



Roman Historians and the Roman Coinage

David Shotter

Greece & Rome, 2nd Ser., Vol. 25, No. 2. (Oct., 1978), pp. 156-168.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0017-3835%28197810%292%3A25%3A2%3C156%3ARHATRC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-8>

Greece & Rome is currently published by The Classical Association.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/classical.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ROMAN HISTORIANS AND THE ROMAN COINAGE

By DAVID SHOTTER

There is no novelty in suggesting the importance of Roman coins as a source for the study of Roman history; a considerable number of works have explored the possibilities of the subject.¹ The chief problem, however, has always lain in appreciating *how far* they can take us in an understanding of events: the coins are after all often as tendentious as the literary sources are sometimes alleged to be—or even more so. Further, when the historian moves from attempting to explain the legends to such matters as interpreting features of the portraiture, he is moving on to very subjective ground: for example, what may be the significance of the fact that on Nerva's DIVVS AVGVSTVS² coins, the portrait of Augustus begins to look uncannily like that of Nerva himself? Or again, what are we to make of the fact that the obverse portrait on early coins of Trajan bears a resemblance to that of Nerva?

Chiefly, however, the value of Roman coins as a historical source lies in the ways, some obvious and some more subtle, in which they were used to express trends in an emperor's policy or particular aspects of it. Building programmes,³ for example, which were seldom of detailed interest to the literary historians, were commonly portrayed. Most emperors sought to make capital out of this aspect of their role as providers of facilities; and the coins by which they achieved this have not infrequently provided information about buildings or aspects of them which would otherwise be unknown.⁴ Trajan was a prolific builder and his coins commemorated the building of roads (the *Via Traiana*), aqueducts (the *Aqua Traiana*), the harbour-works at Ostia, a Triumphal Arch, Temples, as well as the Forum with the Basilica Ulpia and Trajan's Column.

This latter structure illustrates also the possibility of introducing into an apparently factual record a range of extraneous suggestions. Many coins depict the column⁵ itself, and of course it will have been intended that it should indicate the Dacian victories in honour of which it was erected. Far more tendentious, however, is a coin which depicts the column as the Club of Hercules,⁶ for this will have introduced a range of ideas on a different level—about the man who laboured with no thought for himself for the sake of civilization. At the same time we should notice that very large numbers of Trajan's coins, whatever the theme that they illustrated,

carried on the reverse the legend SPQR OPTIMO PRINCIPI, emphasizing constantly that cordial relationship with the senate which had earned for him the unique title, *Optimus Princeps*.

Imperial victories provide another theme given wide publicity on the coinage; there were of course a number of stylized ways in which these might be depicted—with the victory trophy or dejected-captive motif, together with an appropriate legend. A few, however, are particularly arresting, such as the *denarii* of 48 B.C., showing facial portraits of a male and a female Gallic captive,⁷ which will have brought home with great vividness the extent of Caesar's achievement in taming these wild new provincials. Other examples with strong impact were Augustus' *denarii* commemorating the Capture of Egypt (depicting a crocodile) and the return of the legionary standards lost in the East by Crassus and M. Antonius, depicting a kneeling, trousered Parthian.⁸ At the other end of the chronological scale, in the fourth century A.D., we should note the frequency of depictions of emperors dragging captives and so emphasizing—however tendentious we may think it to have been—their role of defending the frontiers, with such inspiring legends as FEL TEMP REPARATIO or GLORIA ROMANORVM.

A different aspect of an emperor's imperial interest is to be found in the case of Hadrian: his biographer, Spartianus, provides information on the emperor's imperial journeys, whilst Hadrian's coinage, with its provincial issues, indicates the importance attached to the journeys. We should notice too that these coins do not consist of a mere recital of provinces visited, but also stress their loyalty, their prosperity, and (where appropriate) instances of imperial benefaction.

The religious policies of emperors provide a further aspect which can be interpreted from the coinage. It was normal to commemorate the state's divinities as an act of *pietas*, and such commemoration might implicitly or explicitly carry the notion of those gods' protection of the emperor, as Jupiter's of Trajan.⁹ Emperors might take the opportunity to advertise gods whom they imagined had an especial interest in their welfare, as Nero commemorates Apollo, the lyre-player.¹⁰ It is hard not to imagine that the reference here is meant to suggest Nero's own musical and poetic pretensions. Indeed, it is not always easy to draw a clear line between the protection offered by a deity, and actual equation with the deity, particularly in the cases of those coins which show an imperial personage on the obverse and a deity on the reverse—as happens, for example, on the coinage of the imperial womenfolk in the second and third centuries A.D.

The protection of the gods was traditionally central to the state's well-being, but the traditional deities found themselves increasingly in competition with foreign cults for emperors' attention; not that interest in a foreign cult necessarily implied lack of attention to the traditional deities: that was rather more a matter of politics. For example, Elagabalus and Severus Alexander were both devotees of Sol Invictus, but whereas the former publicly proclaimed his enthusiasm on the coins, Severus Alexander, who succeeded him, preferred to try to instil calm after his predecessor's exoticism, and provided on his coins full exposure to the state's gods, and to his own role as *Pontifex Maximus*.

The imperial cult was of course a new aspect of Roman religion: the coins of a number of emperors depict the imperial cult altar at Lugdunum.¹¹ Emperors frequently looked back to associate themselves with their deified predecessors (as Tiberius did: DIVVS AVGVSTVS PATER),¹² though in this respect the absence or tardy appearance of references may assume significance: it may be thought rather strange, for example, that Trajan did not issue a DIVVS NERVA coin until A.D. 115, and then only in association with his own father.¹³ CONSECRATIO coins were commonly issued by an emperor for his deified predecessor.

Some emperors of course were reputed to have claimed divine honours for themselves in their own lifetime: Caligula, for example, is claimed by most of the literary sources to have had such pretensions;¹⁴ yet the coins carry no hint of it, though his deification of his dead sister, Drusilla, is on record—itself an advance on what would have been tolerated by Augustus or Tiberius. This and other of Caligula's coins with their commemoration of his mother, father, and sisters, serve to demonstrate the tightly knit élitism of the family.¹⁵

The religious interest of the Roman coinage continues into the fourth century; for here, at a time when after Constantine's victory over Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge in A.D. 312 we might expect to find a flood of Christian symbolism, instead the coinage continues in its commemoration of Jupiter, Mars, and Sol;¹⁶ references of a Christian nature are very muted; indeed the mood of the coinage is apparently to concentrate on aspects which could have a meaning for Christians and non-Christians alike. For example, the standard with the Chi—Rho monogram could be interpreted as the sign of the protective power of the Christian God or simply as a reference to Constantine's victory standard; the personification of Victory which figures constantly on the fourth-century coinage could be a repetition of the simple personification which

had appeared on the coinage for centuries or the Angel of God. Such ambivalence must itself indicate the strength of non-Christians in the government hierarchy through the centuries. There can, however, be no doubt as to the meaning of Julian the Apostate's SECVRITAS REIPVB type depicting a bull, that most potent of pagan symbols. It was not until the fifth century that Christian symbolism came out triumphant on the coinage.

It can thus be seen that the coinage can be used at all periods to elucidate both trends and particular events over a wide variety of aspects of imperial policy. However, there can be little doubt that it is in those periods when the literary source material itself is of significant weight that a study of the coinage as a historical source displays its full possibilities.

We may, for example, speculate on what significance we would attach to Tiberius' CLEMENTIAE and MODERATIONI issues,¹⁷ were it not for Tacitus' indications¹⁸ of Tiberius' pride in these 'virtues' and their probable relationship with the operations under the *Maiestas* law during his reign. The issue of coins is itself sufficient to suggest Tiberius' anxiety for the state of his public image on the question of *maiestas*, and helps to emphasize what appears to be Tacitus' chief point—namely that the emperor, whilst appreciating that public anxiety did exist on the subject, failed to grasp that it was the activities of the *delatores* which really caused that anxiety. In other words, an unsatisfactory law with unsatisfactory procedures, but overruled when appropriate by a merciful pardoner, could not constitute justice; how far removed Tiberius really was from understanding the real cause of anxiety is seen in his attitude to proposals to restrict the scope of the *delatores*.¹⁹ Thus we have here an instance when coins and literary evidence can be brought together into a very meaningful juxtaposition. We should also note that if Tacitus' observations are correctly related to the coins, then we can make a reasonable suggestion as to their date of issue, which is not fixed precisely on internal grounds.

A further example of an advantageous relationship between different types of source material may be cited in the case of Claudius' CONSTANTIAE AVGVSTI issue of A.D. 41–2²⁰ depicting Constantia seated on a curule chair: this, it has been argued, should be seen as the emperor's attempt to disguise the uncomfortable reality that he was raised by the Praetorian Guard, and that his relationship with the senate is likely to have been harmed by the fact and thus difficult from the outset; the reality of power-politics is expressed in the IMPER RECEPT issue depicting

the Praetorian barracks.²¹ Much use has also been made of the coinage issued in A.D. 68–9 in an attempt to elucidate the stances and even physical movements of those involved in the anti-Nero activities.²² Whilst there is no need in the present context to rehearse these arguments, it is worth noting as an example of the importance of the coin evidence that the similarity of appeal between Vindex's and Galba's coinage virtually removes credence from the idea that Vindex was using the anti-Nero movement as a cover for nationalistic designs.²³

Another way in which coins and literary evidence complement each other is to be seen in the reign of Caligula. It has frequently been noticed²⁴ that Suetonius' assertion that Caligula could not bear mention of his descent from the plebeian Agrippa is inconsistent with the numismatic evidence, for the memorial coins for Agrippina do indeed cite her as M.F. (Marci filia): in this case we may take the coins *not* as an indication that Suetonius is wrong, but probably that he is indulging in his common practice of generalizing from particular incidents.

It can thus be seen that particularly in the first century A.D. a large number of coin references are explicable either by themselves or in conjunction with other types of evidence. From the Flavian period onwards, however, the coinage displays with increasing frequency and regularity a long series of imperial 'virtues', such as *Abundantia*, *Fortuna*, *Hilaritas*, *Libertas*, *Liberalitas*, *Pax*, *Pietas*, and the like; the difficulty here is to decide whether these represent a general commemoration with no particular incident in mind, or whether they were intended (presumably obviously to contemporaries) to refer to particular incidents. We have seen the point already with Tiberius' *Clementia* and *Moderatio* and with Claudius' *Constantia*: similarly there can be little doubt about the significance of Galba's *Libertas*. But what should we make of Vespasian's FIDES PVBLICA, which appears from A.D. 71 onwards?²⁵ Does it refer to the restoration of normality after the chaos of civil war? Or does it perhaps indicate a need to impress the idea of confidence in a ruler whose ancestry was very different from that of the Julio-Claudians, and should it perhaps thus be seen as a numismatic parallel to such 'auctoritas-building' propaganda as we see in the healing-miracles and references to Fate?²⁶

Similarly, references on the coinage to *Moneta* should have some application to the coinage itself: in Domitian's case it is widely assumed that the application is to his increase of army pay.²⁷ In other reigns, the references are far less clear; they may simply be to the emperor's responsibility for the coinage, or alternatively

they may conceal some otherwise unknown monetary reform. For example, it may be suggested that in the case of Severus Alexander the reference is to the recovered strength of the *denarius* in its 'competition' with Caracalla's new and inflationary coin, the *Antoninianus* or double-*denarius*. *Concordia* (or *Fides*) *Exercituum* is another case in point: its appearance on the coinage of A.D. 68–9 causes no surprise, nor again, as we shall see under Nerva. But what of its subsequent appearances when we have no documentary evidence of loyalty problems in the army? Are the references automatic and unthinking, or do they conceal actual trouble in the army?

To demonstrate the opportunities and problems of coin evidence in a period when literary source material exists, although not of a very satisfactory nature,²⁸ we may look at the brief principate of Nerva. The picture given by the literary sources highlights differing aspects of the reign. Suetonius²⁹ briefly indicates the very different reactions to Domitian's death amongst various groups of the community; Cassius Dio gives a brief factual account of Nerva's reign; Pliny is largely concerned to magnify Trajan by emphasizing the depth of peril from which Nerva had to be rescued. Tacitus, who as consul in 97 is likely to have known most, refers to the contrast with Domitian and to Nerva's harmonizing of *principatus* and *libertas*.³⁰ Nerva's reign might therefore be seen as a period fraught with tensions, but with great constitutional significance and promise. It attempted to be a period of quiet reconstruction, though above it rises the major question of why Nerva adopted Trajan as his son and successor in the autumn of 97.

Nerva's coinage has a major advantage over that of almost all other emperors, in that it is precisely dated into six issues—in September and December of 96, January, September, and December of 97, and January of 98. The types are relatively few in number (thirteen on the gold/silver coinage, sixteen on the bronze): some of them continue throughout the reign whilst others are of more limited duration—sometimes restricted to a single issue only. Not unnaturally, rather greater interest attaches to these on the ground that they may have been prompted by particular incidents.

Some of Nerva's types are straightforward in their meaning, such as FISCO IVDAICI CALVMNIA SVBLATA, referring to the removal of the less pleasant methods of collecting Vespasian's Jewish tax,³¹ and VEHICVLATIONE ITALIAE REMISSA, one of a series of measures which indicated the new emperor's care for Italy.³² Other types indicate Nerva's understandable interest in his subjects' physical welfare—CONGIAR P R (the payment of a donative),

ANNONA AVGVST and PLEBEI VRBANO FRVMENTO CONSTITVTIO (both of which must relate to the corn-supply, though their precise application is in doubt). However, it can be said that these last three types, which will have involved considerable expenditure, are not all commemorated at the same time, so that it may be surmised that they will not at any rate have constituted a single massive drain on the treasury.³³ On the other hand, the coinage of Nerva does not mention the *Alimenta*, a scheme which he introduced to aid Italian farmers and needy children:³⁴ Dio refers in general to Nerva's care of the poor,³⁵ but it was left to Trajan to give publicity to the scheme.³⁶

Dio also mentions Nerva's reduction of expenditure on games and shows:³⁷ we should not expect the coinage to publicize that fact, though two of Nerva's types are connected with shows: NEPTVNO CIRCENSES CONSTITVT, limited to the first issue of 97, apparently depicting the statue of Consus in the Circus Maximus, cannot be tied to a particular known event.³⁸ More intriguing in this connection is the type (without a legend), showing Diana in a hunt with a dog, and which is limited to the second issue of 96. It has been suggested on the basis of an observation of John Malalas that the type refers to wild-beast shows:³⁹ it should be added, however, that the cult of Diana allows for other more tenuous interpretations, which may none the less have been in the minds of the authorities: the cult of Diana was of especial interest to plebeians, and it was associated with the penultimate king, Servius Tullius, whom tradition saw as the king who had interrupted a dynasty.

These examples then serve to illustrate the fact that whilst some types are clear in their meaning, they can still carry overtones which may have been highly desirable given the circumstances of the times. They also demonstrate that our ability to interpret types fully and clearly depends heavily on the quality of our other source material.

There is little doubt, however, that no matter how important are references to particular events, the historian, encouraged perhaps particularly by the Tacitean references, will be drawn to those coins which appear to concern themselves with the central political issues of Nerva's brief principate. Here the problem is to decide which types represent specific ideas and which are part of a general recital of 'virtues': to this question is related the frequency of appearance of particular types; as we have seen, those limited to a small number of issues are more likely to arrest attention than those which continue throughout.

We shall have little difficulty with such types as ROMA RENASCENS or FORTVNA AVGVST, which is presumably related to the imperial cult; but what complications of interpretation may be involved in IVSTITIA AVGVST, which appears up to the autumn of 97? Plainly the idea of its propriety to Nerva as a jurist will not do, since despite his family's association with that profession Nerva himself had not followed in their footsteps.⁴⁰ A context may be provided by the well-documented judicial activity of the reign, in which followers of Domitian were brought to justice and his victims relieved;⁴¹ for obvious reasons we should expect Nerva to commemorate this, particularly since he was a 'career-senator' and, as we have seen, on Suetonius' evidence it was the senate which most extravagantly abominated the memory of the 'last of the Flavians'.

It is also clear, however, that not all, even in the senate, approved of what was being allowed to happen in the name of justice: Dio records the terse observation on the subject of Catus Fronto, the consul of 96: *κακὸν μὲν ἔστιν αὐτοκράτορα ἔχειν ἐφ' οὗ μηδενὶ μηδὲν ἔξεστι ποιεῖν, χεῖρον δὲ ἐφ' οὗ πᾶσι πάντα*. That the situation was well on the way to anarchy is evidenced by Dio's description of it as *αραχή* and by the fact that Nerva was persuaded to intervene. Thus IVSTITIA AVGVST should not be seen simply as a synonym for legalized revenge, but also a warning that such 'revenge' had to be kept in proportion and due heed given to fair play.⁴² *Iustitia* had appeared infrequently on the coinage, and not since Tiberius' reign;⁴³ the latter emperor, as Sutherland observes,⁴⁴ had probably intended by it to indicate continuity with the Augustan period—as well as providing his own view of the judicial procedures of his reign, which not everyone had seen as *iustitia*. Tiberius too had been anxious for proper procedures to be observed, and clearly felt that actions which others saw as the undermining of *libertas*, were aimed at blunting the enthusiasm of the *delatores* and so supporting *iustitia*.⁴⁵

The application of *iustitia* was, however, not limited simply to the judicial process, as Martial's description of Nerva clearly shows⁴⁶—a description which indeed echoes Tiberius' own description of his role.⁴⁷ It was connected with a group of 'virtues' of especial appeal to the senate, and which at their summit will have had *libertas*, *iustitia*, and *moderatio* as 'virtues' which distinguished human from supra-human,⁴⁸ and which were thus essential components of *libertas*: *iustitia* indeed presented the most obvious contrast to *dominatio*—as Martial's observation bears out; for it represented order as against arbitrary conduct, and whereas on

Dio's evidence Nerva might well have been able to lay claim to *clementia*, this latter 'virtue' was rather more the property of the *dominus*.

It is in the connection between *iustitia* and *libertas* that Tacitus' observations become relevant; it is clear enough from Galba's oration⁴⁹ that *libertas* was denied by the dynastic principle, and thus Tacitus' praise of Nerva as the reconciler of *principatus* and *libertas* derives partly from the fact that he broke the Flavian dynasty, and partly from the fact that as a senator himself his own rise to the principate gave meaning to the concept of *libertas* as applied to the *cursus honorum*.⁵⁰

Such inferences as these may certainly be drawn from a *iustitia* coin: that we may be reasonably certain that they are all intended, however, depends upon our reading and interpretation of the literary sources.

Of similar potential interest is the type, PROVIDENTIA SENATVS, which was restricted to the issue of January 97, and which shows Nerva and a senator facing each other, between them holding a globe in their right hands. Some discussion⁵¹ has centred on the question of who is offering the globe to whom—Nerva to the senator, or the senator to Nerva. The important point, however, is the presence on the coin of Nerva *and* the senator, and as such Nerva's type provides an obvious contrast with what we may regard as Vespasian's dynastic equivalent—PROVIDENT AVG, depicting him and Titus holding the globe;⁵² so too with Trajan's coin of 98–9 in which he is handed the globe by Nerva.⁵³ The chief interest of the coin relates to its chronological place in Nerva's issues, for coming in January 97 it is placed between the chaos that marked the opening of the reign and the re-emergence of chaos in the autumn of 97 which led to the adoption of Trajan. The new year may thus have been seen as offering the hope of ordered government, and thus the opportunity for indicating the desired nature of that ordered government.

However, whatever the hopes entertained by Nerva and the senate for the reign, their destinies were inevitably in the control of the army. The literary evidence leaves no doubt of Nerva's problems in this respect. Suetonius, as we have seen, refers to the Praetorians' attachment to Domitian's memory; legionary discontent is specified,⁵⁴ and Pliny⁵⁵ leaves us in no doubt as to Nerva's proximity to disaster in the autumn of 97.

The literary sources thus provide a framework against which the coinage may be viewed: ADLOCVT AVG, restricted to the first issue of 96, represents Nerva's attempt to pacify the Praetorians;

as such it repeats a formula that had become standard since the accession of Caligula. On the other hand, one has to remember that the type of itself need not necessarily mean a great deal: Galba had issued such a coin, but in his case our fuller literary source material shows that Galba did not pay the promised donative and that therefore the coin-type did no more than pay lip-service to the idea.

All through Nerva's reign *CONCORDIA EXERCITVVM* types are repeated; they do in fact appear in two types—clashed hands, *with* or *without* a legionary eagle. We may take this as an indication that Nerva had learned an important lesson from the events of A.D. 68–9—that the aspirations of different sections of the Roman army might not be identical, and that therefore different interests had to be the subject of separate appeals. The two types presumably therefore refer to the Praetorian Cohorts and the legions respectively. Nerva, as we have seen, had trouble in both quarters; it is thus not surprising if the *VICTORIA AVGVST* type which appears in three issues was an attempt to capitalize for propaganda purposes upon success in the field which is attested,⁵⁶ and which will have been needed to enhance Nerva's military reputation.

Intertwined, however, with Nerva's problems with the army is his adoption of Trajan: both Dio and Pliny present the adoption as Nerva's response to his troubles with the Praetorians. The major question which arises concerns whether or not Trajan forced Nerva into action; Pliny just⁵⁷ stops short of the suggestion, but makes it clear that once the adoption had been made the German legions treated Trajan as already emperor.⁵⁸ The coinage shows that Nerva (and Trajan) assumed the title *Germanicus* in the autumn of 97, and it is easy to assume that this was done as a compliment to the legions which really controlled the Empire's destiny.

We should, however, notice that limited to the autumn issue of 97 is a *PAX AVGVSTI* type, showing Nerva shaking hands with Mars (or a soldier). The literary sources suggest that Nerva was able to see out his reign peacefully after the adoption: the coin suggests that the reason for this was that by adopting Trajan Nerva not only stilled discontent within the legions, but also provided himself with a counterweight to the Praetorians. He had in other words secured the vital ingredient which his reign had lacked for its first twelve months.

Thus Nerva's reign presents us with a highly instructive period for the fruitful combination of source material; the literary sources provide a framework of events and indications of pressures which

open up a wide range of possibilities for interpreting many of the coin types. In Nerva's case, the coins themselves contribute the more because of our ability to relate the issues not just to particular years, but even to specific parts of years. The combination of source material thus offers the opportunity to understand the enthusiasm with which Nerva's accession was greeted in certain quarters, but also the ability to see why 'Nerva and *libertas* is but an episode'.⁵⁹

NOTES

1. A list cannot be exhaustive, but four studies will demonstrate the possibilities: C. H. V. Sutherland, *Coinage in Roman Imperial Policy, 31 B.C.—A.D. 68* (London, 1951), and the same author's *The Emperor and the Coinage: Julio-Claudian Studies* (London, 1976); M. Grant, *From Imperium to Auctoritas* (Cambridge, 1948), and the same author's *Roman History from Coins* (Cambridge, 1958).
2. The chief concordances of Roman imperial coins are: H. Mattingly, E. A. Sydenham, C. H. V. Sutherland (edd.), *The Roman Imperial Coinage* (London, 1923—); referred to as *RIC*; H. Mattingly, *A Catalogue of Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum* (London, 1923); referred to as *BMC Emp.*
- Nerva's DIVVS AVGVSTVS coins are given in *BMC Emp.* (Nerva), 149 ff.
3. On this question see most recently B. L. Trell, 'Architecture on Ancient Coins', *Archaeology* 39 (1976), 6 ff.
4. Grant (*Roman History from Coins*, pp. 63 f.) has pointed out the importance for architectural reasons of Claudius' coin commemorating Artemis of Ephesus and that of Antoninus Pius which commemorates an otherwise unknown restoration by him of the ill-known Temple of Divus Augustus.
5. For example *BMC Emp.* (Trajan), 971.
6. *BMC Emp.* (Trajan), 944; we might compare with this Commodus' coin with the legend HERCVLI ROMANO AVGVSTO (*RIC* (Commodus), 638).
7. M. H. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* (Cambridge, 1974), nos. 448, 2e and 3.
8. *RIC* (Augustus), 19 and 98.
9. *BMC Emp.* (Trajan), p. 215.
10. *RIC* (Nero), pp. 169 ff.
11. *RIC* (Augustus), 359 ff.; (Claudius), 70; (Nero), 438.
12. As one would expect in view of Tiberius' near-obsessive respect for Augustus' memory (*G & R* 13 (1966), 207 ff.).
13. See P. V. Hill, *The Undated Coins of Rome, A.D. 98—148* (London, 1970), p. 146.
14. See J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *The Emperor Gaius* (Oxford, 1934), pp. 160 ff. for reference.
15. *RIC* (Gaius), pp. 116 f. A similar point emerges from Philo's report of a conversation between Macro and Gaius (*Leg.* 41—58).
16. The subject of Christian symbolism on the Constantinian coinage has been fully discussed by A. Alföldi, 'Das Kreuzsepter Konstantins der Grossen', *Schweizer Münzblätter* 4 (1954), 81—6, and P. Bruun, 'The Christian Signs on the Coins of Constantine', *Arctos* 3 (1956), 5—35.
17. *RIC* (Tiberius), 30 and 31: for a discussion of them see C. H. V. Sutherland, 'Two "Virtues" of Tiberius: A Numismatic Contribution to the History of his Reign', *JRS* 28 (1938), 129 ff.
18. *Ann.* 3.50, 3; 56.1.
19. *Ann.* 4.30.5.
20. *RIC* (Claudius), 1 ff.: see C. H. V. Sutherland, *Coinage in Roman Imperial Policy*, p. 129.

21. *RIC* (Claudius), 22 ff.
22. e.g. C. M. Kraay, 'The Coinage of Vindex and Galba A.D. 68 and the continuity of the Augustan Principate', *Num. Chron.*⁶ 9 (1949), 129 ff.; H. Mattingly, 'Verginius at Lugdunum?', *Num. Chron.*⁶ 14 (1954), 32 ff.
23. For this subject see *CQ* 17 (1967), 371 f.
24. Baldson, op. cit., p. 207; Suetonius, *Cal.* 23,1; *RIC* (Gaius), 42.
25. *BMC Emp.* (Vespasian), p. 130.
26. Tac. *Hist.* 4.8, 1 and Suet. *Div. Vesp.* 7 (Miracles); Tac. *Agr.* 13.5 and Suet. *Div. Vesp.* 5 (Fate).
27. Suet. *Dom.* 7 (see G. Webster, *The Roman Imperial Army* (London, 1969), pp. 256 ff.).
28. Chiefly Pliny, *Panegyricus* 5–10; Cassius Dio 68.1–4; Tac. *Agr.* 3 and *Hist.* 1.1.
29. Suet. *Dom.* 23.1: 'Occisum eum populus indifferenter, miles gravissime tulit statimque Divum appellare conatus est, paratus et ulcisci, nisi duces defuissent: quod quidem paulo post fecit, expostulatis ad poenam pertinacissime caedis auctoribus. Contra senatus adeo laetatus est . . .'
30. It is further argued by some (e.g. R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958), ii. 576) that Tacitus has written up elements of Galba's reign, especially his oration on the occasion of the adoption of Piso Licinianus (*Hist.* 1.15–16), with Nerva's situation in mind.
31. See Dio 65.7.2 for the tax, and 68.1.2 for Nerva's action.
32. See R. Syme, 'The Imperial Finances under Domitian, Nerva and Trajan', *JRS* 20 (1930), 63.
33. For discussions see R. Syme, art. cit. 55–70 and C. H. V. Sutherland, 'The State of the Imperial Treasury at the Death of Domitian', *JRS* 25 (1935), 150–62.
34. The coin TVTELA ITALIAE which appeared to refer to it has been designated as false (*BMC Emp.* (Nerva), p. 21).
35. Dio 68.2.1–2.
36. *RIC* (Trajan), 93.
37. Dio 68.2.3.
38. For the cult of Consus, see R. M. Ogilvie, *The Romans and Their Gods* (London, 1969), where the connection of the cult with horse-racing is stressed.
39. A. Merlin, *Les Revers monétaires de l'empereur Nerva* (Paris, 1906), pp. 25 ff.
40. *BMC Emp.* (Nerva), Introduction p. xxxv.
41. Dio 68.1.2–3.
42. The fact that Nerva also produced an *Aequitas*-type is undoubtedly relevant to this. Dio's picture receives confirmation from Pliny *Ep.* 9.13. Nerva's own attitude to Domitian's reign is perhaps best seen in his Edict on Domitian's benefactions (Pliny, *Ep.* 10.58. 7–10).
43. *RIC* (Tiberius), 22.
44. *Coinage in Roman Imperial Policy*, pp. 97–8.
45. e.g. Tac. *Ann.* 1.75.1.
46. Martial 10.72.8: 'Non est hic dominus, sed imperator/sed iustissimus omnium senator.'
47. Dio 57.8.2.
48. Pliny, *Pan.* 78.2–3: cf. Victor, *Caes.* 12.1 ('Quid enim Nerva Narniensi prudentius magisque moderatum?').
49. Tac. *Hist.* 1.15–16. See D. Flach, *Tacitus in der Tradition der antiken Geschichtsschreibung* (Göttingen, 1973), pp. 196 ff.
50. See my article, 'Principatus ac Libertas', *Ancient Society* 9 (1978), forthcoming. Appropriate to this idea is another observation of Martial (11.5.14): 'Si Cato reddatur, Caesarianus erit.'
51. *BMC Emp.* (Nerva), Introduction, p. xlix.
52. *BMC Emp.* (Vespasian), 178.
53. See P. V. Hill, op. cit., pp. 23 f.; *BMC Emp.* (Trajan), 53.
54. Dio 68.3.2 (Calpurnius Crassus); Philostratus *Vit. Soph.* 1.15 (Danube).
55. e.g. *Pan.* 6.3; 7.3; 8.4.
56. Pliny, *Pan.* 8.2. and *ILS* 2720 (R. Syme, *Tacitus* i. 11). Cf. Leo p. 283, 6–9

Cram—ἐκ Παιονίας δὲ ἀγγελία ἐπινικίων ἐλθοῦσα παρὰ Τραιανοῦ . . .

57. *Pan.* 8.5: 'Inritamentum istud irarum et fax tumultus fuisset, nisi incidisset in te.' It is presumably in the context of Trajan's 'claims' that Victor (*Epit.* 13.6) says of Trajan's friend, Licinius Sura, 'cuius studio imperium arripuerat'. Sura may well have been consul in 97 (R. Syme, *Tacitus*, ii. 641.).

58. *Pan.* 9.1. and 10.

59. R. Syme, *Tacitus* i.12.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

P. T. STEVENS: Emeritus Professor of Greek, Bedford College, University of London.

T. T. B. RYDER: Reader in Classics, University of Hull.

JOAN BOOTH: Lecturer in Classics, University College of Swansea.

A. C. F. VERITY: Headmaster, Leeds Grammar School.

JUSTIN GLENN: Associate Professor of Classics, Florida State University.

DAVID SHOTTER: Senior Lecturer and Head of the Department of Classics and Archaeology, University of Lancaster.

DALE HALL: Lecturer in Political Theory and Government, University College of Swansea.

JAMES HOLLADAY: Fellow and Tutor in Ancient History, Trinity College, Oxford.