in his lost book on the life of the Gordians, where he says to have described how Maximinus' brutality could only be mitigated by the gentleness of his wife. This reference is used as a comparison to the cruelty of Constantius Gallus Caesar (AD 350) in book XIV, which closes with a digression on the degeneracy of Rome and is permeated with a moralistic spirit; this could possibly affect also the allusion to the empress, who seems to be idealised.[9] The anecdote told by Iulius Capitolinus (*SHA*) can probably be dismissed as gossip. Centuries later, Zonaras sketched a stereotyped picture of Maximinus as a tyrant and a persecutor of the Christians;

6. Translation: Loeb Edition, *Historia Augusta*, vol. II (1924), p. 9.
7. A shorter version is given by another Byzantine author, Syncellus, p. 442.10, p. 680: 'The twenty-first Roman emperor was Maximinus. Maximinus instigated a persecution against Christians! He was a true Tyrant and extremely violent, so that he killed even his own wife…'. Cf. Banchich, Lane 2009, p. 80-81.
8. Translation: Banchich, Lane 2009, p. 43.
9. Cf. Liggi 1998, p. 146-147.

the insinuation that he was responsible for the death of his wife surely serves the purpose and the source from which he may have gathered this information (if any) is lost.

They all seem to have had very little information about Paulina, especially Zonaras, who otherwise would have reasonably said more. If Ammianus indulged in the description of Paulina's influence on Maximinus, he was probably better informed. On one point the two authors apparently disagree: Zonaras depicts Paulina as an innocent victim of her husband's homicidal fury, whereas Ammianus says that she was successful in appeasing his rage, which should imply that he did not kill her. Overall, the reliability of this literary evidence is undermined by possible senatorial influence on the historians upon which Ammianus and, much later on, Zonaras, drew their information. Given the notorious hostility of the Senate to Maximinus, this is definitely a possibility.[10]

2. Inscriptions

1. *CIL* X, 5054 = Dessau 492. Dedication on statue base.
   Atina, Latium et Campania (Regio I)
   Divae | Caeciliae | Paulinae | Piae Aug(ustae)

2. *AE* 1964, 220. Dedication on statue base.
   Formiae, Latium et Campania (Regio I)
   [[Diva[e] | Paulinae | Augusti n(ostri) | Imp(eratoris) C(ai) Iuli Veri Maximini | Pii Fel(icis) pont(ificis) max(imi) Germ(anici) max(imi) | Sarm(atici) max(imi) Dac(ici) max(imi) co(n)s(ulis) proco(n)s(ulis) | p(atris) p(atriae) uxori | C(ai) Iuli Veri Maximi nobi[lis]ss(imi) | Caes(aris) princ(ipis) iuvent(utis) Germ(anici) | max(imi) Sarm(atici) max(imi) Dacici max(imi) | matri]] | Formiani publice

3. *Paestum* 48 = *AE* 1964, 236. Dedication on statue base.
   Paestum, Bruttium et Lucania (Regio III)
   Divae | Paulinae Aug(ustae) | C(ai) Iuli Veri Maximini | Pii Fel(icis) Imp(eratoris) Aug(usti) uxori | C(ai) Iuli Veri Maximi | matri nobilissi|mi Caes(aris) | d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) p(ecunia) p(ublica)

4. *Gephyra* 2 (2005), 7 = *SEG* 55 (2005), 1471 = *AE* 2006, 1507. Upper part of statue base.
   Phaselis, Lycia (Lycia et Pamphylia)
   Παυλείνᾳ Σε|βαστῇ

10. For a deeper analysis of the literary evidence, see Liggi 1998, p. 132-133, 141-145.

The dedication from Atina (*Latium Adiectum*) was the only non-numismatic evidence that named Paulina until 1964, and still remains of unparalleled importance as the only inscription to report the family name Caecilia, and also addressing Paulina as a deified Augusta. Since it does not put her in relation with Maximinus, the two more recent discoveries from Formiae and Paestum are indispensable to confirm the earlier inference of numismatists (see below) that she was his wife. Both of these latter inscriptions refer to Diva Paulina Augusta as wife of Maximinus and mother of Maximus Caesar, but neither of the two mentions the name Caecilia. The dedication from Formiae was poorly preserved due to intentional damaging,[11] possibly as a result of the condemnation of the memory inflicted on the Maximini after AD 238 and retroactively extended to Paulina.[12] The other two inscriptions, though, did not suffer from the same fate,[13] so it is hard to say whether this was an isolated example or the images and inscriptions of Paulina were destroyed extensively.[14] Anyway, it seems unlikely that the lack of archaeological evidence about Paulina can be a consequence of '*damnatio memoriae*'; other factors, such as the fact that she died prematurely and was absent from Rome, probably played a major role.

It is notable that all three Latin inscriptions come from a relatively compact geographical area: two from the southern part of Latium and the other from Paestum in Lucania. This may be coincidental, or result from the fact that the dedications to Paulina were commissioned more or less simultaneously and consistently around Rome when the news of her death and deification was dispatched. The Caecilii were a powerful senatorial *gens* of long-standing tradition, probably from Central-Southern Italy, but with many ramifications throughout the empire (especially in Northern Africa); however, this does neither necessarily imply that Paulina belonged to a family of senatorial rank, nor that she was native of the Italian peninsula. The concentration of inscriptions in this area could be simply a consequence of the fact that an empress who bore the name of the Caecilii was celebrated copiously by members of her own gens in a region where they were well-established.[15]

11. *AE* 1964, 220 (p. 87).
12. Bellezza 1966, p. 75-76.
13. The damages on the Atina inscription are a consequence of bombing during the Second World War; Morello *et alii* 2006, p. 9.
14. The erasure of the names of Maximinus and Maximus on inscriptions was extensive but far from complete. See Bersanetti 1965, p. 57-65.
15. Cf. Liggi 1998, p. 135-138. This is confirmed by the pattern of dedications to senatorial members of the Caecilii that ranges from Ostia and Tusculum to Puteoli and Beneventum; cf. Andermahr 1998, p. 45-62 and 187-189.

New evidence may come from the Greek inscription (probably a statue base), found in recent years at Phaselis in Lycia, that mentions a Παυλείνα Σεβαστή. The recipient was initially believed to be Domitia Paulina, sister of Hadrian (*PIR*^{2} D 186),[16] probably also because the inscription was recovered near the Hadrian gate of the city.[17] But this Paulina was never given the title of Augusta in Rome, and in fact Cassius Dio (LXIX,11,4) says that Hadrian was mocked for declaring Antinous a god immediately after his death and not honouring promptly his sister Paulina when she died.[18] It has been pointed out (*AE* 2006, 1507) that the wife of Maximinus is the only Paulina for whom the title of Augusta is documented; the coins also show that she was addressed as Σεβαστή in the provinces (see below), so it is possible that the statue was dedicated to her and not to the sister of Hadrian. Two main arguments can be raised against this hypothesis: a) in this inscription Paulina is not regarded as Θεά; b) in the East the title of Σεβαστή could be bestowed upon women of the imperial family before they were elevated to the rank of Augusta in Rome,[19] some of them, like Domitia Paulina, having never been Augustae at all.[20] The first problem can only be resolved by producing further evidence to support the possibility that Caecilia Paulina became Augusta before her death (see below). To answer the second objection, one shall consider the other inscriptions that surely honour Domitia Paulina: she is addressed as 'Domitiae Paulinae sorori Hadriani' on a dedication from Fundi in Latium (*CIL* X, 6220 = Dessau 325), and similarly as 'Παυλεῖναν Αὐτοκράτορος ἀδελφὴν' and 'Σεβαστοῦ ἀδελφὴν Παυλεῖναν' on inscriptions found at Lyttos in Crete (*IGR* I, 1004) and at Attaleia in Pamphylia (*IGR* III, 773) respectively. Neither of the two refers to her as Σεβαστή.

3. The coinage in Rome and the Provinces

Paulina, the wife of Maximinus, was commemorated on mainstream imperial coins only posthumously by a *consecratio* series, on which she is veiled and draped, with the legend DIVA PAVLINA (*RIC* IV/2, 1-4). The omission of 'AVGVSTA' is not unusual; the legend DIVA MARINIANA was adopted on the *consecratio* coins of AD 253-257 for Mariniana, wife of Valerian (*RIC* V/1, 1-12),

16. See also Kienast 1996, p. 130.
17. This is the interpretation given in *Gephyra* 2 (2005), p. 10-11, n. 7, also followed by *SEG* 55 (2005), 1471.
18. See Grimm 1990.
19. Sabina, Hadrian's wife, was awarded the title of Augusta in AD 128, but she was called Σεβαστή on inscriptions in the East as early as AD 120 (Chaniotis 2003, p. 341) and on coins of Gaba (Judaea) even dating to AD 117/118 (*RPC* III, p. 511-513).
20. Many women of the Julio-Claudian family, from Julia to Antonia and Agrippina the elder, were honoured as Σεβαστή (although often preceded by Θεά). See Lozano 2007, p. 144.

who is also believed to have been already dead when her husband became emperor.[21] However, the omission of 'Augusta' between 'Diva' and the personal name of the empress on obverse legends does not imply that she had been granted the imperial title only posthumously. The best example is Faustina the elder, wife of Antoninus Pius, who died in AD 141, three years after becoming empress; she also was commemorated on *consecratio* coins as 'Diva Faustina'.[22] The reverses of the coins of Paulina feature three types: a) peacock facing; b) Paulina seated on a flying peacock, holding a sceptre; c) Diana driving biga, holding a flaming torch. Alram's catalogue lists six issues:[23] denarii 38a (= *RIC* 2, Paulina on peacock) and 39 (= *RIC* 1, peacock; figure 2);[24] sestertii 38b-d (= *RIC* 3, Paulina on peacock; figure 3)[25] and 40 (= *RIC* 4, Diana on biga).[26] Other than attesting that Paulina was deified, these issues do not provide very helpful information. The resemblance of Paulina's portrait to those of Maximinus and Maximus (see below) had been the main argument that she was the wife of Maximinus mentioned by Ammianus and Zonaras, until the discovery of the inscriptions at Formiae and Paestum confirmed it. The portrait is also the only aspect on which a relative chronology of the consecration coins can be based.[27] The features of Paulina are most similar to those of Maximinus' 'triumphal portrait',[28] that Alram dated between the end of Summer 236 and the death of Maximinus in 238 (figure 1);[29] he reckoned that posthumous coins in her name were struck after those that proclaimed Maximus Caesar, so not before the second phase of Maximinus' third emission, in 'Spätsommer' 236.[30]

The coins struck for Paulina in Asia Minor are extremely rare. In 1989, Alram counted only three civic coinages on which Paulina was celebrated: Anazarbus, Mopsus and Timbriada;[31] to date, this number has not increased. Five issues are attested, all but one of which describe Paulina as Θεά.

21. *RIC* V/1, p. 27; Bleckmann 2002, p. 311.
22. The legend DIVA FAVSTINA was adopted on aurei and denarii, whereas DIVA FAVSTINA AVGVSTA was used on bronze denominations *RIC* V/1, p. 27.
23. Alram 38a (= *RIC* 2) is a unique aureus in Florence that *BMC* VI (p. 233, n. 126) claims to be probably a cast in gold from a denarius (*pace RIC* IV/2, p. 153, n. 2).
24. Denarius, Rome (2.60 g); CNG 216, August 2009, lot 457.
25. Sestertius, Rome (20.57 g); NAC 78, May 2014, lot 2364.
26. Alram 1989, p. 72-73, 84.
27. E. Stein believed that Paulina was deified by Gordian III (*RE* 3.1 [1897], col. 1236). *RIC* and *BMC* dated the *consecratio* coins within the reign of Maximinus, but neither of the two had gone as far as to propose a more precise chronology.
28. Alram's categorisation of portraits follows Delbrueck 1940, p. 66-67.
29. Denarius, Rome (3.18 g); Pecunem - Gitbud & Naumann 35, September 2015, lot 692.
30. Alram 1989, p. 29, 54, 70.
31. Alram 1989, p. 56-58.

Figure 1 - Denarius, Rome.

Figure 2 - Denarius, Rome.

Figure 3 - Sestertius, Rome.

Figure 4 - Timbriada, Pisidia.

Figure 5 - Anazarbus, Cilicia.

Figure 6 - Anazarbus, Cilicia.

Figure 7 - Mopsus, Cilicia.

Figure 8 - Mopsus, Cilicia.

1. Timbriada, Pisidia (Lycia and Pamphylia): AD 235 (?).
   Obv. ΚΑΙΚΙΛΙΑ ΠΑΥΛΕΙΝΑ C. Draped bust of Caecilia Paulina, r.
   Rev. ΤΙΜΒΡΙΑΔΕΩΝ. Tyche standing facing, head l., wearing kalathos, holding rudder and cornucopia.
   ANM (Mauromichali Collection): 20 mm, 4.16 g, 6 h; VON AULOCK, *Pisidiens* 2192 = SVORONOS 1903, p. 250, n. 701 (figure 4).

2. Anazarbus, Cilicia: year 254 = AD 235/236.
   Obv. ΘΕΑΝ ΠΑΥΛΕΙΝΑΝ CEB. Draped bust of Diva Paulina, r.
   Rev. ΑΝΑΖ ΕΝΔ ΜΗΤΡΟ(ΠΟ) Β Γ ΕΤ ΔΝC. Seven stars on crescent.
   Triton VII, January 2004, 759 (Levante Collection, ex Sternberg 11, 1981, 350): 25 mm, 12.91 g; *SNG Levante* 1482 = ZIEGLER 1993, n. 649.1 (figure 5).

3. Anazarbus, Cilicia: year 254 (?) = AD 235/236.
   Obv. ΑΥ Κ Γ ΙΟΥ ΟΥΗ ΜΑΞΙΜΕΙΝΟC CEB. Laureate, draped and cuirassed bust of Maximinus Thrax, r.
   Rev. ΘΕΑΝ ΠΑΥΛ[...]. Diademed and draped bust of Diva Paulina, r.
   Levante Collection: 31 mm, 20.29 g, 10 h; *SNG Levante Supp.* I, 349 = ZIEGLER 1993, n. 666 (figure 6).

4. Mopsus, Cilicia: year 305 = AD 237/238.
   Obv. ΘΕΑΝ ΠΑΥΛΕΙΝΑΝ CEBA. Diademed and draped bust of Diva Paulina, r.
   Rev. ΑΔΡΙΑΝΩΝ ΜΟΨΕΑΤΩΝ Ε ΕΤ. Diademed and draped bust of Selene, r., wearing crescent on shoulders.
   Münzen und Medaillen 19, May 2006, 155 (ex Sternberg 16, 1986, 567): 33 mm, 26.52 g; ALRAM 1989, p. 56, n. 179 (figure 7).

5. Mopsus, Cilicia: year 305 = AD 237/238.
   Obv. ΘΕΑΝ ΠΑΥΛΕΙΝΑΝ CEBACT. Diademed and draped bust of Diva Paulina, r.
   Rev. ΑΔΡΙΑΝΩΝ ΜΟΨΕΑΤΩΝ ΕΤ Ε. Aphrodite standing, l., resting on long sceptre and holding apple.
   V.GR.39347: 28 mm, 16.08g; ELSNER 1938, p. 52; VON AULOCK, *Mopsos* 73 (as Julia Mamaea) (figure 8).

The issue of Timbriada (cat. 1; figure 4) is potentially the most important one. It features the full name of Caecilia Paulina in the nominative and the initial C, for CEBACTH, without mentioning her deification, so it is the only one that could be struck while she was still alive, possibly in March/December 235, proving that she had not been proclaimed Augusta posthumously. This is the only issue of Paulina attested from Timbriada and is known only in a single specimen. The coin belongs to the Mauromichali collection in the Numismatic Museum of Athens; it was first published by Svoronos in 1903 and more recently by von Aulock. Although nobody has ever cast doubts on

the authenticity of this coin, because it is unique and presents some characteristics that could raise suspicions, further comments are required. The legends present anomalous lettering, also those on the obverse looking different from those on the reverse. The coin is almost certainly ancient and struck, but the possibility that it may have been altered should be considered.[32] There seems to be no doubts on its attribution to Timbriada, whose production is generally very small, so it is not unusual to have issues from this city only known in a unique specimen. Coinage for Maximinus is attested, even if von Aulock listed, again, only one piece from his own collection;[33] so coins struck for his wife would not be implausible. Retouching the name of the empress on the obverse would have probably required the complete tooling of a preexisting legend and the re-patinating of the surface, which does not seem obvious, though.[34] The provenance of this specimen also comes out in favor of its authenticity. The coin is very likely to have been acquired by Mauromichali in Antalya after 1887,[35] and showed the current legend already in 1903, when the first black and white picture of it was published; so any possible alteration of it should have been done prior to that date. Because the coin legend includes the name ΚΑΙΚΙΛΙΑ, only a counterfeiter who knew from the Atina inscription that CAECILIA was the family name of Paulina would have been able to do this. Although the inscription had already been published by Mommsen in 1852 (*Inscriptiones Regni Neapolitani Latinae*, p. 238, n. 4544), the most accessible source where it could be read at the end of the 19th century was obviously *CIL* X, which was published in 1883.[36] Any alteration of the coin would have plausibly been later than this, arguably between 1883 and sometime from 1887 to 1901, which is possible but does not seem very likely. In my opinion there is no obvious reason to condemn the coin as not authentic so it must be taken into account.

32. I have not had the opportunity to see the coin in Athens, but I am grateful to M. Amandry and A. Andreou, who checked it recently for me, providing useful information.
33. VON AULOCK, *Pisidiens* 2191 = *SNG vA* 5374 (L.1979,0101.2522).
34. The only other imperial name from which ΠΑΥΛΕΙΝΑ could have been more easily re-worked is that of Julia Paula, but no coins are known from Timbriada for Elagabalus and his wives. Also, the reverse die used on this coin does not seem to have been employed for any other known specimens.
35. The coin was donated to the Museum in Athens probably after the death of D. Mauromichali in 1901, as a part of his collection, although Svoronos says that he had already given some coins to the museum in the previous years. Since 1887 until his death, Mauromichali worked as a Greek consul in Antalya (ancient Attaleia in Pamphylia, southern Turkey), where the majority of coins of his collection (80 % coming from Lycia, Pamphylia, Pisidia and Cilicia) were bought on the local antiquarian markets. See SVORONOS 1903, p. 177.
36. A book on local antiquities, which included the inscription (B. Tauleri, *Memorie istoriche della antica città di Atina*, p. 194, n. 32), had already been published in Naples in 1701 (cf. *CIL* X, p. 499-500), but this could not be the source for a potential counterfeiter because the second line of the dedication was transcribed as 'FECIT' instead of 'CAECILIA'.

The first of the two Anazarbus issues (cat. 2; figure 5) is the only one known in more than a single specimen (currently 10). Anazarbus in Cilicia had a large civic coinage under the empire, especially in the 3rd century AD, so it is not surprising that, amongst the cities that celebrated Paulina posthumously, it has yielded the most substantial production. Issue 1 also expressly celebrated the deification of Paulina adopting a *consecratio* reverse type, i.e. a crescent surmounted by seven stars. This design refers to the *Septentriones* ('seven-plough oxen'), the seven stars of the constellation of the Great Bear, which was interpreted in two different ways: it symbolized both immortality and the return of the Golden Age, from Hadrian to the Severans.[37] The first meaning was signified by Roman imperial coins with legend CONSECRATIO that celebrated the apotheosis of an empress in Rome, such as Faustina the elder and the younger (*RIC* 1199 and 750 respectively). But in the 3rd century the other symbolic value prevailed, as shown by imperial denarii of Pescennius Niger, Septimius Severus and Julia Domna celebrating *Aeternitas Aug* and *Saeculi felicitas*, although they were struck by Eastern mints (such as Antioch, Emesa and Laodicea; cf. *RIC* 73-4, 416-418b and 629 respectively). So it is notable that a Roman design was employed for Paulina at Anazarbus expressly as a *consecratio* type to symbolize the empress' ascension (it being actually introduced by the mint on this very occasion) instead of the 'official' ones (peacock, Diana) employed in Rome for the same purpose. It was preferred by the Cilician city probably because it recalled the astral symbolism that belonged to the local and, more broadly, to the Middle Eastern traditions to represent the divine.[38]

This issue of Anazarbus also includes the year of minting (254) that, according to the local era (starting in autumn 19 BC), corresponds to AD 235/236; late summer 236 is thus the *terminus ante quem* for Paulina's deification and death.[39] This production was also accompanied by another (apparently much rarer) issue showing Maximinus on the obverse and Paulina on reverse (cat. 3; figure 6). Regrettably, the second part of the reverse legend is off the flan, so the possible reference to the year is lacking. However, all the dated coins of Maximinus and Maximus from this city feature year 254 and the obverse die of Maximinus employed on this coin was also used on other issues of the same year,[40] so it is probable that the coin with the head of Paulina was also struck in 235/236.

37. *RIC* II, p. 324; see also Melville Jones 1990, p. 285-286.
38. The seven stars (or dots) were depicted to represent the Babylonian Pleiades, the *sibitti*, in ancient Mesopotamia. Cf. Black, Green 1992, p. 162. I am grateful to V. Curtis (British Museum) for flagging this to my attention.
39. *AE* 1964 (p. 98) had already suggested that Paulina was consecrated in AD 236.
40. Die Vs2 of Maximinus employed in combination with the reverse featuring Paulina on issue 666 was also used on issues 663-665 of Maximinus, the last two bearing the date of Anazarbus 254. Ziegler 1993, p. 317-318.

The issues of Mopsus (cat. 4-5; figures 7-8), another Cilician city, although so far known in a single specimen each, present some new evidence. The first one went on sale in an auction after von Aulock published his corpus of the city and was flagged by Alram a few years later, although without providing classification and comments. The second one, in Vienna, was misread by von Aulock (therefore not considered by Alram), who included it in the coinage of Julia Mamaea, reading on the obverse MAMMAIAN CEBAN (*sic*) instead of ΘEAN ΠAYΛEINAN CEBACT, just like on the other issue from Mopsus and on the coins of Anazarbus.[41] So the initial E, for ETOYC, is actually preceded by the numerals ET of the year 305, which corresponds (as on issue 4) to AD 237/238.[42] Therefore in Mopsus Paulina was commemorated two years after her death; these issues were struck specifically to celebrate her, not as part of a larger coinage for the other members of the family, since the coins issued in name of Maximus are two years earlier (i.e. 303).[43] So even if the proximity of one Cilician city to the other would reasonably suggest that such an unexpected concentration of issues for Diva Paulina within the same region was the result of emulation or mutual influences, the chronology of the coins of Mopsus shows that the memory of the deified empress was still kept alive locally, even at a later date. It is notable that both issues of Anazarbus and those of Mopsus adopt the legend ΘEAN ΠAYΛEINAN in the accusative, which is a less usual form than the nominative for posthumous dedications.

4. The portrait

One aspect that has traditionally drawn the attention of modern scholars is the peculiarity of Paulina's portrait on the mainstream imperial coins struck at Rome; her features are strikingly similar to those of Maximinus (and of Maximus as well).[44] But in the provinces we find two patterns of portraiture that are completely different from this typology: one could be regarded as a 'youthful portrait', the other as a 'Severan-style portrait'. The former appears on the coins of Anazarbus with the type of stars and crescent; Paulina

41. von Aulock also interpreted the letters ET E of the reverse as ET(OYC) E, i.e. year 5 of the reign of Alexander (AD 226/7), unlike any other civic issues, that normally follow the local era (beginning in 68 BC).
42. The specimen was first published in 1938 with correct attributions to Paulina and to year 305; Elsner 1938.
43. von Aulock, *Mopsos* 56.
44. *RIC* IV/2, p. 135; Delbrueck 1940, p. 67; *BMC* VI, p. 94; Alram 1989, p. 29, 45, 53-54; Varner 2004, p. 203. The features of Maximus on coins were surely less harsh than those of his father, although perhaps not as idealized as it has been suggested in the past (Haegemans 2010, p. 88 with bibliography); his resemblance to Maximinus and, as a consequence, to his mother, is apparent, and was obviously intended to suggest kinship and dynastic cohesion.

is simply draped with her hair tied behind the nape. The latter was employed on the reverse of the coin of Anazarbus with the bust of Maximinus on the obverse and on the coins of Mopsus;[45] it shows a diademed and draped bust which conforms to the typical Severan-style headdress and recalls Julia Domna and especially Julia Mamaea, which probably misled von Aulock to assign the coin of Mopsus in Vienna to the mother of Severus Alexander rather than to Paulina. What is apparent here is that neither of the two portrait-types followed the model employed on imperial coins.

5. Chronology

It is assumed that Maximinus married Caecilia Paulina in ca. AD 215, when Maximus was possibly born.[46] The dedications to Diva Paulina from Formiae and Paestum also mention Maximus as Caesar; the chronology of the Roman consecration series hinges on the similarities between the portrait of Paulina and that of Maximinus and Maximus after his co-optation to the throne. So the *dies imperii* of Maximus is crucial to establish the *terminus post quem* for the deification of Paulina. The possible dates range from 7th January to 16th May 236 on the basis of combined evidence of papyri and inscriptions.[47] This affects the dating of the civic issues of Anazarbus too. Even if the year 254 of the local era ranges from autumn 235 to late summer 236, a reverse die-link with the type of stars and crescent between some of the coins of Paulina and one specimen of Maximus suggests that they were issued together or within a short time span, so again they should be dated between the first half and the autumn of AD 236.[48] However, reverse dies of civic workshops could be stored and reemployed after decades, so this assumption cannot be taken for granted.

Alram (tentatively followed by Kienast) believed that Paulina earned the title of Augusta only posthumously, she being already dead when Maximinus became emperor.[49] Even if this is possible, there is a short time span between

45. The portrait employed on the coin of Timbriada, although not easy to read, seems to belong in the second typology.
46. Kienast 1996, p. 184-185.
47. Loriot 1973; Loriot 1975, p. 676, n. 157. It must be pointed out that this chronology is grounded exclusively on argumentation *ex silentio*, i.e. based on the lack of references to Maximus as Caesar on inscriptions prior to this period of time.
48. Die Rs 5 in Ziegler's corpus is shared by issue 649 of Paulina (four specimens) and issue 648 of Maximus (a single specimen from a private collection, not illustrated). Ziegler 1993, p. 314-315.
49. Alram 1989, p. 29. In order to support this assumption, one has to not take into account the coin of Timbriada, which, according to Alram, 'kommt keine Beweiskraft zu' (n. 73), and now also the inscription found at Phaselis. I see no reason to discard this evidence unless assuming that the omission of ΘΕΑ on both was a result of misinformation (the cities being unaware that Paulina was dead when they produced them).

the acclamation of Maximinus by the troops in March 235[50] and the elevation of Maximus, no earlier than January AD 236, during which Paulina might have been a living Augusta. This was the opinion of Carson, who believed that Paulina would not have been addressed as Augusta on inscriptions if she had not actually become an empress.[51] The ancient authors give contradictory indications, but provide some clues. On one hand, both Ammianus and Zonaras regarded her generically as 'wife' ('coniux' and 'γῦνή' respectively), whereas in the same sentence Ammianus used the more specific term 'queen' ('regina') to refer to Constantina, wife of Gallus, who was definitely an Augusta, as if Paulina had never acquired that status. But on the other hand, Ammianus regards her as someone who had influence on the behaviour of Maximinus as an emperor, and Zonaras mentions the murder of Paulina among all the other crimes that he committed 'when he had become ruler' ('αὐταρχήσας'); so even if they could be misinformed, both authors seem to believe that she was still alive at the beginning of his reign. The possibility that Paulina was empress for a few months before dying cannot be ruled out,[52] as is implied by the evidence of the coin of Timbriada and the inscription from Phaselis, if they can be used as argued before.

6. Rome and the Provinces: a different view

Modern scholars have traditionally interpreted the very little surviving information on Paulina from a perspective that considers the view from Rome as dominant. The attention dedicated to Diva Paulina on the coinage struck in Italy is seen as one aspect of the political strategy of Maximinus, which aimed at asserting dynastic claims in order to legitimise his power before the senatorial élite. Along with the designation of Maximus as Caesar to secure his own succession, the deification of Paulina was part of the consolidated routine of honours that any legitimate emperor needed to have accorded by the Senate for himself and his family.[53] Because Maximinus never visited Rome during his reign, it is assumed that this production was commissioned by the emperor from the provinces, and the distance surely made the approval of this procedure more strained than usual.[54] This approach has gone as far as to speculate

50. The exact date cannot be established, as all we know is that Severus Alexander died between 18th February and 9th March 235. Maximinus was acknowledged as emperor on official documents in Rome dated to 25th March (*CIL* VI, 2001). See Loriot 1975, p. 670-671.
51. *RIC* IV/2, p. 135.
52. *BMC* VI, p. 94.
53. See in particular Lippold 1968 and Haegemans 2010, p. 86-89.
54. A parallel can be found again with the imperial coinage for Mariniana, which was entirely posthumous; unlike Maximinus, though, Valerian was a senator and probably had optimal relations with Rome at the time of his accession.

on the political role played by Paulina within the schemes of the 'barbarian' emperor. Only because she was a Caecilia, her senatorial rank is taken for granted. And for her senatorial rank, it is proposed that she was chosen by Maximinus as his wife; a mixed and inter-provincial marriage would allow him, who is believed to be an *eques*, to raise his lower family's status.[55] As such, she did not need to be still alive when Maximinus became emperor, her apotheosis being primarily instrumental; so one could take for granted that when he was acclaimed, she was already dead.[56]

But the reality could also be different. Not only could Paulina be still alive after the elevation of her husband; also, the evidence to support the assumption that she belonged to a senatorial family is not stronger than the arguments on which alternative interpretations can be based. Although it is not implausible that Maximinus, as a rising equestrian officer, might have married the daughter of a senator, this would require him to have spent some time in Rome, whereas an entirely equestrian military career could have been spent almost exclusively in various provincial appointments. Not only as an emperor, but also as a soldier or a military commander, Maximinus could have never been in Rome, except perhaps for very short periods. As far as Paulina is concerned, the assumption that she belonged to a senatorial family is far from certain. She could be the descendant of a family of Italian émigrés or colonists, or she could simply be the daughter of a *libertus* of a family of Caecilii, perhaps being born and raised in the East. Another attractive hypothesis is that she could be a member of the provincial élites who was granted the Roman citizenship before AD 212, so perhaps earning her name from a local governor called Caecilius.[57] For instance, looking at the provinces that have yielded inscriptions and coins of Paulina, a L. Iulius Marinus Caecilius Simplex was legatus of Lycia-Pamphylia in AD 98-99 (*PIR*^{2} I 408; Thomasson, *LP* 30:15) and a Caecilius Capella was legatus of Cilicia under Marcus Aurelius and Lucius

55. Liggi 1998, p. 138-141. It has also been argued that Caecilia Paulina was related to Capellianus, the senator governor of Numidia who remained loyal to Maximinus after the African revolt and defeated Gordian II in the battle of Carthage in AD 238; but there is no ground to support this view. Dietz 1980, p. 119, n. 319.

56. Haegemans 2010, p. 86.

57. The name 'Paulina' and those from which it may have derived were widespread across all the regions of Asia Minor. This is the evidence from Lycia-Pamphylia and Cilicia (cf. *LGPN* VB, p. 346-347): Παῦλος is attested in the 2nd century AD at Attaleia in Pamphylia (*PIR*^{2} C 1571) and at Diocaesarea in Cilicia. Παυλῖνος / Παυλεῖνος is found at Hierapolis-Castabala in Ciicia, at Tlos in Lycia and between Perge and Side in Pamphylia. More significantly, Παυλεῖνα is attested at Anazarbus in AD 114 (*IAnazarbos* 155,5). Καικιλία is also occasionally attested as a family name at Anazarbus in the same period (AD 105); (*IAnazarbos* 141,6; see *LGPN* V.B, p. 222). Paulina and Paulinos are also attested in Pisidia, particularly within the territory of the colony of Antioch, where Latin names were more widespread.

Verus (*PIR*^{2} C 27; Thomasson, *LP* 31:16a); also Caecilius Arellianus, a procurator of Cilicia of unknown date (*AE* 1924, 83), could be a possible candidate.[58] We should also look at the Balkans, from where Maximinus is said to be native of or where he may have been stationed for some time before AD 215, having the opportunity to meet Paulina. For example, she could be a fellow Thracian and might be from a family enfranchised under either D. Caecilius Maternus, legatus of Thrace in AD 186 (*PIR*^{2} C 58; Thomasson, *LP* 22:38), or Q. Caecilius Secundus Servilianus legatus of Thrace in AD 187-188 (Thomasson, *LP* 22:39); or if she were of Moesian origin, this could have happened under A. Caecilius Faustinus, consul suffectus in Moesia Inferior in AD 99 (*PIR*^{2} C 43; Thomasson, *LP* 20.68).[59]

This is a scenario that contrasts with the traditional reconstruction of Paulina's prosopography and can be supported by the analysis of the provincial materials. Three points can be considered.

a) One first aspect is the chronological sequence of coin issues. The date on the civic coins of Anazarbus indicates that they could be contemporary with the imperial coins in Rome or possibly even earlier than them. The date on those struck at Mopsus shows that, unlike in Rome, where the *consecratio* coins of Diva Paulina were probably issued entirely in AD 236, she was still commemorated two years later in the East. The celebration of imperial anniversaries are occasions in which one would expect provincial coinages to have been inspired and influenced more directly by imperial models, but this does not seem to be the case here. This perception is strengthened by the fact that these coins were not issued by the main provincial mints (Alexandria in Egypt, Syrian Antioch and Caesarea in Cappadocia) but by local administrations. Again, the existence of the coin of Timbriada (if genuine) and of the dedication at Phaselis (if addressed to Caecilia Paulina), outlines a scenario whereby an empress might be celebrated during her life in the provinces but not in Rome.

58. Other examples of Caecilii who held public offices in the East during this period are: M. Caecilius Fuscianus Crepereianus Floranus was governor of Arabia under Septimius Severus (Augusta-Boularot *et alii* 1998, p. 252-260); one Caecilius Rufinus was proconsul of Crete and Cyrenaica in the late Antonine age and another one was Legatus in Pannonia in the early Severan Age; Barbieri 1952, p. 28; Pflaum 1957, p. 131-133.

59. The onomastics in Thrace shows interesting data too (cf. *LGPN* IV, p. 276). Παῦλος and Παῦλα are attested in the 1st-3rd centuries at Istrus, Pautalia, Byzantium and Perithus; Παυλεῖνος at Panticapaeum, Tomis and Serdica; Παυλεῖνα at Marcianopolis (*IGB* II 805) and Philippopolis (*IGB* III 1010, 1196). The onomastic evidence for the name Caecilius in European provinces based on Latin inscriptions shows an obvious dominance of attestations from Italy, Spain and Gaul, whereas Dalmatia, Pannonia, Dacia and Moesia only account for less than 10 %; *OPEL* II, p. 16-17.

b) A second aspect is the diversity of the coin portraits. Those employed in Rome were modelled on the 'barbarous' features of Maximinus, almost a 'female' version of him, beardless and wearing a veil. This probably means that the mint engravers in Rome had no reliable model of Paulina's portrait to trust, because she was with her husband (or, anyway, not in the capital) when her death was announced;[60] so they adapted the latest available model of Maximinus for her, following a custom that was already in use before.[61] The portraits employed in the provinces are completely different from the imperial ones and do not betray any influence from the contemporary portraits of Maximinus adopted by Anazarbus; this shows that the imperial and the civic production were unrelated to each other. Also, given that the portraits of Paulina employed on Roman coins were fictitious, should we consider the possibility that the provincial portraits of Paulina are more trustworthy reproductions of her features than those employed by the imperial engravers?[62] The fact that the two provincial typologies are different from each other may prompt doubts on their reliability too, but does not necessarily undermine it; the diversity could be a consequence of the second type being adopted in Mopsus two years after the first one at Anazarbus, each following a different model.[63]

c) These thoughts raise questions on whether the evidence that comes from the provinces could be regarded as more convincing than the information conveyed by sources emanating from Rome, especially as they concern the wife of an emperor who never set foot in Rome during his reign. In this regard, it is notable that all the civic coinages on which Paulina was celebrated (and the only Greek inscription discovered so far) belong to a relatively limited area of two neighbouring provinces in south-eastern Anatolia, i.e. Lycia-Pamphylia and Cilicia (figure 9). There is no obvious reason why Maximinus and his family would have privileged relations with the cities of this part of the empire, also given that he is not known to have travelled beyond the Balkans during his reign. However, it is notable that the sources relating to Paulina as a possible living Augusta both come from Lycia-Pamphylia, whereas those relating to

60. See Liggi 1998, p. 144-146.

61. Smith 1985, p. 215.

62. Perassi does not consider this possibility and believes that in the provinces, as in Rome, the engravers did not know Paulina's features and made up another 'fantasy portrait' inspired by late Antonine models. Perassi 2014, p. 185.

63. The second type was also used at Anazarbus on the apparently undated issue with the bust of Maximinus on the obverse; it is likely to have been issues in the same year as type 1, but not definitely. The use of changing typologies of portraits for the same Augusta on civic coins (as well as on imperial ones) was not unusual under the Severans. Julia Domna was portrayed with different hairstyles on the coins of the same city in subsequent years. Compare for example the use of two different typologies in the coinage of Nicopolis (Calomino 2011, nos. 262-269 and 435-456) and Corcyra (Calomino 2014, nos. 7-9 and 34-35) in Epirus. About the hairstyles of Julia Domna, see Ghedini 1984, p. 28-29.

her as a Diva are from Cilicia. To explain the evidence from Lycia-Pamphylia one could only speculate on the possibility that Paulina had family ties in the region or was simply remembered for episodes of civic patronage. The post-humous commemoration of Paulina on the coins of Cilician cities could be a result of her staying in this region during the last years of her life. In this regard, some literary evidence can be considered whereby Maximinus commanded the Roman army in the East before becoming an emperor. According to Herodian, he campaigned against the Parthians in Mesopotamia with Severus Alexander (AD 231-233),[64] before moving to Pannonia as *praefectus tironibus* (AD 234-235).[65] The main Mesopotamian cities, i.e. Edessa and Carrhae, are not too far from the eastern Cilician border, where both Anazarbus and Mopsus lie. If at that time Paulina was following Maximinus in the campaign, she may have visited these cities and even resided there. When Maximinus became emperor, Anazarbus was among the first communities to advertise his elevation and the consecration of Paulina, perhaps because the memory of her was still particularly vivid.

Figure 9 - Map of Lycia, Pamphylia and Cilicia showing the cities in which Paulina was celebrated on coins and inscriptions.

Such an interpretation, as speculative as can be, aims to appraise the evidence from the provincial cities. Coins and inscriptions in the East show a view that may or may not contrast with the information provided by imperial sources, but that definitely does not depend on parameters dictated by Rome. The cities had their own patterns and codes for receiving and reinterpreting the empire. To this extent, this perspective can subvert the traditional way in which we look at the relation between the centre and the periphery of the empire.

64. Herod., VII,8,4.
65. It has been proposed that he was either appointed *praepositus* or *dux vexillationum*; LORIOT 1975, p. 669.

Bibliography

Alram 1989: M. Alram, *Die Münzprägung des Kaisers Maximinus I Thrax*, Wien, 1989.

Andermahr 1998: A. M. Andermahr, *Totus in praediis. Senatorischer Grundebsitz in Italien in der Frühen un Hohen Kaiserzeit*, Bonn, 1998.

Augusta-Boularot *et alii* 1998: S. Augusta-Boularot, A. Mujjali, J. Seigne, Un « nouveau » gouverneur d'Arabie sur un milliaire inédit de la voie Gerasa / Adraa, *MEFRA*, 110 (1), 1998, p. 243-260.

Banchich, Lane 2009: T. Banchich, E. Lane, *The History of Zonaras: from Alexander Severus to the Death of Theodosius the Great*, London / New York, 2009.

Barbieri 1952: G. Barbieri, *L'albo senatorio da Settimio Severo a Carino (193-285)*, Roma, 1952.

Bellezza 1966: A. Bellezza, Cecilia Paolina, in *Tetraonyma*, Genova, 1966, p. 75-83.

Bersanetti 1965: G. M. Bersanetti, *Studi sull'imperatore Masimino il Trace*, Roma, 1965.

Black, Green 1992: J. Black, A. Green, *Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia: An Illustrated Dictionary*, London, 1992.

Bleckmann 2002: B. Bleckmann, Die Severische Familie und die Soldatenkaiser, in *Die Kaiserinnen Roms. Von Livia bis Theodora*, H. Temporini, G. Vitzthum (eds.), München, 2002, p. 265-339.

Calomino 2011: D. Calomino, *Nicopolis d'Epiro. Nuovi studi sulla zecca e sulla produzione monetale*, Oxford, 2011.

Calomino 2014: D. Calomino, The coinage of Corcyra under the Severans, *RN*, 171, 2014, p. 429-462.

Chaniotis 2003: A. Chaniotis, Livia Sebaste, Iulia Sebaste, Caius Caesar Parthikos, Domitian Anikeitos Theos. Inofficial titles of emperors in the Early Principate, *AAHung*, 43, 2003, p. 342-344.

Delbrueck 1940: R. Delbrueck, *Die Münzbildnisse von Maximinus bis Carinus (Das römische Herrscherbild III, 2)*, Berlin, 1940.

Dessau: H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, Berlin, 1892-1916.

Dietz 1980: K. Dietz, *Senatus contra principem. Untersuchungen zur senatorischen Opposition gegen Kaiser Maximinus Thrax*, München, 1980.

Elsner 1938: C. Elsner, Eine unedierte Münze der Kaiserin Paulina von Mopsus in Cilicien, *MNGW*, 5, 1938, p. 52.

Ghedini 1984: F. Ghedini, *Giulia Domna tra Oriente e Occidente. Le Fonti Archeologiche*, Roma, 1984.

Grimm 1990: G. Grimm, Paulina und Antinous. Zur Vergöttlingung der Hadriansschwester in Ägypten, in *Das Antike Rom und der Osten. Festschrift für K. Parlasca zum 65. Geburtstag*, C. Börker, M. Donderer (eds.), Erlangen, 1990, p. 33-44.

Haegemans 2010: K. Haegemans, *Imperial Authority and Dissent. The Roman Empire in AD 235-238*, Leuven / Paris / Walpole, 2010.

Hahn 1994: U. Hahn, *Die Frauen des römischen Kaiserhauses und ihre Ehrungen im griechischen Osten anhand epigraphischer und numismatischer Zeugnisse von Livia bis Sabina*, Saarbrücken, 1994.

Heath 2005: S. Heath, Roman Provincial coins and Imperial chronology from Elagabalus to Valerian, *ANS Magazine*, Spring 2005.

KIENAST 1996: D. KIENAST, *Römische Kaisertabelle. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, Darmstadt, 1996.

LIGGI 1998: I. LIGGI, Caecilia Paulina : un destin d'impératrice, in *Femmes et vie publique dans l'Antiquité gréco-romaine*, *Études de lettres* 249 (1998 [1]), R. Frei-Stolba, A. Bielman (eds.), 1998, p. 131-158.

LIPPOLD 1968: A. LIPPOLD, Der Kaiser Maximinus Thrax und der römische Senat (Interpretationen zur vita Maximini Duo), in *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium*, 3, 1966-1967, Bonn, 1968, p. 73-90.

LORIOT 1975: X. LORIOT, Les premières années de la grande crise du IIIe siècle : De l'avènement de Maximin le Thrace (235) à la mort de Gordien III (244), in *ANRW*, II (2), 1975, p. 657-787.

LOZANO 2007: F. LOZANO, Divi augusti and theoi sebastoi: Roman initiatives and Greek answers, *CQ*, 27, 2007, p. 139-152.

MELVILLE JONES 1990: J. MELVILLE JONES, *A Dictionary of Ancient Roman Coins*, London, 1990.

MORELLO *et alii* 2006: V. ORLANDI, C. CEDRONE, M. MONTESANO CANCELLARO, A. MORELLI, K. PONTONE, M. MELLO, A. M. NARDONE, *Diva Caecilia Paulina Pia Augusta, una imperatrice ad Atina e suo marito Massimino I Trace. Storia e monetazione*, Cassino, 2006.

MÜNSTERBERG 1914: R. MÜNSTERBERG, *Die Beamtennamen auf den Griechischen Münzen. Nachtrag*, Wien, 1914.

Paestum: M. MELLO, G. VOZA, *Le iscrizioni latine di Paestum*, Napoli, 1968.

PERASSI 2014: C. PERASSI, *Similitudinem quidem immensa reputatio est (NH* VII, 52). Evocazione, assimilazione, sovrapposizione nella ritrattistica monetale antica, *NAC*, 43, 2014, p. 169-202.

PFLAUM 1957: H. G. PFLAUM, Les gouverneurs de la province romaine d'Arabie de 193 à 305, *Syria*, 34 (1/2), 1957, p. 128-144.

SMITH 1985: R. R. R. SMITH, Roman portraits: honours, empresses and late emperors, *JRS*, 75, 1985, p. 209-221.

SVORONOS 1903: I. N. SVORONOS, Νομισματικπὴ συλλογὴ Δημητρίου Π. Μαυρομιχάλη, *JIAN*, 6, 1903, p. 178-268.

THOMASSON, *LP*: B. E. THOMASSON, *Laterculi Praesidium*, vols. I-III, Göteborg, 2009.

VARNER 2004: E. R. VARNER, *Mutilation and Transformation, Damnatio Memoriae and Roman Imperial Portraiture*, Leiden, 2004.

VON AULOCK, *Mopsos*: H. VON AULOCK, Die Münzprägung der Kilikischen Stadt Mopsos, *AA*, 1963, p. 231-278.

VON AULOCK, *Pisidiens*: H. von Aulock, *Münzen und Städte Pisidiens*. Teil II, Tübingen, 1979.

ZIEGLER 1993: R. ZIEGLER, *Kaiser, Heer und Städtisches Geld: Untersuchungen zur Münzprägung von Anazarbos und anderer Ostkilikischer Städte*, Wien, 1993.