

THE JUG AND LITUUS ON ROMAN REPUBLICAN COIN TYPES: RITUAL SYMBOLS AND POLITICAL POWER

ROBERTA STEWART

[PLATES 1–3]

IN THE COINAGE OF THE Roman Republic, a jug and lituus (the curved staff of the augurs) sometimes appear as a paired group of symbols; the earliest use is by Sulla, the last on issues of Antony in 39. From the ritual context, I argue here that the jug and lituus refer to the pontifical and augural jurisdiction over the ritual preliminaries to political action and particularly to the ceremonies of investiture of Roman magistrates—namely initial auspices, sacrifice, and vows. From the political context of each issue, I suggest that the symbols allude to ritual in order to legitimize military power.

The jug and lituus pair are first seen on the issue of Sulla, dated by Crawford to 84–83 B.C. (*RRC* no. 359 = pl. 1, fig. 1): the jug and lituus are the central emblems on the reverse and are flanked by military trophies; the inscription identifies Sulla as *imper(ator) iterum*. These symbols have generated a continuing debate. L. R. Taylor referred the symbols to membership in the augurate.¹ But Sulla was not an augur until 82.² T. Martin (1989: 19–44, esp. 24–44) has therefore reassigned the coin to late 82 and urged that the legend on the coin (*imperator iterum*) refers to Sulla's victory at the Colline Gate. A. Keaveney (1982: 150–171, esp. 158–161) has kept to 84/3 and taken the lituus and jug as symbols of Sulla's auspices as a Roman magistrate and so of his *iustum imperium*.

These explanations are insufficient. While Martin legitimately questions Crawford's seriation of Sulla's coins on the basis of hoard analysis and wear patterns and considers the coin-type, particularly the legend, to reassign the coins, the iconography of Sulla's coin does not support his reassignment. Athenian tetradrachms issued by Sulla in Greece commemorate the twin trophies erected by him at Chaeroneia (Plut. *Sull.* 19.5; Paus. 9.40.7) and suggest that trophies on his coinage refer to his Eastern victories.³ Moreover, Martin (1989: 35–43)

Unless otherwise noted, quotations of Livy and Caesar are drawn from the Teubner editions. I have used Flober's Budé edition (1985) for the text of Varro and Peterson's Oxford edition (1917) for citations from Cicero's *Verrines*.

¹Taylor 1944: 352–356, esp. 353, followed by Frier 1967: 115–118; *idem*, 1969: 187–199; Fears 1975: 592–602.

²Badian (1969: 199–201) first noted the chronological problem. Crawford (1974: 373–374) summarizes the debate on this problem.

³Camp *et al.* 1992: 449–450. Associating the lituus with personal tenure of the augurate will not explain its subsequent usage on the coins of Sex. Pompeius, who was an *augur designatus* only in 39 (App. *BCiv.* 5.72), and of Metellus Scipio, M. Brutus, and C. Cassius, who were never augurs at all. Broughton (*MRR* 2.369) identifies Cassius as a *XVvir s.f.* because of the tripod on his coins; cf. Crawford 1974: 741, n. 6, with reservations. No other evidence exists for a priesthood. M. Brutus was *pontifex*: see Cic. *ad Brut.* 1.5.3, 15.8. On the coins, see *infra*.

argues that Sulla's victory at the Colline Gate would not have violated Republican sensibilities, for Sulla defeated an army composed largely of Samnites who were not yet recognized as Roman citizens. Yet to claim glory (IMPER ITER) for victory over already conquered foes also violated Republican tradition.⁴ As victor, Sulla could disregard Republican tradition (most recently, Martin 1989: 37–38); but to do so would undercut the traditions so consciously invoked by the remaining symbolism on this coin. In sum, Martin's criticism of Crawford's dating is legitimate, but his reassignment of the date of the coin and realignment of the iconography may not be. Second, to interpret the lituus as referring to the auspices of the magistrate/moneyer presents its own difficulties. Keaveney recognized that the symbols, like the inscription IMPER, alluded to separate activities that legitimated political authority: the legend IMPER identified military success and, according to Keaveney, the jug and lituus referred to the initial auspication of a magistrate entering office. Yet Keaveney does not explain why a priestly implement would symbolize the authority of the magistrate. The lituus belonged to the augur, not the magistrate,⁵ and cannot refer directly to the magistrate's auspices or his authority. Again, Fears argues that representations of symbols of victory (trophy; legend IMPER) appear together with the lituus and heads of gods in order to attribute the magistrate's military success and his auspices to the favor of the god shown on the coin, but he here implies first that the jug and lituus refer to the auspices and second that a curule magistrate in taking the auspices for an intended action sought approval from a deity other than Jupiter, the god traditionally associated with the auspices.⁶ He thus conflates the *auspicia privata* and *auspicia publica* possessed by magistrates of the State.⁷ Finally, these explanations focus on the lituus on one particular coin of Sulla to explain the symbols; and every interpretation so far offered of the presence and the meaning of the jug begins with the assumption that it is an augural implement.⁸ Thus, the reference for the paired symbols is implicit in, rather than proved by, the argument.

The recurrence of the symbols as a pair suggests a sensible reference for them, and the unambiguous reference of the lituus to augury invites us to consider the ritual associations of the jug. The jug appears regularly in art in the context of sacrifice.⁹ Thus, for example, on a late-second-century B.C. bronze cista from

⁴ See Val. Max. 2.8.4, on the Senate's refusal of a triumph to the praetor L. Opimius in 125 for his defeat of Fregellae: his victories did not realize an increase in Rome's territory but simply recovered areas previously subject to Rome.

⁵ For the lituus as the symbol of the augur, see Wissowa 1912: 429–430; Pease 1963: 140–141.

⁶ Fears 1981: 599–600. For the lituus on coins associated with deities other than Jupiter, see Alföldi 1956: 86–87.

⁷ For the distinction between *auspicia privata* and *auspicia publica*, see Linderski 1990: 36–37.

⁸ Taylor (1944: 353; 1966: 74) assumed that both jug and lituus referred to the augurate and dismissed any identification of the jug as a sacrificial vessel. She was followed by Frier 1967: 117 and Keaveney 1982: 159.

⁹ The interpretation of symbols on Roman coins has generated a long debate. For contrasting views, see Jones 1973: 64; Sutherland 1959. Both scholars emphasize the need to understand a symbol

Praeneste (Ryberg 1955: fig. 13, pl. 6), the jug appears among the implements for libation: a figure in military garb holds a patera and staff crowned by an eagle and is attended by a youth holding a ladle and jug; behind them, a togate figure *capite velato* holds a patera in either hand; behind the *togatus*, a slave holding a patera stands ready beside a large amphora and a table filled with pateras (cf. Ryberg 1955: 20–22). Again, on the altar of C. Manlius (Ryberg 1955: pl. 25, 39a), a youth stands behind an altar holding a jug, while a bull is slaughtered (right) and a togate figure *capite velato* (left) pours a libation onto the altar.¹⁰ Further, on the altar of Vespasian at Pompeii (Turcan 1988: no. 12, pl. 6; Ryberg 1955: pl. 25, 38a), sacrificial implements on the lateral faces complement the sacrificial scene depicted on the front face and offer ornamental illustration of the altar's role in cult: one short side shows a jug and patera, while a lituus, sacrificial shawl, and incense box appear on the opposing side.¹¹ The altar frieze of the Ara Pacis (Turcan 1988: no. 48, pl. 24) makes a similar functional allusion in its decoration: a youth stands at the front of a sacrificial procession holding a jug and a box for incense, the ritual substances for beginning the sacrifice. Finally, the frieze of the so-called altar of Domitius Ahenobarbus (Turcan 1988: no. 78, pl. 41; Ryberg 1955: pl. 8, 17b, first century B.C.) documents the sacrificial use of the jug: a sacrificial scene shows a togate figure holding a patera over an altar while

on a particular coin historically, in relation to other uses of the symbol on coins. On coins and family history, see Zehnacker 1973: 480–483, discussing the generic battle scenes typically figured on the reverse of Republican denarii. A secondary debate considers the effect of coinage. Of the imperial coinage, Levick (1982) has suggested that coins were fashioned by moneyers to flatter the *princeps* by presenting him with his own idealized vision of himself. For the Republican period, see Newman (1990), arguing that the coins of Antony and Octavian represented consciously formulated messages of the issuers. The correlations he uncovers suggest the value of his approach.

¹⁰The date of the altar is controversial. For discussion, see Torelli 1982: 16–20, who adduces prosopographical and stylistic arguments for dating the monument to the Augustan period, late first century B.C.

¹¹The association of the lituus with sacrifice may underscore the divinatory function of the sacrificial *litatio* which, like an auspice, identified the absence of divine disapproval: see Wissowa 1912: 353. Cf. the joint issue of M. Antony and M. Aemilius Lepidus in 43–42 B.C. (*RRC* no. 489/2 and 4). The denarius and quinarius show a lituus, jug, and raven on the obverse with the legend M ANTON IMP. The reverse of the denarius shows a single-handled cup, sprinkler, axe, and apex with the legend M LEPID IMP (*RRC* no. 489/2); on the reverse of the quinarius a winged victory crowns a military trophy (*RRC* no. 489/4). The obverse type adds the raven to conventional iconography, cf. the reverse type appearing on Julius Caesar's first issue during the civil war (*RRC* no. 443/1) and a coin of a *pontifex* (Val. Max. 8.11.2) and partisan of Octavian in 39 (*RRC* no. 532). The formulation is unparalleled (this could be due to the failure of the issuer to win) and conspicuous. The lituus was clearly the distinctive feature of the augur and easily understood: on another coin of Antony, a figure identified as an augur holds the lituus, not a jug (*RRC* no. 533/2, cf. 242/1; 243/1; 497/1; 509/2, 4, 5; 540/1). Yet no coin shows only a lituus as the central emblem to represent the augurate. Earlier coins present the jug and lituus as central emblems, attesting to the iconographic sufficiency of the jug and lituus to make a symbolic reference and a perception of their artistic appropriateness to the pictorial field. As an addition to otherwise conventional iconography, the raven perhaps underscored the divine approval suggested in the initial auspication and preliminary sacrifice and *litatio*. Cf. Taylor (1944: 353) and Crawford (1974: 739–740), who associate the symbols with the respective priesthoods of Antony and Lepidus, the obverse showing augural symbols and the reverse pontifical emblems.

a youth fills the patera from a jug. The appearance of the jug both in pictorial representations of sacrifice and in friezes of sacrificial implements documents its ritual association and shows that the object had a comprehensible signification within Roman culture.¹²

Ritual associates wine, and hence the jug, with the pontifical college. All public sacrifice required two sacred substances: *mola salsa* for the *immolatio* of the sacrificial victims and wine for the preliminary libation and the *immolatio*.¹³ The Vestal Virgins prepared, stored, and presumably distributed the *mola salsa*. The Roman ritual calendar identifies two wine festivals at which the pontifical college ritually prepared the sacrificial wine. At the August *Vinalia*, the *flamen Dialis* violated the ritual taboo against contact with vines and cut the first grapes, as yet green, thereby inaugurating the harvest: *Vinalia a vino; hic dies Iovis, non Veneris. huius rei cura non levis in Latio, nam aliquot locis vindemiae primum ab sacerdotibus publice fiebant, ut Romae etiam nunc; nam flamen Dialis auspicatur vindemiam et ut iussit vinum legere, agna Iovi facit, inter cuius exta caesa et prorrecta flamen primus vinum legit* (Varro *Ling.* 6.16). The harvest of unripe grapes parallels the harvest of as yet green spelt by the Vestals and may have guaranteed that the sacred substances be as near as possible to maturity without yet beginning to decay (die), a sacral principle further reflected in the taboo against the *Dialis* having contact with defilement such as a corpse, a grave, or fermenting bread.¹⁴ An inscription dating from the imperial period identifies a public vineyard, corroborating pontifical jurisdiction over the vineyard and viticulture there.¹⁵ The necessary sacredness of the public vineyards also supplies a sensible referent for the augural jurisdiction over vineyards (Cic. *Leg.* 2.21; see Schilling 1954: 129). Again in April, the new wine was ritually opened and Festus records the name

¹² See Elsner (1991: 50–61), emphasizing the cultural creation of meaning in art. Grueber (*BMCR* 2, p. 357, n. 3) identifies the vessel as a *capis*. Earlier, Wissowa in Marquardt 1881: 3.407–408, referred to obscure sacrificial rituals of the augurs (*augurium salutis* and *canarium*) in order to explain the presence of the sacrificial jug on coins. He later corrected himself (Wissowa 1912: 451 and n. 6). Association of the jug with the provincial allotment may accord with the context for Sulla's coin but is ill-suited to the coins of Pompey, Julius Caesar, M. Antony, L. Cassius, M. Brutus, Sex. Pompeius, and perhaps Metellus Pius, whose commands did not depend on an allotment. For the coins, see *infra*.

¹³ For the sacrificial ritual, see Wissowa 1912: 351–353. For the Vestals' preparation and storage of *mola salsa*, see Holland 1961: 313–331, esp. 317–325; Wissowa 1912: 143. The Vestals seem to have regulated the entire preparation of the *mola salsa*, regulating the *factores* who prepared the sacred cakes for libation, see Varro *Ling.* 7.44; *ILS* 4926, 4933, 4936; *CIL* VI 32419, 32423. Holland has also suggested that the shrines of the Argeii are to be associated with the public grain fields which produced the spelt for the *mola salsa* and that the festival of the Argeii in May concluded the ritual harvest.

¹⁴ On the taboos, see Dumézil 1966: 153, Schilling 1954: 129. On offering substances at their peak to diety, cf. Porte 1985: 84, who likens the rite to the offering of the as yet green harvest to Ceres. On liminality and the sacred, cf. Beard 1980. Cf. Nagy 1992: 8–9.

¹⁵ For the pontifical vineyard, see *ILS* 249 (A.D. 75) recording Vespasian's investigation, with the authority of the pontifical college, of encroachments on a public vineyard: *Imp. Caesar | Vespasianus Aug. | pontif. max., tribunic. | potest. VI, imp. XIII, p.p., | cos. VI desig. VII, censor, | locum vineae publicae occupatum | a privatis | per collegium pontificum | restituit*. See Richardson 1992: 431.

of the first libation offered to Jupiter: *Calpar. vinum novum, quod ex dolio demitur sacrificii causa, antequam gustetur. Iovi enim prius sua vina libabant, quae appellabant festa Vinalia* (p. 57 Lindsay). Jupiter appears as the god of wine and libation only here in Roman cult, and myth emphasizes the politico-religious significance of the libation. Pre-Vergilian sources identify the *aition* for the ritual in the wars of the Latins and Rutuli: the Latins vowed a wine harvest to Jupiter in order to secure divine aid in the war.¹⁶ Jupiter thus received the vintage and libation vowed for victory in war,¹⁷ and the ritual opening of the harvest by the *flamen Dialis* in August and the opening of the wine in April commemorated Jupiter's patronage of Roman warfare. While all sacrificial wine used for public sacrifice symbolized Jupiter's patronage of Roman military enterprise, the association was particularly meaningful at the annual initial sacrifices and when the magistrates drew lots and made vows to Jupiter for their allotted campaigns.

The symbols of the jug and lituus individually have sensible references within Roman culture to augury and sacrifice, to the augurs who alone carried the lituus and to the *pontifices* who exercised a primary, logistical control of public sacrifice by preparing and presumably distributing the necessary substances for it.¹⁸ The symbols as a pair also form a sensible political allusion, for the auspices and the sacrifice were the necessary preliminaries for every political act, representing the two ritual means by which the Romans sought to guarantee divine sanction for public business. In presiding over the auspices and sacrifice, the augurs and *pontifices* had influential roles in politics and especially prominent roles in the ceremonies of investiture which ritually affirmed the legitimate authority of the public officials who were to carry out state business.

The augurs exercised a general and decisive control over the use of the auspices by curule magistrates at Rome and had very precise roles in the religious ceremonies for the empowerment of magistrates.¹⁹ First, the augurs attended on the elections, guaranteeing the validity of the auspices under which a magistrate was elected.²⁰ Although elections were considered valid even if magistrates were declared *vitio creati* by the augurs, in all known instances the magistrates abdicated if the augurs determined a ritual flaw.²¹ Second, the augurs witnessed the passage

¹⁶ For a clear and thorough discussion, see Porte 1985: 82–99; Schilling 1954: 137–148.

¹⁷ Cf. Fears 1981: 30, emphasizing Jupiter's patronage of wine with its communal function rather than grapes and the agricultural function. Fears (1981: 30–31) ascribes Jupiter's connections with wine to feasting and the ritual definition of community.

¹⁸ Cf. the Vestals' storage and distribution of the *suffimenta* at the Parilia: Ovid *Fasti* 4.731–734; Wissowa 1912: 166, 444 and n. 2.

¹⁹ Keaveney (1982: 161–164) never discusses this jurisdiction in his long appendix on the *lex curiata*.

²⁰ For an augur's attendance on the elections, see Varro *Rust.* 3.2.2 and 7.1. For discussion, see Linderski 1986: 2192–95.

²¹ The case of C. Flaminius in 223 may offer the only possible exception. The *Fasti* record neither the declaration that he was *vitio creatus* nor the abdication, see Degraffi 1947: 615. For discussion, see Linderski 1986: 2162–65.

of the *lex curiata* (Linderski 1986: 2193). While the formal vote of the *curiae* was outmoded in the first century and of problematic effect even for the Romans, it and the augural sanction of its passage were nevertheless important enough to Ap. Claudius that he attempted to bribe three augurs to swear to its passage for him in 54 (Cic. *Att.* 4.17.2). Third, the augurs guaranteed the initial auspication of a curule magistrate on entering office; and in our one testimony to their jurisdiction over the initial auspication, M. Claudius Marcellus abdicated his consulship in 215 because thunder was heard as he entered office and the augurs determined him *vitio creatus: cui ineunti consulatum cum tonuisset, vocati augures vitio creatum videri pronuntiaverunt* (Livy 23.31.13–14).²² Fourth, the augurs guaranteed the assignment of the provinces.²³ As late as the first century, Cicero argues from the augural requirements when he attacks the provincial allotment of the praetor Verres in 74: *qui auspiciato a Chelidone surrexisset, sortem nactus est urbanae provinciae* (Verr. 2.1.104). The verb *surrexisset* was technical of the rising to seek the auspices (Festus p. 474 Lindsay); and the reference to augural propriety (*auspiciato*)²⁴ and to Verres' mistress maligns the allotment (cf. Ps.-Asc. p. 247 Stangl). The underlying assumption is that attention to augural requirements is important and that augural authority has value. Thus while curule magistrates performed the ceremonies of investiture, the augurs oversaw each event, sanctioning the particular public action and affirming the legitimate authority of the public officials.²⁵

The *pontifices* had a general jurisdiction over sacrifices and vows. On their first day in office, the consuls sacrificed on the Capitolium and renewed the annual vows for the welfare of Rome.²⁶ The consuls and praetors made other vows for their military campaigns before their formal departure from the city; in the first century these were a separate ceremony.²⁷ The *pontifex maximus* guaranteed the religious propriety of the ritual by reciting first the vows which the consuls then repeated (Livy 36.2.3, 42.28.9, cf. 4.27.1).²⁸ Before departing on campaign, the

²² Linderski (1986: 2191, citing Cic. *Div.* 2.71–72), suggests that the augurs regularly attended at the auspices before Cicero's time. For discussion of Marcellus' abdication, see Linderski 1986: 2168–72, esp. 2169, demonstrating the absence of political motives in this; cf. Magdelain (1968: 37–40), who suggests that curule magistrates originally performed an inaugural auspication to establish Jupiter's sanction of their appointment.

²³ Sortition used in public business stood under the general jurisdiction of the augurs: see Livy 41.18.8 and the comments of Linderski 1986: 2173–75. The assignment of commands was considered a type of auspice: Festus p. 276 Lindsay.

²⁴ For the meaning "in accordance with augural law," see Livy 41.18.7–8 contrasting sortition "auspiciato" and "vitio factum." For discussion, see Catalano 1960: 279.

²⁵ Magdelain (1968: 39) emphasizes the distinct roles of magistrates and priests in these rituals. For the distinct role of magistrate and priest in all State ritual, see Szemler 1986: 2323–24.

²⁶ Mommsen 1887: 1.63–64 and n. 1, 1.616 and n. 6; Wissowa 1912: 319–321; Eisenhut 1974: 969–970.

²⁷ The two vows were distinct in reference even when initially they coincided: see Mommsen 1887: 1.616 and n. 6; Wissowa 1912: 321; Eisenhut 1974: 970.

²⁸ For the contractual nature of the vota, attempting to secure Roman prosperity, see Wissowa 1912: 319–320; Eisenhut 1974: 969. On the formality and publicity of the event, see Festus p. 176

consuls together with all the magistrates of Rome celebrated the *feriae Latinae*, the annual sacrifice to Jupiter Latiaris on the Alban Mount which was a prerequisite to all military undertakings.²⁹ The *pontifices* oversaw successful completion of the rite, regulating the sacrificial ritual and the prayers.³⁰

Pontifical attendance at and approval of public vows and sacrifices was considered essential, for strict adherence to traditional ritual was believed to maintain the *pax deorum* and so guarantee the safety of Roman military enterprise.³¹ In 200 B.C. the *pontifex maximus* P. Licinius Crassus delayed the departure of the consul P. Sulpicius Galba for the newly declared war in Greece. Crassus objected to Galba's vows because they were imprecise: *Cum dilectum consules haberent . . . ludos Iovi donumque vovere consulem cui provincia Macedonia evenisset* [sc. *senatus*] *iussit. moram voto publico Licinius pontifex maximus attulit, qui negavit ex incerta pecunia voveri debere* (Livy 31.9.5–7). Political motives have been adduced: the new war in Greece gave opportunity to challenge the fame of Scipio Africanus, the victor over Carthage; the failure of the *comitia centuriata* to vote war on the first motion demonstrates division and competition among the aristocracy; Crassus as consul in 205 together with Scipio Africanus had already supported Scipio's quest for reputation by resigning from the allotment for the province of Sicily.³² Yet Crassus displayed similar religious scruples when in 211 he ordered C. Claudius, the *flamen Dialis*, to resign his priesthood because of negligence at the sacrifice; when in 189 he forbade the praetor Q. Fabius Pictor, the *flamen Quirinalis*, to depart for his allotted province because of the religious duties incumbent upon him as *flamen*; and finally when as consul in 205 he himself withdrew from the allotment for Sicily because of his religious responsibilities (Livy 28.38.12).³³ Again, the Romans paid greater attention to details of political and religious procedure when undertaking a war in an area not yet organized as a province (Rich 1976: 13–17). Finally and most important, Crassus' insistence on ritual precision, whatever its

Lindsay: *vota nuncupata dicuntur, quae consules praetores, cum in provinciam profisciscuntur, faciunt: ea in tabulas praesentibus multis referuntur.*

²⁹ For the cult, see Wissowa 1912: 109–110. For the political obligation, see Mommsen 1887: 1.618–619. For the military purpose, see Alföldi 1963: 31–32.

³⁰ For pontifical jurisdiction over ritual, see Livy 32.1.9 (199 B.C.): *Feriae Latinae pontificum decreto instauratae sunt, quod legati ab Ardea questi in senatu erant sibi in monte Albano Latinis carnem, ut adsolet, datam non esse*; Livy 37.3.4 (190 B.C.): *Ea* [sc. *prodigia*] *procurata, Latinaeque instauratae, quod Laurentibus carnis quae dari debet data non fuerat.* For jurisdiction over the forms of prayer, see Livy 41.16.1–2: *Latinae feriae fuere ante diem tertium nonas Maias, in quibus quia in una hostia magistratus Lanuvinus precatus non erat populo Romano Quiritium, religioni fuit. id cum ad senatum relatum esset senatusque ad pontificum collegium reiecisset, pontificibus, quia non recte factae Latinae essent, instauratis Latinis placuit Lanuvinos, quorum opera instauratae essent, hostias praebere.*

³¹ On the precision and conservatism of ritual, see Wissowa 1912: 329–34; Dumézil 1966: 1.83–88.

³² See Dorey 1959; Briscoe 1973: 46, 80. Eckstein 1987: 269–270, suggests that considerations of policy rather than simply political factions influenced the preliminaries of the war.

³³ See the discussion of Richard (1968: esp. 800), contrasting the integrity of Crassus' actions with the political motivations of P. Licinius Crassus Dives, *pontifex maximus* and consul in 131.

motivation, provided an effective obstruction which was deemed legitimate and needed to be met before undertaking the campaign.³⁴

Improper performance or outright disregard of augural or pontifical ritual, it was believed, endangered military success.³⁵ In Livy's account of 176, faulty inaugural sacrifices (41.14.7–15.4) were one of a series of ominous events that included the flawed ritual of the *feriae Latinae* (41.16.1–2), the death of the consul C. Valerius Laevinus while returning to Rome from Alba (41.16.3), and a number of prodigies (41.16.6) that culminated in the death of the consul Q. Petilius in battle (41.18.11). The augurs advised the Senate on flaws in auspical procedure during Petilius' campaign: the faulty sortition to determine the order of battle (41.18.7–8), and Petilius' verbal slip/omen before battle (41.18.10; Linderski 1986: 2173–75). The *pontifices* advised the Senate on the ritual flaw at the Latin festival and on the proper ritual to expiate the prodigies following the death of the consul Scipio Hispallus. Again, the consul Flaminius' outright neglect of the ritual is linked directly to the Roman disaster at Trasimene in 217. According to Livy, Flaminius left Rome in 217 before performing the inaugural auspication, sacrifices, and vows, and thus had no legitimate authority;³⁶ his actions threatened divine sanction for Roman military enterprise.³⁷ Again, according to Livy, Fabius Maximus, who was named dictator after Flaminius' defeat and death at Trasimene, displayed ritual scrupulousness, restored the *pax deorum*, and insured the safety of Rome. While both Flaminius' behavior and Livy's evidence of it have been dismissed as unique, Linderski has noted that the political and religious unease following Flaminius' disregard of ritual and his disastrous defeat at Trasimene affected the elections for 215.³⁸ Roman cultural sensibilities thus

³⁴ Cf. the case of the consul C. Claudius Pulcher, who left Rome without undertaking the vows in 177 B.C. (Livy 41.10.5–13) and in consequence, his predecessor in the province refused to hand over the command to him and the army refused him obedience: see Giovannini 1983: 17.

³⁵ See Rosenstein 1990: 54–91, who considers the effect of defeat and ritual sensibilities concerning defeat on individual political careers.

³⁶ Livy 22.1.5–7: *quod enim illi iustum imperium, quod auspicium esse? magistratus id a domo, publicis privatisque penetibus, Latinis feriis actis, sacrificio in monte perfecto, votis rite in Capitolio nuncupatis secum ferre; nec privatum auspicia sequi, nec sine auspiciis profectum in externo ea solo nova atque integra concipere posse.*

³⁷ 21.63.6–9: *non cum senatu modo, sed iam cum dis immortalibus C. Flaminius bellum gerere . . . Capitolium et sollemnem votorum nuncupationem fugisse, ne die initi magistratus Iovis optimi maximi templum adiret . . . ne auspicio profectus in Capitolium ad vota nuncupanda paludatus inde cum lictoribus in provinciam iret.* Reports of prodigies increased the fear of danger from Flaminius' actions, see 22.1.8, cf. 9–20.

³⁸ Linderski 1986: 2172 and n. 89. Polybius (3.75.5, 77.1), Plutarch (*Fab. Max.* 2.3–3.1), and Appian (*Hann.* 8) make no mention of Flaminius' early/faulty entry into office; Cicero (*Div.* 1.77–78, 2.21, 67, 71) records no impropriety in the ceremonies of investiture, although he does record Flaminius' disregard of the auspices and omens before battle. Cf. Broughton, *MRR* 1.242, doubting the tradition; Lippold (1963: 46–49 and 307), who while doubting the truth of Flaminius' early departure accepts the procedural details of Livy's account as essentially correct. Fabius Maximus also emphasized the religious rather than military failings of Flaminius: *dictator iterum quo die magistratum*

associated adherence to traditional ritual with the safety of Rome, and the augurs and *pontifices* determined the propriety of ritual observance.

In the opening chapters of the *Bellum Civile*, Julius Caesar exploited religious concerns regarding the vows and *feriae Latinae* and their political implications in the first century. Caesar pointed out the constitutional irregularities in the provincial assignments (*BCiv.* 1.6.5–6) and vows (1.6.6–7) of 49: *neque exspectant—quod superioribus annis acciderat—ut de eorum imperio ad populum feratur paludatique votis nuncupatis exeant. consules—quod ante id tempus accidit nunquam—**** ex urbe proficiscuntur, lictoresque habent in urbe et Capitolio privati contra omnia vetustatis exempla*. Caesar intended to deny the legitimacy of the existing (senatorial) government and its leadership;³⁹ he also performed the *feriae Latinae* in December 49 (*BCiv.* 3.2.1; Lucan 5.400–402). Weinstock (1971: 321–322) notes that the magistrates of 49 had performed the rite and suggests that the *feriae* performed by Caesar were unusual and not corrective of the first performance. But repetition of the rite is consistent with Caesar's rhetoric: inaugural vows were important for a magistrate's authority, and the magistrates appointed in January 49 were not duly empowered; thus the ritual of the *feriae Latinae* was vitiated and the festival needed to be performed again and correctly. Caesar was *pontifex maximus*, heading the college that oversaw the *feriae* (and the vows). His rhetoric provides evidence that the traditional ceremonies of investiture under the jurisdiction of the augurs and pontifices continued to play an important role in legitimizing the power of elected officials in the first century.⁴⁰

To sum up thus far, the jug and lituus have sensible, discrete ritual associations with sacrifice and augury. These rituals jointly sanctioned the actions of elected officials, suggesting an intelligible, political significance for the occurrence of the paired symbols. The *pontifices* and augurs sanctioned the ritual preliminaries to all public business, and their general jurisdiction was particularly important at the ceremonies of investiture which identified the authority of elected officials themselves as legitimate.⁴¹ Fourteen Republican coins show the augural lituus and

iniit vocato senatu, ab dis orsus, cum edocuisset patres plus negligentia caerimoniarum quam temeritate atque inscitia peccatum a C. Flaminio consule esse (Livy 22.9.7). The text follows the reading of Walters.

³⁹ Collins 1972: esp. 942–966 (with bibliography). Cf. Cicero's criticism of Verres' position in Sicily in 73: *Hunc tu igitur imperatorem esse defendis, Hortensi?* (*Verr.* 2.5.32). Cicero suggests that Verres re-entered the city to visit his mistress and so vitiated the ritual of formal departure from Rome: *cum paludatus exisset votaue pro imperio suo communique re publica nuncupasset, noctu stupri causa lectica in urbem introferri solitus est ad mulierem nuptam uni, propositam omnibus, contra fas, contra auspicia, contra omnis divinas atque humanas religiones* (*Verr.* 2.5.34).

⁴⁰ Cf. Cassius Dio, who in discussing the deaths of the consuls Hirtius and Pansa in 43 links disregard of the Latin ritual and Roman military disaster in general: καὶ προσέτι καὶ τὸ τοὺς ὑπάτους τὴν ἔξοδον πρὸ τῶν Λατίνων ἀνοχῶν ποιήσασθαι· οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ὅποτε τοῦτου γενομένου καλῶς ἀπήλλαξαν (46.33.4). For discussion, see Weinstock 1971: 321–322.

⁴¹ For the consular ceremonies, see Ovid *Fasti* 1.79–84; *Pont.* 4.4.23–42, 4.9.1–38. For survey and discussion, see Mommsen 1887: 1.615–18. The ceremonial on the first day in office of the lesser

sacrificial jug. The particular political context for the issue of each coin suggests the political function of the symbols: in each instance, the legitimate authority of the commander/moneyer was open to question.

Sulla was first to use the jug and lituus as the central emblems on the reverse of a coin. As consul in 88 he was assigned by lot the province of Asia (Vell. Pat. 2.18.3; App. *BCiv.* 1.55); the tribune Sulpicius Rufus passed a law that transferred Sulla's command to Marius. Sulla returned to Rome, expelled Marius and Cinna, and set out for the East. Marius and Cinna returned, installed their own government, and reversed Sulla's laws, presumably including the law that had reversed Sulpicius' law (App. *BCiv.* 1.53). Sulla successfully concluded the war against Mithridates and returned to Italy with his army. Appian duly reports his anomalous position in 84–83: Sulla, although declared *hostis*, claimed to have retained his military command: ἐδόκει γὰρ δὴ καὶ ὁ Σύλλας, ἀνθύπατος ἐπὶ Μιθριδάτῃ γενόμενος, οὐκ ἀποθέσθαι πω τὴν ἀρχήν, εἰ καὶ πολέμιον αὐτὸν ἐψηφίσαντο Κίννας (*BCiv.* 1.81). Thus, as Keaveney has emphasized, Sulla's authority was questionable (1982: 155–156). Crawford has noted how Sulla's coinage played upon numismatic conventions in order to legitimize his position (1964: 148–149). Those who fought for Sulla identified themselves by their magistracies: the moneyers as quaestors (*RRC* no. 367) and the commanders as proconsuls (*RRC* no. 366), i.e., as legitimate holders of Republican magistracies. After Sulla's reconciliation with the Senate, the coins advertise that they are issued on the authority of the Senate, EX S C (*RRC* no. 365/1a and b, 366, 376). In this context, the politico-religious reference of the jug and lituus would likewise have asserted the legitimacy of Sulla's position by specifically recalling the inaugural ceremonies which had been attended by the augurs and *pontifices* (Frier 1967: 115–118; Keaveney 1982: 158–161).

Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius issued a coin (*RRC* no. 374/2 = pl. 1, fig. 2) showing a jug and lituus within a victory wreath on the reverse and a head of Pietas on the obverse. A legend on the reverse identifies Metellus' title, IMPER. Grueber dated the coin to the time of Metellus' proconsulship in Spain, for Metellus was acclaimed *imperator* there in 75 (Plut. *Sert.* 22.2); but the coin is found only in hoards in Italy, strong evidence that it was in fact issued there during the civil wars, 84–81 B.C.⁴² In these years, moreover, Metellus' status, like that of Sulla, was questionable.⁴³ Praetor in 89 (Cic. *Arch.* 7, 9, 31), Metellus was prorogued in

magistrates is less well documented: see Mommsen 1887: 1.618. Crawford (1974: 374) suggested that the lituus on Sulla's coins in the 80s symbolized the presence of the augurs at the passage of his *lex curiata* and so asserted his legitimate authority; cf. Grueber 1910: 357, n. 3. Crawford did not consider the implications of this symbolism.

⁴² See Crawford 1964: 149; 1974: 81 and n. 8, associating the coin with Metellus' campaigns in the North, 82–81 B.C. Grueber 1910: 357 and n. 1; cf. Sydenham 1952: 122.

⁴³ Crawford (1964: 149 and 1974: 390) has associated the iconography on Pius' coin with Sulla and Sulla's political position; Pius did, however, identify himself as *imperator* on another issue (Q. C.M.P.I.: *RRC* no. 374/1).

his office and given a command (the logistics of his appointment are not specified) to fight the Samnites (*Vir. Ill.* 63.1, App. *BCiv.* 1.53). Metellus took himself and his army to Africa when Marius and Cinna gained control at Rome in 87 (App. *BCiv.* 1.80); the praetor Flavius Hadrianus expelled Metellus from Africa in 84 (Livy *Per.* 84); Metellus, still commanding his army, subsequently joined Sulla in Italy (App. *BCiv.* 1.80). Metellus claimed that he had never ceded his command (App. *BCiv.* 1.80; *MRR* 2.57, n. 4). In this political setting, Metellus issued his coins invoking the sacrifice and auspication, rituals that sanctioned the propriety of his command.

Pompey issued a coin to commemorate a triumph in 81, 71, or 61 that shows on the obverse a personification of Africa flanked by a jug and a lituus; the legend identifies Pompey as *MAGNVS*; the obverse image is surrounded by a victor's wreath (*RRC* no. 402/1 = pl. 1, fig. 3). The reverse shows a figure in a *quadriga*, accompanied by a figure on a horse; a winged victory holding a crown is figured above; the title *PRO COS* appears in the exergue. The private issue of the coin without the authority of the Senate suggests the date of 81, during the Sullan civil war; and the iconography alluding to the African campaigns supports this assignment.⁴⁴ Yet Granius Licinianus (36.1) reports Pompey's title as *propraetor* in a notice probably drawn from the triumphal lists: *Pompeius annos natus XXV, equ<e>s Romanus, [qu]od nemo antea, pro praetore ex Africa triu[mph]avit IIII idus Martias*. Crawford (1974: 83) assigns the coin to Pompey's second triumph in 71 over Spain; for Pompey then held *proconsular imperium* (Livy *Per.* 91), and the date is nearer (than 61) to the civil war years with their irregular issues. Yet the minting of a commemorative issue for the triumph in 71 appears impolitic. Pompey's triumph in 71 was a delicate issue. He fought against Sertorius and triumphed over Spain in order to avoid the constitutional problem of triumph over a Roman citizen (Florus 2.10.9).⁴⁵ Moreover, Pompey's privately issuing a coin to commemorate his triumph would have been no less illegal in 71 than in 61, and by recalling the military issues of the Sullan civil wars would have alienated a perhaps already obstinate Senate. The Senate granted him a triumph while he kept his army (Plut. *Pomp.* 21.4).⁴⁶

⁴⁴ For the illegal military issues, see Burnett 1977: 57; Crawford 1974: 604. For the date of the triumph, see Badian 1955. Badian suggests that opposition to the triumph was probably overcome by the presence of Pompey's legions outside of the city.

⁴⁵ Triumph was only over foreign enemies of Rome. On Sulla's coinage, Frier (1967: 112) has noted that the title *imperator* cannot refer to his victories in the civil wars. Cf. Crawford 1974: 413: "the reference to Africa is somewhat surprising, but is intelligible if one remembers that the swift and decisive victory in Africa was a more striking achievement than the victory in Spain, long delayed and only achieved after the murder of Sertorius by Perperna."

⁴⁶ Plutarch (*Pomp.* 21.3, cf. App. *BCiv.* 1.121) records the Senate's fear of Pompey's army. Seager (1979: 21–23), Marshall (1976: 49–53), and Gruen (1974: 43) downplay the importance of Pompey's army in his dealings with the Senate. Seager and Marshall suggest that Pompey would have been considered a hero in 71. Yet Crassus too would have been a hero for defeating Spartacus, and the Senate adhered to the traditional requirements for triumph in granting him only an *ovatio* (see

This leaves 61 B.C., the year in which Pompey celebrated a spectacular triumph at Rome, deposited enormous quantities of gold, silver, and coined money into the public treasury from the East, and, as a victorious commander, legitimately distributed large donatives to his soldiers and friends.⁴⁷ While his minting a coin would have been illegal, he certainly had the gold to do it in 61 and the sources remark upon his largesse (Pliny *NH* 37.16; Plut. *Pomp.* 45.3). Yet Pompey's authority for the wars against the pirates in 67 and against Mithridates in 66 was unusual. His command came from legislative enactment, not from an elective magistracy; and the grants of command faced opposition for this reason (Cic. *Leg. Man.* 49–50; Vell. 2.31–32.1).⁴⁸ The sources record apprehension in anticipation of his return and astonishment when he dismissed his army (Vell. 2.40.2–3; Plut. *Pomp.* 43). Thus Pompey had held no elective office; his appointment and his triumph were atypical. An allusion to traditional rituals for empowerment would have suggested the legitimacy of his command.

Faustus Cornelius Sulla, grandson of Sulla and son-in-law of Pompey, issued a coin in 56: three trophies are flanked by a jug and lituus on the reverse; Venus appears on the obverse (*RRC* no. 426/3 = pl. 1, fig. 4). Q. Cassius Longinus (*RRC* no. 428/3 = pl. 1, fig. 5) issued a coin in 55 that shows on the obverse a figure identified as the *genius populi Romani* and on the reverse an eagle standing on thunderbolts and flanked by a lituus and jug. The eagle and the thunderbolts are both auspical signs associated with Jupiter, the god of the auspices: Jupiter sent twelve eagles to Romulus to identify his authority at Rome, while lightning (on the left) was considered the optimal auspical sign for conducting public business, especially elections (Cic. *Div.* 2.74, cf. *Serv. ad Aen.* 2.693).⁴⁹ Both moneyers were adherents of Pompey,⁵⁰ whose position in 56–55 was problematical.⁵¹ As part of the agreement made with Julius Caesar

Marshall 1976: 33–34), although his insistence on a laurel crown indicates that he wanted more (Cic. *Pis.* 58; Gell. 5.6.23), cf. Ward 1977: 99–102.

⁴⁷ See Shatzman 1972: 202–204. On the triumph, see Weinstock 1971: 37–39.

⁴⁸ Cf. Gruen (1974: 65–66), who notes that in 61 the political opposition to ratifying Pompey's settlement in the East was again formulated in constitutional terms: Pompey had acted without the assistance of a senatorial legation. The initial votes of command were for the most part widely supported: see Gruen (1974: 63), who lists the senatorial supporters of the command and the elites who served on Pompey's staff.

⁴⁹ For Jupiter as the god of the auspices, see Linderski 1986: 2226–29. Crawford (1974: 452) interprets the eagle as a reference to the consulship.

⁵⁰ Faustus Sulla, the grandson of Sulla, had served with Pompey in the East in 63 and was his son-in-law: see Suet. *Caes.* 27.1; Plut. *Pomp.* 47.6, *Caes.* 14.7. For a brief biography, see Münzer 1900: 1515–17. Q. Cassius Longinus was personally selected by Pompey to serve as his quaestor in 52 and Pompey, as consul in 55, may have appointed him to the office of moneyer. For the appointment of moneyers by the consuls, see Burnett 1977: 41–42.

⁵¹ The coins have been shown to relate to Pompey in other ways. On Sulla's coin, Crawford (1974: 450) notes that the three trophies reproduce the device of Pompey's signet ring and that Sulla's own name is unobtrusive on the coin. Crawford gives a personal interpretation to the jug and lituus, referring them to Pompey's augurate but see *infra*. On Longinus' coin, see Burnett (1977: 43–44),

at Luca in April 56, Pompey and Crassus sought the consulship in that year (Cic. *Fam.* 1.9.8–9; cf. Plut. *Pomp.* 51.4, *Cat. Min.* 41.1; App. *BCiv.* 2.17). Their candidacy entailed a host of irregularities: they did not announce their candidacy within the proper time and worked to impede the regular elections and force an *interregnum* (Dio Cass. 39.27); they enlisted tribunes to stall the government by vetoes (Livy *Per.* 105) and employed soldiers provided by Caesar to terrorize the city (Dio Cass. 39.31.2, cf. Cic. *QFr.* 2.7.2; Plut. *Pomp.* 51.4), the Senate (Dio Cass. 39.30.3) and the one candidate who dared to oppose them (Dio Cass. 39.31.1–2; Plut. *Pomp.* 52.1–2, *Cat. Min.* 41.4–5, *Crass.* 15.2–4, cf. Cic. *Att.* 4.8a.2). As consuls in 55 Pompey and Crassus engineered the provincial appointments, again employing force (Plut. *Crass.* 15.5). A tribunician law, the *lex Trebonia*, determined the provinces, and it is unclear whether they were allotted or simply assigned. Livy (*Per.* 105), Velleius (2.46.2), Cassius Dio (39.33.2), and Plutarch in his biography of Pompey (*Pomp.* 52.3) record the direct assignment of the provinces, while Appian (App. *BCiv.* 2.18) and Plutarch in the biography of Crassus (*Crass.* 15.5) mention an allotment. The point is that the propriety of Pompey's office and of his command in 55 was a matter of debate and a scandal.⁵² The coins, however, respond to this by alluding to the traditional sanctions for political power, identifying Pompey's desire for political and military prestige with the political and religious values of Rome (cf. Wallace-Hadrill 1986: 74–75).

Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio, grandson of Metellus Pius, issued a coin in Africa in 47–46 (*RRC* no. 460/3 = pl. 2, fig. 6). A jug and lituus flank a trophy on the reverse; a female head wearing a turreted crown, perhaps Tanit the African goddess of war, is figured on the obverse (García-Bellido 1989: 38–40). Scipio was consul in 52 and received a provincial allotment to Syria in 49 B.C. He fought with Pompey at Pharsalus and subsequently commanded the senatorial forces in Africa (Livy *Per.* 113; Vell. Pat. 2.54.2–3; Plut. *Cat. Min.* 57.3; App. *BCiv.* 2.87). His authority in Africa was challenged in 47–46 by Julius Caesar who claimed that Pius had been given his command in Syria in 49 as a *privatus*: *Provinciae privatis decernuntur, duae consulares, reliquae praetoriae. Scipioni obvenit Syria, L. Domitio Gallia* (*BCiv.* 1.6.5).⁵³ Metellus had received his appointment under Pompey's new law on provincial administration (*lex Pompeia de provinciis*), which required a period of five years between tenure of the curule magistracy and tenure of a

who has noted that the policies of the consul who appointed a moneyer did affect the iconography of the coins.

⁵² Cf. Seager (1979: 127–131), who emphasizes the political intrigue and violence of Pompey and Crassus' candidacy and suggests that Pompey built his theatre (the temple of Venus Victrix) in an attempt to restore his popularity.

⁵³ For the tract as propaganda, see Collins 1972: 922–966. The unfinished state of the work does not lessen its usefulness. If not a commentary on Caesar's political thinking during the war (see Collins 1972: 944–945), the work would contain arguments that Caesar believed to justify his actions.

province; Scipio's appointment probably represented one of the interim measures to provide governors before the first group of magistrates were legally qualified (Marshall 1972: 891–893). Caesar also disparaged Pius' military successes, claiming that Pius arrogated to himself the title *imperator* rather than receiving it by acclamation from his troops in 49: *his temporibus Scipio detrimentis quibusdam circa montem Amanum acceptis imperatorem se appellaverat* (*BCiv.* 3.31.1).⁵⁴ Thus Caesar was impugning both Scipio's authority and his ability; the symbols on Scipio's coin invoked the traditional rituals of investiture and his military success.

Julius Caesar issued a coin after Pharsalus that shows a jug and lituus surrounded by a wreath on the reverse. The obverse displays the ritual axe and two-handled cup, implements associated with the pontifical college (*RRC* no. 456/1a = pl. 2, fig. 7). Caesar's own authority in 48–47 was scarcely legitimate. He had invaded Italy at the head of an army in 49; after gaining control at Rome he had caused himself to be named as dictator (*Caes. BCiv.* 2.21.5) and oversaw his own election to the consulship for 48; following Pompey to Greece, Caesar as consul engaged and defeated Pompey at Pharsalus. Cicero (*Att.* 9.9.3, cf. 15.2) avowed the augural impropriety of Caesar's appointment as dictator (cf. App. *BCiv.* 2.48; Dio Cass. 41.36.1); and Lucan described his subsequent conduct of the elections as a sham met by vitiating omens: *Fingit sollemnia Campus / et non admissae dirimit suffragia plebis / Decantatque tribus et vana versat in urna / Nec caelum servare licet: tonat augure surdo, / et laetae iurantur aves bubone sinistro* (*Pharsalia* 5.392–396). The legend on the coin showing the jug and lituus CAESAR DICT. ITER dates the coin to the period shortly after Caesar's defeat of Pompey and the senatorial forces (see *MRR* 2.272). While the legend on Caesar's coin defined his absolute position as dictator, the symbols asserted that his authority accorded with the political and religious traditions of the Republic.

A double portrait coin of M. Antony in 43 associates the lituus with Antony on the obverse and the jug with Caesar on the reverse (*RRC* no. 488/1 = pl. 2, fig. 8).⁵⁵ As consul in 44 M. Antony had been assigned Macedonia; he wanted Cisalpine Gaul and received this assignment by a tribunician law of June, 44 (*Cic. Att.* 14.14.4; *Livy Per.* 117; App. *BCiv.* 3.30); the current governor D. Brutus refused to yield the province to Antony (*Livy Per.* 117; *Suet. Aug.* 10.2; App. *BCiv.* 3.49). At Rome, Cicero denied the legitimacy of the tribunician law granting the Gallic provinces to Antony (*Phil.* 5.7–10) and of Antony's position (*Phil.* 3.6, 12, cf. 4.8–9). Cicero supported the actions of Brutus who claimed to act in the Senate's interests (*Cic. Phil.* 3.8, 38; on Cicero's rhetoric, see Syme 1939: 162–75). Antony besieged Brutus at Mutina, was defeated by a senatorial

⁵⁴ Cf. the honorary inscription from Pergamum: *Syll.*³ 757 (49/48 B.C.). On the coins struck by him at Pergamum in 49 or 48 and inscribed *Q. Metellus Pius Scipio imper(ator)*, see Crawford 1985: 206–209.

⁵⁵ The symbols have been interpreted as referring to the membership of Caesar and Antony in the augural college, see Crawford 1974: 739; Newman 1990: 49.

army under the command of the consul Hirtius and was declared a public enemy (Livy *Per.* 119; App. *BCiv.* 3.63; Dio Cass. 37.7–39.3, 46.39.3; Oros. 6.18.3). Thus, in 43 Antony faced continuous opposition from the provincial governor of Gaul, from a senatorial army in Gaul, and from the senatorial government at Rome. Antony's double portrait coin of Julius Caesar and himself is his first issue in Gaul. Newman has noted the use of iconography for legitimization in that the double portraits of Caesar and Antony invoke the memory of Caesar and identify Antony as Caesar's legitimate heir.⁵⁶ The jug and lituus emphasize the identification of Antony and Caesar by the division on obverse and reverse of a recognized pair. Framing Antony's portrait, the symbols assert the ritual and therefore legal propriety of Antony's authority.

A double portrait coin of Antony and Octavian, issued in 41, pairs the jug on the obverse with Antony, identified by his religious and political offices as M ANT IMP AVG III VIR RPC, and the lituus on the reverse with Octavian, designated CAESAR IMP PONT III VIR RPC (*RRC* no. 517/8 = pl. 2, fig. 9).⁵⁷ A second coin of 39 combines the jug and lituus as the central emblems on the obverse with the legend M ANTON IMP AVG III VIR RPC; an amphora flanked by thunderbolt and caduceus appears on the reverse (*RRC* no. 522/4 = pl. 2, fig. 10).⁵⁸ In 43 M. Antony, Octavian, and M. Lepidus agreed among themselves to take political and military control of the Roman State (App. *BCiv.* 4.2, Dio Cass. 46.55.3–4). They marched on Rome; a tribunician law (*lex Titia*) defined their title of office (*tresviri rei publicae constituendae*), their consular authority, and placed a five year limit on their tenure of office. While their office was framed so as not to offend Republican traditions (Eder 1990: 92–95), Appian (*BCiv.* 4.7) and Cassius Dio (47.2.1–2) emphasize that the *lex Titia* was passed by force and without debate: military power guaranteed their position. Thus the authority of Antony and Octavian derived from a personal agreement forcibly confirmed by a tribunician law. Newman has noted Antony's emphatic use of Republican titlature to assert his adherence to Republican traditions.⁵⁹ The jug and lituus

⁵⁶ Newman (1990: 49) suggests that the coin was minted during the campaign at Mutina. Crawford's suggestion (1974: 498) that the coin was issued after Antony was declared a public enemy by the Senate at Rome (April 42) and the establishment of the second triumvirate (November 42) leaves the coinage for the campaign at Mutina unaccounted for.

⁵⁷ Crawford (1974: 742, n. 6) associates the jug and lituus with personal membership in a priesthood and assigns the lituus on the reverse to Octavian's augurate (which he held presumably already in 41, see *MRR* 2.369), although the legend on the coin is explicit in identifying Octavian's religious office as *pontifex* (CAESAR IMP PONT III VIR RPC). M. Antony is unlikely to have recognized any advantage in Octavian's power and prestige in 41, see Newman 1990: 58 and esp. 59 on *RRC* no. 517/1.

⁵⁸ Newman 1990: 56, notes Antony's emphatic use of Republican titlature in his Eastern coinage and assigns the coin to 39, cf. Crawford 1974: 528, dating the coin to 40. Crawford (1974: 743) identifies the symbols with membership in the priestly colleges, the obverse alluding to Antony's augurate and the reverse symbols suggesting Plancus' membership in the *VII viri epulones*.

⁵⁹ Newman 1990: 56, of the coins of 39. The coin of 41 invokes the same political and religious titles and displays them similarly.

go further and connect his political power with the traditional rituals required of a Republican magistracy.

C. Cassius Longinus and M. Iunius Brutus, the assassins of Caesar, placed the jug and lituus pair as the central emblems on the reverses of three coins issued in 43/2. The legend on the reverse names P. Lentulus Spinther, *pro quaestore pro praetore* in 43 (Cic. *Fam.* 12.15), who served under Brutus and Cassius and probably minted the coins.⁶⁰ The obverses of the coins honoring Crassus show a tripod (*RRC* no. 500/1 = pl. 3, fig. 11) or a female head identified by the legend as *LEIBERTAS* (*RRC* no. 500/3 = pl. 3, fig. 12), thereby championing Cassius' opposition to Julius Caesar as a tyrant;⁶¹ the obverse legends identify Cassius as *imp(erator)*. The obverse of the coin honoring Brutus (*RRC* no. 500/7 = pl. 3, fig. 13) shows the sacrificial axe, cup, and knife with the legend *BRVTVS*. C. Cassius Longinus and M. Iunius Brutus were praetors in 44. Caesar had assigned Brutus to Macedonia and Cassius to Syria (App. *BCiv.* 4.57; Flor. 2.17.4). After Caesar's assassination and the hostile popular reaction to it, Macedonia and Syria were re-assigned to Antony and Dolabella, and the Senate sent Brutus to Crete and Cassius to Cyrene instead (Plut. *Brut.* 19.3; App. *BCiv.* 3.7, 8, 12). Both men nevertheless seized power in their originally assigned provinces, Brutus in Macedonia and Cassius in Syria (Vell. Pat. 2.62.2; App. *BCiv.* 3.24); the Senate confirmed their authority in these regions in 43 (App. *BCiv.* 4.58); Brutus and Cassius met at Smyrna to decide the best policy for opposing Antony and Octavian (Livy *Per.* 122; Plut. *Brut.* 28.6–7; App. *BCiv.* 4.65, 76). Velleius (2.62.2) and Cassius Dio (47.21.1) are explicit that they lacked authority, and Cicero's argument that senatorial interest legitimized military and political action (*Phil.* 10.25–26 and 11.27, cf. 13.29) presumes the same. The joint issue dates from the conference at Smyrna late in 43,⁶² after the Senate had recognized their tenure of Macedonia and Syria. The symbols serve to claim Brutus and Cassius as traditional Republican commanders.

⁶⁰ On the issue of provincial and military coinage by quaestors, see Burnett 1977: 58. Crawford (1974: 741 with n. 4) has interpreted the iconography of obverse and reverse separately, suggesting that the jug and lituus on the reverse allude to Spinther's augurate. But Wallace-Hadrill (1986: 67–73, esp. 71–72) has emphasized the false dichotomy between obverse and reverse and shown how the coinage of Augustus create unified and connected statements. We have already seen a similar use of obverse and reverse on the coins of Antony and Octavian.

⁶¹ *Libertas* served as the password of Brutus and Cassius at Philippi (Dio Cass. 47.43.1) and was invoked by both sides in the civil wars: see Weinstock 1971: 139–142. Crawford (1974: 741 and n. 6) has suggested that the tripod appearing on Cassius' coins alluded to Apollo as patron of freedom: cf. Zanker 1988: 49.

⁶² The two joint issues of Brutus and Cassius (*RRC* no. 500, 505) would correspond to their two recorded meetings, at Smyrna in 43 and at Sardis in 42. Two historical considerations serve to date the coins: Lentulus Spinther, named on the reverse of no. 500, is first recorded serving with Brutus and Cassius after the meeting at Smyrna, hence 43 (App. *BCiv.* 4.72, 82); the identification of both Brutus and Cassius as *imperatores* on no. 505 accords with the notice that both were acclaimed *imperatores* at the meeting at Sardis in 42 (Plut. *Brut.* 34.1). On the basis of the titulature, Crawford (1974: 741) assigns no. 500 to the meeting at Smyrna, which he dates early in 42.

Finally, a coin of Sex. Pompeius, the son of Pompey, of 42–40 B.C. (*RRC* no. 511/3a = pl. 3, fig. 14) shows on the obverse a portrait of Pompey framed by a jug and lituus; the legend on the obverse reports a military success of Sextus, *MAG PIVS IMP ITER*, conflating the military accomplishments of father and son; the reverse shows a figure holding an *aplustre* and resting his right foot on a ship's prow; the reverse legend records Sextus' political office and its source *PRAEF CLAS ET ORAE MARIT EX SC*. Iconographic allusions to Neptune and naval victory on the reverse and the legend recording Pompey's second acclamation as *imperator* on the obverse commemorate Sextus' defeat of Q. Salvidienus Rufus and date the coin late in 42 (Crawford 1974: 520–521, who also identifies the figure on the reverse as Neptune). The Senate had given Sex. Pompeius a maritime command in 43 (Vell. Pat. 2.73.1–2; Dio Cass. 46.40.3; App. *BCiv.* 4.84); after the *lex Titia* gave legal sanction to the triumvirate, Octavian declared Sextus a public enemy and deprived him of his command (Dio Cass. 46.48.4, 47.12.2); Sextus nevertheless retained his fleet (Dio Cass. 48.17.1, cf. 47.12.1). His coins proclaim the authority voted to him by the Senate: *PRAEF CLAS ET ORAE MARIT EX SC*,⁶³ and the jug and lituus similarly invoke the traditional Republican sources of power.

Thus in each instance the issuing of a coin with a jug and lituus coincided with a Roman commander's authority being assailed and/or assailable. On the coins of Sulla and Metellus Pius in the 80s, M. Antony in 43, Brutus and Cassius in 42, and Sex. Pompeius in 42, the jug and lituus countered the pronouncements of a politically hostile government in power at Rome.⁶⁴ On the coins of Pompey, Pompey's adherents in 56–55, and Antony and Octavian in 41 and 39, the symbols lent authority to tribunician laws for empowerment and obscured the defiance of Republican traditions. Symbols of the augury and sacrificial rituals invoked the traditional religious sanctions of political power and represented the commander's right to command, most immediately to his army. The coins indicate the rhetorical value of allusions to ritual in Roman political life.

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
DARTMOUTH COLLEGE
HANOVER, NH 03755
U.S.A.

⁶³The legend *PIVS* and the iconography of the coin challenged Octavian's power: see Zanker 1988: 40.

⁶⁴Cf. Syme 1939: 180, describing the disorder following Caesar's assassination: "Where and with whom stood now the legitimate government and the authority of the Roman State it was impossible to discover." This paper began as a summer project at the summer seminar of the American Numismatic Society, and I owe thanks to Drs Roger Bland and William Metcalf for their help, encouragement, and criticism in the development of the argument. I would also like to thank the anonymous referees of *Phoenix* and my colleague Jeremy Rutter for useful criticism. Special thanks are due to Professor Lawrence Richardson, Jr.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alföldi, A. 1963. *Early Rome and the Latins*. Ann Arbor.
- 1956. "The Main Aspects of Political Propaganda on the Coinage of the Roman Republic," in R. A. G. Carson and C. H. V. Sutherland (eds.), *Essays in Roman Coinage Presented to Harold Mattingly*. Oxford. 63–95.
- Badian, E. 1955. "The Date of Pompey's First Triumph," *Hermes* 83: 107–118.
- 1969. "A Reply," *Arethusa* 2: 199–201.
- Beard, M. 1980. "The Sexual Status of Vestal Virgins," *JRS* 70: 12–27.
- Briscoe, J. 1973. *A Commentary on Livy, Books XXXI–XXXIII*. Oxford.
- Broughton, T. R. S. 1951, 1952, 1986. *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*. 3 vols. Volume 1 (New York 1951). Volume 2 (New York 1952). Volume 3 (Atlanta 1986).
- Burnett, A. M. 1977. "The Authority to Coin in the Late Republic and Early Empire," *NC* 17: 37–63.
- Camp, J. et al. 1992. "A Trophy from the Battle of Chaironeia of 86 B.C.," *AJA* 96: 443–455.
- Catalano, P. 1960. *Contributi allo studio del diritto augurale*. Turin.
- Collins, J. 1972. "Caesar as Political Propagandist," *ANRW* 1.1: 922–966.
- Crawford, M. 1985. *Coinage and Money under the Roman Republic*. Berkeley.
- 1974. *Roman Republican Coinage*. 2 vols. Cambridge.
- 1964. "The Coinage of the Age of Sulla," *NC* 4: 141–155.
- Degrassi, A. 1947. *Inscriptiones Italiae*. 13.1: *Fasti consulares et triumphales*. Rome.
- Dorey, T. A. 1959. "Contributory Causes of the Second Macedonian War," *AJP* 80: 288–295.
- Dumézil, G. 1966. *Archaic Roman Religion*. 2 vols. Chicago.
- Eckstein, A. 1987. *Senate and General. Individual Decision Making and Roman Foreign Relations, 264–194 B.C.* Berkeley.
- Eder, W. 1990. "Augustus and the Power of Tradition: The Augustan Principate as Binding Link between Republic and Empire," in K. Raafaub and M. Toher (eds.), *Between Republic and Empire*. Berkeley. 71–122.
- Eisenhut, W. 1974. "Votum," *RE Suppl.* 14.964–973.
- Elsner, J. 1991. "Cult and Sculpture: Sacrifice in the *Ara Pacis Augustae*," *JRS* 81: 50–61.
- Fears, J. R. 1981. "The Cult of Jupiter and Roman Imperial Ideology," *ANRW* 2.17.1: 3–141.
- 1975. "The Coinage of Q. Cornificius and Augural Symbolism on Late Republican Denarii," *Historia* 24: 592–602.
- Frier, B. 1967. "Augural Symbolism in Sulla's Invasion of 83," *ANSMN* 13: 111–118.
- 1969. "Sulla's Priesthood," *Arethusa* 2: 187–199.
- García-Bellido, M. Paz. 1989. "Punic Iconography on the Roman Denarii of M. Plaetorius Cestianus," *AJN* 1: 37–49.
- Giovannini, A. 1983. *Consulare Imperium*. Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 16. Basel.
- Grueber, H. A. 1910. *Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum*. 3 vols. London.
- Gruen, E. 1974. *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*. Berkeley.
- Holland, L. 1961. *Janus and the Bridge*. Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome 21. Rome.

- Jones, A. H. M. 1973. "Numismatics and History," in *idem*, *The Roman Economy: Studies in Ancient Economic and Administrative History* (ed. P. A. Brunt). Oxford. 61–81.
- Keaveney, A. 1982. "Sulla Augur," *AJAH* 7: 150–171.
- Levick, B. 1982. "Propaganda and the Imperial Coinage," *Antichthon* 16: 104–116.
- Linderski, J. 1986. "The Augural Law," *ANRW* 2.16.3: 2146–2312.
- 1990. "The Auspices and the Struggle of the Orders," in Walter Eder (ed.), *Staat und Staatlichkeit in der frühen römischen Republik*. Stuttgart. 34–48.
- Lippold, A. 1963. *Consules. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des römischen Konsulates von 264 bis 201 v. Chr.* Bonn.
- Magdelain, A. 1968. *Recherches sur l'Imperium: La Loi curiate et les auspices d'investiture*. Paris.
- Marquardt, J. 1881. *Römische Staatsverwaltung*³. 3 vols. Leipzig. reprt. New York 1975.
- Marshall, A. J. 1972. "The *Lex Pompeia de provinciis* (52 B.C.) and Cicero's Imperium in 51–50 B.C.: Constitutional Aspects," *ANRW* 1.1: 887–921.
- Marshall, B. A. 1976. *Crassus. A Political Biography*. Amsterdam.
- Martin, T. 1989. "Sulla *Imperator Iterum*, the Samnites and Roman Republican Coin Propaganda," *SNR* 68: 19–44.
- Mommsen, Th. 1887. *Römisches Staatsrecht*³. 3 vols. Leipzig. reprt. Basel 1952.
- Münzer, F. 1900. "Cornelius" no. 70. *RE* 4.1515–17.
- Nagy, B. 1992. "The Argeii Puzzle," *AJAH* 10: 1–27.
- Newman, R. 1990. "A Dialogue of Power in the Coinage of Antony and Octavian (44–30 B.C.)," *AJN* 2: 38–69.
- Pease, A. S. 1920, 1923. *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Divinatione*. University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 6.2 and 8.3. Urbana (reprt. Darmstadt 1963).
- Porte, D. 1985. *L'Étiologie religieuse dans les Fastes d'Ovide*. Paris.
- Rich, J. W. 1976. *Declaring War in the Roman Republic in the Period of Transmarine Expansion*. Brussels.
- Richard, J.-Cl. 1968. "Sur quelques grands pontifes plébéiens," *Latomus* 27: 786–801.
- Richardson, L. jr., 1992. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Baltimore.
- Rosenstein, N. 1990. *Imperatores Victi: Military Defeat and Aristocratic Competition in the Middle and Late Republic*. Berkeley.
- Ryberg, I. S. 1955. *Rites of the State Religion in Roman Art*. Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome 22. Rome.
- Schilling, R. 1954. *La Religione romana de Venus depuis les origines jusqu'au temps d'Auguste*. *BEFAR* 178. Paris.
- Seager, R. 1979. *Pompey. A Political Biography*. Berkeley.
- Shatzman, I. 1972. "The Roman General's Authority over Booty," *Historia* 21: 481–500.
- Sutherland, C. H. V. 1959. "The Intelligibility of Roman Imperial Coin Types," *JRS* 49: 46–55.
- Syme, R. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford.
- Sydenham, E. 1952. *The Coinage of the Roman Republic*. London.
- Szemler, G. J. 1986. "Priesthoods and Priestly Careers," *ANRW* 2.16.3: 2314–31.
- Taylor, L. R. 1944. "Symbols of the Augurate on the Coins of the Caecilii Metelli," *AJA* 48: 352–356.
- 1966. *Roman Voting Assemblies*. Ann Arbor.
- Torelli, M. 1982. *Typology and Structure of Roman Historical Reliefs*. Ann Arbor.

- Turcan, R. 1988. *Religion romaine 2: Le Culte*. Iconography of Religions 17, fasc. 2. Leiden.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1986. "Image and Authority in the Coinage of Augustus," *JRS* 76: 66–87.
- Walters, C. F. and R. S. Conway (eds.). 1929. *Titi Livi, Ad urbe condita*. Oxford.
- Ward, A. 1977. *Marcus Crassus and the Late Roman Republic*. Columbia.
- Weinstock, S. 1971. *Divus Julius*. Oxford.
- Wissowa, G. 1912. *Religion und Kultus der Römer*. Munich.
- Zanker, P. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Ann Arbor.
- Zehnacker, H. 1973. *Moneta. Recherches sur l'organisation et l'art des émissions monétaires de la République romaine (289–31 av. J.-C.)*. BEFAR 222. Rome.



fig. 1: Crawford no. 359, aureus/denarius of L. Cornelius Sulla
(photo courtesy of the American Numismatic Society)



fig. 2: Crawford no. 374/2, denarius of Q. Caccilius Metellus Pius
(photo courtesy of the American Numismatic Society)



fig. 3: Crawford no. 402/1, aureus of Cn. Pompeius Magnus
(photo courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum)



fig. 4: Crawford no. 426/3, denarius of Faustus Cornelius Sulla
(photo courtesy of the American Numismatic Society)



fig. 5: Crawford no. 428/3, denarius of Q. Cassius Longinus
(photo courtesy of the American Numismatic Society)



fig. 6: Crawford no. 460/3, denarius of Q.
Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio}
(photo courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum)



fig. 7: Crawford no. 456/1a, aureus of C. Julius Caesar
(photo courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum)



fig. 8: Crawford no. 808/1, denarius of M. Antonius
(photo courtesy of the American Numismatic Society)



fig. 9: Crawford no. 517/8, denarius of M. Antonius
(photo courtesy of the American Numismatic Society)



fig. 10: Crawford no. 522/2 or 4, denarius of M. Antonius
(photo courtesy of the American Numismatic
Society)



fig. 11: Crawford no. 500/1, denarius of C. Cassius (and M. Brutus)
(photo courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum)



fig. 12: Crawford no. 500/3, denarius of C. Cassius (and M. Brutus)
(photo courtesy of the American Numismatic Society)



fig. 13: Crawford no. 500/6, denarius of C. Cassius (and M. Brutus)
(photo courtesy of the American Numismatic Society)



fig. 14: Crawford no. 511/3a, denarius of Sex. Pompeius
(photo courtesy of the American Numismatic Society)