



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Commemorating the Past and Performing Power: Parades of Ancestors on Caligula's Coinage

Gwynnaeth McIntyre 

University of Otago, New Zealand
Email: gwynnaeth.mcintyre@otago.ac.nz

(Received 20 May 2022; revised 17 October 2022; accepted 10 December 2022)

Abstract

This article explores the interconnection between Caligula's rehabilitation of his family and the performance of imperial power through processions as presented on three of his coin types. It argues that Caligula used the depictions of processions in connection with coin types celebrating his father, mother, and brothers to create a 'parade of ancestors'. These coins served as portable visual reminders (*monumenta*) of Germanicus' *pompa triumphalis* of 17 CE, the inclusion of Agrippina's image into the *pompa circensis* as part of the honours granted to Caligula's family members upon his accession, and the likely inclusion of Nero and Drusus' images at the head of the *transvectio equitum* during the early years of Caligula's reign. By parading his family members on his coins in this way, Caligula was able to propel himself forward by looking to and commemorating the past, thereby creating permanent *monumenta* of these public performances of power.

Keywords: Caligula; imperial family; consensus; Roman coins; *pompa*; *monumenta*

When Gaius Caesar Augustus (Caligula) received 'authority and judgement of all things',¹ he had not held the various political offices or powers which had previously been granted to his predecessors, Augustus and Tiberius.²

¹ *ius arbitriumque omnium rerum*, Suet. *Calig.* 14.1. Regularly translated as 'all the powers of the principate.' See Hurley (1993) 40 for a discussion of this phrase and its parallels. Cassius Dio corroborates this, stating that μοναρχικώτατος ἐγένετο, ὥστε πάντα ... ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ λαβεῖν, ('becoming most autocratic, in so much as he took all [honours] ... in one day', Cass. Dio 59.3.2)

² Rose (1997: 32) suggests that Caligula's position upon accession was much weaker than Tiberius' as Caligula had no 'civic or military achievements that legitimated his authority'.

The princeps relied on consensus,³ especially in the early decades of the first century CE when the idea of political power being concentrated into the hands of one man and his family was still in its infancy. Augustus and Tiberius had secured this consensus by highlighting the continuation of Republican powers and by promoting the stability created through the elevation of family members to important political offices coupled with hints of succession planning.⁴ Yet Caligula had held no magistracy before his accession. Moreover, since he had been named as joint heir with Tiberius Gemellus in Tiberius' will (Suet. *Calig.* 14.1), he needed to distance himself from the idea of 'legitimacy through succession'.⁵

While it is clear that Tiberius favoured Caligula in the latter half of his reign, it could be supposed that Caligula resented Tiberius for his inaction – or indeed his involvement, if we can believe what the ancient sources imply⁶ – regarding the imprisonment, exile, and even death of Caligula's immediate family members.⁷ When Germanicus died under suspicious circumstances in the East in 19 CE, rumour spread that Tiberius and Livia may have been indirectly involved.⁸ In 27 CE, Agrippina was forced out of Rome and placed under military guard.⁹ Following the death of Livia in 29 CE, Agrippina and Nero were declared public enemies; Agrippina was then sent in exile to Pandateria, Nero to Pontia. In 30 CE, Drusus was detained in Rome. All died in captivity shortly after. This family history likely contributed to Caligula's actions as princeps, seeking to distance himself from Tiberius and rehabilitate his family's memory.

In order to separate himself from his predecessor, Caligula instead sought to consolidate power and gain acceptance of his position through the rehabilitation of his family, all of whom had been persecuted under Tiberius.

³ Bell (2004: 5–6) discusses this in terms of the dynamics between political actors and their audiences. He argues that political actors 'perform power' through various rituals and an audience always has some power in how they receive (and accept or reject) that performance. Flaig (2015: 89) argues that the princeps relied on 'consent rituals' such as *ludi*, in which all participants confirmed their political consent (or acceptance) through ritualised behaviour. For further discussion of consensus through ritual and shared participation, see Rich (2015). For a discussion of what this process looked like on a provincial scale, see Ando (2000). The idea of consensus for Roman imperial power has been challenged by Lendon (2006).

⁴ However, see Osgood (2013) 19–40 for an analysis of how scholars have discussed 'succession' and how anachronistic and problematic the idea of a 'succession policy' is for the early first century CE.

⁵ See Flaig (2015) 89 for a rejection of the idea that imperial Rome had dynastic legitimacy. Arguably, it is not Caligula's family connection to the previous princeps that is used to secure Caligula's accession. Instead, Caligula can draw on an imperial bloodline to Augustus through his mother, Agrippina, and uses the fame of his father, Germanicus, to gain acceptance from the army and the people of Rome.

⁶ For example, Suetonius (*Calig.* 7) states that Nero and Drusus were declared enemies by the Senate because of Tiberius' accusation (*Neronem et Drusum senatus Tiberio criminante hostes iudicavit*) and states in *Tib.* 54 that it was Tiberius who 'starved them to death' (*fame necavit*).

⁷ Barrett (2015) 45.

⁸ Lott (2012) 19.

⁹ Sen. *Ira* 3.21.5; Barrett (2015) 38.

...confestim Pandateriam et Pontias ad transferendos matris fratrisque cineres festinavit, tempestate turbida, quo magis pietas emineret, adiitque venerabundus ac per semet in urnas condidit; nec minore scaena Ostiam praefixo in biremis puppe vexillo et inde Romam Tiberi subvectos per splendidissimum quemque equestris medio ac frequenti die duobus ferculis Mausoleo intulit, inferiasque iis annua religione publice instituit, et eo amplius matri circenses carpentumque quo in pompa traduceretur.

Suet. *Calig.* 15.1¹⁰

Immediately, he hurried off to Pandateria and the Pontian islands to transfer the ashes of his mother and brother, even in a violent storm, so that his piety might shine forth more. Approaching with reverence, he placed the ashes in the urn with his own hands. Nor with any less theatricality, he brought them to Ostia, fastened in a bireme with a military flag in the stern, and then up the Tiber to Rome, he carried them on two biers to the Mausoleum, by the most distinguished of the equestrians and in the middle of the day, when most crowded. He established annual sacrifices in honour of the dead with public ceremony and more grandly still, circus games for his mother, and a *carpentum* in which she might be transported in the procession.

Caligula's actions showcase how imperial power was performed and cultivated through monuments, statuary, processions, and spectacle. The showmanship of Caligula's actions is clearly highlighted in Suetonius' account; the demonstration of his piety (*pietas*) even in the face of adversity (in this case, in a violent storm, *tempestate turbida*) and how he placed the ashes in the urn with his own hands (*per semet*).¹¹ In fact, Suetonius even comments on the theatricality of the whole event (*nec minore scaena*). This spectacle of power – the public procession and the commemoration and inclusion of his family members into

¹⁰ An abridged account of this can also be found at Cass. Dio 59.3.5–6: τὰ τε ὅστ᾽ αὐτὰ τε τῆς μητρὸς καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν τῶν ἀποθανόντων αὐτὸς τε πλεύσας καὶ αὐτὸς αὐτοχειρῶς ἀνελόμενος ἐκόμισε καὶ ἐς τὸ τοῦ Αὐγούστου μνήμα κατέθετο, τὸ ἱμάτιον τὸ περιπόρφυρον ἐνδὺς καὶ ῥαβδούχοις πρὶν ὥσπερ ἐν ἐπινικίοις κοσμηθεὶς: τὰ τε ψηφισθέντα κατ' αὐτῶν πάντα ἀπήλειψε, καὶ τοὺς ἐπιβουλευσάντας σφισι πάντας ἐκόλασε, τοὺς τε φεύγοντάς δι' αὐτοῦς κατήγαγε ('He himself went by sea, and collecting with his own hands the bones of his mother and brothers who had been killed, he carried them home and placed them in the Mausoleum of Augustus, wearing a toga edged with purple and attended by lictors, like as one in triumph. He annulled all that had been voted against them, punished all those who plotted against them, and recalled those who fled on their account'). Cassius Dio mistakenly says that Caligula collected the bones of his brothers (τὰ ὅστ᾽ αὐτὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν) rather than just those of Nero (since Drusus died in Rome), and does not mention the annual sacrifices or Agrippina's image's inclusion in the *pompa circensis*. He does highlight the performative nature of his actions by likening his appearance to a general in triumph.

¹¹ Wardle (1994: 159) argues that it was more important for his *pietas* to be conspicuous, and thus it was not genuine. Cassius Dio 59.4.5 also focuses on how Caligula undertook these actions himself with the repetition of αὐτός.

public religious rituals – helps Caligula to gain public consensus for his position as princeps and distance him from his predecessor.¹²

Caligula's spectacle of commemoration was not novel. His mother, Agrippina, had performed a similar journey to return Germanicus' ashes to Rome in 20 CE.¹³ Agrippina's own adversity was the winter sea ('never having been interrupted in her navigation of the winter sea...', *nihil intermissa navigatione hiberni maris*, Tac. *Ann.* 3.1) and she undertook this journey accompanied by two children (likely the two eldest sons). The public procession of Germanicus' ashes by his family members provided a focal point for an empire united through extravagant communal mourning.¹⁴ This promotion of Germanicus and his family is in direct conflict with the actions of Tiberius and Livia, who abstained from public appearance (*publico abstinuere*, Tac. *Ann.* 3.3) and may have even had a hand in Germanicus' death. Even at this early stage, Tacitus highlights the adversarial nature of the relationship between Tiberius and the family of Germanicus.

This article examines how Caligula, upon becoming princeps, was able to propel himself forward by looking to and commemorating the past. It explores the interconnection between Caligula's rehabilitation of his immediate family and the performance of imperial power through processions, namely the *pompa triumphalis*, *pompa circensis*, and *transvectio equitum*. The depiction of these important processions as part of his commemoration of his father, mother, and brothers on several coins served as a visual parade of ancestors and created permanent *monumenta* of these public performances of power.

Coins as 'Parades of Ancestors'

Scholars continue to debate whether, during the principate, the princeps imposed his own ideas for images on coins or whether the decision still lay with the moneyers.¹⁵ While it cannot be determined whether Caligula was personally responsible for the images on coins minted from 37–41 CE, it is

¹² In Lindsay's (1993: 80) commentary on the passage, he argues that this rehabilitation of family should be seen as an important political gesture.

¹³ Tac. *Ann.* 3.1. For a discussion of this passage and its importance as a model for Caligula's later actions, see Barrett (2015) 31–2.

¹⁴ Tacitus (*Ann.* 3.2) mentions Drusus, Claudius, and the 'children of Germanicus who had remained in the city' (*liberisque Germanici qui in urbe fuerant*).

¹⁵ See Wallace-Hadrill (1986) 86–7, Cheung (1999) 58–60, and Kemmers (2019) 29–30 for a summary of the discussion and bibliography. Kemmers (2019: 29) argues that it is unlikely that the princeps was directly involved given that coin production did not cease in his absence from Rome but that there must have been some sort of imperial guidelines or approval process. Barrett (2015: 322) suggests that it makes little difference whether the princeps was responsible for the images or the moneyers as those officials overseeing the mint would have 'at the very least been sensitive to what the princeps would have considered appropriate'. Yet, Suetonius states that Augustus 'struck a silver coin with the sign of the constellation of Capricorn, under which he was born' (*nummumque argenteum nota sideris Capricorni, quo natus est, percusserit*, Suet. *Aug.* 94) and that Nero 'set up his statues as a lyre-player, and even struck a coin with the same image' (*posuit, item statuas suas citharoedus habitu, qua nota etiam nummum percussit*, Suet. *Ner.* 25), suggesting that the princeps did have control over these images.

generally accepted by scholars that coins were minted under imperial authority to at least some extent, and it seems clear that the promotion of family played a significant role in Caligula's performance of power.¹⁶ It is also evident that these coins were not used as 'propaganda' in the sense that they were not designed 'to persuade' but rather 'to remind'.¹⁷ Meadows and Williams argue that coins in the late second century BCE were circulating ideas of memory (*memoria*) and the things accomplished (*res gestae*) by their ancestors, thereby creating a *monumentum* to the moneyer's family.¹⁸ As I will argue, this categorisation can also be applied to Caligula's family coins.

Most of the coins promoting family members depict the bust of the individual and the legend identifying the figure and their family relationship.¹⁹ However, amongst the 'family coins', there are three types which are of particular interest in terms of 'performing' or 'parading' power.²⁰ They show movement through the inclusion of either horses or wheeled vehicles. The idea of reading certain coin types in connection with others is not new in the study of Caligula's coinage. Both Wood (1999: 210) and Jucker (1980: 206) have discussed how Germanicus' 'Triumph' coin and Agrippina's 'Carpentum' coin work together, specifically in terms of the depiction of the vehicle, legend, and overall design, as well as the link between the triumphal chariot as a 'male' vehicle and the *carpentum* as a 'female' vehicle for self-promotion. Wood has also drawn a connection between Caligula's 'sisters' coin and 'brothers' coins in terms of their connections to the gods.²¹

¹⁶ Caligula's precious metal coinage almost exclusively promotes his ancestry, while his *aes* coinage showcased his father Germanicus, his mother Agrippina, his brothers, his sisters, and his grandfather Agrippa in addition to his other messaging connected to the army, the dedication of the temple of Divus Augustus, and other types (Wolters [2012] 343).

¹⁷ The debate about whether coins should be understood as propaganda or not has been succinctly summarised in Wallace-Hadrill (1986) with updated discussions in Cheung (1999), Noreña (2011), and Kemmers (2019). Other key works in the debate are: Levick (1982); Sutherland (1983) and (1986); Jones (1956).

¹⁸ Meadows and Williams (2001) 42. Flower's (1996: 11) discussion is based on the category labelled 'integration propaganda' as analysed by sociologists, 'While evoking a familiar and expected picture of the Roman past, they confirmed and reminded people of what they already knew.' She uses 'advertising' instead of propaganda due to the twentieth century connotations of 'propaganda'. Levick (1982: 105–6) uses 'publicity' instead of 'propaganda'. Alföldi (1956: 72) also discusses how coin types might influence the perception of the trustworthiness of an individual based on their ancestors' authority, deeds, and actions.

¹⁹ In addition to the 'parading coins' discussed in this article, the other exceptions to the 'bust' images are the 'sisters' coins (depicted as goddesses; *RIC I*² (Gaius/Caligula) 33, 41) and coins commemorating his grandfather Agrippa with an image of Poseidon on the reverse (*RIC I*² (Gaius/Caligula) 58).

²⁰ Hölscher (2006) stresses the significance of monuments as vehicles for transforming military successes into political power. I argue that the coins which depict various *pompae*, although they do not all celebrate military victory, can achieve the same end.

²¹ Wood (1999) 211 and (1995) 461. She highlights that both these sets of coins show Caligula's siblings in the guise of gods: the sisters as personifications of virtues (likened to the Horai, the Fates, or the Graces) and his brothers as the Dioscuri. Cheung (1999: 59–60) argues that Caligula's sister coins (*RIC I*² (Gaius/Caligula) 33, 41) should also be understood to have been personally ordered by the princeps. Wolters (2012: 343) suggests that these coins should be linked to the sisters' inclusion in oaths (Suet. *Calig.* 15.3; Cass. Dio 59.3.4).

The connection between these three ‘parading’ coins and the significance of movement has not yet been made. Each provides a visual representation of a different type of procession involving family members: the *pompa triumphalis*, *pompa circensis*, and *transvectio equitum*.²² Unlike other large monuments which display depictions of *pompae* and highlight movement,²³ coins can only provide a limited snap-shot or one image meant to evoke memory of that event. It is likely that these representations of parades played a role in the development of post-event memories,²⁴ thereby promoting Caligula’s own position through the commemoration of his family members.

Germanicus and the *pompa triumphalis*

The Roman triumph was central to the creation and enforcement of social memory.²⁵ Each triumph was unique, but the repetition of the various components ensured that these events were imprinted in the Roman collective memory.²⁶ When Germanicus celebrated his triumph in 17 CE following his recall from his Germanic campaign, spectators were presented with an image of the victorious general like no other. ‘The admiration of the viewers was heightened by the striking appearance of the general and the chariot which bore his five children’ (*augebat intuentium visus eximia ipsius species currusque quinque liberis onustus*, Tac. Ann. 2.41).²⁷ Although the triumph was meant to celebrate military victory, the inclusion of children in Germanicus’ triumphal chariot turned this military event into a family one.²⁸ It sent a clear message that it was the *domus Augusta* which oversaw Rome’s victory. One of the children in this chariot was the future princeps, Caligula.²⁹

²² For a discussion of the significance of *pompae* for the performance of power and consensus in the Republic, see Hölkeskamp (2017) 189–236. He focuses specifically on the *pompa triumphalis*, *pompa funebris*, and *pompa circensis*.

²³ For a discussion of the importance of movement in artistic representations, specifically of triumphs, see Favro (2014). Latham (2016: 14) stresses how processions could connect to other rituals, practices, and memories while also seeking a place in Roman cultural memory.

²⁴ Favro (2014) 93.

²⁵ Brilliant (1999) 221. Beard (2007: 238) highlights the triumph’s importance for re-enforcing Roman values and ideology for a Roman audience.

²⁶ Favro (2014) 87. Beard (2007: 43–5) suggests that the sheer number of depictions of triumphs on monuments attests to the importance of the triumph in Rome. In the case of Germanicus’ triumph, the arch erected by the senate in the Circus Flaminius in 19 CE following the death of Germanicus commemorates this event through a visual representation of triumphal scenes and the procession. This monument also serves as a family monument in that it was also decorated with the statues of all six of Germanicus’ children as well as his father, mother, sister, brother, and wife (Flory [1998] 491).

²⁷ The five children are (approximate age in brackets): Nero Caesar (11), Drusus Caesar (9), Caligula (5) Agrippina the Younger (2), and Drusilla, (1).

²⁸ McIntyre (2017) 80. Children (mostly boys) had appeared in triumphal chariots before this, although the interpretation of their significance (and identification of those children) varies. For example, see Beard (2007: 244) for a discussion of the children represented on the Actium Monument. For the significance of the triumph in general, see Hölcher (2006) 38.

²⁹ Barrett (2015: 26–7) even suggests that participating in the triumph might have been one of Caligula’s earliest childhood memories.



Figure 1. Bronze Dupondius, Rome, 37–41 CE, RIC I² (Gaius/Caligula) 57.³⁰ Otago Museum E2017.519. Copyright Tūhura Otago Museum, Dunedin.

On a coin of uncertain date (fig. 1), Caligula commemorates his father's recovery of the standards lost by Varus and the triumph in which he himself participated as a child.

The obverse depicts the triumphator in a quadriga with the legend GERMANICUS CAESAR and is likely meant to represent and evoke the memory of the entire celebration of Germanicus' triumph in 17 CE.³¹ The reverse shows a figure standing with a military standard and the legend SIGNIS RECEPT(is) DEVICTIS GERM(anis) which makes reference to the re-acquisition of those standards, although Germanicus was only able to recapture two of the three that were lost in 9 CE. The military imagery on this coin is striking. The literary accounts highlight that Caligula had spent much of his early life in military camps.³² However, when he came to power, Caligula had yet to embark on any major military campaigns or achieve glory or renown for any of his actions. Instead, he had to rely on the goodwill of the soldiers, many of whom had fought with his father and even remembered him as a small child in the camp.

Triumphal imagery on coinage has a long history. The first example of a coin celebrating an individual's specific triumph dates to the late second century BCE, but coins depicting gods (most commonly Victory or Jupiter) in a quadriga celebrating victory date back to the late third century BCE. A denarius issued by C. Fundanius in 101 BCE depicts the horses as if they were

³⁰ Obv: GERMANICVS CAESAR. Rev: SIGNIS RECEPT(is), DEVICTIS GERM(anis) ('after the standards had been recovered and the Germans defeated')

³¹ Beard (2007: 220) argues that the triumphator in a quadriga becomes an artistic shorthand to represent the triumph itself. Favro (2014: 97) stresses how the viewing and reviewing of processional scenes on monuments reshaped the memories of those who had attended the triumph and fostered pseudo-memories in those who had not. The literary accounts of Germanicus' triumph are found in Tac. *Ann.* 2.41; Str. 7.1.4; Suet. *Calig.* 1.1; and Vell. Pat. 2.129.2. See Brilliant (1999: 224–5) for a discussion of the significance of the triumph for social memory.

³² His father was campaigning for much of his early childhood and sources tell us that both Caligula and Agrippina were regularly in the camps. Most notably, Suetonius reports that it was the very sight of Caligula which changed the minds of the mutinous soldiers following the death of Augustus (Suet. *Calig.* 9). For a discussion of this event and a comparison of Cassius Dio's, Suetonius', and Tacitus' accounts, see Hurley (1989).

marching in a parade rather than rearing as had been the case with the divine quadriga. This coin likely commemorates Marius' victory over the Teutones and Cimbri.³⁴ It seems to recall a recent triumph and, while many coin types from this period used ancestral connections to promote themselves and their families,³⁵ Fundanius was not related to Marius. Thus, this is not a coin designed to promote the actions of one's ancestors. Instead, it is likely that Fundanius (a quaestor) might have been attempting to promote Marius' deeds to connect himself with this military champion in order to further his own aspirations for higher political offices, which he never did achieve. Other triumphal coins with similar imagery continued to be used throughout the first century BCE, such as this example (fig. 2) promoting the expected triumph of Sulla – to take place early 81 BCE – minted by L. Manlius Torquatus (Pro Quaestor).³⁶

As Woytek's recent work has shown, many Republican coin types were still in circulation well into the first and second centuries CE.³⁷ It is likely that this promotion of military success through triumphal imagery on coins was part of a broader collective memory during this period and that Caligula's coins could help promote him through the celebration of his father's military success.

By the early first century CE, the triumphal coin type linked ancestral achievements and succession. Minted near the end of Augustus' life in 13/14 CE, several coins from Lugdunum depict Augustus on the obverse, with Tiberius in a triumphal chariot on the reverse (fig. 3).³⁹

Minted as both aurei and denarii, this coin type employs imagery previously used to showcase the successes of one's ancestors to now promote shared power and to suggest that imperial power can be inherited. These higher denomination coins in particular were commonly used by Augustus to highlight succession, especially from 8 BCE to his death.⁴⁰ Several bronze sestertii were minted in the final years of Tiberius' life, which depict *quadrigae* ornamented with trophies,⁴¹ while two types commemorate Divus Augustus in a

³³ Obv: [L(ucius) MANLI(us)] PRO Q(uaestor). Rev: L(ucius) SULLA IM(perator).

³⁴ Crawford draws attention to the rider on one of the horses as depicting Marius' son who likely rode along beside his father in the triumph. See commentary on *RRC* 326/1.

³⁵ Flower (1996: 81) identifies approximately 99 issues in *Roman Republican Coinage* that have some ancestral imagery on them.

³⁶ Sulla's triumph took place over two days (27–28 January, 81 BCE) and included two separate *pompae*. For a discussion of the significance of this triumph, see Sumi (2002) 416–19. L. Manlius Torquatus went on to hold a number of significant magistracies, culminating in the consulship of 65 BCE. Noreña (2011: 254–5) traces the development of the promotion of living individuals, triumphal imagery, and monarchical illusions through the first century BCE, culminating with Caesar and Augustus.

³⁷ Woytek (2022).

³⁸ Obv: CAESAR AUGUSTUS DIVI F(ilius) PATER PATRIAE Rev: TI(berius) CAESAR AUG(usti) F(ilius) TR(ibunicia) POT(estate) XV

³⁹ *RIC* I² (Augustus), 221–4; *RIC* I² (Tiberius), 1.

⁴⁰ Rowan (2019) 167.

⁴¹ *RIC* I² (Tiberius) 54 (34–35 CE), 56 (34–35 CE), 60 (35–36 CE), 66 (36–37 CE).



Figure 2. Silver Denarius, Rome, 82 BCE, *RRC* 367/5.³³ Otago Museum E2017.390. Copyright Tūhura Otago Museum, Dunedin.



Figure 3. Silver Denarius, Lugdunum, 13/14 CE, *RIC I*² (Augustus) 222.³⁸ American Numismatic Society 1944.100.39116. Courtesy of the American Numismatic Society

quadriga with elephants, thereby recalling Augustus' own triumphal imagery.⁴² If we consider the Germanicus coin within the context of both of the Republican and Imperial traditions, a possible interpretation for Caligula's promotion of his father's triumph could be that it was intended to connect him to his father's achievements in order to promote his own claim to political power.

Suetonius explicitly highlights the expectation of Caligula living up to his father's memory when he states:

Sic imperium adeptus, populum Romanum, vel dicam hominum genus, voti compotem fecit, exoptatissimus princeps maximae parti provincialium ac militum, quod infantem plerique cognoverant, sed et universae plebi urbanae ob memoriam Germanici patris miserationemque prope afflictatae domus.

Suet. *Calig.* 13

⁴² *RIC I*² (Tiberius) 62 (35–36 CE), 68 (36–37 CE). Augustus minted coins during his lifetime which depicted him in a chariot with Victory drawn by two elephants, likely referencing his military successes in the east or Africa, although this differs from Tiberius' coin type in that the biga is placed on top of an arch (*RIC I*² (Augustus) 140). See Hickson (1991) for further discussion of Augustus as triumphator.

Having thus acquired imperium, he fulfilled the prayers of the Roman people – or should I say, all humankind – the ruler most highly favoured by the greater part of provincials and soldiers, whom many had known as a child, and by all the people of Rome [the universal urban plebs] on account of the memory of his father Germanicus and the pity for the near ruined house.

This child of Germanicus, the only surviving male heir, who had been present in that triumphal chariot, had now come to power. The use of Germanicus' memory to promote Caligula's position as princeps is made explicit. He is highly favoured by the soldiers (because he was known to them) and the people (because of the pity they felt for the 'near ruined house'). Germanicus had achieved the status of 'popular hero' and all of Rome united in mourning his passing, granting him exceptional status in the collective memory.⁴⁴ By promoting his father's military victory on a coin likely used to pay the soldiers, Caligula not only reminded them of their much-loved commander but implied that, as Germanicus' son, he could also lead them to victory.

Agrippina and the *pompa circensis*

As discussed in the introduction, Caligula undertook a spectacle of rehabilitation of his family and established a number of rituals and honours to commemorate his deceased family members and further promote those still living.⁴⁵ These exceptional honours and the public performance of mourning could all be interpreted as examples of Flaig's 'consent rituals' by which all of Rome confirmed their political consent (or acceptance) of Caligula's accession through this ritualised behaviour.⁴⁷ These honours included 'circus games for his mother, and a *carpentum* in which she might be transported in the procession' (*matri circenses carpentumque quo in pompa traduceretur*, Suet. *Calig.* 15.1).⁴⁸ Coins were then minted that commemorate Agrippina's memory, including a visual representation of the *carpentum* (fig. 4).⁴⁹

⁴³ Obv: AGRIPPINA M(arci) F(ilia) MAT(er) C(ai) CAESARIS AUGUSTI. Rev: MEMORIAE AGRIPPINAE. ('Agrippina, daughter of Marcus [Agrippa], mother of Gaius Caesar Augustus')

⁴⁴ Suetonius' narrative of reactions to the news of Germanicus' death is incredibly dramatic, with people casting out the gods (and even their own newborns, *partus coniugum expositi*) and everyone, even foreign kings and *barbari*, joining in the public mourning (Suet. *Calig.* 5). For further details about the honours granted to Germanicus after his death, see the *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre*, *Tabula Hebana*, and the *Tabula Siarensis* in Lott (2012).

⁴⁵ Honours for his living family members included the renaming of September for Germanicus, honours for Antonia, and for his sisters' names to be included in oaths, as just some other examples.

⁴⁶ Obv: IULIAE AUGUST(ae). Rev: TI(berius) CAESAR DIVI AUG(usti) F(ilius) AUGUST(us) P(ontifex) M(aximus) TR(ibunicia) POT(estate) XXIII.

⁴⁷ See n. 3 above.

⁴⁸ While Livia had been given the privilege of using a *carpentum* during festivals, Agrippina is the first to be granted this honour posthumously: Wardle (1994) 161; Trillmich (1978) 43.

⁴⁹ It is worth noting that Agrippina was Caligula's direct connection to Augustus. She is the third most common figure on his coins thus highlighting her significance for Caligula's promotion of family (Wood [1988] 410).



Figure 4. Bronze Sestertius, Rome, 37–41 CE, RIC I² (Gaius/Caligula) 55.⁴³ American Numismatic Society 1944.100.39318. Courtesy of the American Numismatic Society

The *carpentum* was a carriage, in which Roman matrons were allowed to be conveyed in the public festival processions (a privilege that by this period was only given to imperial family members and had previously been given to Vestal Virgins, the *rex sacrorum*, and *flamines*).⁵⁰ It was a state-sponsored product built specifically to command attention, much like the triumphal chariot.⁵¹ As a coin type, *carpenta* only appear on coins in connection with a member of the imperial family.⁵² The first depiction of a *carpentum* on a coin dates to 22/23 CE (fig. 5).

There is much debate about what the *carpentum* on Livia's coin is meant to symbolise. In 22 CE, Livia came down with a terrible illness. According to Tacitus, when the senate heard about her illness, 'public prayers to the gods and great games were decreed'.⁵³ Ginsburg suggests that the obverse legend, IULIAE AUGUST(ae), commemorates these *supplicia* for Livia's recovery.⁵⁴ Wood interprets the *carpentum* as representing the honour of sitting amongst the Vestals in the theatre,⁵⁵ assuming that she would have also received the right to transportation within Rome by *carpentum*.⁵⁶ Jucker argues that this image

⁵⁰ Abaecherli (1935–1936: 5–7) and Pagnotta (1977–1978: 159–70) present a history of the *carpentum* and its use from the narratives of early Rome through to the Principate, whereas Jucker (1980: 208–9) focuses solely on its use during the Principate. Hudson (2016: 218) discusses the background for the honour, but focuses on how 'mobile' women became an important literary trope, highlighting the dangers that such women posed to Rome. It is clear from his discussion that literary presentations of the *carpentum* in historical sources and the granting of this honour during the imperial period follow different traditions. For more details about *carpentum* type and its use, also see Trillmich (1978) 33–6 and Lucchi (1968) 136–9.

⁵¹ Hudson (2021) 209.

⁵² Lucchi (1968) 136–7. Hudson (2021) discusses the rhetorical significance of the *carpentum* in literary sources and suggests that Suetonius' *carpentum* is used to highlight the overbearing nature of the female members of the imperial family (see especially p. 247).

⁵³ *set tum supplicia dis ludique magni ab senatu decernuntur*, Tac. *Ann.* 3.64.3.

⁵⁴ Ginsburg (2006) 59.

⁵⁵ *et quotiens Augusta theatrum introisset, ut sedes inter Vestalium consideret*, ('and whenever Augusta entered the theatre, she should be seated among the seats of the Vestals', Tac. *Ann.* 4.16.4).

⁵⁶ Wood (1999) 82; Flory (1998) 493. Abaecherli (1935–1936: 5) connects the *carpentum* to her 'honorary Vestal' status but also suggests it might be related to her position as priestess of Divus Augustus. Ginsburg (2006: 60) rejects this interpretation linking Livia's 'honorary Vestal'



Figure 5. Bronze Sestertius, Rome, 22/23 CE, RIC I² (Tiberius) 51.⁴⁶ Otago Museum E2017.512. Copyright Tuhura Otago Museum, Dunedin

represents an abstraction.⁵⁷ While the Livia coin image may serve as a model for the Agrippina coin, the interpretation of the Agrippina coin is much more straightforward; a clear connection can be made between the literary sources and the numismatic evidence, suggesting that this coin was intended to evoke the memory of a particular event – in this case, her image’s inclusion in the *pompa circensis*.

While *carpenta* are not always directly connected to the *ludi circenses*, those that are all date from the imperial period. They became associated with the commemoration of deceased female imperial family members.⁵⁸ This is part of a larger tradition of the gradual incorporation of imperial family members into the *pompa*. Following the death and deification of Julius Caesar, the image of Divus Iulius was added into the *pompa*.⁵⁹ This allowed Octavian to connect himself with his divine father in social memory, reinforced through processions. The appropriation of the *pompa circensis* to achieve this was a direct result of the newly-deified ancestor’s absence from funeral processions. Over time, the *pompa circensis* became a dynastic tool to ‘honour the memory of predecessors and construct imperial lineages’.⁶⁰ The increased focus on the divine ancestry of the princeps also helped to build consensus for his position of power within the city.⁶¹ This connection is made even more explicit when

status to the *carpentum* stating that this privilege was not granted until sometime in 23 CE (suggesting it was after the coin was minted) but then posits that the *carpentum* was the ‘vehicle which Livia or her image rode in the *pompa* from the Capitol to the Circus Maximus’. Foubert (2015) has convincingly argued that Livia did not become an ‘honorary Vestal’ but instead received honours similar to those granted to Vestals. These honours were not intended to create a ‘Vestal image’.

⁵⁷ Jucker (1980) 214.

⁵⁸ Abaecherli (1935–1936) 5. There are three other Julio-Claudian women connected with *carpenta* in the surviving sources (Livia, Messalina, and Agrippina the Younger), all so honoured during the decades following Caligula’s death.

⁵⁹ A coin was minted with the *tenna* of Divus Iulius in 32–29 BCE, likely as part of Octavian’s ideological promotion during his conflict with Mark Antony: RIC I² (Augustus) 259; see Latham (2016) 111. A similar type was minted again in 18 BCE.

⁶⁰ Latham (2016) 108.

⁶¹ For a discussion of the significance of the divine aspects of the *pompa circensis* and their appropriation by the princeps and his family, see Arena (2009) 92–3. Lucchi (1968: 137–8) interprets the *carpentum* as either a symbol of deification or as a funerary vehicle. Flory (1998: 493) challenges

Caligula changed the starting point for the *pompa* to the Temple of Divus Augustus, following its completion in 38 CE.⁶²

Although the MEMORIAE AGRIPPINAE coin cannot be definitively dated,⁶³ both the legend *memoriae* and Suetonius' description of the honours given to Agrippina situate this coin within the context of Caligula's appropriation of part of the *pompa circensis* as a *pompa funebris* for his mother in the months following his accession. The addition of her *carpentum* in the *pompa circensis* served to rehabilitate her memory and establish her place alongside Caligula's divine ancestors. This coin provides a portable visual memorial of this event, reinforcing the other honours that increased Agrippina's visibility within the city's ritual calendar and incorporated the entire city in the preservation of her memory.

Nero and Drusus Caesares and the *transvectio equitum*

In the early 30s CE, Nero died in exile and Drusus died in confinement on the Palatine. Caligula's retrieval of his brother Nero's ashes from the Pontian islands, along with the ashes of his mother from Pandateria, was part of the spectacle of rehabilitation, the description of which introduced this article. While not part of the narrative of the honours granted by Caligula to his family in Suetonius' *Life of Caligula*, Suetonius tells us in his *Life of Claudius* that Caligula also commissioned Claudius to set up statues of Nero and Drusus in Rome during Claudius' first consulship (37 CE).⁶⁴ It is worth noting that we may not be able to take Suetonius at his word as there is no external evidence corroborating this 'commissioning'; the statues themselves do not survive, and there is no conclusive evidence what form these statues took (or if they even were completed). However, many equestrian statues had previously been erected to commemorate deceased family members, such as the statues for Lucius and Gaius on an honorific arch erected in the community of Pisa, and the golden equestrian statue of Drusus (son of Tiberius) erected in the Lupercal.⁶⁵ It has thus been suggested by scholars that the statues to Drusus and Nero (if they were actually erected) were also equestrian statues, following

this interpretation while Wood (1999: 208) suggests that Caligula had intended to deify his mother and that the honour of her image being carried by a *carpentum* reflected this.

⁶² Arena (2009) 90.

⁶³ Trillmich (1978: 43) attempts to show that there were three groups of *carpentum* types and that they were minted in three separate emissions, 37/38 CE, 39/40 CE, and 40/41 CE. Most scholars who discuss this type continue to refer to it as 'undated'.

⁶⁴ *Primum in ipso consulatue, quod Neronis et Drusi fratrum Caesaris statuas segnius locandas ponendasque curasset, paene honore summotus est*, ('First, in his own consulship, he was almost removed from the honour, because he had been too slow in attending to arranging and placing statues of Nero and Drusus, the brothers of Caesar [Caligula]', Suet. *Claud.* 9.1).

⁶⁵ Gaius and Lucius: *CIL* 11.1421, and Lott (2012) 75, and 205 for commentary; Drusus (son of Tiberius): *CIL* 6.31200 B, col. 1, 2. 8–9, also see Lott (2012) 167, and 315–16 for commentary. Germanicus also was voted a number of honorific statues after his death (in Rome, Syria, and Germany), but none of these were specifically equestrian (*Tab. Siar.* 2 col. 9).



Figure 6. Bronze Dupondius, Rome, 40/41 CE, *RIC I*² (Gaius/Caligula) 49.⁶⁶ Otago Museum E2017.517. Copyright Tuhura Otago Museum, Dunedin



Figure 7. Silver Denarius, 9 BCE, Lugdunum, *RIC I*² (Augustus) 199.⁶⁷ American Numismatic Society 1944.100.39113. Courtesy of the American Numismatic Society

the precedent of posthumous honours granted to these other imperial family members, and that the coins minted on three separate occasions during Caligula’s principate – depicting the brothers on horseback – are meant to evoke those statues (fig. 6).⁶⁸

There were no coins depicting honorific equestrian statues erected for previously-deceased members of the imperial family which could serve as a model for this particular coin image. During Gaius Caesar’s lifetime, aurei and denarii were minted which depicted him on horseback with aquila in the background (fig. 7). However, given that these coins commemorate the living Gaius and his military successes, without mentioning his brother Lucius, it is unlikely that these coin types served as a model for Caligula’s.

⁶⁶ Obv: NERO ET DRUSUS CAESARES. Rev: C(aius) CAESAR DIVI AUG(usti) PRON(epos) AUG(ustus) P(ontifex) M(aximus) T(ribunicia) P(otestate) IIII P(ater) P(atriciae).

⁶⁷ Obv: AVGVSTVS DIVI F(ilius). Rev : C(aius) CAES(ar) AVGVS(ti) F(ilius); The aureus is *RIC I*² (Augustus) 198.

⁶⁸ For example, see Rose (1997) 33 and Barrett (2015) 84. This coin type was minted in 37/38 CE (*RIC I*² (Gaius/Caligula) 34), 39/40 CE (*RIC I*² (Gaius/Caligula) 42) and 40/41 CE (shown in fig. 2). The dates for each coin type are identified through the change in Caligula’s titles on the reverse, namely specifically the number of times he had held the tribunician power.



Figure 8. Silver Denarius, 148 BCE, Rome, RRC 214/1b.⁶⁹ Otago Museum E2017.330. Copyright Tūhura Otago Museum, Dunedin

Instead, the depiction of Caligula's brothers on horseback bears a striking resemblance to one of the most common Republican coin types, that of the Dioscuri (fig. 8).⁷⁰

In historical/mythographical terms, the Dioscuri were first tied to Rome's military success at the Battle of Lake Regillus,⁷¹ and a temple was built in the forum in fulfilment of Postumius' battlefield vow.⁷² As tradition has it, the *transvectio equitum*, a yearly parade on the 15 July, was established to commemorate this success and secure the Dioscuri's position as patron deities of the *equites*.⁷³ The procession travelled to the temple of Castor in the Roman Forum and was led by two 'leaders of the youth' (*principes iuventutis*).⁷⁴ Augustus seems to have revived this procession after some period of disuse.⁷⁵ This revival has been directly tied to the promotion of Gaius and Lucius and the appropriation of the title *princeps iuventutis* for members of the imperial family alone.⁷⁶ The Dioscuri then also become connected to the promotion

⁶⁹ Obv: SARAN(us) X. Rev: M(arcus) ATIL(ius), ROMA (referring to the name of the name of the issuer M. Atilius Saranus).

⁷⁰ Rose (1997) 33; Wood (1995) 461; Jucker (1980) 205–6; Trillmich (1978) 39. The image of the Dioscuri on Roman coinage was likely adapted from earlier Hellenistic coinage. See Rowan (2016) 34 for a discussion of how many of the images for the denarius system established after the Second Punic War were taken from existing Hellenistic types.

⁷¹ They either appear on the battlefield and help or are responsible for heralding the victory back in Rome. This event is presented in the historical accounts in Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 6.13.1–3 and Livy 2.19.

⁷² In Livy's account (2.19), Postumius vowed a temple to Castor should he be victorious in battle. The temple was then erected beside the temple of Vesta and the fountain of Juturna, where the men had watered their horses and announced Rome's victory.

⁷³ For a discussion of how the *transvectio equitum* became associated with the commemoration of this event, sources, and bibliography, see Latham (2016) 81–2; Sumi (2009) 179–81; Poulsen (1991) 122–3.

⁷⁴ See Davenport (2018) 381–2 for a brief discussion of the main components of the parade and references to the relevant ancient sources. The most complete ancient account comes from Dionysius of Halicarnassus (6.13.4).

⁷⁵ Suet. *Aug.* 38.3.

⁷⁶ As stated by Augustus in his *Res Gestae*, it was the *equites* who acclaimed Gaius and Lucius with the title *princeps iuventutis* (*equites [a]utem Romani universi principem iuventutis appellaverunt*, RG 14.2). Cooley (2009: 166) discusses the ideological significance of this title.

of potential heirs and imperial succession.⁷⁷ Although several other ‘imperial princes’, such as Germanicus and Drusus, and most importantly for the current discussion, Nero and Drusus, were not officially acclaimed as *principes iuventutis*,⁷⁸ there is evidence of their connection to the *transvectio equitum* – albeit after their deaths. Tacitus records that Tiberius ordered the company (*turmae*) to follow behind Germanicus’ image on the 15 July.⁷⁹ While Tacitus does not explicitly identify this procession as the *transvectio equitum*, the date (15 July) and the link to the equestrian order in the preceding sentence suggest that we should interpret this honour as relating to this procession specifically.⁸⁰ Drusus was also most likely added to the parade in 23 CE.⁸¹ Following this precedent, it is likely that Caligula ordered his brothers’ images to take this place of honour as well.

The newly revived *transvectio* itself came to connect the ideological power of the *equites* with the princeps and members of his family, both living and dead, securing their inclusion into the ‘new more monarchical Roman societal framework’.⁸² This appropriation of the *transvectio equitum* thus serves as another instance whereby a Republican procession was adapted to actively promote the imperial family,⁸³ similar to the *pompa triumphalis* and *pompa circensis* discussed above. The inclusion of images of deceased family members in the parade further strengthened the connection between the *equites* and the imperial family. In Caligula’s case, this bond was further strengthened through the inclusion of the most distinguished of the equestrians in Caligula’s own procession of his family’s ashes (Suet. *Calig.* 15.1)

In addition to the Dioscuri’s role as saviours of Rome, the Dioscuri likely serve another ideological purpose. In Greek traditions, the divine Polydeuces (Pollux) shared his immortality with his dying brother Castor.⁸⁴ Roman adaptations of this tradition included the feature of shared immortality as a symbol of fraternal piety and Castor’s divine elevation as promoting a mortal’s ability to gain immortality.⁸⁵ When Tiberius returned from Germany, he celebrated a

⁷⁷ Gartrell (2021: 151) argues that the connection between the Dioscuri and pairs of successors came from Greece and Asia Minor.

⁷⁸ Although not a *principes iuventutis*, in Ovid’s *Epistulae ex Ponto* (2.5.41), Germanicus is referred to as *iuvenum princeps*.

⁷⁹ *institutque uti turmae idibus Iulii imaginem eius sequerentur*, Tac. *Ann.* 2.83. It is worth noting that amongst the list of honours recounted here, it also stipulates that Germanicus’ image was included in the *pompa circensis* too.

⁸⁰ *equester ordo cuneum Germanici appellavit qui iuniorum dicebatur* (‘The equestrian order renamed their division of seats in the theatre which had been called ‘junior’ after Germanicus’, Tac. *Ann.* 2.83).

⁸¹ The surviving evidence for this is fragmentary. See *CIL* 6.31200 and Lott (2012) 316 for fragments and commentary.

⁸² Davenport (2018) 385.

⁸³ Poulsen (1991) 122–3.

⁸⁴ Pind. *Nem.* 10.49–91.

⁸⁵ See McIntyre (2018) 163; Sumi (2009) 183. For example, Val. Max. 5.5 showcases Tiberius and Drusus’ fraternal piety by comparing them with Castor and Pollux. This connection to the Dioscuri could also help ‘smooth over’ fraternal conflict, see Germanicus and Drusus’ *concordia* (Tac. *Ann.* 2.43.6) and conflict (Tac. *Ann.* 4.60).

triumph and with the spoils he dedicated both the temple of Concord and the temple of Pollux and Castor.⁸⁶ The latter he dedicated not only in his name, but also included the name of his brother Drusus, exemplifying his fraternal piety in monumental form.⁸⁷ By rededicating this temple of Castor as the temple of Pollux and Castor, Tiberius is setting himself up as 'Pollux' and his brother up as 'Castor'. Pollux, the son of a god, shares his divinity with his mortal brother after his death and here Tiberius is responsible for bestowing a quasi-divine status on his own dead brother.⁸⁸ In Ovid's *Fasti*, the connection between the 'divinity' of the dedicators and the divinity of the recipients is made explicit: Tiberius and Drusus, brothers from the race of gods (*fratres de gente deorum*), dedicated this temple to Castor and Pollux, the brother gods (*fratres dei*).⁸⁹

Both Suetonius and Cassius Dio suggest that Caligula was also responsible for some renovations of this same temple.⁹⁰ Suetonius' thematic, rather than chronological, structure for his narrative prevents scholars from securely dating this supposed renovation.⁹¹ Cassius Dio's description appears in Book 59, which largely presents events that occurred in 40 CE, although its immediate context is within a more general narrative of imperial cult practices and Caligula's interactions with the divine. For the most part, interpretations of these passages hint at Caligula's inappropriate treatment of the gods and his own claim to divinity and that the renovations might be entirely fictional. If the renovations did in fact occur, the successive issues may follow in the tradition of other 'architecture' coin types, such as the Augustan coins depicting the Temple of Mars Ultor.⁹² However, given that these coins do not have

⁸⁶ Suet. *Tib.* 20; Cass. Dio 55.27.

⁸⁷ Cassius Dio 55.1–2 also preserves a tradition which identifies an omen appearing upon Drusus' death (two youths riding through the camp, identified as Castor and Pollux), although Champlin (2011: 76) notes that this is the first time they had heralded disaster rather than victory.

⁸⁸ Champlin (2011) 90. Ironically, Drusus is linked with Castor, breaker of horses, especially poignant considering that it was the fall from a horse which ultimately led to his death.

⁸⁹ *At quae venturas praecedit sexta Kalendas, | hac sunt Ledaëis templa dicata deis: | fratribus illa deis fratres de gente deorum | circa Iuturnae composuere lacus*, ('On the six day before the Kalends, a temple was dedicated to Leda's divine sons: brothers of the race of gods built that temple to the brother gods near the pool of Iuturna', Ov. *Fast.* 1.705–8)

⁹⁰ *Atque aede Castoris et Pollucis in vestibulum transfigurata, consistens saepe inter fratres deos, medium adorandum se adeuntibus exhibebat; et quidam eum Latiarem Ioven consalutarunt* ('And after the temple of Castor and Pollux had been transformed into a vestibule, often placing himself between the brother gods, he displayed himself in their midst to be adored by those approaching, and some addressed him as Jupiter Latiaris,' Suet. *Calig.* 22); τό τε Διοσκόρειον τὸ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ τῇ Ῥωμιάᾳ ὄν διατεμὼν διὰ μέσου τῶν ἀγαλμάτων ἔσοδον δι' αὐτοῦ ἐς τὸ παλάτιον ἐποιήσατο, ὅπως καὶ πλωροῦς τοὺς Διοσκόρους, ὡς γὰρ καὶ ἔλεγε, ἐχῆ ('Cutting the temple of the Dioscuri in the Roman Forum through the middle of the statues of the gods, he made an access through it to the Palatine, in order, as he would say, that he might have the Dioscuri as gate-keepers', Cass. Dio 59.28.5)

⁹¹ For a discussion of Suetonius' style and the structure of the *Lives*, see Wallace-Hadrill (1983). The veracity of the 'renovations' is also called into question due to the lack of archaeological evidence supporting such a major modification to the building. Hurlley (1993: 87) states that much of what is claimed to have been done already existed, with references.

⁹² Elkins (2015) discusses a number of 'architectural' coin types and how these images were meant to evoke the building but not necessarily provide an accurate representation. In his

any explicit 'architectural' component to them, it is more likely that the desire to evoke the Dioscuri through this imagery is not connected directly with the renovations but is of greater ideological significance.⁹³

The inclusion of both living and deceased family members in the *transvectio equitum* and both Tiberius' and Caligula's restoration and renovation of the Temple of Castor in the Forum directly connected the imperial family to the Dioscuri. The Dioscuri as symbols of both fraternal piety and succession, as promoted in the early decades CE, added a further layer of meaning that could be deployed by those using their images. Although there is no evidence to prove that either of Caligula's brothers received the title *princeps iuventutis* or ever led the *transvectio equitum*, Suetonius (*Tib.* 54) suggests that Tiberius looked to Drusus and Nero after the deaths of Germanicus and Drusus.⁹⁴ Following their own deaths and the rehabilitation of their memory, Caligula modelled the commemoration of his brothers on previous honours. As with previous pairs of 'successors' who died before they were able to fulfil their roles, Caligula was able to evoke the memory of his brothers through spectacle and *monumenta*.

Conclusion

Caligula's three 'parading' coins discussed in this article commemorated his father, mother, and brothers, all of whom had been 'mistreated' by Tiberius. Upon his accession, Caligula had not achieved any military or political victories of his own. This was his first real foray into public life. If we interpret his coins in terms of advertising ancestral deeds and actions to promote and build consensus for one's own position, we can see that these coin types follow a similar tradition to the use of ancestors by late Republican moneyers, where the bulk of these coins depict ancestors in order to evoke their memory. Each of Caligula's family coins contains underlying traditionalism or Republican themes which are then overlaid with ideas of dynastic imperial power.

The *pompa triumphalis*, *pompa circensis*, and *transvectio equitum* were key to the construction and promotion of the imperial family. As Caligula searched for ways to commemorate his father and rehabilitate the memory of his mother and brothers, he only had to look to the series of honours and traditions

discussion of the Temple of Mars Ultor (pp. 61–3), he argues that coins were minted immediately after the decree of the Senate in c. 20 BCE, and coins continued to be minted with different depictions of the temple during its period of construction.

⁹³ The renovation of the temple could also be an ideological attempt for Caligula (as Pollux) to share divinity with his mortal brothers (Castor), just as Tiberius had done with his brother Drusus. One could consider the Dioscuri coin and these ideas of quasi-divinity in connection with Caligula's coins promoting his sisters and the later deification of his sister Drusilla, although this is beyond the scope of the current study.

⁹⁴ Horster (2011: 73–103) and Poulsen (1991: 129) suggest that Drusus and Nero were also promoted as examples of fraternal piety. Bannon (1997: 178–81) discusses the importance of *pietas* for the pairs of imperial successors (Gaius and Lucius, Tiberius and Drusus, Drusus and Germanicus, and potentially Drusus and Nero) as well as the problems associated with fraternal rivalry.

which had become well established. Commemorating his father's triumph of 17 CE some twenty years later allowed Caligula to remind people of his father's military successes, how he could fulfil 'the prayers of the Roman people' (Suet. *Calig.* 13) and follow in his father's footsteps. Adapting the honour of the *carpentum* used for Livia to carry the image of his mother in the *pompa circensis* furthered that procession's importance for commemorating imperial family members and constructing imperial lineages. The link drawn between his brothers, the Dioscuri, and the *transvectio equitum* showcases Caligula's own fraternal piety as well as the continued importance of the equites for the imperial family. The depiction of these important processions as part of his commemoration of deceased family members on several coins served as a visual parade of ancestors and created permanent *monumenta* of these public performances of power.

Acknowledgements. I would like to express my gratitude to members of the *Working Group in Roman History* for their helpful feedback on an earlier draft of this article. I would also like to thank the audiences at the *Annual Meeting of the Australasian Society for Classical Studies* in 2022 and several seminars, workshops, and public talks in 2019 for their helpful feedback as I workshoped different interpretations of Caligula's use of family on his coinage. Thanks are also due to the anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions and bibliography. All remaining errors are my own.

Bibliography

- Abaecherli, A. L. (1935–1936), 'Fercula, Carpenta, and Tensae in the Roman Procession', *Bollentino dell'Associazione internazionale degli studi mediterranei* 6, 1–28.
- Alföldi, A. (1956), 'The Main Aspects of Political Propaganda on the Coinage of the Roman Republic', in Carson and Sutherland (1956), 63–95.
- Ando, C. (2000), *Imperial Ideology and the Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*. Berkeley.
- Arena, P. (2009), 'The *Pompa Circensis* and the *Domus Augusta* (1st–2nd Century A.D.)', in O. Hekster, S. Schmidt-Hofner, and C. Witschel (eds.), *Ritual Dynamics and Religious Change in the Roman Empire: Proceedings of the Eighth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Heidelberg, July 5–7, 2007)*. Leiden, 77–93.
- Bannon, C. J. (1997), *The Brothers of Romulus. Fraternal 'Pietas' in Roman Law, Literature, and Society*. Princeton.
- Barrett, A. A. (2015), *Caligula: The Abuse of Power*. 2nd edn. London.
- Beard, M. (2007), *The Roman Triumph*. Cambridge.
- Bell, A. (2004), *Spectacular Power in the Greek and Roman City*. Oxford.
- Brilliant, R. (1999), "'Let the Trumpets Roar!' The Roman Triumph", in B. Bergmann and C. Kondoleon (eds.), *The Art of Ancient Spectacle*. New Haven, 221–9.
- Carson, R. A. G. and Sutherland, C. H. V. (eds.) (1956), *Essays in Roman Coinage Presented to Harold Mattingly*. Oxford.
- Champlin, E. (2011), 'Tiberius and the Heavenly Twins', *JRS* 101, 73–99.
- Cheung, A. (1999), 'The Political Significance of Roman Imperial Coin Types', *GNS* 48/9, 53–61.
- Cooley, A. E. (2009), *Res Gestae Divi Augusti. Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Cambridge.
- Davenport, C. (2018), *A History of the Roman Equestrian Order*. Cambridge.
- Elkins, N. (2015), *Monuments in Miniature: Architecture on Roman Coinage*. New York.
- Favro, D. (2014), 'Moving Events: Curating the Memory of the Roman Triumph', in K. Galinsky (ed.), *Memoria Romana: Memory in Rome and Rome in Memory*. Ann Arbor, 85–101.
- Ferrary, J. L. and Scheid, J. (eds.) (2015), *Il princeps romano: Autocrate o magistrato? Fattori giuridici e fattori sociali del potere imperiale da Augusto a Commodo*. Pavia.

- Flaig, E. (2015), 'A Coherent Model to Understand the Roman Principate: 'Acceptance' instead of 'Legitimacy' and the Problem of Usurpation', in Ferrary and Scheid (2015), 81–100.
- Flory, M. B. (1998), 'The Integration of Women into the Roman Triumph', *Historia* 47, 489–94.
- Flower, H. I. (1996), *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*. Oxford.
- Foubert, L. (2015), 'Vesta and Julio-Claudian Women in Imperial Propaganda', *AncSoc* 45, 187–204.
- Gartrell, A. (2021), *The Cult of Castor and Pollux in Ancient Rome: Myth, Ritual, and Society*. Cambridge.
- Ginsburg, J. (2006), *Representing Agrippina: Constructions of Female Power in the Early Roman Empire*. Oxford.
- Hickson, F. V. (1991), 'Augustus Triumphant: Manipulation of the Triumphal Theme in the Political Programme of Augustus', *Latomus* 50, 124–38.
- Hölkeskamp, K. -J. (2017), *Libera Res Publica. Die politische Kultur des antiken Rom – Positionen und Perspektiven*. Stuttgart.
- Hölscher, T. (2006), 'The Transformation of Victory into Power: From Event to Structure', in S. Dillon and K. E. Welch (eds.), *Representations of War in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge, 27–48.
- Horster, M. (2011), 'Princeps Iuuentutis. Concept, Realisation, Representation', in S. Benoist, A. Daguët-Gagey and C. Hoët-van Cauwenberghe (eds.), *Figures d'empire, fragments de mémoire. pouvoirs et identités dans le monde romain impérial (II^e s. av. n. è. – VI^e s. de n. è.)*. Villeneuve-d'Ascq, 73–103.
- Hudson, J. (2016), 'Carpento certe: Conveying Gender in Roman Transportation', *ClAnt* 35, 215–46.
- Hudson, J. (2021), *The Rhetoric of Roman Transportation. Vehicles in Latin Literature*. Cambridge.
- Hurley, D. W. (1989), 'Gaius Caligula in the Germanicus Tradition', *AJPh* 110, 316–38.
- Hurley, D. W. (1993), *An Historical and Historiographical Commentary on Suetonius' Life of C. Caligula*. Atlanta.
- Jones, A. H. M. (1956), 'Numismatics and History', in Carson and Sutherland (1956), 13–33.
- Jucker, H. (1980), 'Zum Carpentum-Sesterz der Agrippina maior', in F. Krininger (ed.), *Forschungen und Funde. Festschrift Bernhard Neutsch*. Innsbruck, 205–17.
- Kemmers, F. (2019), *The Functions and Use of Roman Coinage. An Overview of 21st Century Scholarship*. Leiden.
- Latham, J. A. (2016), *Performance, Memory, and Processions in Ancient Rome: The Pompa Circensis from the Late Republic to Late Antiquity*. Cambridge.
- Lendon, J. E. (2006), 'The Legitimacy of the Roman Emperor: Against Weberian Legitimacy and Imperial "Strategies of Legitimation"', in A. Kolb (ed.), *Herrschaftsstrukturen und Herrschaftspraxis. Konzepte, Prinzipien und Strategien der Administration im römischen Kaiserreich*. Berlin, 53–63.
- Levick, B. (1982), 'Propaganda and the Imperial Coinage', *Antichthon* 16, 104–16.
- Lindsay, H. (ed.) (1993), *Suetonius. Caligula*. London.
- Lott, J. B. (2012), *Death and Dynasty in Early Imperial Rome. Key Sources with Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Cambridge.
- Lucchi, G. (1968), 'Sul Significato Del Carpentum Nella Monetazione Romana Imperiale', *RIN* 70, 131–43.
- Meadows, A. and Williams, J. (2001), 'Moneta and the Monuments: Coinage and Politics in Republican Rome', *JRS* 91, 27–49.
- McIntyre, G. (2017), 'Uniting the Army: The Use of Rituals Commemorating Germanicus to Create an Imperial Identity', in W. Vanacker and A. Zuiderhoek (eds.), *Imperial Identities in the Roman World*. London, 78–92.
- McIntyre, G. (2018), 'Maxentius, the Dioscuri, and the Legitimation of Imperial Power', *Antichthon* 52, 161–80.
- Noreña, C. F. (2011), 'Coins and Communication', in M. Peachin (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman World*. Oxford, 248–68.
- Osgood, J. (2013), 'Suetonius and the Succession to Augustus', in A. G. G. Gibson (ed.), *The Julio-Claudian Succession: Reality and Perception of the 'Augustan Model'*. Leiden, 19–40.
- Pagnotta, M. A. (1977–1978), 'Carpentum. Privilegio del carro e ruolo sociale della matrona romana', *AFLPer(class)* 15, 157–70.
- Poulsen, B. (1991), 'The Dioscuri and Ruler Ideology', *SO* 66, 119–46.

- Rich, J. (2015), 'Consensus Rituals and the Origins of the Principate', in Ferrary and Scheid (2015), 101–38.
- Rose, C. B. (1997), *Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio-Claudian Period*. Cambridge.
- Rowan, C. (2016), 'Ambiguity, Iconology and Entangled Objects on Coinage of the Republican World', *JRS* 106, 21–57.
- Rowan, C. (2019), *From Caesar to Augustus (c.49 BC – AD 14). Using Coins as Sources*. Cambridge.
- Sumi, G. S. (2002), 'Spectacles and Sulla's Public Image', *Historia* 51, 414–32.
- Sumi, G. S. (2009), 'Monuments and Memory: The Aedes Castoris in the Formation of Augustan Ideology', *CQ* 59, 167–86.
- Sutherland, C. H. V. (1983), 'The Purpose of Roman Imperial Coin Types', *RN* 6, 73–82.
- Sutherland, C. H. V. (1986), 'Compliment or Complement? Dr Levick on Imperial Coin Types', *NC* 146, 85–93.
- Trillmich, W. (1978), *Familienpropaganda der Kaiser Caligula und Claudius. Agrippina Maior und Antonia Augusta auf Münzen*. Berlin.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1983), *Suetonius: The Scholar and His Caesars*. London.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1986), 'Image and Authority in the Coinage of Augustus', *JRS* 76, 66–87.
- Wardle, D. (1994), *Suetonius' Life of Caligula. A Commentary*. Brussels.
- Wolters, R. (2012), 'The Julio-Claudians', in W. E. Metcalf (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Coinage*. Oxford, 335–55.
- Wood, S. (1988), 'Memoriae Agrippinae: Agrippina the Elder in Julio-Claudian Art and Propaganda', *AJA* 92, 409–26.
- Wood, S. (1995), 'Diva Drusilla Panthea and the Sisters of Caligula', *AJA* 99, 457–82.
- Wood, S. E. (1999), *Imperial Women. A Study in Public Images, 40 BC – AD 68*. Leiden.
- Woytek, B. E. (2022), 'The Imperial Afterlife of Roman Republican Coins and the Phenomenon of the Restored Denarii', in J. Mairat, A. Wilson, and C. Howgego (eds.), *Coin Hoards and Hoarding in the Roman World*. Oxford, 237–72.

Cite this article: McIntyre G (2023). Commemorating the Past and Performing Power: Parades of Ancestors on Caligula's Coinage. *Antichthon* 57, 137–157. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ann.2023.8>