



RESEARCH ARTICLE

‘Slogans’ on Coins in Julius Caesar’s Dictatorship Years (49–44 BC)

Bruce Marshall

Independent Scholar, Australia
Email: brucemar@spin.net.au

(Received 19 September 2022; accepted 30 November 2022)

Abstract

A number of coins issued during the years 49–44 had on them an additional legend, a trend which had been developing in the preceding fifty years, but which was used much more extensively by Caesar’s moneyers. The legends (with two exceptions) all refer to recognised ‘qualities’, which had temples and cults established in the Roman community. The coin types, particularly in the opening years of the civil war between Caesar and Pompeius, were issued in very large numbers, suggesting that they were not only used to pay the troops whom Caesar had already and those he was recruiting, but also that they were put into general circulation. The qualities emphasised on the coins indicate Caesar’s programmatic ideology, and the number issued shows that he wished to circulate this ideology widely. The additional legends can be taken therefore to be ‘slogans’, a form of propaganda for Caesar’s aims. The two exceptions were *Pax* and *Clementia*, but there is evidence to suggest that a cult and temple were planned for each of these.

Keywords: Julius Caesar; coin legends; divine qualities; *denarius*; *quinarius*; *triumviri monetales*

Introduction

(a) *The development of the denarius and the increasing use of additional legends*

Following the introduction of a new system of coinage by the Romans during the Second Punic War (218–201),¹ the silver *denarius* became the principal coin,

¹ A consensus is emerging that the date of the introduction of the new system was 211, but there is still dispute. For a summary, see Woytek (2012) 316, citing Thomsen (1961) 2.311, and Crawford (1974) 28–35. Following standard practice, coin numbers are taken from M. H. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage*, vol. 1 (Cambridge 1974), hereafter abbreviated as *RRC*. The following works have been consulted where relevant: Broughton (1952), Hölscher (1982), and Shackleton Bailey (1965). All dates are BC.

and it remained in use for the next 450 years until the middle of the 3rd century AD. For some time after its introduction, the images on *denarii* were consistently conservative: on the obverse was a helmeted head of Roma, and the Dioscuri were on the reverse. The use of the head of Roma continued until the end of the second century, while the image of the Dioscuri on the reverse gave way sooner.²

Originally the only legend on the *denarius* was the word ROMA. Subsequently there were some additions, commonly on the reverse: simple signs, such as a corn ear, or a dolphin, or a prawn, and monograms, and occasionally groups of 1–4 letters (but it is difficult to identify the moneyer from these, if that is what was intended). Later, from the 190s onwards, the names of moneyers, in long or short abbreviations, appeared, making it easier to identify them. These various sorts of additions were not a linear development: symbols, monograms, letters, and abbreviated names appeared variously and in combination in successive mintages.³

Realising the possibility of using coinage for self-advertisement, the *tresviri monetales* (the annual board of three young officials supervising the mint) began placing on their coins not only their names, but also images which represented the achievements of their forebears, as a way for the moneyers to point to the worth of their families – and therefore of themselves as potential candidates for office.⁴ These deeds were illustrated on the coin reverse, while the head of Roma continued on the obverse. As the possibilities for advertising developed, the conservatism of standard obverse and reverse was abandoned, and a great multiplicity of types appeared, reflecting the individual concerns of the annually changing moneyers.⁵ Moneyers were

² Roma was replaced with Mars on an issue of 137 (RRC 234/1), and with Janus in 119 (RRC 281/1), though Roma was still the most commonly used obverse until 100. The Dioscuri were replaced on reverses around 194–190 when a series began with Luna in a *biga*; this was later replaced around 157–156 with one of Victory in a *biga* (RRC 133/3), and then after 143 with a variety of deities in either a *biga* or a *quadriga* drawn by different animals (e.g. RRC 222/1, Diana in a *biga* drawn by stags). For a discussion of the development of *denarius* coin designs, see now Woytek (2012) 325–6; Woytek (2018) 359–63; Yarrow (2021) 42–4.

³ Crawford, RRC, 2, pp. 725–6.

⁴ This is the standard interpretation of the escalation in the number of designs on coinage. For example, Hamilton (1969: 181–99) argues that the use of coins for self-advertisement grew gradually from the 140s and was more noticeable from the 90s and 80s on, as moneyers came increasingly from known aristocratic families. He includes tables to illustrate these trends. However, Cheung (1998: 53–61) and Meadows and Williams (2001: 27–49) suggest that these representations should be seen in the context of a wider Roman cultural practice of honouring one's ancestors: coins may not have been designed solely for the purposes of self-advertisement, but as a commemoration or *monumentum* for the family to which the moneyer belonged. Rowan (2019: 2) (followed by Yarrow [2021] 60–1) calls them 'monuments in miniature', on which 'Roman culture, mythology, and history could be inscribed'. This concept derives from the important discussion of 'monumentalisation' by Meadows and Williams (2001) esp. 40–1. On the *tresviri monetales*, see Hamilton (1969) 181–2; Lintott (1999) 138–40.

⁵ From about the 130s, while some conservatism persisted, there developed the multiplicity of images on both obverse and reverse: Howgego (1995) 67; Rowan (2019: 2) calls them 'a bewildering array of types'. Some commentators see this development as connected to the desire of the aristocratic elite, brought on by the increasing competition for office, to produce public displays

presumably advised of the amount of coinage to be produced each year, by the Roman senate on the advice of the consuls (mainly for the purpose of funding military campaigns), but they seem to have been free to work out their own designs, allowing them to take advantage of these advertising possibilities.⁶

In addition to the usual legends like ROMA and the moneyer's name (mostly abbreviated), there are some coins, particularly *denarii*, of the late Roman republic which have on them an additional legend. Such coins were not common, just a handful down to the 50s.⁷ This additional legend may simply be a 'label', because it is occasionally difficult to determine whether the word inscribed is simply identifying the image on the coin.⁸ Clark uses the term 'divine qualities' to describe the female figures shown on such coins which 'personified' the quality; Cornwell uses the term 'identifying legend'.⁹ One suggestion is that these additional legends or 'labels' were included to make the personification clear: the qualities personified were female and a number of the images look similar.¹⁰

(b) *The increasing variety of political discourse – slogans*

Towards the end of the Republic various forms of political discourse, such as pamphleteering, graffiti, placards, ribald songs and verses, sloganeering, etc., expanded and increased in use, as power rivalries and civil conflicts escalated.

(buildings, monuments, games, fabricated divine genealogies, literary patronage, etc.): Meadows and Williams (2001) 37–45; Woytek (2012) 326–7. This change is connected by some with the series of laws introducing the written ballot which made voting secret, and which created a need for the aristocratic elite to find new ways of bringing themselves to the attention of the citizenry: e.g. Wiseman (1971) 4 and 148; Crawford RRC vol. 2, 728; Woytek (2012) 327 and (2018) 364. For the ballot laws, see the summary in Marshall (1997) 55–7.

⁶ Lintott (1999) 140; Woytek (2012) 326 and (2018) 361–2.

⁷ The first *denarius* with an additional legend appeared in 110 or 109 (RRC 301/1), issued by P. Porcius Laeca, with the legend PROVOCO on it. For an analysis of the coin and its legend, see Marshall (2018–2019) 59–65. For the subsequent coins with an additional legend down to the 50s, see Marshall (2021–2022). On my calculation from Crawford's RRC, there were twelve *denarii* with additional legends in the sixty years down to 50. In Caesar's dictatorship years alone, there were nine coins altogether, almost all with different additional legends – a considerable increase. In addition to *denarii* (though they were by far the most common type), there were (rare) *aurei* (issued under Sulla and by Pompeius) and in the period covered here there were *aurei* (frequent), *quinarii*, and *sestertii*. There were also bronze coins, the *as* and its divisions. For a brief description of each denomination, see Melville-Jones (2021–2022), arranged alphabetically by denomination name.

⁸ For example, see below Fig. 11 for the coin with *Clementia* on it.

⁹ Clark (2007) 11; Cornwell (2020) 123.

¹⁰ Clark (2007) 144: 'The addition of a verbal inscription to the visual imagery in the introduction of legends on Roman Republican coinage appears initially to have answered a similar need to ensure that the ever-expanding number of coin types could be understood. . . . Certain images appear to have presented particular difficulties of identification and hence to have required an explanatory legend, notably the ideal female heads or busts used to represent divine qualities.' Cf. Hölscher (1980) 279; and see also Howgego (1995) 75. Other images on the coin may also have helped in the identification, but on their own they may not have been considered so easy to be 'read' by soldiers or ordinary citizens.

The overall aim, of course, was to influence public opinion.¹¹ Pamphlets (*libelli*), as one would expect, circulated mainly among the upper socio-economic classes, because of the level of literacy required. A good example in this period is the issue of pamphlets relating to the younger Cato, particularly after his suicide in Utica: Cicero and Brutus wrote eulogies, while Caesar and Hirtius each wrote an *Anticato*.¹² Graffiti, on the other hand, if they were related to the current political circumstances, seem to have been more an expression of popular opinion. They were usually autonomous and generally put up surreptitiously at night.¹³

We can extrapolate from literary evidence the likelihood for the existence of slogans as well. Chanting, jeering, and audience reactions at games, in the theatre, and at public meetings were common and reflected popular feelings,¹⁴ and one can imagine that placards and slogans played a part in these sorts of situations, as happens universally when crowds assemble, just as orchestrated chants and prepared placards do today in demonstrations and protest marches. In the early 50s, when the political alliance of Pompeius, Crassus, and Caesar had fallen into disfavour, there were occasions of popular political protest. On one of these occasions the chanting was led by a prominent organiser, Clodius, and it was clearly orchestrated.¹⁵ So it is likely that other forms of 'political literature', like graffiti, placards, and slogans too, were orchestrated. We know from literary and material evidence that placards were carried in triumphs to indicate aspects of the conquest; it is not too much of a leap to infer that placards with slogans, prepared in advance, were carried where and when crowds gathered.¹⁶

¹¹ See the recent analyses of Morstein-Marx (2012) (graffiti expressing popular opinion); Angius (2015) (graffiti and pamphlets); Rosillo-López (2017) esp. chaps 4 and 5 (verse and prose 'political literature', as she calls it). She argues (152–4) that there was an increase in the various forms of 'political literature' during the period under discussion.

¹² For the eulogies by Cicero and Brutus, see Cic. *Att.* 12.4.2, 13.46.2, Plut. *Cic.* 39.6, *Caes.* 54.2–3; for the *Anticato* by Caesar, see Plut. *Cat. Min.* 36.5, cf. 11.4; Tac. *Ann.* 4.34.7, and by Hirtius, see Cic. *Att.* 12.40.1, 44.1. See Rosillo-López (2017) 111–12 and 139–40. Brutus, dissatisfied with Cicero's work, wrote a second pamphlet called simply *Cato*, which provoked a reply from the young Caesar. All of these works are lost.

¹³ For example, the graffito on the Temple of Concordia, ἔργον ἀπονοίας ναὸν ὁμονοίας ποιεῖ ('An act of discord built the temple of Concord') (see below, n. 51). Or a graffito on the statue of the elder Brutus (aimed at moving the younger Brutus to act against Caesar), *utinam viveres!* ('Brutus, if only you were alive!'). See Morstein-Marx (2012) 197–9 and 204–5.

¹⁴ Cic. *Att.* 2.19.3 describes public reaction to the political alliance of Pompeius and Caesar at gladiatorial games in 59 when there was hissing (*sibilis conscissi*); and he reports that at the Games of Apollo the actor Diphilus attacked Pompeius brutally (*in nostrum Pompeium petulanter invecus est*) when speaking the line, 'To our misfortune you are great' (*nostra miseria tu es magnus*), and that the crowd called for multiple encores.

¹⁵ At a trial of Milo by Clodius in February 56, when Pompeius got up to speak, the assembled crowd, filled with Clodius' gangs, interrupted and responded to Clodius' question, 'Who is starving the people?', by shouting on cue 'Pompeius!'. To another question, 'Who do you want to go to Alexandria?' (referring to the matter of restoring Ptolemy Auletes to his Egyptian throne), the crowd chanted 'Crassus!'. The scene is described in Cic. *QFr* 2.3.1; cf. Cic. *Mil.* 40, and Plut. *Pomp.* 48.7 (evidence for orchestration, with Clodius twitching his toga as a signal to start a chant).

¹⁶ An example: Cicero mentions (*Att.* 2.8.1, April 59) a phrase from Lucilius passed on to him by the younger Curio, *reges odisse superbos* ('he hates proud rulers'), which may well be the basis for a

There is some material evidence for slogans on small objects: for example, sling shots during the Perusine war carried either single scatological terms or the names of units from one side or the other.¹⁷ Coins also had limited space for additional legends of only a word or two, but it is argued here that awareness was growing of the possibility of using this space to 'spread a message'. The intent of such 'slogans', of course, was to provide 'propaganda' for one side or another,¹⁸ attempting to advertise an action or an event, or to justify an action which had been undertaken, or to proclaim a theme or quality which a protagonist wished to promote. The rivalries and conflicts at the end of the late Republic 'produced a rapidly expanding repertoire of virtues or ideals, exemplified on the coinage, as part of a political language of crisis'.¹⁹

After he had crossed the Rubicon and launched a civil war, Julius Caesar picked up on this trend of using additional legends on coinage for promoting political themes – and developed the opportunities presented by coins for emphasising the qualities he wished to advertise and for fitting into the new and expanding forms of political discourse. The coins of Caesar's dictatorship years, issued in very large numbers (in some cases in the millions), took advantage of this medium for widespread publicising of his ideological program to influence public opinion. We might conclude therefore that the additional legends on these coins were intended as political 'slogans'.

As will be seen, a wider variety of these additional legends appeared, and more frequently, on coins issued during the period of Caesar's dictatorships from 49 onwards. The 'qualities' presented certainly show the political themes he wished to advertise – *Libertas*, *Pietas*, *Concordia*, *Clementia*, *Pax* – exactly the sort of terms which one would expect to be used in such a time of civil conflict. Clearly, they comprise 'political messages' or 'slogans' aimed at 'target audiences' (i.e., his own troops and the general population) for Caesar's political position and aims.

It is the intention here to examine eight *denarii* and two *quinarii* minted during Julius Caesar's dictatorship years (49–44) which had on them one of these additional or identifying legends, and to suggest that they were now used to circulate political 'slogans' (as well as their basic use for financial transactions). As already noted, these legends represent 'divine qualities': in all except two

derogatory slogan against Pompeius and Caesar. There was singing also of derogatory verses and epigrams, which suggests deliberate organising: some are listed by Rosillo-López (2017) 148. There is evidence of tracts and pamphlets (*γράμματῶν*) being scattered anonymously and indiscriminately in the Forum in this period (implying organised production): Plut. *Pomp.* 49.6, Dio Cass. 44.12.1; Rosillo-López (2017) 114–5. Placards in triumphs: e.g., Plut. *Pomp.* 45.2–3 for Pompeius' triumph in 61; friezes on the Arch of Titus show troops carrying placards.

¹⁷ Discussed by Hallett (1977) and Benedetti (2012).

¹⁸ There is considerable debate over the use of the term 'propaganda' with regard to coins. Howgego (1995: 70–1) prefers 'political themes' to 'propaganda'; Levick (1982: 104–6) rejects 'propaganda' in favour of 'publicity'; Noreña (2011: 253–4) refers to coins as a 'medium of communication' focussing first on the senatorial aristocracy and eventually on powerful living individuals; while Morstein-Marx (2004: 85) calls them 'instruments of publicity' whose 'target audience' is the Roman people themselves.

¹⁹ Cornwell (2020) 123.

cases the additional legends refer to qualities which had received public cult and temples in Rome,²⁰ and intrinsic to the discussion is an examination of the relevant temples and cults, since the qualities represented in them were those which the Roman community recognised and understood.

The moneyers themselves will also be examined to assess the strength of their connection to Caesar and to consider whether they were promoting qualities the dictator wished to emphasise and the political agenda he wished to pursue. Examining these links may help in deciphering the intent and motivation behind the choices made for both the images and the legends on their coins. As noted above, some themes were more particularly mentioned and constitute therefore his 'slogans'. They fit with Caesar's programmatic ideology, but, as so often, they indicate the absence of these ideals or qualities and the desire to instil them.

I. SALVS and VALETVDO

Denarius of M'. Acilius (Glabrio?) – 49

The first coin in this period to carry a slogan was a *denarius* (Fig. 1, RRC 442/1a and b) issued in 49 by M'. Acilius (Glabrio?).²¹ The obverse of this *denarius* has a personified head of Salus ('Safety'), with SALVTIS on the left downwards behind the head; the reverse shows a personified Valetudo ('Health') holding a snake, with VALETV and the moneyer's name and his office (IIIVIR). It carries the two additional legends, *Salus* and *Valetudo*. Crawford suggests two possible interpretations: one, that the terms may be a reference to Archagathus, the first Greek doctor to come to Rome, who practised in the *comitum Acili* (Plin. *HN* 39.12),²² and so the coin may be a family commemoration; and two, that expectations of – or hopes for – a Caesarian victory may have influenced the types. There is no evidence that Glabrio was a Caesarian supporter. What little we know of him may suggest rather that he was a Pompeian: he is mentioned in the long list of those who defended Scaurus in 54 at his trial for extortion, and many on the list were pro-Pompeian.²³ It is difficult, however, to draw any conclusions about the political attitudes of such a miscellany of defence supporters, complicated by familial relationships and by past and present political affiliations.

A temple to *Salus* had long been established in Rome, vowed by C. Iunius Bubulcus Brutus when he was consul in the Samnite Wars (either 317, or

²⁰ Clark (2007) 11 and 139–40. The exceptions are *Pax* and *Clementia*: they are discussed below (Figs. 10 and 11).

²¹ The moneyer is perhaps to be identified as the son of M. Aemilius Scaurus' sister, Aemilia; she was married to M'. Acilius Glabrio (later cos. 67), but was divorced from him, though pregnant, and given in marriage to the young Pompeius at the behest of Sulla in 82. She died shortly after in childbirth, though the child survived. The identification of the moneyer with Glabrio is secure only if the praenominial initial M. in Ascon. 28.18C is emended to M': the emendation is generally accepted; *contra* Shackleton Bailey (1960) 41 n. 1.

²² The *comitum Acili* (or *Acilium*) is presumably connected somehow with the family of the Acilii. For what is known about it and its location, see Richardson (1992) 98.

²³ There were 23 altogether; for the list, see Ascon. 28C. For some analyses of their familial and political affiliations, see Gruen (1974) 333–6; Marshall (1985) 150–6; Lewis (2006) 228–30.



Figure 1. *denarius* of M'. Acilius (Glabrio?), RRC 442/1a and b, 49 BC
[Triton XXI, Lot 648, January 2018, courtesy of CNG]

313, or 311), contracted by him as censor in 307, and dedicated by him in 302 as dictator (Livy 9.43.25, 10.1.9).²⁴ Whether there was a temple and cult of *Valetudo* is more problematic. This is the only Republican coin in Crawford's index to carry this identifying legend. Those who argue for the existence of such a cult in the city do so therefore on the basis of this coin alone, because of its association with *Salus* on the obverse. But, as Clark points out, it would be a circular argument to use the coin itself as evidence for a temple and cult, and so there is little independent evidence that *Valetudo* received public cult in the city.²⁵

Clark also comments that one aspect of *Salus* in play here and clearly marked by the connection with *Valetudo* is the healing capacity of these particular divine qualities.²⁶ This might celebrate a connection between the Acilii (Glabriones) and the medical practice of Archagathus. His original connection with the *gens* may, however, have been no more than topographical and arbitrary. The particular aspect of the divine quality relevant to the commemoration of forebears may perhaps be marked by the additional legends,²⁷

²⁴ It was dedicated on the Nones of August: Richardson (1992) 341–2. It was struck by lightning a number of times, but not seriously damaged. There is an earlier *denarius* issued by a D. Iunius Silanus in 91 (RRC 337/2b-f), carrying the additional legend *Salus* and referring probably to this temple. Most likely the moneyer was claiming descent from the earlier Iunius. On another *denarius* issued by this Silanus (RRC 337/1) a plough is shown (*bubulcus* means 'ploughman', his [putative] forebear's *cognomen*). For discussion of this coin and its additional legend, see Marshall (2021–2022) 111–12.

²⁵ Clark (2007) 158–9, but she postulates that this 'divine quality' may have had cult elsewhere in Italy.

²⁶ Clark (2007) 153–4.

²⁷ Morstein-Marx (2004: 82–7) has demonstrated that ordinary Roman citizens had a wider knowledge of history, monuments, urban landscape, etc. than we imagine, particularly in relation to 'reading' the images and legends on coins and other artefacts. Woytek (2018: 371–3) disagrees,

but a contemporary viewer could also have 'read' another meaning into the legends *Salus* and *Valetudo* in terms of a currently expected Caesarian victory. Given that Caesar was fighting the first stages of the civil war when the coin was issued, it might have been intended that the 'slogans' of 'Safety' and 'Health' were part of Caesar's program – promises that he would restore the state's safety and health.²⁸

This coin was minted in very large numbers: Crawford calculates 651 obverse and 723 reverse dies.²⁹ Another coin produced in 49–48 was the famous 'elephant' *denarius* (RRC 443/1);³⁰ Crawford calculates 750 obverse and 833 reverse dies for it. Together these two types injected a massive amount of coinage into the state. In the second half of the 50s there was an economic/credit crisis, and on the outbreak of the civil war the state was facing a severe shortage of coin, possibly because people were hoarding due to the crisis.³¹ Caesar also had a large army to pay: something like 10 legions, with more troops being recruited.³² By authorising the minting of very large numbers, Caesar, with his ability to deal with economic matters, handled the two requirements – increasing the amount of coin available, and having money to pay his troops. The two coin types would have been more than needed to pay the soldiers, and many will have likely circulated directly into the hands of ordinary citizens.

In the case of Acilius' coin the additional legends made the slogan clear: Caesar was spreading a message that he was promoting the 'health' and 'safety'

arguing that the common citizens were not capable of working out the complex iconographic messages on coinage, and citing the views of Hölscher (1982).

²⁸ Perhaps of relevance here is that the Pompeians had a plan to starve out the population of Italy (Cic. Att. 9.7.4). [I owe this point to one of the readers.]

²⁹ There is some dispute over calculating numbers based on estimated die counts: for a recent discussion of the problems, see Yarrow (2021) 46–50. Suffice it to say that these two coins were produced in much larger numbers than other coins around this time. See table in Crawford RRC 2, pp. 658–9.

³⁰ This *denarius* has on the obverse an elephant trampling on something, with CAESAR in exergue, while the reverse has a number of priestly implements. Various interpretations have been put forward for the obverse images: the elephant as a symbol of power, or of Africa, trampling on a snake or scorpion (triumph of good over evil?), a Gallic *carnyx* or war trumpet (Caesar's Gallic victories?). For a summary of possible interpretations, see Rowan (2019) 26–7. The priestly instruments shown on the reverse draw attention to the fact that Caesar was *pontifex maximus* (since 63), but perhaps also indicate how religion was closely linked with warfare for the Romans (Stewart [2018] 108–9). This coin was produced in even larger numbers than Acilius' *denarius*: Stewart (2018: 109), following Crawford and Nousek, calculates up to 22.5 million by a mint travelling with Caesar. Woytek (2003: 127–32) shows that part of the issue was produced with a number of anvil dies mounted together, and deduces that the entire issue was minted in Gaul or Spain; *contra* Crawford (2012) 339–40. At any rate the commonest find sites outside Italy are in Gaul and Spain (Woytek [2006] 73–6; see distribution map in Rowan [2019] 26), as we would expect, since the issue was primarily intended to pay Caesar's troops. The legend CAESAR would have made it readily intelligible to anyone who handled the coin.

³¹ Verboven (2003) 49–62. The evidence of coin hoards suggests that coins were being hoarded in this period at much greater than the normal rate; the huge bribes offered by consular candidates in 53 and 52 may also have contributed to the credit crisis (50).

³² Brunt (1971) 474–5.

of the state. Such an interpretation might support a conclusion that Acilius as moneyer was producing coins to suit Caesar's program, and thus was a Caesarian adherent. The ease with which the images and additional legends would be recognised and the very large number put into circulation leads to the conclusion that these coins were political in intent and decidedly contained 'slogans'.

2. LIBERTAS

Denarius of C. Vibius Pansa Caetronianus – 48

The political intent of the next coin is easier to establish. It was a *denarius* issued in 48 by C. Vibius Pansa Caetronianus (Fig. 2, RRC 449/4), containing the additional legend, *Libertas*. This was not the only coin in the late Republic which had allusions to *libertas* on it. They were relatively numerous,³³ reflecting the frequency with which *libertas* was used to convey a political theme.³⁴ The obverse of Pansa's *denarius* has a personified head of *Libertas*, with LIBERTATIS on the left downwards behind the head; the reverse shows Roma seated on a pile of shields, holding a sceptre in her right hand and placing her left foot on a globe, with a flying Victory offering her a crown. Other *denarii* issued by Pansa and his colleague, Albinus Brutus, were minted in very large numbers, according to Crawford's die calculations (RRC 2, p. 660).

Pansa was a loyal supporter of Caesar,³⁵ and had served under him throughout his career: as tribune in 51 he had vetoed several anti-Caesarian resolutions in the senate (Cic. *fam.* 8.8.6–8), and he was one of the moneyers in 48, unusually after previously holding a tribunate,³⁶ minting the coin described here and several other *denarii*. He must have held a praetorship soon after, for he was made governor of Bithynia and Pontus in 47–46 and of Cisalpine Gaul in 45–44. He became consul in 43 as a colleague of A. Hirtius but died as a result of wounds incurred in the fighting against M. Antonius around Mutina that year.

Pansa's coin, issued when it was, and trying to suggest with its reverse images that conflict was over, was presumably intended to carry the message justifying Caesar's attack on the state. He claimed that initially he was forced to defend himself against his enemies, to re-instate the tribunes of the people who had been forced out of the city and fled to him, and to assert the freedom

³³ For a comprehensive list, see Clark (2007) Appendix 3, 291–9; she comments that symbols came to be associated with the quality (in this case the *pileus*) and then by 'the abstract language of symbols' they came to stand for the quality itself.

³⁴ Hellegouarc'h (1972) esp. 542–59. On *libertas* as a political theme, see also Arena (2012), esp. 113–16.

³⁵ He was possibly the son of the C. Vibius Pansa who was a moneyer c. 90 or 89 (see RRC 1, p. 349) and who may have come from Perugia (Wiseman [1971] 274). The other coins of the younger Pansa contain images of Ceres and Liber: see Crawford's comments in RRC 1, p. 465 on possible interpretations.

³⁶ It would be normal for an aspirant to a political career to hold one of the very junior magistracies collectively called the *vigintivirate* (which included the office of moneyer) before moving on to a quaestorship; a tribunate would come next for a plebeian. For the usual career sequence, see Hamilton (1969) 181–2; Lintott (1999) 138–40.



Figure 2. denarius of C. Vibius Pansa Caetronianus, RRC 449/4, 48 BC
[British Museum: 2002,0102.4449]

(*libertas*) of himself and of the Roman people who had been oppressed by a small faction.³⁷ But as Syme noted long ago, *libertas* is the commonest term of propaganda in Roman factional politics: 'a vague and negative notion . . . a convenient term of political fraud,' used by one side against another or to claim that one side was defending the freedom of the Roman people.³⁸ Sallust (*Cat.* 38.3) refers to the 'fair-sounding pretexts' (*honestis nominibus*) used by those 'who agitated against the state, some maintaining that they were defending the rights of the Roman people, others upholding the prestige of the senate, while in actual fact each was working for his own power.'³⁹ Caesar was no different, using his defence of the people's *libertas* to claim that he had freed the state, when what he was really claiming was the aristocratic notion of freedom to pursue his own *dignitas* and preserve his own position. Are there hints, however, of his ambitious claims to wider power already

³⁷ Caes. BCiv. 1.22.5: *cuius orationem Caesar interpellat: se non malefici causa ex provincia egressum sed uti se a contumeliis inimicorum defenderet, ut tribunos plebis in ea re ex civitate expulsos in suam dignitatem restitueret, ut se et populum Romanum factione paucorum oppressum in libertatem vindicaret* ('Caesar claimed that he did not leave his province with the intention of harming anyone, but to defend himself against the slanders of his enemies, to restore the tribunes of the people, who had been expelled from the state in relation to his cause, to their proper position, and to restore to freedom himself and the Roman people which had been oppressed by the faction of a few'). The claim about the 'oppression of a faction' is echoed by Augustus' in RG 1.1: he had liberated the state 'which had been oppressed by the domination of a faction' (*rem publicam a dominatione factionis oppressam*). Cf. Caes. BCiv. 3.91.2: the shout uttered by Cratinus at the battle of Pharsalus was 'recover Caesar's dignity and our liberty'. On this coin of Pansa and the theme of *Libertas*, see now Morstein-Marx (2004) 52–3 and 86; Tatum (2008) 140–2; Arena (2012) 76–7; Rowan (2019) 29–30; Yarrow (2021) 197–9.

³⁸ Syme (1939) 154–5; Weinstock (1971) 133–5; Hellegouarc'h (1972) 542; Arena (2012) 1–2 and 5–10. A slight variant: Brunt (1988) 282–3.

³⁹ Sall. *Cat.* 38.3: *post illa tempora quicumque rem publicam agitavere honestis nominibus, alii sicuti populi iura defenderent, pars quo senatus auctoritas maxuma foret, bonum publicum simulantes pro sua quisque potentia certabant*.

in 48, with Roma's foot resting on a globe?⁴⁰ He was subsequently given the title *Liberator* by the Senate in 45 (after his victory over the remaining Pompeians at Munda), and a temple was voted (Dio Cass. 43.44.1), though it is probable that the temple was never built.⁴¹

There was an early temple to Libertas, linked to Iuppiter, on the Aventine, said to have been vowed in 246 by Ti. Sempronius Gracchus as plebeian aedile (Livy 24.16.19).⁴² There was also the small shrine which Clodius had built on the site of Cicero's house, but which Cicero had persuaded the senate to demolish when he returned from exile and regained possession of his property.⁴³

A coin minted on behalf of the other side in the civil war has on it an additional legend, which can be seen as a 'slogan': a *denarius* of Q. Sicinius issued in 49 (Fig. 3, RRC 440/1). On the obverse is a head of Fortuna, wearing a diadem, with FORT downwards in front and P R (= P[*opuli*] R[*omani*]) upwards behind; on the reverse there is a palm branch tied with a fillet, a winged *caduceus*, with a wreath above, and the moneyer's name and office. This coin too was issued in very large numbers: 129 obverse and 143 reverse dies, according to Crawford's calculations (RRC 2, p. 660). Weinstock states that Sicinius was aligned with Pompeius; his role as a moneyer with C. Coponius at this time suggests that link.⁴⁴ Crawford comments: 'The association of the symbols of *felicitas* and victory with the head of Fortuna *populi Romani* allude to the hopes of the Republican side at the beginning of the Civil War.'⁴⁵

⁴⁰ This is not the first time that a globe appears on a coin associated with universal conquest. The earliest coin with the globe as a symbol was issued in 74 (RRC 397/1) but seems to be associated with worldwide dominance by the Roman people as a whole. The first appearance of a globe on a coin associated with a major military commander was one issued in 56 by Faustus Sulla honouring Cn. Pompeius Magnus (RRC 426/4a and b); see now Welch (2012) 48. The globe may not, however, be hinting at ambitions for universal domination; it can also be associated with *Fortuna*. The sphere became a distinct feature of *Fortuna* and was associated with the goddess' unbalanced (or fickle) mood and sway over the world: Arya (2002) 80–3. Other symbols linked to *Fortuna* are the rudder and cornucopia. *Fortuna* in turn is connected with *Felicitas*, one of the essential qualities of a good general.

⁴¹ Richardson (1992) 234. On the title and the temple, cf. Weinstock (1971) 142–3.

⁴² Richardson (1992: 234) says the temple was not linked to Iuppiter; *contra* Clark (2007) 58–9: 'probably one and the same', referring to RRC 391/2, issued in 75 by C. Egnatius Maxsumus, which shows a distyle temple, with two figures inside it, a thunderbolt above the left figure and a *pileus* below. On this double temple and the coin, see also Arena (2012) 34–6. Another *denarius* of this moneyer (RRC 391/1a and b) has Libertas in a biga on the reverse, the figure identifiable by a *pileus*.

⁴³ On Cicero's recovery of his property, see *Dom.*, esp. 141–7.

⁴⁴ Weinstock (1971) 115; cf. Wiseman (1971) 149 n. 2. Sicinius issued coinage jointly with C. Coponius (RRC 444/1), on the authority of the senate (S C on the reverse). The P R on this coin stands for *pr(aetor)*: Sydenham (1952) 157, no. 939. Unusually Coponius held the position of *triumvir monetalis* while also praetor. He was clearly a Pompeian: he was in command of the Rhodian section of Pompeius' fleet in 49 (Caes. *BCiv.* 3.5.3). Again, this coin was produced in large numbers (105 obverse and 117 reverse dies) probably because Pompeius needed to have large amounts ready to pay his troops, and because he had had to transport his army across the Adriatic hastily due to Caesar's unexpected invasion.

⁴⁵ Crawford RRC 1, p. 460. Cf. *id.* 2, p. 607.



Figure 3. *denarius* of Q Sicinius, RRC 440/1, 49 BC
[British Museum: 2002,0102.4396]

3. PIETAS

Denarius of D. Iunius Brutus Albinus – 48

Pietas was another additional legend placed on a Caesarian coin in 48 BC: a *denarius* issued by D. Iunius Brutus Albinus, a fellow moneyer of Pansa (Fig. 4, RRC 450/2). The obverse has a female head, with *PIETAS* on the left; the reverse has two clasped hands in front of a *caduceus*, and the moneyer's name below. Throughout his career (until 44) Brutus Albinus had served under Caesar: he was prefect of the fleet against the Veneti in 56, commanded a Caesarian fleet at Massilia in 49, and was made governor of Transalpine Gaul by Caesar (48–46). In 44, however, he turned against Caesar and joined the conspirators, even though he had been named as an heir of the second rank in Caesar's will and had been designated consul for 42.⁴⁶ He too was caught up in the constantly changing allegiances and fighting associated with M. Antonius, M. Aemilius Lepidus, and the young Caesar; he fled to join Brutus (the assassin) in his province of Macedonia but was captured on the way by a Gallic chief and put to death on Antonius' orders. His support for Caesar can also be seen in some of the images on another *denarius* issued by him (RRC 450/1): the obverse has a helmeted head of Mars, and the reverse has two *carnyces* (Gallic war trumpets) and two shields, recalling Caesar's successful campaigns in Gaul.⁴⁷

What would be the political message intended by the legend *Pietas* on Albinus' coin in 48? *Pietas* had three aspects: duty towards the gods, duty to the family, especially parents, and duty towards the state (*pietas erga patriam*).⁴⁸ In the case of Albinus' coin, it was the latter aspect which was

⁴⁶ On naming in the will, Suet. *Iul.* 83.2, Plut. *Caes.* 64.1; on designation for the consulship, see the references collected in Morstein-Marx (2021) 550–1.

⁴⁷ Rowan (2019: 30) points out 'the juxtaposition of contemporary ideology and Caesar's past [military] achievements'.

⁴⁸ Berdowski (2014: 143–5) argues the quality is more flexible than the tripartite division implies; cf. Welch (2012) 27–30, 304–8. Weinstock (1971: 251–2) suggests there was also the element



Figure 4. denarius of D. Iunius Brutus Albinus, RRC 450/2, 48 BC
[British Museum: R.8893]

being emphasised, Caesar's duty to the state at a time when he was still trying to justify his starting of the civil war.⁴⁹ The earliest temple to *Pietas* was vowed by M'. Acilius Glabrio in 191 at the battle of Thermopylae against Antiochus and dedicated ten years later by his son (Livy 40.34.4).⁵⁰ Weinstock suggests that another aspect of *pietas* was its equivalence to *fides*, that is, duty and loyalty, especially of the troops towards Caesar as their leader, and reciprocally of Caesar towards his troops and supporters.⁵¹ Weinstock also speculates that the award of the title *parens patriae* in 45 (after victory at Munda) may have lent a particular significance to this bond of political *pietas*.⁵²

The images on the reverse of the coin illustrate some other themes – and it is an example of the need to look at both sides of a coin to see the totality of its messages. As Crawford suggests in his comment on the coin, the clasped hands on the reverse represent *concordia*, while the *caduceus* is a symbol associated with *felicitas*, the two symbols 'presumably reflecting the Caesarian propaganda of moderation and reconciliation'.⁵³ Caesar would certainly have wanted to suggest that he was trying to achieve *concordia* while he was still fighting

of *pietas* towards the gods in this legend, as Caesar was *pontifex maximus* and *dictator*, pointing to his building of temples and his reform of the calendar, but those actions did not occur until later, and there is nothing on Albinus' coin to suggest religious associations.

⁴⁹ Berdowski (2014) 158: by examining earlier coins with allusions to *pietas* on them, he concludes that the quality alluded to *pietas erga patriam* more and more as the first century progressed.

⁵⁰ Richardson (1992) 290; Clark (2007) 69–71.

⁵¹ Weinstock (1971) 256–7: 'Caesar must have cultivated this type of political patronage systematically.' Hellegouarc'h (1972: 276–8) suggests a connection between *pietas* and *fides*. The two terms are linked in Cic. Att. 9.7.1 (on which see Gelzer [1968] 125 and 152), Att. 9.7.2, Fam. 1.8.2, 10.31.3. Compare the use of *Fides* as a slogan on the coin of Licinius Nerva (below, Fig. 5). On Caesar as a paragon of *pietas*, see Tatum (2008) 34–5 and 100.

⁵² Weinstock (1971) 259.

⁵³ Crawford RRC 1, p. 466. Weinstock (1971: 251) agrees that the reverse of the coin has 'symbols of concord and peace'. On *concordia*, see Hellegouarc'h (1972) 125–7.

against the Pompeians across the Mediterranean, and that he was aiming at *concordia* in his pursuit of *libertas*. *Felicitas* was also considered a desirable asset for a military commander, and if Albinus' coin is referencing this quality, it could be hinting at Caesar's military successes.⁵⁴

There were a number of temples of Concordia in Rome.⁵⁵ The earliest was traditionally vowed by Camillus in 367 (Ov. *Fast.* 1.641–4, Plut. *Cam.* 42.4) to mark the end of 'the Struggle of the Orders' with the passage of the Licinian laws; it seems never to have been built, though the designated site was retained, and other shrines connected to Concordia were later built on it. A second was supposedly founded by Cn. Flavius marking the reconciliation of the *ordines* in 304 (Livy 9.46); it was unusual, if it was actually built, in being founded by an aedile. In 121 the senate ordered L. Opimius to construct a Temple of Concord on the site (App. *B Civ.* 1.26, August. *De civ. D.* 3.25), which was near the Forum, because (ironically) *concordia* had been established by his killing of C. Gracchus and many of his supporters. There was a strong connection of *concordia* with the *libertas* of the people, both metaphorically and physically (because the Temple was very close to the Rostra, from which tribunes of the people presided over *contiones*),⁵⁶ and perhaps these Caesarian ideological themes are hinted at in this coin.

4. FIDES

Denarius of A. Licinius Nerva – 47

A *denarius* issued in the next year by A. Licinius Nerva is inscribed with the slogan *Fides* (Fig. 5, RRC 454/1). On the obverse is a wreathed head of a personified *Fides*, with *FIDES* downwards on the right in front of the head and *NERVA* downwards behind the head; on the reverse is a horseman dragging a naked warrior who is holding a shield and a sword. The moneyer is otherwise unknown, so there is no evidence of activity to connect him with Caesar.

The image from warfare on the reverse of the *denarius*, and the images on a *quinarius* (Fig. 6, RRC 454/3) also issued by Nerva (on the obverse a head of

⁵⁴ Cicero (*Leg. Man.* 47) provides a statement about 'luck' as a quality of a great general: *ego enim sic existimo Maximo, Marcello, Scipioni, Mario, et ceteris magnis imperatoribus non solum propter virtutem, sed etiam propter fortunam saepius imperia mandata atque exercitus esse commissos. fuit enim profecto quibusdam summis viris quaedam ad amplitudinem et ad gloriam et ad res magnas bene gerendas divinitus adiuncta fortuna.* ('In my opinion, commands and armies were frequently entrusted to Maximus, Marcellus, Scipio, Marius, and other great generals, not only because of their bravery, but also because of their luck. For certainly some great men have had a kind of additional good luck to help them achieve distinction and reputation and the successful accomplishment of great deeds'). See Clark (2007) 228–32, and cf. comments on the *quinarius* of M. Lollius Palicanus with *Felicitas* on it (Fig. 9 below), and on the coin of Q. Sicinius with *Fortuna* on it (Fig. 3 above). The additional name 'Felix' taken by Sulla (based on Ἐπαφρόδιτος, the name he used in the East) was meant to show the link between *felicitas* and military success.

⁵⁵ Details in Richardson (1992) 98–9, and Clark (2007) 54–6, 121–3, who sees them as occasions of a plea for 'harmony' after disturbances. The plea may not have worked: Plutarch (*C. Gracch.* 17.9) preserves the graffito in Greek written on Opimius' temple – 'A work of Discord built the temple of Concord' (cf. above, n. 13).

⁵⁶ A useful summary of these connections can be found in Morstein-Marx (2004) 54–5 and 101–3. Arena (2012: 113–6) shows the link between the people's *concordia* and their *libertas*.



Figure 5. *denarius* of A. Licinius Nerva, RRC 454/1, 47 BC
[British Museum: 1843,0116.718]



Figure 6. *quinarius* of A. Licinius Nerva, RRC 454/3, 47 BC
[British Museum: 1950,1006.391]

Minerva wearing a Corinthian helmet, and on the reverse Victory holding a wreath and palm branch) might suggest connection with Caesar's victories, but the types are really of uncertain significance. Nor is there anything much in the imagery used on the coins of Nerva's fellow *triumviri monetales*, L. Plautius Plancus and C. Antius Restio, except perhaps a hint on the reverse of Plancus' *denarius* types, which have the popular image of the head of Medusa and which may 'reflect a desire to be associated with the victory of a great individual, perhaps Caesar'.⁵⁷ But it may be too long a stretch in all of this to conclude that Nerva was a Caesarian supporter.

⁵⁷ See Crawford's comment on RRC 453/1a-e, and also his comments in RRC 2, pp. 736-7.

So, is it possible to make anything of the term *fides* ('loyalty' or 'trust')? There is nothing to suggest that *fides* was a theme emphasised by Caesar,⁵⁸ though the concept might well be one that someone in his position would want to emphasise. On the principle that slogans often emphasise an ideal precisely because it is *not* in place but is something which is desired or aimed at (e.g., *concordia* – see above on Brutus Albinus' *denarius*, Fig. 4),⁵⁹ one might consider suggesting that *fides* was a Caesarian slogan in this period. In the absence, however, of anything to connect Nerva with Caesar, one cannot be definitive in drawing such a conclusion about the appearance of *fides* on this coin.

5. LIBERTAS, HONOS, and FELICITAS

Denarii and Quinarius of M. Lollius Palicanus – 45

The theme of *libertas* is taken up again on a *denarius* issued in 45 by M. Lollius Palicanus (Fig. 7, RRC 473/1). On the obverse is a head of *Libertas* with the legend downwards on the left behind the head, while the reverse depicts the Rostra on which stands a tribunes' bench (*subsellium*). The images refer primarily to the actions of the moneyer's father who as tribune in 71 agitated for the restoration of the tribunes' powers, associated with the people's freedom, after Sulla had removed them ten years earlier.⁶⁰ The father was more likely connected with Pompeius: following a praetorship (69?) he stood as a consular candidate at the elections in 67, but was blocked by C. Calpurnius Piso, the consul that year presiding over the elections,⁶¹ who was bitterly opposed to Pompeius and the popular bill of A. Gabinius giving him the pirate command. Palicanus' daughter was married to Gabinius, so it would seem that all three were linked politically at that time.⁶²

Two other qualities are inscribed on coins issued by this moneyer. A *denarius* (Fig. 8, RRC 473/2a) has a head of *Honos* on the obverse, with *HONORIS* downwards behind the head, and on the reverse a curule chair with a corn-ear on either side. Crawford takes this to refer to the *honores* (offices) of Palicanus' father, as tribune and praetor. *Felicitas* appears on a *quinarius* (Fig. 9, RRC 473/3); the obverse has a personification of *Felicitas* wearing a diadem, with *FELICITATIS* downwards on the left behind the head, and on the reverse *Victory* in a biga. *Felicitas* often refers to success in war, and presumably this coin refers

⁵⁸ See the comments on *Fides* on the coin of D. Iunius Brutus Albinus (Fig. 4 above), and Cornwell's suggestion about the *quinarius* of L. Aemilius Buca (below Fig. 10). Weinstock sees a link between *fides* and *pietas* (above, n. 51), and the latter quality was one of Caesar's 'slogans'.

⁵⁹ Cf. the comment of Yarrow (2015) 345: 'There is a political truism that says whenever an ideological concept or principle is being loudly proclaimed, the more absent it is likely to be.'

⁶⁰ Morstein-Marx (2004: 51–3) suggests that the image of the Rostra was intended to show 'the powerful ideological significance of the tribunician *contio* for the Roman citizen', which is linked to the concept of freedom, as much as to advertise his father's tribunate.

⁶¹ Piso said that, even if Palicanus were to be elected, he would refuse to announce the result (Val. Max. 3.8.3, whose comments on Palicanus are scathing, reflecting a very hostile source).

⁶² On the links between them, see Gruen (1974) 131–2; Seager (2002) 175; Marshall (2009) 111–12. Less certain of the link: Syme (1939) 374.



Figure 7. *denarius* of M. Lollius Palicanus, RRC 473/1, 45 BC
[British Museum: 1843,0116.738]



Figure 8. *denarius* of M. Lollius Palicanus, RRC 473/2a, 45 BC
[British Museum: 2002,0102.4649]

to Caesar's successes in the civil war, the younger Palicanus now siding with Caesar.⁶³

There were several temples in Rome for Honos and Virtus. The earliest may go back to one to Honos said to have been established by Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucosus in 234 during the Ligurian war, and subsequently refurbished by M. Claudius Marcellus in 222, following a vow made at Clastidium, when a separate *cella* for Virtus was added (Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.61). A second temple for Honos and Virtus jointly was built by Marius from the spoils obtained from the defeat of the Cimbri and Teutones.⁶⁴ At the top of the cavea of the stone theatre built

⁶³ See Crawford's comment on RRC 473/3, and also his comments in RRC 2, pp. 736–7. Cf. Clark (2007) 227–8 on *felicitas* as a quality of a general; see also references at n. 54.

⁶⁴ On the development of the original single temple to Honos to a double shrine to both Honos and Virtus, see Richardson (1992) 189–90; Clark (2007) 67–8.

by Pompeius out of *manubiae* gained from his Eastern campaigns and dedicated in 55 were five shrines, the main one to Venus Victrix, and the others to Honos, Virtus, Felicitas, and V(ictoria?).⁶⁵ The military associations of these 'qualities' are obvious.

6. PAXS

Quinarius of L. Aemilius Buca – 44

There are two more coins which have additional legends, but are exceptions, in that the divine qualities mentioned on them did not have a temple in Rome. The first is a *quinarius* issued in 44 by L. Aemilius Buca (Fig. 10, RRC 480/24), with a female head on the obverse and the legend PAXS behind, and two clasped hands on the reverse, surrounded by the moneyer's name and position. The clasped hands represent the familiar idea of *concordia*, which links with the 'slogan' on the obverse of a desire for 'peace'. This year Caesar had increased the number of *monetales* from three to four; Aemilius Buca was one of this new board, along with M. Mettius, P. Sepullius Macer, and C. Cosutius Maridianus. Little is known of them, but given they were serving on this new board, we can assume that they were approved by Caesar. Between them they issued a large number of 28 different types, including the head of a living person, Caesar himself, for the first time.⁶⁶

Cornwell gives a full analysis of this coin and its political implications, and concludes that the 'introduction of Peace onto the coinage in a period of internal stability is part of a much wider programmatic statement made by Julius Caesar in 44'.⁶⁷ She adds that the additional legend *paxs* is indicative of the increased use over the 40s of a range of ideals or 'divine qualities' on coinage, but suggests that the large number of types minted by the increased board of *monetales* in 44, with the various images and symbols depicted on them, 'emphasised the security of the state as contingent on Caesar's successes, victories, and the perpetuation of his memory'.⁶⁸

While these conclusions fit with the premise of this article, the large number of other types including Buca's *quinarius* were not confined to Caesar's programmatic statements put forward just in 44. The *quinarius* better belongs to the string of precedents already set by the coins minted from 49 on with an identifying legend referring to a 'divine quality'. The clasped hands on the reverse of this coin reference *concordia*; Cornwell suggests that it represents *fides* as well. Both of these qualities had already appeared as additional legends

⁶⁵ Richardson (1992) 384; Clark (2007) 225–8.

⁶⁶ The senate had authorised the use of Caesar's image on coinage: *πρὸς τε τοιοῦτοις οὐσι πατέρα τε αὐτὸν τῆς πατρίδος ἐπονόμισαν καὶ ἐς τὰ νομίσματα ἐνεχάραξαν*, Dio Cass. 44.4.4 ('In addition to such [honours] as these, they [the senate] named him father of his country [= *pater patriae*] and stamped [this] on the coinage.'). The precedent was followed immediately, as another *denarius* issued by Sepullius Macer after Caesar's assassination has the veiled head of M. Antonius on the obverse, bearded as a sign of mourning for the dead Caesar, with *lituus* and jug (RRC 480/22). On this coin, and Antonius' innovation of being shown bearded, see now Welch (2012) 186–7 with n. 60.

⁶⁷ Cornwell (2020) 123.

⁶⁸ Cornwell (2020) 123, referring also to the comments on the whole range of these types by Crawford RRC 1, pp. 492–5.



Figure 9. *quinarius* of M. Lollius Palicanus, RRC 473/3, 45 BC
[British Museum: 1896,0308.2]



Figure 10. *quinarius* of L. Aemilius Buca, RRC 480/24, 44 BC
[British Museum: 1897,0202.1]

on earlier coins in this period (Figs. 4 and 5 above), suggesting that the references here fit with Caesar's ideology.

In this case there was not yet a temple to Pax, but the legend *pax* aligns with the idea of a 'slogan' aiming at something which Caesar wished to promote, but which was not yet achieved. There may have been plans for a temple to Pax. As Clark comments, temples to a number of new, or newly interpreted, 'qualities' were being planned in the 40s, such as a temple to *Concordia Nova* in honour of Caesar, and particularly a temple to *Clementia Caesaris* (see next coin). A temple to Pax might conceivably fit into a similar context, although no literary evidence records any plan for such a temple.⁶⁹

⁶⁹ Clark (2007) 159–60. Weinstock (1971: 269) argues for Caesar's introduction of the cult of Pax.



Figure 11. *denarius* of P. Sepullius Macer, RRC 480/21, 44 BC
[British Museum: 2002.0102.4682]

7. CLEMENTIA CAESARIS

Denarius of P. Sepullius Macer – 44

The second exception: a *denarius* (Fig. 11, RRC 480.21) issued in 44 by P. Sepullius Macer. On the obverse is a tetrastyle temple with a globe (a symbol noted before) in the pediment of the temple and the legend *Clementia Caesaris*, and on the reverse is Victory in a biga, with the moneyer's name. The question: is the inscription a 'slogan', or simply a 'label' for the building? The two possibilities are really the same thing, in my view. Caesar made much of his *clementia*, the pardoning of his opponents, though he did not use the term himself, preferring other words for it.⁷⁰ The claim goes back to the siege of Corfinium in February 49, when Caesar captured L. Domitius Ahenobarbus and some troops whom the latter was assembling for his command in Transalpine Gaul. Cicero himself remarked that, since Caesar was deliberately putting no one to death or confiscating any property, public opinion was turning in Caesar's favour.⁷¹

Now in 44 to mark that quality of 'clemency' which Caesar had long stressed, a temple of *Clementia Caesaris* was decreed by the senate (App. B

⁷⁰ Crawford comments (RRC 2, p. 736) that, while there is little or no reference to Caesar in the coins issued in 47, 'from 46 onwards there is almost nothing else'. On the coin and its 'slogan', see Clark (2007) 140, 247–9; Rowan (2019) 58.

⁷¹ Cic. Att. 8.13.1 (1 March 49) in which Cicero expresses cynicism that 'all this clemency (*omnis haec clementia*) may simply be a prelude to the cruelty we expect.'; cf. 8.11.2 where Cicero notes the desire of both Caesar and Pompeius to rule (*regnare*). Cf. Cic. Marc. 8–9; App. B Civ. 2.106. Writing to his envoys in Rome, Oppius and Cornelius Balbus, Caesar himself states that his wish is to show all possible leniency (*lenissimus*) and to reconcile with Pompeius, and his new way to secure victory is by pity (*miseriordia*) and generosity (*liberalitas*): Caes. in Cic. Att. 9.7C.1 (c. 5 March 49). On these various letters, see Gelzer (1968) 200–2. Two questions are raised: whether this was a genuine 'virtue', or simply a political ploy to win support, and whether it was viewed by opponents as patronising or demeaning, a despot showing 'pity' for his enemies: Weinstock (1971) 239; Konstan (2005) 338–42; Tatum (2008) 149–50.

Civ. 2.106, Dio Cass. 44.6.4), not long before Caesar's assassination. To what extent was the decree encouraged by Caesar himself?⁷² He wished to emphasise this quality, and so the coin might serve both to designate the actual temple and to circulate the slogan of his *clementia*.

Conclusion

During the period of Caesar's dictatorships, there were several new initiatives in coinage. By capturing Rome, he seized control of state bullion, which he was able to use to issue large amounts of coinage, more than he needed to pay his troops, meaning that the coins and their 'slogans' got into general circulation more quickly – 'propaganda' for his programmatic ideology. He resumed the use of gold as a metal for coinage,⁷³ which had not been used since towards the end of the Second Punic War. There had been small but unusual issues of *aurei* by Sulla and by Pompeius, but they had been what Woytek calls *Gelegungheitsprägungen*, 'occasional issues'.⁷⁴ The board of moneyers was increased from three to four, possibly because there was a great deal more production of coinage required (the number was reversed by Augustus). There was an increase in designs showing multiple religious implements, not just because of Caesar's position as *pontifex maximus*, but with other religious themes in mind.⁷⁵ Above all, the appearance of Caesar's own portrait on coinage set a precedent which was immediately followed by many other issues after his assassination.

In the case of the coins with additional legends, however, Caesar and his moneyers were not innovating. Rather, and not unusually for developments in coin designs which had been rapidly expanding since the 130s, they built on precedents which had already been appearing and by which these additional legends were definitely taking on the nature of political 'slogans', spreading a particular message aimed at a target audience. What the Caesarian coins did was to use these 'slogans' more specifically, more frequently, and more extensively.

In addition, the increasing use of 'divine qualities' set a precedent for the coinage produced by those who came after Caesar – portraits of leaders, extensive use of gold, and emphasis on specific qualities. The assassins, Brutus and Cassius, put *libertas* on their coins; Antonius and the young Caesar put *pietas*

⁷² Morstein-Marx (2021: 473–4) examines whether Cicero himself may have been most responsible for promoting this honour. In a lengthy chapter (413–487) Morstein-Marx examines Caesar's 'clemency'; he preferred to call it *lenitas* ('leniency'), a term used by Caesar himself, along with *mansuetudo* ('mildness'), *misericordia* ('pity'), and *liberalitas* ('generosity'). On Caesar's *clementia*, see Hellegouarc'h (1972) 261–2.

⁷³ The first issue of *aurei* by Caesar was in 46, signed by Aulus Hirtius (RRC 466/1), perhaps to cover the cost of his quadruple triumph over Gaul, Egypt, Pontus, and Africa, and perhaps to provide a donative to his troops (Rowan [2019] 31–2). It is calculated to have 111 obverse and 122 reverse dies, 'a staggering number for a gold issue' and indicative of Caesar's wealth at this time.

⁷⁴ Woytek (2003) 142 and (2012) 321.

⁷⁵ Such as the ritual traditions of the state and claims to religious piety and authority: Stewart (2018) 107–8 and 115.

and *concordia*; and Sextus Pompeius put *pietas* – all to be expected in the specific circumstances. The precedents were set and the personification of 'divine qualities' led to the proliferation of 'qualities' mentioned on imperial coins.⁷⁶ Clark summarises: 'By the time of the emperors, of course, "personifications" of a large number of qualities were a common feature on the coinage of Rome, some receiving cult in the city, others not.'⁷⁷

As suggested earlier, sloganeering became more frequent towards the end of the Republic, as rivalries and civil conflict escalated. The 'slogans' on late Republican coins seem designed to reinforce the message contained in the other images on them, as well as to push a particular 'message'. This can be seen most particularly on the coins issued under Caesar, with a much-increased number of 'slogans' emphasising his political themes. They set a trend which was more fully developed on imperial coinage, where slogans and personifications of 'divine qualities' became even more common.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Hannah Cornwell from the University of Birmingham, John Melville Jones from the University of Western Australia, Clare Rowan from the University of Warwick, Kathryn Welch from the University of Sydney, and Liv Yarrow from City University New York for their helpful advice on some numismatic matters, and their prompt and kind comments on some of the points I have raised. I also thank the anonymous readers for the journal for suggestions which have improved my argumentation.

Bibliography

- Alföldi, A. (1956), 'The Main Aspects of Political Propaganda in the Coinage of the Roman Republic', in R. A. G. Carson and C. H. V. Sutherland (eds.), *Essays on Roman Coinage Presented to Harold Mattingly*. Oxford, 63–95.
- Angius, A. (2015), 'Graffiti e pamphlet. Lessico e sociologia di un fenomeno politico', *BIDR* 5, 247–77.
- Arena, V. (2012), *'Libertas' and the Practice of Politics in the Late Roman Republic*. Cambridge.
- Arya, D. A. (2002), *The Goddess Fortuna in Imperial Rome: Cult, Art, Text*. PhD thesis. University of Texas at Austin.
- Benedetti, L. (2012), 'Glandes perusinae, Revisione e aggiornamenti', *Quasar/Opuscula Epigraphica* 13.
- Berdowski, P. (2014), '*Pietas erga patriam*: Ideology and Politics in Roma in the Early First Century B.C. The Evidence from Coins and *glandes inscriptae*', in K. Twardowska et al. (eds.), *Within the Circle of Ancient Ideas and Virtues: Studies in Honour of Professor Maria Dzielska*. Krakow, 143–60.
- Broughton, T. R. S. (1952), *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic [MRR]*. 2 vols. New York.
- Brunt, P. A. (1971), *Italian Manpower 225 B.C. – A.D. 14*. Oxford.
- Brunt, P. A. (1988), *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*. Oxford.
- Cheung, A. (1998), 'The Political Significance of Roman Imperial Coin Types', *GNS* 48, 53–61.
- Clark, A. J. (2007), *Divine Qualities: Cult and Community in Republican Rome*. Oxford.
- Cornwell, H. (2020), 'A Place for Peace in a Time of War', in A. Powell and A. Burnett (eds.), *Coins of the Roman Revolution, 49 BC–AD 14: Evidence without Hindsight*. Swansea, 123–44.
- Crawford, M. H. (1974), *Roman Republican Coinage [RRC]*. 2 vols. Cambridge.
- Crawford, M. H. (2012), Review of B. Woytek (2003), *Arma et Nummi*, in *Gnomon* 84, 337–42.
- Gelzer, M. (1968), *Caesar: Politician and Statesman*. Trans. P. Needham. 6th edn. Oxford.

⁷⁶ For a list under early emperors, see Levick (1982) 109 ff. Noreña (2001: 153) shows that in the early imperial period 'personifications' on coins did not reflect the full canon of 'virtues'.

⁷⁷ Clark (2007) 139, referring to Noreña (2001) esp. 155–6: in the later imperial period (AD 69–235) 55% of *denarii* had personified 'qualities' on them, of which the commonest was *Aequitas* (24%), followed by *Pietas* (20%), and *Virtus* (13%).

- Gruen, E. S. (1974), *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Hallett, J. P. (1977), 'Perusinae glandes and the Changing Image of Augustus', *AJAH* 2, 151–71.
- Hamilton, C. H. (1969), 'The Tresviri Monetales and the Republican Cursus Honorum', *TAPhA* 100, 181–99.
- Hellegouarc'h, J. (1972), *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la République*. Paris.
- Hölscher, T. (1980), 'Die Geschichtsauffassung in der römischen Repräsentationskunst', *JDAI* 95, 265–321.
- Hölscher, T. (1982), 'Die Bedeutung der Münzen für das Verständnis der politischen Repräsentationskunst der späten römischen Republik', in T. Hackens and R. Weiller (eds.), *Actes du 9e Congrès International de Numismatique, Berne Septembre 1979*. Vol. 1. Luxembourg and Louvain-la-Neuve, 269–82.
- Howgego, C. (1995), *Ancient History from Coins*. London and New York.
- Konstan, D. (2005), 'Clemency as a Virtue', *CPh* 100, 337–46.
- Levick, B. M. (1982), 'Propaganda and the Imperial Coinage', *Antichthon* 16, 104–16.
- Lewis, R. G. (2006), *Asconius: Commentaries on Speeches by Cicero*. Oxford.
- Lintott, A. W. (1999), *The Constitution of the Roman Republic*. Oxford.
- Marshall, B. A. (1985), *An Historical Commentary on Asconius*. Columbia, MO.
- Marshall, B. A. (1997), 'Libertas Populi: The Introduction of Secret Ballot at Rome and its Depiction on Coinage', *Antichthon* 31, 54–73.
- Marshall, B. A. (2009), 'Marriage Alliances and Politics in the Last Decade of the Late Roman Republic', *AH* 39.1, 104–26.
- Marshall, B. A. (2018–2019), 'A Slogan on a Late Roman Republican denarius', *Journal of the Numismatic Association of Australia* 29, 59–65.
- Marshall, B. A. (2021–2022), '"Labels" on Late Roman Republican Denarii', *Journal of the Numismatic Association of Australia* 31, 107–125.
- Meadows, A. and Williams, J. (2001), 'Moneta and the Monuments: Coinage and Politics in Republican Rome', *JRS* 91, 27–49.
- Melville-Jones, J. R. (2021–2022), 'The Names of Roman Coins', *Journal of the Numismatic Association of Australia* 31, 176–214.
- Morstein-Marx, R. (2004), *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*. Cambridge.
- Morstein-Marx, R. (2012), 'Political Graffiti in the Late Roman Republic: Hidden Transcripts and Common Knowledge', in H. Beck, A. Duplá, M. Jehne, and F. Pina Polo (eds.), *Consuls and Res Publica*. Cambridge, 191–217.
- Morstein-Marx, R. (2021), *Julius Caesar and the Roman People*. Cambridge.
- Noreña, C. F. (2001), 'The Communication of the Emperor's Virtues', *JRS* 91, 146–68.
- Noreña, C. F. (2011), 'Coins and Communication', in M. Peachin (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman World*. Oxford, 248–68.
- Richardson, L. Jr (1992), *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Baltimore and London.
- Rosillo-López, C. (2017), *Public Opinion and Politics in the Late Roman Republic*. Cambridge.
- Rowan, C. (2019), *From Caesar to Augustus (c. 49 BC–AD 14): Using Coins as Sources*. Cambridge.
- Seager, R. (2002), *Pompey the Great: A Political Biography*. 2nd edn. Oxford.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (1960), 'Sextus Clodius – Sextus Cloelius', *CQ* 10, 41–2.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (1965), *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*. 6 vols. Cambridge.
- Stewart, R. (2018), 'Seeing Caesar's Symbols: Religious Implements on the Coins of Julius Caesar and his Successors', in N. T. Elkins and J. DeRose Evans (eds.), *Concordia Disciplinary: Essays on Ancient Coinage, History, and Archaeology in Honor of William E. Metcalf*. New York, 107–21.
- Sydenham, E. A. (1952), *The Coinage of the Roman Republic*. New York.
- Syme, R. (1939), *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford.
- Tatum, W. J. (2008), *Always I am Caesar*. Hoboken.
- Thomsen, R. (1957–1961), *Early Roman Coinage: A Study of the Chronology*. 3 vols. Copenhagen.
- Verboven, K. (2003), '54–44 BCE: Financial or Monetary Crisis', in E. Lo Cascio (ed.), *Credito e moneta nel mondo romano. Atti degli Incontri capresi di storia dell'economia antica (Capri 12–14 ottobre 2000)*. Bari, 49–68.
- Weinstock, S. (1971), *Divus Iulius*. Oxford.

- Welch, K. (2012), *Magnus Pius: Sextus Pompeius and the Transformation of the Roman Republic*. Swansea.
- Wiseman, T. P. (1971), *New Men in the Roman Senate*. Oxford.
- Woytek, B. E. (2003), *Arma et nummi. Forschungen zur römischen Finanzgeschichte und Münzprägung der Jahre 49 bis 42 v. Chr.* Vienna.
- Woytek, B. E. (2006), 'Die Verwendung von Mehrfachstempeln in der antiken Münzprägung und die "Elefantendenare" Iulius Caesars (RRC 443/1)', *SNR* 85, 69–95.
- Woytek, B. E. (2012), 'The Denarius Coinage of the Roman Republic', in W. E. Metcalf (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Coinage*. Oxford, 315–34.
- Woytek, B. E. (2018), 'The Depth of Knowledge and the Speed of Thought: The Imagery of Roman Republican Coins and the Contemporary Audience', in P. P. Iossif et al. (eds.), *TYPOI Proceedings of the International Conference Organised by Belgian and French Schools, Athens, September 2012*. Liège, 355–87.
- Yarrow, L. M. (2015), 'Ulysses's Return and Portrayals of Fides on Republican Coins', in P.G. van Alfen, G. Bransbourg and M. Amandry (eds.), *Fides: Contributions to Numismatics in Honor of Richard B. Witschonke*. New York, 335–56.
- Yarrow, L. M. (2021), *The Roman Republic to 49 BC: Using Coins as Sources*. Cambridge.