

PONTIFICALIA ATQUE AUGURALIA INSIGNIA AND THE POLITICAL PROPAGANDA IN THE COINAGE OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC

Religion was always organically connected with the Roman state. The link was all the stronger as a theoretical expression of religious experience in the form of a doctrine virtually did not exist. Instead, its functional expression prevailed. Usually, then, Roman religion is identified with worship, with *religio*.

Without worship the state could not function. Deeply rooted in Roman consciousness was the conviction that a proper performance of rituals won their state the favors of the gods thanks to which it could achieve greatness.¹ Without *religio* – which embraced the notion of fear of the gods – it would have been difficult to force citizens to give the state its due.²

The keeping of the rites was entrusted to priests, who, however, did not constitute a separate class. Nor was their legal status within the administration very well defined. There is evidence to suggest interconnection between religious and administrative functions. Priesthoods were a customary stage in the political careers of nobles. Through personal unions between priests and state administration (and not with the temple, though there were exceptions), we can even glimpse administrative functions in worship rites.

Nevertheless, a priest cannot be thought of as merely a state official. Priesthoods, usually held for life, were never incorporated in the official *cursus honorum*.³

Candidates were admitted into the sacerdotal collegium through *cooptatio* quite independently of the opinion of the people at large. Priests did not possess a defined imperium, thus they had no power to implement their rulings. These

1 Cic. nat. deor. III, 2, 5; cf. B. Mac Bain, *Prodigy and Expiation: a Study in Religion and Politics in Republican Rome*, (Bruxelles: 1982).

2 Cic. nat. deor. I, 42, 118; cf. R. Muth, "Vom Wesen römischer religio", ANRW 16, 1 (1978), pp. 290 ff. The concept of *religio* also embraced superstition: cf. J. Korpanty, "Pojęcie religio w poemacie Lukrecjusza" (*The concept of Religio in Lucretius' poem*), *Meander* 9–10, 1988, pp. 317 ff.

3 Cf. P. Riewald, s.v. sacerdotes, RE, N.R. I, col. 1644; T. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, II, 1 (Leipzig: 1877), p. 18. "Die Frage in welchem Rangverhältnis Aemter und Priesterthümer zu einander stehen, ist nich zu beantworten, sondern abzulehen; es sind ungleiche Größen."; cf. G.J. Szemler, *The Priest of the Roman Republic* (Bruxelles: 1972); J.H. Wanggaard, *The Flamen: a study in the History and Sociology of Roman Religion* (Kobenhaven: 1988).

shortcomings – from the political point of view – seem all the more to have strengthened the links between *religio* and *auctoritas magistratuum*. Therefore, religious elements constantly accompany Rome's ideology and political propaganda.

On republican coinage, religious motifs were one of the most frequent iconographic elements. It was typical to decorate coins with images of a gamut of gods from almost the entire Roman pantheon. The semi-divine sphere was represented by lesser deities and personifications of the *virtutes*. This division of religious types left no room for any symbols of priesthood. Yet it was those, more than anything else, that spanned political and religious authority.⁴

The meaning of priesthood symbols occurring on coins has not been comprehensively described. Only the *lituus* attracted the attention of researchers as it was not only a symbol of augurate but, by association with theology of victory, it expressed the highest imperium of a leader with divine charisma.⁵ The remaining insignia are generally interpreted as an allusion to various priesthoods, whose authority contributed to the holder's political position. Without questioning the truth of these assertions, we may nevertheless attempt a deeper analysis, and especially determine their import in Roman political propaganda. The basic problem is to find whether the meaning of priesthood symbols is always the same, or whether it depends on iconographic context. The appearance of monetary types made up of several symbols may suggest an altering of individual symbol meaning to reflect new notions.

Only a few symbols come into play; they are traditionally identified on coins as apex, *securis*, *aspergillum*, *secespita*, *simpulum*, *capis*, and *lituus*. Some of them can be traced back to Etruscan tradition. This applies to the apex, i.e. a cone made of olive wood⁶ characteristic for Roman priests and therefore also symbolizing the headdress of flamines, and especially of flamen *Dialis* and *fratres Salii*;⁷ and to the *lituus*, the crooked stick used by augurs.⁸ Roman origin is probable for sacrificial vessels: *capis*⁹ and *simpulum*¹⁰ used for libations, *secespita*

4 H. Mattingly, *Roman Coins from the Earliest Times to the Fall of the Western Empire* (London: 1967), pp. 58–68; cf. L. Morawiecki, *Symboly urzędów religijnych na monetach republiki rzymskiej* [Symbol of Priesthoods on the Coins of the Roman Republic] in: *Religia w świecie starożytnym* [Religions in the Ancient World], ed. D. Musiał, M. Ziolkowski (Toruń: 1993), pp. 73–79.

5 Cf. J. Carcopino, *Sylla ou la monarchie manquée* (Paris: 1931); A. Alföldi, The Main Aspect of Political Propaganda in the Coinage of the Roman Republic (in: *Essays in Roman Coinage Presented to Harold Mattingly* (Oxford: 1956), pp. 85 ff; J.R. Fears, *Princeps a diis electus. The Divine Election of the Emperor as a Political Concept at Rome*, *Papers and Monographs of the American Academy of Rome*, XXVII (Rome: 1977).

6 Paul. Fest. 10.

7 Gell. noct. Att. X, 15; cf. L.B. Warren, "Roman Costumes. A Glossary and Some Etruscan Derivations", *ANRW I*, 4, pp. 605 ff.

8 Warren, *op. cit.*, p. 609.

9 Varro l.l. V 121 *Quae in illa capis et minores capulae a capiendo quod ansatae ut prehendi possent id est capi. Harum figuras in vasis sacris ligneas ac fictilis antiquas etiam nunc videmus.*

10 Cf. Liv. X 7, 10; Varro l.l. V 124 (...) *qui sumebant minutatim, a sumendo simpulum nominarunt* (...) *in sacrificiis remansit guttus et simpulum*. There were also other libation vessels, or perhaps only their names: *armillum* (Fest. 2); *atnanuvium* (Fest. 18); *cuturnium* (Fest. 51); *capeduncula* (Cic. nat. deor. III 17, 43); *lepesta* (Varro l.l. V 123); *simpuvium* (Arnob. IV 31); *bria* (Arnob. VII 29).



1. Q. Pompeius Rufus, denarius, National Museum, Cracow [photo: J. Książek]

2. C. Caelius Caldus, denarius, [photo after Frank Sternberg, 1981, pl. XXIX, no 513]



3. C. Minucius Augurinus, denarius, National Museum, Cracow [photo: J. Książek]

4. T. Minucius Augurinus, denarius, National Museum, Cracow [photo: J. Książek]



5. L. Marcius Phillipus, denarius, National Museum, Cracow, [photo: J. Książek]

6. C. Servilius C. f., denarius [photo after Frank Sternberg, 1981, pl. XXVIII, no 506]



7. L. Postumius Albinus, denarius [photo after Frank Sternberg, 1981, pl. XXVI, no 451]

8. L. Valerius Flaccus, denarius, National Museum, Cracow [photo: J. Książek]

(sacrificial knife)¹¹ and securis (sacrificial ax)¹² used to slaughter animals for blood offerings. Aspergillum, in turn, is a medieval term used in numismatic literature to describe an ancient sprinkling brush.¹³ All these instruments were used by priests while performing religious ceremonies and were thus associated with specific actions.

Another category of priesthood symbols are insignia that were earlier associated with a god himself as his attribute. Their use to identify also a priest of this god seems to be secondary. In the coinage symbols of this kind are associated with only one deity. A tripod is a symbol of both Apollo and membership in the *collegium X viri sacris faciundis*. *Decemviri* looked after Sybill's books and all new cults imported to Rome as a consequence of prophesies therein. This also applied to Apollo, who shared a prophetic nature with Sybill.

Interpretation follows the same spirit for the arrow and laurel twig which stand next to the sella curulis on the Q. Pompeius Rufus denarii of 54 B.C. As Apollo's attributes, they stood for the moneyer's paternal grandfather's membership in *collegium XV viri s.f.* (ill. 1).¹⁴

Other references to priesthoods were used sporadically and – because of ambiguity in interpretation – supplied with an inscription. On 51 B.C. denarii, an iconographically rich scene of preparation for a feast – epulum. Together with the legend L CALDUS VII V EPV, it signified that the moneyer C. Caelius Caldus had an ancestor who belonged to *collegium VII viri epulones* (ill. 2).¹⁵

With respect to their content, all priesthood symbols on coins fall into three function groups. Their most significant role is that of a propaganda message, usually of a political nature. In this, they need not constitute a separate monetary type. They often use an added sign to individualize the meaning of traditional and petrified types.

It is less often, at least on coins, that they perform purely religious functions. Priesthood symbols are then solely the attributes of deities shown on the coin. A direct connection between the idea expressed on a coin and the moneyer is normally imperceptible.¹⁶

11 Suet. Tib. 25; cf. *Secespitam esse Antistus Labeo ait cultorum ferreum, oblongum, manibrio eburneo, rotundo, solido, vincto ad capulum auro argentoque, fixum clavis aeneis auro Cyprio, quo flamines, flaminicae, virgines pontificesque ad sacrificia utuntur.* (In:) *Iurisprudencia anteiusianiana*, ed. E. Huschke (Lipsiae: 1886), p. 111.

12 Another name is *dolabra*; cf. Hor. Od. 3, 23; Prudent. Apoth. 461; Fest. 319. (...) *scena sive sacena dolabra pontificalis*... For more on sacrificial vessels and utensils, see J. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung* III, (Lepizig: 1878), pp. 162–164, 239–240.

13 A term derived from <a> spargine. Cf. G. Gaetz, G. Gunfermann, *Glossae latino-graecae et graeco-latinae* II (Lipsiae: 1888, rep. Amsterdam: 1965), p. 404, followed by: Th.L.L. vol. II, col. 817, 30; Habel, in: RE II col. 1725; cf. Tert. de baptismo 5; Sozom. 6,6; and M. Plezia, *Słownik łaciny średniowiecznej w Polsce* [Dictionary of Medieval Latin in Poland] I, (Kraków: 1953–1958), col. 822.

14 Caw. 434/2. The obverse was devoted to the moneyer's maternal grandfather.

15 Caw. 437/2a–4b. The type is also dated at 53 B.C., see Ch. Hersh, A. Walker, "The Mesagna Hoard", ANS MN, 29 (1984), pp. 103–134.

16 Caw. 385/5; 410/8; 411/1–2 (or Sybill).

Entirely propaganda-free are priesthood symbols placed on the coin purely as mint signs. Those do nothing to change the message of the coin, nor do they make any reference to the moneyer.¹⁷

Coins bearing priesthood symbols and containing a propaganda message did not, however, constitute a uniform group. It is clear enough that first they spread family propaganda, while political slogans in the strict sense did not appear in coinage until the time of civil wars.

Priesthood symbols first appeared on coins in the 130's. Their role was to enliven the usually petrified monetary types.¹⁸ Between the late second century and Sulla's dictatorship, there is a visible gap: coins of the time do not bear priesthood symbols at all. These returned only with Sulla's emissions, which, however, found new ways of presenting priesthood symbols. The lituus, previously occurring independently, became part of a set of priesthood symbols. This arrangement became widespread since Caesar. It was then that priesthood symbol sets became separate monetary types. At the same time, an explanatory legend was added. This may suggest that priesthood symbols were employed in political struggle on coins as late as approximately mid-first century.

The way symbols were used suggests that time had passed when moneyer's intentions were received unambiguously. Several single symbols expressing an unquestionable message were replaced by complex sets of symbols. Many of these had never appeared independently of others. Resulting ambiguity required that explanatory inscriptions be added to improve a coin's propaganda value.

Coins also enable us to judge the political usefulness of priesthood. In the religious life of second and first century Rome, of the greatest importance were *sacerdotum quattuor amplissima collegia*.¹⁹ Of these, only two had any real political and propaganda significance: *collegium pontificum* and *augures*.

Priesthood symbols were used as a propaganda weapon in ways that are revealed only in an analysis of individual emissions. The earliest symbol was the lituus. It was first shown in 135 on C. Minucius Augurinus denarii (ill. 3).²⁰

17 Craw. 343/2b; Craw 405/1a-4c = Syd. 801-802; cf. Craw. I, pp. 415 ff, tabs. XXXIX and XL; Craw 384/1 = Syd. 773; cf. Craw. II, tab. LXVI Nos. 69 and 117. M. Mayer, "La aparición del lituus augural en la amonedación romana y los fastos augurales republicanos", *Numisma*, p. 135, also includes the denarii of L. Capurnius Piso Frugi and C. Vibius Pansa; also J. Babelon, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 294; No. 307, p. 293, No. 176; vol. II, p. 538. No. 1 reports a lituus on the denarii of L. Piso L.f.L.n. Frugi and C. Vibius C.f. Pansa. However, their existence is not confirmed by Crawford, vol. I, pp. 342-3, 349. For anonymous denarii with a secespita, see Craw. 109/1 (of 211-208 B.C.); Craw. 120/1-7 (of 206-195 B.C.); and with an apex, see Craw. 52/1 (of 208 B.C.) and Craw. 59/1a-7 (of 211-208 B.C.).

18 Two types of aes signatum with an image of a tripod have been left out owing to the highly dubious nature of this tender. Cf. Craw. 6/1; Craw. 10/1.

19 R.G. 2.16. The *sacerdotum quattuor amplissima collegia* took final shape after 196, as the *collegium tresviri epulones* was created. With time, it was enlarged from seven to ten persons. Yet, it kept its name of *septemviri epulones*. Cf. Liv. XXXIII, 42, 1; J. Marquardt, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 333-334; RuKdR (Wis-sowa), p. 518.

20 Craw. 242/1; Syd. 463 is dated at 133-126 B.C.; BMCRR I, No. 952 at 150-125 B.C.; Cf. Morawiecki 71; Sukiennik 70.

It was held in the hand of the moneyer's ancestor, C. Minucius Fesus, standing together with Publius or Lucius Minucius Augurinus flanking the Columna Minucia, which supported a statue of L. Minucius Augurinus. The lituus symbolized Fesus's augurate, which he held as one of the first plebeians. At the same time, as a *nom parlant*, the lituus may have referred to Augurinus's *cognomen*, frequent enough in the Servilius family.

A similarly ambiguous role is played by the lituus on the denarii of Tiberius Minucius, brother of Gaius. The moneyer managed to achieve the effect by continuing the type columna Minucia in 134 (ill. 4).²¹ Yet on his bronze coins, he placed the lituus next to the standard rendition of a *prora*. It was probably a direct allusion to the cognomen Augurinus. Incidentally, much seems to indicate that it is the moneyer's nickname, which adds to the emission's propaganda effect. In the 130's, monetary symbols were used to bring out from the anonymous mass of Roman officials the outstanding figures in the moneyer's family, to endow them with individual qualities, and associate them with the state's history. An allusion to a living person – and one just beginning to make a career – was a complete novelty. Was that a way to make his family more popular with the people and facilitate his own career? It is difficult to answer this question with any degree of certainty. Perhaps monetary references had no political significance at all, given the traditional ties between nobles and their supporting plebeian circles. Thus, it is no easy matter to detect connections between family and personal propaganda with political propaganda in the strict sense.

An analysis of the emissions of both Minucii is rendered even more difficult by uncertain dating. Attributing the coins to the years 135–134 imposes a near automatic assumption of their support for the Gracchi program.²² Dating after 133 favors interpreting the coins as a reaction to Tiberius Gracchus' agrarian program and the resulting problem of food supply.²³ In reality – although there are strong indications that the dating 135–134 is too early – there are no grounds for such exact dating. What is even more important is the split in the close connection between Tiberius' and Gaius' emissions and insertion of some other in between.²⁴ This favors considering their images as part of family tradition without trying to find in them a reaction to contemporary political events. Even later – at least since Sulla – emissions did not serve such modern-sounding propaganda purposes. The Minucius coins are still less likely to echo the ideological clash between the optimates and the populares.

21 Craw. 243/1–5; Syd. 494–495 are dated at 119–91 B.C.; BMCRR Nos. 1005–1007 are dated at 124–103 B.C. Cf. Morawiecki 72; Sukiennik 71–2; Marek 38. Cf. Mayer, *op. cit.*, pp. 136–137.

22 Marek, pp. 30–31.

23 Cf. J. Ungern v. Sternberg, "Die politische und soziale Bedeutung der spätrepublikanischen *leges frumentariae*" in: Adalberto Giovannini, ed., *Nourrir la plèbe, Actes du Colloque tenu à Genève les 28 et 29 IX 1989 en hommage à Denis van Berchem* (Basel: 1991), pp. 19–41, cf. pp. 29–30.

24 Already proposed by E.A. Sydenham. Recently, following an analysis of a hoard, by H. Mattingly, "The Management of the Roman Republic Mint", *Annali*, 29, p. 40.



9. T. Quinctus Flamininus, denarius [photo after Frank Sternberg, 1981, pl. XXVI, no 453]

10. C. Cecilius Metellus Pius, denarius, [photo after Frank Sternberg, 1981, pl. XXVI, no 480]



11. F. Cornelius Sulla, denarius [photo after Frank Sternberg, 1981, pl. XXVIII, no 509]

12. F. Cornelius Sulla, denarius, Czartoryski Museum, Cracow [photo: J. Książek]



13. C. Pompeius Magnus, aureus [photo after Bahrfeldt, pl. III, 12]

14. Q. Cassius Longinus, denarius [photo after Frank Sternberg, 1981, pl. XXVII, no 499]



15. C. Iulius Caesar, denarius, National Museum, Cracow [photo: J. Książek]

16. C. Iulius Caesar, aureus, [photo after Bahrfeldt, pl. III, 23]

For almost half a century, successive emissions with the lituus refrained from taking up subjects connected with political struggles within the state. For it is in the family tradition that the lituus which appeared in 127 on C. Servilius' denarii should be interpreted.²⁵ It was placed on the obverse, behind goddess Roma's head. The reverse depicts two combatant equestrians, one of whom, defending himself with a shield bearing the letter "M" is identified with M. Servilius Pulex Geminus.²⁶ The lituus commemorated his augurate. If the moneyer had been C. Servilius M.f. Augur, the lituus might have made an allusion to the *cognomen*.²⁷

Moneyers' ancestors' augurates are referred to in the litui shown on the denarii M. Iunius Silanus of 116 or 115²⁸ and L. Marcius Philippus of 56 (ill. 5).²⁹ In the latter case, a possibility is admitted of the lituus being associated with the augurate of the moneyer himself.³⁰

Still, the interpretation of the lituus on the denarii of C. Servilius³¹ of 82–80 and C. Servilius C.f.³² of 57 raises doubts (ill. 6). The lituus is shown behind the heads of Apollo and goddess Flora on the obverse. The reverses consist of the following types: a duel of M. Servilius Pulex Geminus and figures of two soldiers which fall within family tradition. There is no indication that obverse litui should be interpreted in any other context. Although the Apollo on the coins of the 80's is often interpreted as an example of Sullan propaganda, it could just as well have expressed the slogans of any other party. This god had become symbolic for the belief shared by the whole society, regardless of political views, in the completion of an epoch and the coming of new, happier time.

The lituus behind Apollo's head need not indicate the deity's prophetic nature. Mint tradition demonstrates that the lituus on the obverse, which was always occupied by a likeness of a deity, referred to person pictured on the reverse or mentioned in the legend. In the case of the 82–80 emissions, it symbolized the augurate held by an ancestor of the moneyer's.

The lituus in conjunction with Flora has an uncertain meaning. Persons shown on the reverse have not been plausibly identified. Perhaps, then, the lituus con-

25 Caw. 264/1; Syd. 483 is dated at 125–120; BMCRR I, No. 1166 at 94; cf. Morawiecki 86; Sukiennik 87–88.

26 Liv. XLV, 39, 16–19; Plut. Paul. 31, 4; cf. Zehnacker, *Moneta*, I, p. 465; Babelon, *op. cit.*, II, p. 446, No. 5; Mayer, *op. cit.*, pp. 137–138. The suggestion in H. Mattingly, *Roman Coins*, p. 74, that the reverse shows Servius Ahala, an opponent of the Gracchi, seems isolated.

27 Cf. Syd., p. 57. There are also denarii of M. Servilius (son?) of 100 B.C., cf. Caw. 327/1 with a similar reverse, but no lituus on the obverse. Thus the link with the Pulex Geminus augurate was not clear and definite.

28 Caw. 285/2; Syd. 537; Morawiecki, 122–123; Sukiennik, 116; Marek, 52a–c.

29 Caw. 425/1; Syd. 919; Morawiecki, 303–305; Sukiennik, 291–294; Marek, 136a–c. Zehnacker, *Moneta*, I, p. 515 assumes that the coin shows L. Marcius Philippus, cos. 91 B.C.; BMCRR No. 3890 identifies with Ancus Marcius.

30 Broughton, II, p. 255; cf. Mayer, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

31 Caw. 370/1–2; Syd. 720; Morawiecki, 246.

32 Caw. 423/1; Syd. 890; Sukiennik, 290; Marek, 134.

tains a reference to the augurate of an unidentified member of *gens Servilia* who could have been at the same time flamen *Floralis*.³³ Nor can it be ruled out that the moneyer's own augurate was in question.

In the late 130's, an independent meaning was ascribed to the apex. Worn by various flamines, it could yet be interpreted only in a broader context. The apex behind goddess *Roma*'s head on the obverse of the L. Postumius Albinus denarii of 131 is generally held to allude to flamen *Martialis* (ill. 7). The reverse shows a standard depiction of *Mars* in a quadriga chariot.³⁴ It was the moneyer's father that had held the office of flamen *Martialis*.

A similar interpretation is applied to the apex featured next to *Mars* on 180 or 107 denarii coined by L. Valerius Flaccus (ill. 8).³⁵ In its turn, the apex held by Q. Fabius Pictor, who also wields a spear, alludes to the office of flamen *Quirinalis*. Such interpretation of the apex and the spear is confirmed by the legend *QUIRIN*.³⁶ It is found on Pictor's shield, so it was he who was the flamen *Quirinalis*. In this way, the moneyer honored his ancestor.

If iconographic context permits no exact interpretation of the apex – each of the 12 flamines was associated with one deity – the symbol can be used in a figurative sense as it constitutes a play on words. Thus, appearing on 126 B.C. denarii T. Quinctius Flaminius (ill. 9),³⁷ the apex is just a graphic reference to cognomen *Flamini* used by a branch of the *Quinctiorum* family.

Sulla's reign is a watershed in priesthood symbols being used on coins. In 84–83, on Sulla's coin the *lituus* was joined with the *capis*, both symbols separated by two *tropaions*.³⁸ Assuming that Sulla had been an augur as early as 88, some researchers maintain that the *lituus* and *capis* jointly refer to the augurate already held by him.³⁹ It would be a clear instance of coin reference to the current status of the moneyer-politician. There are indications, however, that Sulla did not become an augur until 82. The *lituus* and *capis* must have expressed some other message: first of all his desire to obtain *imperium iustum*.⁴⁰ The pair *lituus-capis* had thus been stripped of its strictly religious significance and reference to augurate and made to express only the political aspects of augurate – the idea of divine approval for the leader exercising power. Divine support gave his authority a charismatic character. In this way, the *lituus-capis* began to ex-

33 V. Marek put forward a hypothesis that the *lituus* could be accounted for by the moneyer's memberships in the collegium *Florales*. Still, the claim is controversial. A Flamen *Floralis* (CIL IX, 705; Varro l.l. V, 45) – that a collegium existed is not certain – belonged to a group of 12 flamines *minores*, each of whom was devoted to a different deity. There is no record to suggest that the flamines had the *lituus* as their sign.

34 Caw. 252/1.

35 Caw. 306/1.

36 Caw. 268/1a–1b (of 126 B.C.).

37 Caw. 267/1 (of 126 B.C.).

38 Caw. 359/1–2; Syd. 760–761 is dated at 82–80; as is BMCRR II, p. 459–460.

39 Cf. E. Badian, "Sulla's Augurate", *Arethusa*, I, 1, 1968, pp. 26–46.

40 Zehnacker, *Moneta*, I. p. 575; Alföldi, "The Main Aspects...", p. 86.

press desires to seize political power enjoying the support of protective deities. It appeared mainly on the coins of Sulla's supporters, which suggests that it had come to be associated with Sullan-style authority.

On the coins of Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius, one of Sulla's war commanders, the lituus and capis became a separate reverse type (ill. 10).⁴¹ Despite the fact that this moneyer's other emissions remain in the circle of family tradition and the legend IMPER may refer to Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius Imperator as well as to Sulla, there are signs that the lituus-capis expressed Sullan propaganda. It is also possible that the lituus and capis have a two-fold meaning: a reference to Sulla's rule and an allusion to the imperium of the moneyer's ancestor. This is the nature of the lituus and capis on the denarii of Q. Metellus Scipio coined in 47–46.⁴² They are accompanied by a trophaion and the legend METEL PIUS IMP, both of which hint at the leader's imperium. Other types of Q. Metellus Scipio coins bear legends that refer to his authority as propraetor.

The lituus-capis began to separate from Sulla himself and to express a broader Sullan tradition or – even more – the idea of the charismatic imperium in general. Sullan tradition survived visibly only in his own family circle. Sulla's son, Faustus Cornelius Sulla, on his coins of 56 showed the lituus alone, thus referring to his own augurate held since 57 (ill. 11). As the lituus and capis flanking three trophaions, we may suppose that Faustus was alluding to his father's imperium (ill. 12).⁴³

A certain return to Sullan tradition is probably referred to in the somewhat modified arrangement of the lituus and wreath on the coins of Q. Pompeius Rufus of 54.⁴⁴ Sulla was the moneyer's maternal grandfather. The lituus-capis arrangement had been modified probably in order to depart from a treatment of Sulla as dictator. The reverse legend SVLLA COS and the curule chair, and especially the wreath indicate that a tendency dominated the 50's to emphasize Sulla's traditional authority as a consul.

The lituus and capis on Pompeius' aurei of 71, together with the legend MAGNVS point not so much to Pompeius' augurate as to his political authority (ill. 13).⁴⁵ Likewise, the lituus and capis next to an eagle on the Q. Cassius Longinus coins of 55⁴⁶ are also associated with imperium (ill. 14). There is a plausible hypothesis associating these symbols with Romulus and his superhuman power.

41 Craw. 374/2; Syd. 751 is dated at 77 B.C.; BMCRR No. 47 (Spain) at 79–72; cf. L.R. Taylor, "Symbols of the Augurate on the Coins of the Caecilii Metellii," *AJA*, 1944, p. 352–356.

42 Craw. 460/3; Syd. 1049; cf. Craw., II, p. 738.

43 Craw. 426/1–2, 4; Craw. 426/3; Syd. 884.

44 Craw. 434/2; Syd. 909; cf. Suet. gramm., 12; E. Badian, "Notes on Roman Senators of the Republic," *Historia*, 1963, p. 138.

45 Craw. 402/1; Syd. 1028 is dated at 61; cf. Mattingly, "Notes...", p. 51; Broughton, II, pp. 192 and 255 follows Syd.'s dating and places Pompeius' augurate at 61 B.C.

46 Craw. 428/3; Ascon., 78c; cf. Alföldi, "The Main Aspects...", p. 86; *idem*, "Symboles syllaniens et propagande pompéienne," *REL*, 1950, pp. 54–55; *idem*, "Die Geburt der kaiserlichen Bildsymbolik," *MH*, 1951, p. 191; Broughton, II, p. 254; Mayer, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

The suggestion that the reference might have been to the moneyer's augurate in unsubstantiated.

A new caesura in the use of priesthood symbols and their meanings is the time Caesar commenced his coinage in the early 40's. He had made his sacerdotal career much earlier. In 87 or early 86 he became flamen Dialis, in 73 pontifex, in 63 pontifex maximus, in 47 augur.

The first to appear in 49-48 were symbols referring to the office of high priest: apex, securis, aspergillum, and simpulum (ill. 15).⁴⁷

Then, in 47, aureus obverses showed the securis and simpulum, which some believe to symbolize pontificate, while the reverse lituus and capis are supposed to refer to Sullan tradition (ill. 16).⁴⁸ This meaning of the lituus-capis would be served by the legend CAESAR DICT ITER. However, opinions are heard that it is simply a commemoration of Caesar's augurate. Since the issue remains unresolved, I put forward a new hypothesis. I propose that both obverse and reverse images should be understood in conjunction, and not separately. The four symbols treated jointly would add up to a new quality which referred to Caesar's office of pontifex maximus.

Iconographically, a departure from the priesthood symbols' original meanings seems fully understandable because liturgical vessels and instruments had a variety of uses. Some of them, notably the capis, simpulum, or aspergillum, were used during sacrificial offerings by all priests. None of the instruments could be attributed exclusively to the pontifex maximus.

From the point of view of a politician, adherence to individual meanings in symbols would have led Caesar to build his religious authority on the basis of lesser priesthoods such as augur and pontifex, and ignore the most prestigious – that of high priest. That seems unacceptable.

There is little substance in reservations resulting from Caesar's abandoning the principle of not belonging to two collegia. Precedents are known to have existed.

I believe that the securis, simpulum, lituus, and capis taken together lose their original meanings in favor of a new common value. Since it was to express primarily Caesar's religious prerogatives and his status, it could only refer to the office of high priest.

A cumulation of priesthood symbols making up a new iconographic design ran parallel to the formation of Caesar's political base. An assembly of various symbols that individually referred to various priesthood and taken together to the supreme position of pontifex maximus was featured on Caesar's coins, whose legends point to his supreme political power. What recipients of coins saw was not individual offices but their sum as that constituted Caesar's supreme authority.

47 Craw 443/1; Syd. 1006 is dated at 54-51.

48 Craw. 456/1a-b; cf. vol. II, p. 735; Syd. 1027.

It is in this spirit that the lituus, capis, and securis on the reverses of aurei coined in 46 by Aulus Hirtius⁴⁹ should be interpreted (ill. 17). Even though their legend reads A HIRTIVS PR, they made a reference to Caesar himself, whose presence is expressed in the obverse legend C CAESAR COS TER. In this case, too, I object to breaking up symbols into those that stand for augurate (lituus, capis) and pontificate. Together, they made up a compound symbol of Caesar the pontifex maximus.

Between the sets of symbols on Caesar's and Hirtius's aurei, there is a surprising difference. It seems to me that it did not have any real propaganda significance, but rather resulted from a lack of traditional symbolic rendition of pontifex maximus. What mattered was the principle of graphically adding the symbols of lower priesthoods and thus using them in their number to express one above them.

A clear cumulation, without a split between two sides of a coin, of pontifex maximus symbolism occurs on Caesar's denarii of 46 (ill. 18). On the reverse, next to the legend AVGV R PONT MAX, there appear: simpulum, aspergillum, capis, and lituus. On the obverse, the cumulation of political offices is expressed by the legend COS TER DICT ITER placed ground goddess Ceres' head.⁵⁰ Thus, the coin expressed Caesar's supreme position in his state and his attainment of highest offices that gave him unlimited political power and full religious sanction.

An identical set of priesthood symbols appeared on the reverse of Octavian's denarii coined in 37, prior to August-September.⁵¹ The set's clearly Caesarean origin permits its interpretation in the context of Octavian's political propaganda. First of all, there is a reference to Octavian's power, which must have consisted of religious and purely political honors. The latter were referred to only in the legend IMP CAESAR DIVI F III VIR R P C. The earlier could not speak of pontifex maximus, a title Octavian did not then possess, but only symbolized his ambition to reach for it. It is the first time that the idea is conveyed that later lay at the foundation of the princeps' authority, namely that supreme political power should be joined with the highest religious authority.

In restoring Caesar's reverse, Octavian was probably referring to the resolution of 46 which stated that Caesar's son should hold the title of pontifex maximus. Perhaps it was a way in which Caesar sought to make Octavian his successor, which the latter used to claim his legacy also in the political-religious sphere.⁵²

49 Craw 466/1; Syd. 1017.

50 Craw. 467/1-2; Syd. 1023-1024; in the reverse legend, there are also letters D (=donativum) and M (=munus).

51 Craw. 537/1.

52 Dio XLIV, 5, 3; cf. E. Meyer, *Caesars Monarchie und das Principat des Pompejus* (Stuttgart, Berlin: 1918), pp. 517-518; S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (Oxford: 1971), p. 33; the opposite in: W. Schmitthenner, "Oktavian und das Testament Cäsars," *Zetemata* 4 (München: 1952), p. 9. Even if the law had been made after Caesar's death, under pressure from Octavian's propaganda, it would not have changed the interpretation of coins, which would have been an element in the campaign.



17. Aulus Hirtius, aureus [photo after Frank Sternberg, 1984, pl. X, no 229]

18. C. Iulius Caesar, denarius, National Museum, Cracow [photo: J. Książek]



19. Domitius Calvinus, denarius [photo after Frank Sternberg, 1982, pl. XVII, no 499]

20. M. Brutus, Lentulus Spinter, aureus [photo after Bahrfeldt, pl. VII, 11]



21. Gaius Antonius, denarius [photo after Hess, 1912, no 306]

22. Sextus Pompeius, denarius, Czartoryski Museum, Cracow [photo: J. Książek]



23. Sextus Pompeius, aureus [photo after Bahrfeldt, pl. , 21]

24. C. Iulius Caesar, denarius [photo after Frank Sternberg, 1989, pl. XI, no 243]

By displaying priesthood symbols, pontifex maximus Octavian also stressed the traditional links between this office and gens Iulia. We know that following the death of Aeneas, Silvius ascended to the throne, while Julius, excluded from power, assumed the title pontifex maximus. Since then, Diodorus writes, it has been held by members of Julian lineage up to our time.⁵³

The same reverse type was kept up by Octavian after August-September 37, after the treaty of Tarentum had been signed.⁵⁴ Apart from introducing his likeness onto the obverse, he placed on it a legend that extended to the reverse: IMP CAESAR DIVI F III VIR ITER RPC – COS ITER ET TER DESIG. The whole coin makes an even stronger claim to Caesar's highest political and religious power, which Octavian treated as part and parcel of his inheritance. A fusion of religious and political power in Octavian's hand, as shown on the coin, manifested the legality of his position. At the same time, Octavian's coins struck a blow to his grand rival Sextus Pompeius. Under the terms of the Tarentum treaty, the latter was deprived by the senate of the offices of pontifex and consul.⁵⁵

After Caesar's death, his monetary type composed of the apex, securis, aspergillum, and simpulum was also continued. These symbols appeared on denarii and quinarii coined in 43 by M. Antonius and M. Lepidus.⁵⁶ As they stood next to the legend M LEPID (COS) IMP they doubtless referred to Lepidus' title pontifex maximus and testified to his Caesarean views.

Additional explanation is in order in the interpretation of the Domitius Calvinus denarii issued in 39 (ill. 19).⁵⁷ They repeat the same reverse type as they add the legend DOM COS ITER IMP. The obverse shows Heracles' head and the legend OSCA, which is the name of a Spanish mint. Calvinus never was pontifex maximus, but only – as it is supposed – a pontifex.⁵⁸ Still, there is no reason to treat the Caesarean set of symbols differently in this case and narrow down its message. It is likely, then, that the symbols were not connected with Calvinus. It is my belief that much as was the case with Octavian's 37 emission, Calvinus used Caesarean type of reverse to express his political views, perhaps also his aspirations. There might have been some significance in the fact that Calvinus owed his pontifex status to Caesar.⁵⁹

The propaganda warfare that erupted violently following Caesar's death strongly affected the way priesthood symbols were used. What with civil war, declining

53 Diodor. VII, 5, 8; cf. Dion. Hal., I, 70, 4; cf. Meyer, "Caesars...", p. 504; P. Jal, *La guerre civile à Rome. Etude littéraire et moral* (Paris: 1963), p. 404.

54 Craw. 538/1. Anti-Pompeian feeling is also present in Octavian's emissions of 37 B.C., which introduced elements of Apollonian symbolism. Cf. Craw. 538/2; L. Morawiecki, *Władza charyzmatyczna w Rzymie u schyłku republiki (lata 44–27)* (*Charismatic Authority in Rome at the Decline of the Republic (44–27)*) (Rzeszów: 1989), p. 230.

55 Dio XLVIII, 54, 6.

56 Craw. 489/1–3. For Caesar's type of 49–48, see Craw. 443/1.

57 Craw. 532/1.

58 Broughton, *op. cit.*, II, p. 388.

59 Stein, s.v. Domitius 43 in: RE V, col. 1422.

authority of state offices, shaken mores, the exercise of religious authority was conducive to wielding political power. The aura that surrounded the religious functions of pontifices attracted attention to graphic ways of rendering priest-hoods. Since, as I believe, a conviction had developed that the importance of an office was in the number of symbols, even ordinary pontifices tried to embellish their office with several symbols. For obvious reasons, republicans refrained from emulating Caesarean designs on their coins. Instead, they created their own types.

On the obverses of denarii and aurei coined by M. Brutus together with Lentulus Spinther, a securis, simpulum, and secespita were shown with the legend BRVTVS (ill. 20).⁶⁰ This reference to Brutus' sacerdotal function probably reflected not only a desire to break away from Caesarean tradition, but also a need to mark his religious position as identical to that held by his then adversary Gaius Antonius, brother of Mark. The latter, on his denarii coined in January-February 43, placed two simpula and a securis plus a legend PONTIFEX (ill. 21).⁶¹ That both leaders used two different sets of symbols with the same number of elements indicates that propaganda rivalry had by then acquired much finesse.

No less sophisticated was the way in which the lituus-capis was used on coins. The sign had an unquestionable Sullan background and one not affected by Caesarean legacy. Caesar had used it only once and he had changed the whole iconographic expression by adding new symbols. In effect, Caesarean tradition ignored the lituus-capis. Probably for this reason, both these symbols appear on republican coins. In 42, Lentulus Spinther included them on the reverses of his aurei and denarii.⁶² Since the obverses alternated between M. Brutus and C. Cassius, we may suppose that the capis and lituus were associated only with Spinther. He was a leader with much political ambition who wanted to join Brutus and Cassius at the head of the republican camp. The lituus and capis expressed – in Sullan spirit – not so much Spinther's augurate as his drive to win as much political power as he could.

It is also characteristic that the lituus and capis appeared on Pompeian coins. They were struck in 42–40 by Sextus Pompeius, who dedicated them to his eminent father (ill. 22). The capis and lituus are on both sides of a portrait of Pompeius the Great and serve as a reminder of, again, not so much his augurate, but imperium.⁶³

Breaking up the traditional pair lituus-capis seems to bring out the individual meaning of each of the symbols which – even though they appear on one coin – are associated with different persons. The lituus next to the portrait of M. An-

60 Craw. 500/5–6; Syd. 1309; cf. Cic. ad Brut. I, 5, 3; 15, 8; P. Wallmann, *Triumviri Rei Publicae Constituendae. Untersuchungen zur politischen Propaganda im zweiten Triumvirat* (43–30 v. Chr.) (Frankfurt am Main: 1989), p. 41.

61 Craw. 484/1; Syd. 1286; dating according to L. Morawiecki, *Political Propaganda in the Coinage of the Late Roman Republic* (Wrocław: 1983), pp. 58–61.

62 Craw. 500/1–7; Zehnacker, *Moneta*, I, p. 526.

63 Craw. 511/3a–c; Syd. 1344; Wallmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 167–168.

tony symbolizes his augurate (obv.), while the capis near Octavian (rev.) stands for his pontificate.⁶⁴

A similar interpretation is called for in the split lituus-capis, especially when the capis is replaced by another symbol. The lituus beside Pompeius the Great's portrait must be primarily a symbol of his augurate, while the tripod beside Gaius' probably alludes to his office of *XV viri s.f.*⁶⁵

The lituus and capis appeared only once on a Caesarean coin. It was issued in the year 40 by M. Antony and L. Munatius Plancus.⁶⁶ The arrangement, however, did not echo Sullan spirit. The lituus and capis on the obverse associated by the legend with M. Antony (M. ANTON IMP AVG III VIR R P C) were joined with a thunderbolt, capis, and scepter; on the reverse is the legend: L PLANCVS PRO COS and L PLANCVS IMP ITER. Thus, even if the obverse can be interpreted as a symbol of M. Antony's augurate, and even more of his imperium, the reverse is rather incomprehensible in the context of L. Munatius Plancus. Associating the capis with his position of *VII vir epulo*⁶⁷ and linking the caduceus with the peace of Brindisium and the bolt with M. Antony's place in the triumph⁶⁸ breaks up the composition and propaganda message of the reverse. Therefore, all the reverse elements should be analyzed according to the same criteria and related to L. Plancus.

It seems to me that the coin was supposed to show M. Antony and L. Plancus as holders of the imperium. This is suggested by both legends as they list both men's honors. Insofar as M. Antony's augurate gave his authority religious sanction, the reverse symbolism supported by the legend seems to express predominantly L. Plancus' political power.

Once determined, the coin's message does not explain the reason why the Caesarean reached for Sullan symbolism. Perhaps an understanding of the lituus-capis is possible if we assume that in this instance both symbols have nothing to do with Sullan tradition. I believe that the moneyer wanted to use the coin's symbolism to stress not only both leaders' imperium, but their Caesarean views. One way of doing this was to use Caesarean-inspired iconography. This is why he made use of Caesar's obverse, while the reverse was pieced together from the reverses of Caesar's aurei and half-aurei and the moneyer's own coins of 45.⁶⁹ But since performing his function as PRAEF. VRB in 45, L. Plancus had moved to PRO COS and had been declared IMP ITER which caused him to add to the capis a scepter and bolt to symbolize his present political position.

64 Craw. 515/7. But Syd. 1164 is counterfeit, cf. M. v. Bahrfield, *Die römische Goldmünzenprägung während der Republik und unter Augustus* (Halle/Saale: 1923), p. 46; Craw., I, p. 551, No. 103.

65 Craw. 511/1; Syd. 1346.

66 Craw. 522/1-4; Wallmann, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

67 Craw., II, p. 743.

68 P.V. Hill, "Coin-Symbolism and Propaganda during the Wars of Vengeance (44-36)," *Quaderni Ticinesi. Numismatica e antichità classiche*, IV, 1975, p. 180.

69 Craw. 475/1a-2.



25. Q. Cornificius, aureus [photo after Bahrfeldt, pl. VII, 20]



26. C. Iulius Caesar, denarius, [photo after Frank Sternberg, 1985, pl. XI, no 287]



27. Marcus Antonius, denarius [photo after Frank Sternberg, 1988, pl. XVII, no 325]

That the Caesarean abstained from using the Sullan lituus-capis set is exemplified by the emissions of Gallic denarii and quinarii by M. Antony and M. Lepidus.⁷⁰ To the lituus and capis they added a symbolic crow as this bird, as a messenger from Jupiter, revealed the god's intentions to an augur. The coin's reverse was made up of symbols proper for the high priest: *simpulum*, *aspergillum*, *securis*, *apex*. Fighting the senate, deprived of offices as enemies, both men reached for symbols that bestowed on their real power religious sanction. Coin iconography was a reminder of their Caesarean background. Since, however, the lituus and capis might have raised connotations of Sullan tradition and his dictatorial power, M. Antony – who had just legally abolished dictatorship – expanded their composition.

The characteristic trait in Caesar's and Caesarean coins was the use of the lituus alone. It seems that it expressed meanings much deeper than augurate itself. This was achieved by separating the lituus from any other priesthood symbols and attaching it to Caesar's guardian deity. Thus the lituus expressed Caesar's imperium and pointed to the divine patron Venus, who supported her favorite through auspicia and omina and gave him charismatic powers. This was the message on the coins of 46–45 (ill. 24).⁷¹

The lituus had a similar meaning on the Q. Cornificius aurei and denarii coined in Africa in 42 (ill. 25).⁷² Their obverse bears the head of Jupiter-Ammon, Tanit, or the personification of Africa. The reverse always shows the moneyer standing with a lituus and crowned by Juno Sospita; the legend is: Q CORNIFICI AVGVR IMP.

Q. Cornificius was the proconsul of Africa vetus appointed by Caesar in early 44. In March 44, the senate extended his appointment in appreciation of his faithful service to the republic. This caused him to be proscribed in absentia by the triumviri late in 43. Q. Cornificius fought for survival by referring to local tradition. He placed on coins images of gods associated with Africa and a figure of Juno Sospita, his protective goddess, identified with Carthaginian Dea Celestis. Because of personal links with the deity, the lituus should be interpreted not only as symbolic for the moneyer's augurate, but above all as a symbol of the imperium strengthened in the Caesarean fashion by the divine sanction of a goddess.

Caesar's imperium was also often referred to through a direct connection of the lituus with his likeness (ill. 26).⁷³ This won popular approval and the lituus appeared next to Caesar even after his death. In time, Caesarean tradition spread to other leaders.⁷⁴ In 44 the lituus was conjoined with M. Antony and remained

70 Craw. 489/1–4; cf. Morawiecki, *Political Propaganda...*, pp. 81ff; cf. Cic. de vat., II, 35, 73.

71 Craw. 468/1.

72 Craw. 509/1–5; cf. Broughton, op. cit., II, pp. 308, 532; J.R. Fears, "The Coinage of Q. Cornificius and Augural Symbolism on the Late Republic Denarii," *Historia*, XXIV, 1975, pp. 592–602.

73 Craw. 480/3; cf. Craw. 480/2a.

74 Craw. 480/19; Syd. 1368; FITA, p. 50; and Craw. 526/2; and Craw. 540/1–2.

so for many more emissions (ill. 27).⁷⁵ After 42, Octavian adopted the same idea, although he did not appear with the lituus too often.⁷⁶

Holding a priesthood provided opportunities to wield religious authority as a political and ideological weapon. The opportunities were especially vast for the pontifex maximus, who presided over the whole religious life, and for the augurs, who voiced the will of the gods through divination. The remaining offices were definitely inferior in rank.

An analysis of coins on which priesthood symbols serve a propaganda purpose permits a division into two basic periods. Neither of them should be regarded as marking an exceptional rise of religious feeling. In the first, from the 130's to the 80's, especially the lituus and the apex appear as part of a general and clearly visible trend in Roman coinage to differentiate the then scant and monotonous iconographic motifs. Like most symbols of the day, they help create family propaganda as they refer to the moneyer's family past. Any allusion to current political situation is hard to find.

The second period in the use of priesthood symbols coincides with domestic chaos and political struggles to build a new power structure. It lasted from Sulla's time all the way to the end of the republic. Priesthood symbols, often reinforced with a suitable legend, serve as a vehicle for political propaganda. They lose their religious character and become an allegory of an imperium sanctioned by destiny and divine support. Iconographically, it found an expression in the loss of individual symbol meanings in favor of multi-symbol combines. Monetary types thus created were used not only by Sulla and Caesar, but also their political successors. This is a clear indication that symbols were severed from their original meanings and attached to the idea of power exercised by the holder.

Caesar's concentration of power ran parallel to his cumulation of priesthood symbols expressive in their number of the highest religious authority. The same device was used by his political successors, who – though they had no claim to being pontifex maximus – took advantage of Caesarean symbol sets to stress their position and political aspirations. In this way, the model of a princeps was created over time. His political and religious power was the sum of various political and religious functions.

Political groups began to use separate sets of symbols purely for propaganda purposes.

In the light of numismatic material, the hypothesis of augurate decreasing in political importance to the benefit of haruspices as early as the second century seems highly doubtful.⁷⁷ Haruspices or their symbols never appear on coins or

75 Craw. 480/27; Craw. 488/1–2; Craw. 492/1–2; Craw. 496/2–3; Craw. 516/3–6; Craw. 520/1; Craw. 521/1–2; Craw. 531/1a–b; Craw. 533/2.

76 Craw. 497/1; Craw. 517/7–8; Craw. 526/3.

77 J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz, *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion* (Oxford: 1979), pp. 22–23; M. Jaczynowska, *Religie świata rzymskiego* [*The Religions of the Roman World*] (Warszawa: 1987), p. 83.

other means of official propaganda. Their social position was much inferior, even comparable with petty temple offices.⁷⁸ Another important thing is that pontifex and augur were near the core of the Roman state system, while haruspices were long treated as alien. Besides, augurate and pontificate were personally held by Roman politicians and their direct contacts with the gods made for an inextricable bond between divine will, politics, and the personality of a priest who performed a political function. Haruspices were never in the position personally to influence state policy. It is augurate and pontificate – and, related to those, idea of charismatic authority – that is referred to on coins, which best testifies to the high political importance of both these functions.

WYKAZ SKRÓTÓW

- ANS MN – *The American Numismatic Society. Museum Notes.*
 AJA – *American Journal of Archeology*
 Annali – *Istituto Italiano di Numismatica, Annali, Roma*
 ANRW – *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*
 BMCRR – *Grueber H.A., Coins of the Roman Republic in The British Museum, 3 vols., London 1910*
 Broughton – *Broughton T.R.S., The Magistrates of the Roman Republic, vol. II, New York 1952*
 CIL – *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*
 Crawford – *Crawford M.H., Roman Republican Coinage, 2 vols., Cambridge 1974*
 FITA – *Grant M., From Imperium to Auctoritas, Cambridge 1946*
 Historia – *Historia. Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte*
 Marek – *Marek V., Roman Republican Coins in the Collection of the Charles University, Praha 1985*
 MH – *Museum Helveticum*
 Morawiecki – *Morawiecki L., The Coins of the Roman Republic. Catalogues of the Collection of the National Museum in Cracow, Kraków 1982*
 Numisma – *Numisma. Revista de la Sociedad iberoamericana de estudios numismaticos*
 RE – *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Stuttgart 1994*
 REL – *Revue des Etudes Latines*
 RuKdR(Wissowa) – *Wissowa G., Religion und Kultus der Römer, München 1912*
 Sukiennik – *Sukiennik G., Catalogue of Ancient Coins in the Ossoliński National Institute Library, Part I. Coins of the Roman Republic, Wrocław 1985*
 Syd. – *Sydenham E.A., The Coinage of the Roman Republic, London 1952*
 Zehnacker H., – *Moneta. Recherches sur l'organisation et l'art des émissions monétaires de la République romaine (289–31 av. J.-C.), vols. 1–2, Paris–Roma 1973 (Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 222)*

⁷⁸ Cf. Cic., II Verr., II, 10, 27 puts all in the same line: *praefecti, scribae, accensi, medici, haruspices, praecones.*

Pontificalia atque auguralia insignia a propaganda polityczna na monetach Republiki Rzymskiej

Streszczenie

Insignia kapłańskie, pojawiając się na monetach republikańskich, w sposób naturalny informowały o piastowaniu urzędów religijnych przez osoby, z którymi były związane treści monet. Obok nurtu „religijnego” zaczął pojawiać się od czasów Sulli, nabierając intensywności w czasach Cezara, nurt „polityczny”, w którym te same symbole urzędów kapłańskich wyrażały treści bardziej złożone, związane ze sferą władzy charyzmatycznego wodza.

Nowa rola symboli urzędów religijnych, umieszczonych na monetach, została prawdopodobnie wykreowana przez zintensyfikowanie walki politycznej i ideologicznej w połowie I w. p.n.e. Polityczne przesłanie symboli zależało przede wszystkim od kontekstu ikonograficznego. Wspólne występowanie kilku symboli, tworzących samodzielne już typy monetarne, spowodowało prawdopodobnie zanik indywidualnego ich znaczenia na rzecz nowych wartości. Wyraźnie widać to na monetach Cezara, na których nadzwyczajnej kumulacji urzędów politycznych, wyrażanych za pomocą legendy, towarzyszyło niespotykane dotąd nagromadzenie symboli najwyższej władzy religijnej. Pewne typy monetarne stworzone przez symbole urzędów religijnych tak bardzo były związane z osobą i władzą Cezara, że po jego śmierci zostały przejęte przez jego ideologicznych spadkobierców w celu zaznaczenia ich cezariańskiego rodowodu i pretensji do najwyższej władzy w państwie. W ten sposób został stworzony model władzy princepsa, skupiającego w swoim ręku pełnię władzy politycznej wzmocnionej najwyższą sankcją religijną.