AMERICAN JOURNAL OF NUMISMATICS

33

Second Series, continuing
The American Numismatic Society Museum Notes

THE AMERICAN NUMISMATIC SOCIETY
NEW YORK
2021

© 2021 The American Numismatic Society

ISSN: 1053-8356
ISBN 978-0-89722-375-1

Printed in Canada

Contents

Editorial Committee v

Giuseppe Castellano. XRF Analysis of the Volterra Hoard and a Sample of the Earliest Etruscan Coinage 1

Metodi Manov. An Obverse Die Wrongly Ascribed to a Tetradrachm Struck at Kabyle in the Third Century BC 33

Yoav Farhi, Yuval Gadot, Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming. A Note on Two Unique Seleucid Bronze Coins from Ramat Raḥel, Israel 45

Daniel Wolf. A Metrological Survey of Ptolemaic Bronze Coins II: Alexandria First and Second Centuries BC 57

Eneko Hiriart and Julia Genechesi. Gold and Silver "Ingots" across Celtic Continental Europe: A Monetary Use? 121

Katheryn Whitcomb. Coinage and the Client Prince: Philip the Tetrarch's Homage to the Roman Emperor 141

Sven Betjes. Hadrian, the Pantheon and the Ideological Resonance of the Third Consulship 161

Ronald Bude and Erin Bigelow. Non-Invasive Detection of a "Cut and Shut" Ancient Coin Forgery Using Micro-Computed Tomography 185

Pushkar Sohoni and Pallavee Gokhale. Strike Two: Afterlife of Bahmani Coinage 189

Samuel G. Kramer. The Livonese of 1756–1760: Centralizing Economic Policy in Estonia and Livonia 211

Bill Dalzell. The Origins and Context of the First Coinage for Liberia 229

American Journal of Numismatics

Nathan T. Elkins
David Yoon
Editors

Oliver D. Hoover
Managing Editor

Editorial Committee

John W. Adams
Boston, Massachusetts

Jere L. Bacharach
University of Washington

Gilles Bransbourg
American Numismatic Society

Andrew Burnett
British Museum

Wolfgang Fischer-Bossert
Austrian Academy of Science

Suzanne Frey-Kupper
University of Warwick

Evridiki Georganteli
Harvard University

Kenneth W. Harl
Tulane University

Jonathan Kagan
New York, New York

Paul T. Keyser
Relativity

John M. Kleeberg
New York, New York

John H. Kroll
Oxford, England

Ira Rezak
Stony Brook, New York

Stuart D. Sears
Westport, Massachusetts

Peter van Alfen
American Numismatic Society

Bernhard Weisser
Münzkabinett
Staatliche Museen zu Berlin

AJN Second Series 33 (2021) pp. 161–184
© 2021 The American Numismatic Society

Hadrian, the Pantheon and the Ideological Resonance of the Third Consulship

Sven Betjes*

A reference to Agrippa's third consulship features prominently on the inscription that is still visible on the Pantheon in Rome. As the building and its inscription are now understood as a second-century CE restoration of Agrippa's original edifice, the inscription is exceptional in leaving out any reference to the restorer. I aim to understand this inscription in its second-century context by stressing the prominence of the third consulship, which corresponds to a similar prominence on Hadrian's coinage. I argue that the emphasis on the third consulship meant to give expression to the idea of Hadrian as *primus inter pares*.

The inscription M AGRIPPA L F COS TERTIVM FECIT on the façade of the Pantheon is still one of the most conspicuous inscriptions from the city of Rome (Fig. 1, below).[1] Now properly dated to the first half of the second century CE, the period when the Pantheon was restored after a series of calamitous events, it is in recent scholarship assumed to shed light on the political climate of the day. Especially the notable absence of the restorer of the building in the inscription has led scholars to interpret it variously. As a consequence, the inscription has been understood as a token of Hadrian's devotion to Augustus, as an attempt

* Radboud University Nijmegen (S.Betjes@let.ru.nl).

1. *CIL* VI 896/1.

Figure 1. The Pantheon inscription (Photo by author).

to reach out to the Senate, and even as a conscious means to avoid linking the emperor to the building.[2] Although each of these interpretations provides us with useful insights into the Hadrianic age, they have left unexplored the fact that—if one follows the now commonly accepted chronology—the Pantheon inscription highlighted the third consulship at about the same time that we also find this emphasis in Hadrian's coinage across all denominations.[3] This article will, therefore, examine this correspondence between the building's completion and the remarkable transformations occurring in Hadrian's numismatic formula, suggesting that this may have been part of a concerted effort to propagate the emperor's *moderatio*. It does so by first surveying our current understanding of the second-century CE Pantheon and its inscription before delving into developments contemporary with the final stages of the Pantheon's restoration.

RECONSTRUCTING THE PANTHEON

On account of the complete absence of the name of the emperor responsible for restoring the Pantheon, its inscription misled both onlookers and scholars for centuries into believing that it was Augustus' trusted companion Agrippa who

2. For the inscription as part of Hadrian's devotion to Augustus, see M. T. Boatwright, "Hadrian and the Agrippa Inscription of the Pantheon," in *Hadrian. Art, Politics and Economy*, ed T. Opper (London: British Museum Press, 2013), 25–26. Hadrian reaching out to the Senate: C. J. Simpson, "The Pantheon's Inscription, *CIL* 6.896. Its Date of Composition, Cultural Context, and 'Message,'" *Athenaeum* 97 (2009), 150–157. The inscription as a means to detach Hadrian from the Pantheon: M. Wilson Jones, "Who Built the Pantheon? Agrippa, Apollodorus, Hadrian and Trajan," in *Hadrian. Art, Politics and Economy*, ed. T. Opper (London: British Museum Press, 2013), 41–42. For the latter, also see n. 39.

3. For the dating of the restoration and dedication of the Pantheon, see Wilson Jones, "Who," 37; M. Wilson Jones, "Building on Adversity: the Pantheon and the Problems with its Construction," in *The Pantheon. From Antiquity to the Present*, ed. T. A. Marder and M. Wilson Jones (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 224–226. As for the coinage, this article follows the chronology as presented in the new volume of *The Roman Imperial Coinage* on the coinage of Hadrian by Richard Abdy: *RIC* II^3 Hadrian, 9–35. On the complexity of dating Hadrian's coinage, see M. Beckmann, "The Gold Coinage of Hadrian, AD 130–138," *AJN* 31 (2019), 145–146.

built the building still visible today. It was only in the late nineteenth century that Heinrich Dressel and Georges Chédanne used brick stamps to date the building to the first half of the second century CE.[4] Julien Guey and Herbert Bloch narrowed the time period to the reign of Hadrian, but later scholars argued for an earlier date.[5] Based on the Trajanic date of the majority of brick stamps, Lise Hetland argued that Trajan was not only the instigator of the project, but also the one under whose reign most of the work was completed.[6] With this, she furthered the argument of Wolf-Dieter Heilmeyer, who, based on stylistic similarities with buildings designed by Apollodorus of Damascus, had seen Trajan's architect in the reconstructed Pantheon.[7] Nevertheless, it appears that Trajan did not survive to see the building completed, and Mark Wilson Jones suggested that his successor Hadrian was responsible for the portico and the building's eventual completion, based on a Hadrianic brick stamp in the Pantheon that dates to 123 CE.[8] Wilson Jones argued that because the construction of the portico would not have taken as long as the complex rotunda structure, Hadrian probably dedicated the Pantheon quite early during his stay in Rome between 125 and 128 CE.[9]

Although Hadrian may have been nothing more than the one completing the restoration of the Pantheon, he received full credit in the *Historia Augusta*.[10] The

4. H. Dressel, *Untersuchungen über die Chronologie der Ziegelstempel der Gens Domitia* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1886); H. Dressel, *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Vol. 15. Part 1. (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1891). For Chédanne's views see R. P. Spiers, "Monsieur Chédanne's Drawings of the Pantheon," *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects* 2 (1895), 175–182; with W. C. Loerke, "Georges Chédanne and the Pantheon. A Beaux-Arts Contribution to the History of Roman Architecture," *Modulus* 4 (1982), 40–55. For an overview of the scholarship on who was responsible for the Pantheon, see Wilson Jones, "Who." On the importance of brickstamps in the debate see M. L. Hetland, "New Perspective on the Dating of the Pantheon," in *The Pantheon. From Antiquity to the Present*, ed. T. A. Marder and M. Wilson Jones (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 83–89.

5. J. Guey, "Devrai-on dire: le Panthéon de Septime Sévère? A propos des estampilles sur briques recueillies dans ce monument notamment en 1930 ou en 1931 et depuis," *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire* 53 (1936), 198–249; H. Bloch, *I bolli laterizi e la storia edilizia romana. Contributi all'archeologia e alla storia romana* (Rome: Comune di Roma, Ripartizione antichità e belle arti, 1947), 14–26.

6. L. M. Hetland, "Dating the Pantheon," *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 20.1 (2007), 5–112; Hetland, "New Perspective."

7. W.-D. Heilmeyer, "Apollodorus von Damaskus, der Architekt des Pantheon." *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 90 (1975), 316–347.

8. Wilson Jones, "Who," 37; Wilson Jones, "Building," 224–226.

9. Wilson Jones, "Who," 37; Wilson Jones, "Building," 225–226.

10. *SHA* Hadrian 19.10. For Hadrianic building activity at the Campus Martius, see M. T. Boatwright, *Hadrian and the City of Rome* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 42–49.

Pantheon is mentioned among many other buildings of the Campus Martius that were supposedly restored by Hadrian, including the Saepta Julia, the Basilica of Neptune, and the baths of Agrippa. Known collectively as the *monumenta Agrippae*,[11] these structures were all part of the construction project undertaken by Agrippa on the Campus Martius.[12] They had been damaged by fire in 80 CE, after which Domitian saw to their restoration, but the buildings seem to have been even more severely harmed in the conflagration of 110 CE.[13] Following the *Historia Augusta*, Hadrian stepped in to restore the area to its former glory, thus implying that he connected his own name with an area that was strongly reminiscent of Augustus and Agrippa. The Pantheon itself played an important part in the ideological connection with Augustus in that its façade faced the first *princeps*' mausoleum, a feature that remained unaltered after its restoration.[14] Any emperor who would subsequently make an impact on the topography of the Campus Martius thereby automatically created a link between himself and the golden age of Augustus.[15]

Given that the Pantheon was part of an integrated structure, even being physically linked to the Basilica of Neptune, we may assume that the restoration of at least some of the *monumenta Agrippae* had already started during the reign of Trajan as well.[16] There are nevertheless good grounds for seeing the Campus Martius and—by extension—the Pantheon as a useful ideological device for Hadrian, the emperor under whose reign (most of) the project was completed.[17]

11. Tac. *Ann.* 15.39.

12. Dio 53.27.1–2, with J.-M. Roddaz, *Marcus Agrippa* (Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 1984), 252–291; L. Haselberger, *Urbem Adornare. Die Stadt Rom und ihre Gestaltumwandlung unter Augustus = Rome's Urban Metamorphosis under Augustus*, trans. A. Thein (Portsmouth, RI: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 2007) 100–128.

13. The fire of 80 damaging many of the *monumenta Agrippae*: Dio 66.24.2. Domitian's restorations: *Chronogr. A.* 354; Hier. *Chron. A. Abr.* 2105. Fire of 110: Oros. *Hist.* 7.12.5; Hier. *Chron. A. Abr.* 2126. Also see Ziolkowski 1999, 54; Hetland, "New Perspective," 94–95.

14. Haselberger, *Urbem*, 114–115; Wilson Jones, "Who," 30–31.

15. For the reign of Augustus and the *saeculum aureum* as synonyms, see H. Bellen, "SAEC(ulum) AVR(eum). Das Säkularbewusstsein des Kaisers Hadrian im Spiegel der Münzen," in *Politik, Recht, Gesellschaft. Studien zur Alten Geschichte*, ed. H. Bellen (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1997), 136, with further references.

16. For the Pantheon as part of an integrated structure, see J. DeLaine, "The Pantheon Builders. Estimating Manpower for Construction," in *The Pantheon. From Antiquity to the Present*, ed. T. A. Marder and M. Wilson Jones (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 190.

17. The idea that Hadrian was indeed the one to complete the restoration of most of the *monumenta Agrippae* is further corroborated by the lack of Trajanic evidence for the other buildings. See for example the discussions on the restoration of the Saepta Julia and the baths of Agrippa by H. Bloch, "I bolli laterizi e la storia edilizia romana," *Bullettino della Com-*

Only completing a building of a predecessor had not stopped many earlier emperors from adding their name to, or even taking full credit for, a project. In addition, cementing his name in the topography of the Campus Martius had some obvious benefits to which Hadrian would undoubtedly have subscribed. Perhaps in a more notable fashion than his predecessors, Hadrian was no stranger to aligning his image with Augustus.[18] In both his political actions and in his visual image, a number of Augustan elements can be discerned. Among the most notable of these are Hadrian's emulation of Augustus in accepting the title *pater patriae* at quite a late stage (in 128 CE) as well as the fact that he was the first since Augustus to be initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries.[19] It should be expected that when he dedicated the Pantheon in the mid-120s, Hadrian took the chance to link his own name to the legacy of Agrippa, and by extension to Augustus, on account of his concerted efforts to connect with Augustus elsewhere. However, if the Pantheon was indeed put to ideological use by Hadrian, why then did he omit to mention his own name in the inscription as so many of his predecessors had done before him?

INTERPRETING THE AGRIPPA INSCRIPTION

After the Pantheon was reinterpreted as a second-century CE restoration, some scholars believed the inscription to be the actual inscription that was placed on the façade, whereas others thought it to be a verbatim replication of the original.[20] However, as has been recently argued by Mary Boatwright, the former seems rather impossible, whereas the latter is unsure at best.[21] Following Géza Alföldy, Boatwright pointed to the remarkable size of the letters of the Pantheon

misione Archeologica Comunale di Roma 64 (1937–1938), 110–111, and G. Ghini, "Thermae Agrippae," in *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, Vol. 5, ed. E. M. Steinby (Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1999), 40–42, respectively.

18. For Hadrian's predecessors referring to Augustus for legitimacy, see E. Lyasse, *Le principat et son fondateur: l'utilisation de la référence à Auguste de Tibère à Trajan* (Bruxelles: Latomus, 2008).

19. On the late acceptance of *pater patriae* by Augustus and Hadrian see T. Stevenson, "Roman Coins and Refusals of the Title *Pater Patriae*," *NC* 167 (2007), 120–121, 129–130. Hadrian's initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries was even celebrated by a *cistophorus* connecting Hadrian to Augustus, on which see D. Kienast, "Hadrian, Augustus und die eleusinischen Mysterien," *JNG* 10 (1959–1960), 61–69; W. E. Metcalf, *The Cistophori of Hadrian* (New York: American Numismatic Society, 1980), 89–90. Also see T. Opper, *Hadrian. Empire and Conflict* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008), 54–55, for more personal aspects of Hadrian's attention to Augustus.

20. See Boatwright, "Hadrian," 26 n. 33 for references.

21. Boatwright, "Hadrian."

inscription as well as the fact that they were originally gilded.[22] The letters, 70 cm in height, are the tallest bronze letters of all of the inscriptions found in Rome, with the letters from the Temple of Castor and Pollux, measuring 53 cm at their tallest, coming in second.[23] Furthermore, gilded bronze letters only seem to have become common from 17 BCE onwards, almost a decade after the completion of Agrippa's Pantheon in 25 BCE.[24] The original Pantheon may have been meant to appear as a magnificent building from the outset,[25] yet it is unlikely to have tried to outshine all of the other Augustan monuments in such an ostentatious way. Therefore, the inscription as seen on the Pantheon today was almost certainly not part of the original edifice of Agrippa, nor a close copy of the original inscription.

Just because the inscription is unlikely to have been part of the original structure does not automatically make it Hadrian's doing.[26] Yet here is where we should discuss the remarkable fact that the person responsible for the restoration of the Pantheon is left unmentioned. The *Historia Augusta* claimed that Hadrian "dedicated all of [the buildings he restored] in the names of their original

22. G. Alföldy, *Der Obelisk auf dem Petersplatz in Rome. Ein historisches Monument der Antike* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1990), 72–73; Boatwright, "Hadrian," 23.

23. G. Alföldy, *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.* Volume VI. Part 8, Fas. 2. *Titulos Imperatorum Domusque eorum Thesauro Schedarum Imaginumque ampliato* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1996), 4387.

24. Alföldy, *Der Obelisk*, 72–73. The date of 25 BC is derived from the account of Dio 53.27.2–4. For discussions on Agrippa's Pantheon, see, e.g., A. Ziolkowski, "Was Agrippa's Pantheon the Temple of Mars in Campo?" *Papers of the British School at Rome* 62 (1994), 261–277; A. Ziolkowski, "Pantheon," in *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae,*Vol. 4, ed. E. M. Steinby (Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1999), 54–56; A. Ziolkowski, "Prolegomena to any Future Methaphysics on Agrippa's Pantheon," in *Res bene gestae. Ricerche di storia urbana su Roma antica in onore di Eva Margareta Steinby*, ed. A. Leone, D. Palombi, and S. Walker (Roma: Edizioni Quasar, 2007), 465–476; A. Ziolkowski, "What did Agrippa's Pantheon Look Like? New Answers to an Old Question," in *The Pantheon in Rome. Contributions to the Conference Bern, November 9–12, 2006*, ed. G. Graßhoff, M. Heinzelmann and M. Wäfler (Bern: Bern Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science, 2009), 29–39; A. Grüner, "Das Pantheon des Agrippa: architektonische Form und urbaner Kontext," in *The Pantheon in Rome. Contributions to the Conference Bern, November 9–12, 2006*, ed. G. Graßhoff, M. Heinzelmann and M. Wäfler (Bern: Bern Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science, 2009), 41–68; E. La Rocca, "Agrippa's Pantheon and its Origin," in *The Pantheon. From Antiquity to the Present,* ed. T. A. Marder and M. Wilson Jones (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 49–78.

25. Excavations in the late 1990s made clear that the current building shows many similarities with the original structure built by Agrippa, for which see P. Virgili and P. Battistelli, "Indagini in Piazza della Rotonda e sulla Fronte del Pantheon." *Bullettino della Commisione Archeologica Comunale di Roma* 100 (1999), 137–154.

26. Ziolkowski, "Prolegomena," 465–468; Ziolkowski, "What," 38–39, for example, argued for the inscription as a posthumous honor for Agrippa. Cf. Boatwright, "Hadrian," 25.

builders,"[27] a remark to which our inscription seems to stand witness. As she compared it to actual building inscriptions as well as to similar remarks made for other emperors, Boatwright found that even though emperors were often credited for having restored a certain building in the names of the original builders only, actual building inscriptions never fail to name the restorer.[28] The Pantheon inscription stands as a remarkable exception in this, thus making Hadrian—to our present knowledge—the only emperor whose reign saw a restored building that was dedicated without openly honoring the one responsible for the restoration.[29]

It may then be surmised that the monumental inscription was a Hadrianic addition, even more so because Domitian—the emperor who had restored the Pantheon after the fire of 80 CE—was criticized for adding his own name to the buildings he restored.[30] This, too, may well have been a literary *topos* though, well-fitting the general image we gain from reading through the testimonies of Roman authors writing about the reign of Domitian.[31] Still, in the admittedly hypothetical case that the statement holds veracity for the Pantheon at least, it would have given the Hadrianic inscription all the more resonance. As a matter of fact, not only would the inscription have made Hadrian the first (and only) emperor to actualize what had until then been nothing more than an imagined virtue, but he would have done so by restoring, as opposed to renovating, a sup-

27. *SHA* Hadrian 19.10: *eaque omnia propriis auctorum nominibus consecravit.*

28. Boatwright, "Hadrian," 21–23.

29. Of course, the Pantheon is at the same time part of the tradition to which the Agrippa inscription forms an exception, for just below the Agrippa inscription is a Severan inscription that gives credit to Septimius Severus and his son Caracalla for having restored the building in 202 CE. For this inscription, see in more detail n. 64. As far as anonymous restorations during the time of Hadrian are concerned, one may draw comparisons between the Pantheon and the restoration of Augustan denarii during the age of Hadrian, which were also without an indication of Hadrian's involvement. For the anonymous restoration of Augustan coins and its Hadrianic dating, see B. Woytek and M. Blet-Lemarquand, "The C.L. CAESARES Denarii *RIC* I² Augustus 208. A Pseudo-Augustan Unsigned Restoration Issue. Corpus, Die Study, Metallurgical Analyses," *RN* 174 (2017), 183–248.

30. Suet. *Dom.* 5. Unfortunately, very little is known of Domitian's Pantheon, on which see D. Gruben and G. Gruben, "Die Türe des Pantheon," *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung* 104 (1997), 53; Ziolkowski, "What"; La Rocca, "Agrippa's Pantheon," 51, 62.

31. On which see, e.g., M. Charles, "'Calvus Nero.' Domitian and the Mechanics of Predecessor Denigration," *Acta Classica* 45 (2002), 19–49; P. Roche, "Pliny's Thanksgiving. An Introduction to the *Panegyricus*," in *Pliny's Praise. The Panegyricus in the Roman World*, ed. P. Roche (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 11–14; A. Galimberti, "The Emperor Domitian," in *A Companion to the Flavian Age of Imperial Rome*, ed. A. Zissos (Malden, MA: Wiley/Blackwell, 2016), 92–108.

posedly lost inscription. Whether it was then a verbatim rendering of the actual inscription of Agrippa or an invented inscription that was a reminiscence of an earlier inscription, is probably impossible to establish with any certainty. The coins struck with Agrippa's effigy during the reign of Caligula that surround him with the legend M AGRIPPA L F COS III, which were struck as restitution coins under Titus and (interestingly enough) Domitian, raise the impression that it was a rather stereotypical way to refer to Augustus' trusted associate.[32] If this inscription was indeed a Hadrianic invention rather than a repetition of the one that had been part of the original building of Agrippa, this also solves another problem. As a matter of fact, the neutrality of the inscription has often vexed scholars trying to uncover the function of the Agrippan edifice.[33] The inscription obviously becomes useless in answering such a question if its wording was of Hadrianic origin.[34]

However, it is not so much the original inscription that matters most to our present purpose as the fact that its eventual rendering on the second-century CE Pantheon made for an apparently unique case of omitting the name of the restorer. This is more intriguing when we consider its monumental size and gilded bronze letters. Its uniqueness has been stressed before yet there has been little headway in finding a convincing motive for its installation. Boatwright herself suggested that it may have been a Hadrianic strategy to challenge Augustan sole responsibility for Rome's embellishment.[35] Facing the Augustan mausoleum in the north, it would have made a clear statement against the *Res Gestae* found on the tomb boasting the building activities of the *princeps*.

Christopher Simpson, on the other hand, emphasized the *cos tertium* part of the inscription.[36] Underlining Agrippa's status as *privatus*, he argued for a con-

32. *RIC* I² Gaius/Caligula 58; *RIC* II², Titus 470; *RIC* II², Domitian 825.

33. On the complex discussions of the Pantheon's function that often include a consideration on the odd inscription see, e.g., W. L. MacDonald, *The Pantheon. Design, Meaning, and Progeny* (London: A. Lane, 1976), 76–93; Coarelli 1983; Godfrey and Hemsoll 1986; Ziolkowski, "Was"; Ziolkowski, "Pantheon," 56; Ziolkowski, "Prolegomena"; Ziolkowski, "What"; P. Broucke, "The First Pantheon. Architecture and Meaning (Abstract)," in *The Pantheon in Rome. Contributions to the Conference Bern, November 9–12, 2006*, ed. G. Graßhoff, M. Heinzelmann and M. Wäfler (Bern: Bern Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science, 2009), 27–28. See also E. Thomas, "The Cult Statues of the Pantheon," *Journal of Roman Studies* 107 (2017), 146–212, who by meticulously analyzing the statuary and structure of the Pantheon argues that it may well have functioned as a sundial, both in its original form erected by Agrippa and in the restoration of the second century CE.

34. On this also see Boatwright, "Hadrian," 25.

35. Boatwright, "Hadrian," 26.

36. Simpson, "The Pantheon's Inscription."

nection between the inscription and the exclusivity of a third consulship for men other than the emperor. Under Trajan this happened only three times, whereas Hadrian awarded only two men—L. Iulius Ursus Servianus and M. Annius Verus—with a third consulship.[37] Noting that Verus received this honor in 126 CE, at about the same time that the Pantheon was completed, Simpson suggested a parallel with Agrippa. After all, Agrippa was probably among the most notable *privati* to have attained this honor as a reward for his services to the Roman state. As such, the inscription was meant as an encouragement for other *privati* in the time of Hadrian to prove themselves beneficial to the state, for which the honor of a third consulship could be expected.[38]

This is an interesting suggestion, especially given the fact that it makes the inscription rather topical in contemporary politics. The idea that the people of Rome were invited to make a connection between the inscription and the political situation of their day is further augmented by a passage from Cassius Dio. It tells us that besides the more straightforward locations to hold court such as the Forum Romanum and the palace, the Pantheon was also at times used by Hadrian as some sort of audience hall.[39] And as recent surveys have made clear, such events probably took place in the building's portico, which are now known to have included stairways that served as speaker's platforms.[40] As a consequence, during some of his gatherings Hadrian would have been seated right below the

37. Under Trajan, Sex. Julius Frontinus, L. Julius Ursus, and L. Licinius Sura received this honor, the renowned former serving as consul for the third time at the same time as Trajan himself did.

38. Simpson, "The Pantheon's Inscription," 155–157. A third explanation for the unusual inscription was offered by Wilson Jones, "Who," 41–42. In his view, Hadrian tried to avoid adding his name to the building because it had been altered during its construction. It follows the author's "compromise hypothesis," which holds that the eventual *pronaos* deviated from Apollodorus's original plan by installing columns that were three meters smaller, as expressed in P. Davies, D. Hemsoll, and M. Wilson Jones, "The Pantheon. Triumph of Rome or Triumph of Compromise?" *Art History* 10 (1987), 133–153; M. Wilson Jones, *Principles of Roman Architecture* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2000); M. Wilson Jones, "The Pantheon and the Phasing of its Construction," in *The Pantheon in Rome. Contributions to the Conference Bern, November 9–12, 2006*, ed. G. Graßhoff, M. Heinzelmann, and M. Wäfler (Bern: Bern Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science, 2009), 85; Wilson Jones, "Who," 32–34, 40–41; Wilson Jones, "Building," esp. 211–224. Cf. L. Haselberger, "The Pantheon. Nagging Questions to No End," in *The Pantheon in Rome. Contributions to the Conference Bern, November 9–12, 2006*, ed. G. Graßhoff, M. Heinzelmann, and M. Wäfler (Bern: Bern Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science, 2009), 181–184.

39. Dio 69.7.1.

40. Virgili and Battistelli,"Indagini"; La Rocca, "Agrippa's Pantheon," 61; Thomas, "Cult Statues," 195.

Figure 2. The façade of the Pantheon (Photo by author).

very monumental inscription that he had installed (Fig. 2). If the message had not been clear at the moment of the building's dedication, it would surely have been driven home whenever Hadrian presided over meetings held at the Pantheon.

The question remains: what was the exact message? It seems excessive to install Rome's most sizable inscription only to make a rather implicit statement towards the Senate, as the hypothesis of Simpson implies. It may be expected that the inscription was also meant to reflect on the emperor himself. Boatwright's suggestion that it aimed to undermine Augustus' supposed sole responsibility for embellishing the city of Rome—which automatically leaves more room for Hadrian himself—could well be true but lacks supportive evidence. The alternative is to look for parallel messages expressed in other media, especially Hadrian's coinage, which exhibits a remarkable change that is more or less contemporary with the dedication of the Pantheon.[41]

41. Simpson ("The Pantheon's Inscription," 153) also noted the emphasis on the third consulship on Hadrian's coins, but did not discuss how the Pantheon inscription may have reflected on the emperor.

HADRIANVS AVGVSTVS, COS III

The reign of Hadrian saw a number of rather remarkable developments as far as numismatic representation is concerned. Irrespective of whether this had ideological motivations from the outset, his bearded effigy in sculpture and coin portraiture alike made him notably different from his clean-shaven predecessors.[42] This distinctiveness found further expression in the legend surrounding the portrait on Hadrian's coinage. After briefly following the Trajanic practice of lengthy obverse legends at the very start of his reign, the coinage soon reverted to the shorter IMP CAESAR TRAIAN HADRIANVS AVG.[43] Although differing clearly from the immense obverse legends of Trajan, the legend that was the result of this reduction still filled most of the space surrounding the portrait. When the coins really began to stand out was when the numismatic rendering of the imperial formula was—again in all denominations—even further reduced to HADRIANVS AVGVSTVS (Fig. 3, obverse).[44] The coins with this shortened legend are dated between 124 and 127 CE, thereby closely corresponding to the time of Hadrian's return from his first journey in 125 CE.[45] The seventeen-character legend was something completely different from the still circulating coins of Hadrian's predecessors that at times could have more than forty characters. The result was a message that impressed its audience not by overwhelming expansiveness but by the power of brevity. Indeed, if placed in the context of other coins that by that time would have been in circulation, the coinage of Hadrian stands out in the fact that the text surrounding the imperial portrait occupies far less space than the greater majority of the legends found on the coins of his predecessors.[46]

The transformation of the legend on the obverse coincided with the reorganization of its reverse counterpart. This side of the coin, too, had soon after Hadri-

42. On the significance of Hadrian's beard see, e.g., S. Walker, "Bearded Men," *Journal of the History of Collections* 3.2 (1991), 272–275; A. R. Birley, *Hadrian. The Restless Emperor* (London: Routledge, 1997), 61, 81.

43. *RIC* II^3, 9–10.

44. Shortening of the coin legend in this way had precedents in the coinage of Nero (as NERO CAESAR AVGVSTVS) and Domitian (as DOMITIANVS AVGVSTVS), but these short legends had been restricted to *aurei*.

45. *RIC* II^3, 15–16.

46. An important exception may be found in Augustan coinage. Because the coins of Augustus contained obverse legends of similar brevity, the Hadrianic transformation of the obverse has often been understood as another attempt to evoke the memory of Augustus. Such associations would have been strengthened by the (anonymous) restoration of Augustan *denarii* by the Roman mint during the age of Hadrian, for which see Woytek and Blet-Lemarquand, "C.L. CAESARES," 183–248.

Figure 3. *Aureus* of Hadrian, Rome, ca. 124–125 CE (*RIC* II³, Hadrian 709). Obverse: HADRIANVS AVGVSTVS. Reverse: COS III. ANS 1956.184.33.

an's accession been altered significantly and until 124 CE had mostly had P M TR P COS III surrounding the image, with the occasional addition of an explanatory legend in the exergue or placed horizontally slightly higher up the reverse image. References to both the emperor's supreme pontificate and his *tribunicia potestas* disappeared abruptly in 124–127 CE, however, at exactly the same time as three of his *nomina* on the obverse disappeared.[47] The only part to survive was COS III, to which generally no additional text was added (Fig. 3, reverse).[48] COS III would continue to appear predominantly on its own until 128 CE, the year Hadrian accepted the title *pater patriae*, which, from that moment, would continue to be featured in coin legends along with COS III for most of Hadrian's reign.[49] Further decreasing the prominence of the third consulship from this moment onwards was the increasing tendency of pairing the reverse image with an identifying legend. The period during which COS III was prominently communicated in the reverse legend was therefore brief, but it was at a time that the production of the Roman mint was substantial.[50] To any observer of his coins it must have been

47. *RIC* II³, 15–16. Elsewhere I will argue that this never-reversed disappearance of the Rome-centred titles of *pontifex maximus* and *tribunicia potestas* from his coin legends is likely to have been part of representational strategies of Hadrian that meant to bring the empire as a whole into focus, thereby purposefully deviating from the traditional emphasis on the city of Rome as found under his predecessors.

48. Leaving aside the ever-present SC for bronzes, there are only a few exceptions to the reverses with COS III as the only legend. First are those hybrid coins that combined a HADRIANVS AVGVSTVS with a pre-124 CE reverse: *RIC* II³, Hadrian 736, 740, 825. Second are the double obverse types: *RIC* II³, Hadrian 749, 889; with R. A. Abdy, "Capita aut Capita? The Double Heads (and Double Tails) Coins of Hadrian," in *Studies in Ancient Coinage in Honour of Andrew Burnett*, ed. R. Bland and D. Calomino (London: Spink, 2015), 143–160. Third are the coins that besides COS III have an identifying legend in exergue: *RIC* II³, Hadrian 734–735, 737, 742–745, 806–809. Exceptions to this last category are *RIC* II³, Hadrian 828–829, which instead have the identifying legend SALVS AVGVSTI surrounding the image and COS III in the exergue.

49. For the importance of the acceptance of *pater patriae* for the chronology of Hadrian's coinage, see Beckmann, "Gold," 145–146.

50. P. V. Hill, "The Dating and Arrangement of Hadrian's 'COS III' Coins of the Mint of Rome," in *Mints, Dies and Currency. Essays Dedicated to the Memory of Albert Baldwin*, ed. R. A.

clear that there was an intimate link between the man whose effigy figured on the obverse and the third consulship, which as sole text figured so prominently on the reverse.

The coinage thus forged a strong link between Hadrian and the third consulship, yet the question remains what this peculiar emphasis was meant to communicate aside from the mere number of his consular tenures. We have already seen in Simpson's argument that the third consulship was arguably the highest honor for any senator, as is unequivocally attested by the testimony of Pliny the Younger.[51] However, his *Panegyricus* not only mentions how a multitude of consulships was exceptional for *privati*, it also makes a very explicit case as far as imperial tenure of the consulship is concerned. Indeed, a significant part of this praise of Trajan is dedicated to his third consulship of 100 CE, the year in which the speech was delivered.[52] This year seems to have been a rather important one as far as third consulships are concerned, as the same year saw the same honors for Sex. Julius Frontinus (as ordinary consul) and L. Julius Ursus (as suffect consul), an occasion that Pliny did not leave unmentioned.[53] In this part, Trajan's status as good emperor is defined through his attitude towards the consular position.[54] This appears not just from his apparent *moderatio* in reluctantly accepting his third tenure, but all the more from showing deference to, as well as participating in, the traditional practices and procedures surrounding the office.[55] This is placed in sharp contrast especially with Domitian, who is portrayed as having been rather irreverent with respect to traditional practices during his string of

G. Carson (London: Methuen. 1971), 48–49. This observation is corroborated by a survey of the Reka Devnia Hoard, as for most reigns the most sizable hoard for the age of Hadrian. Of the almost 6,755 Hadrianic *denarii* found in the Reka Devnia hoard, 1,051 belong to the period 124–127 CE. Data provided by the Coin Hoards of the Roman Empire Project of the Ashmolean Museum and the Oxford Roman Economy Project, and available at http://chre.ashmus.ox.ac.uk/ (consulted 28 April 2020).

51. Plin. *Ep.* 2.1.2–3; *Pan.* 61.

52. Plin. *Pan.* 57–79.

53. Plin. *Pan.* 61.1.

54. On the emphasis Pliny puts on the third consulship also see M. Morford, "Iubes Esse Liberos: Pliny's Panegyricus and Liberty," *American Journal of Philology* 113.4 (1992), 575–588; D. Innes, "The Panegyricus and Rhetorical Theory," in *Pliny's Praise. The Panegyricus in the Roman World*, ed. P. Roche (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 80–81; C. Noreña, "Self-fashioning in the Panegyricus," in *Pliny's Praise. The Panegyricus in the Roman World*, ed. P. Roche (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 36. The latter especially illustrates how this reflects on Trajan as an emperor.

55. For the importance of this *moderatio* for the political balance and social order in the Principate, see A. Wallace-Hadrill, "Civilis Princeps. Between Citizen and King," *Journal of Roman Studies* 72 (1982), 32–48.

consulships.[56] These contrasting attitudes towards the consulship are presented by Pliny as symbolic of the relationship between emperor and Senate: uneasy co-operation under Domitian, strong partnership under Trajan.[57] The latter caused Trajan to serve a fourth, a fifth, and even a sixth time as consul, and is further reflected by the Senate's bestowal of the epithet *Optimus* upon Trajan in 114.[58]

What does this all tell us about Hadrian? Unfortunately, we lack a similar speech of praise for Trajan's successor, yet we do know that his relationship with the Senate was markedly different from that entertained by Trajan.[59] After all, surrendering his predecessor's recent eastern conquests and especially his role in the execution of four leading senators soon after his accession had challenged Hadrian's ability to establish a steady partnership with the Senate.[60] However, as we learn from Cassius Dio and the *Historia Augusta*, it seems that Hadrian went out of his way to reverse the situation. Much in the style of Trajan, he paid his respects to the Senate and its traditions, and he tried to present himself in the same modest way.[61] It is in the summing up of Hadrian's gestures towards the Senate that the *Historia Augusta* tells us that during the four months Hadrian held the third consulship "he often administered justice," and that he attended every meeting of the Senate when he was in or close to Rome.[62] The first part suggests that Hadrian treated his third consulship with more care than his second consulship, which he held *in absentia* in 118 CE, and during which he could not have been the dutiful consul he appears to have been during the first months of 119 CE. Instead, one is reminded of the third consulship of the dutiful Trajan as described by Pliny.

56. Plin. *Pan.* 58.1, 58.4, 59.2, 63, 65.3. That the situation was actually more nuanced is shown by Jones, who demonstrates that quite soon in his reign Domitian in fact broke with his father and brother's practice of monopolizing the consulship: B. Jones, "Designation to the Consulship under the Flavians," *Latomus* 31.3 (1972), 849–853; B. Jones, "Domitian's Attitude to the Senate," *American Journal of Philology* 94.1 (1973), 79–91.

57. This is most explicit in Plin. *Pan*. 61.

58. M. Hammond, "Imperial Elements in the Formula of the Roman Emperors during the First Two and a Half Centuries of the Empire," *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 25 (1957), 41–46; D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle: Gründzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990), 123. For the bestowal of *Optimus*, also see J. Bennett, *Trajan Optimus Princeps. A Life and Times* (London: Routledge, 1997), 198.

59. See in more detail R. Syme, "Hadrian and the Senate." *Athenaeum* 62 (1984), 31–60.

60. On the opening moves of Hadrian after his accession, see A. R. Birley, *Hadrian. The Restless Emperor* (London: Routledge, 1997), 77–92.

61. Dio 69.7.1–2; *SHA* Hadrian 8, 9.7–8, 20.1, with Birley, *Hadrian*, 102, who suggests both accounts are likely to have been derived from the same source.

62. *SHA* Hadrian 8.5–6: *ipsum autem tertium consulatum et quattuor mensibus tantum egit et in eo saepe ius dixit. senatui legitimo, cum in urbe vel iuxta urbem esset, semper interfuit.*

But these were the circumstances of 119 CE. And even though Hadrian's third consulship was indeed referred to in most coin legends from this year onwards, it was always preceded by the abbreviated forms of *pontifex maximus* and *tribunicia potestas* until 124 CE. It was only from that year onwards that COS III became—in most instances—the sole text to appear on the reverse. If it was Hadrian's exemplary tenure of the consulship that was to be highlighted in this way, one would expect this change to have taken place closer to 119 CE. Therefore, the reason for the transformation of the coin legend after 124 CE is likely to be sought elsewhere. And here is where the Pantheon comes in again. If we follow the commonly accepted dating for both the dedication of the Pantheon and the change in coin legends, the timing seems too neat to be coincidental. The change in coinage is conveniently dated between 124 CE and 127 CE, whereas the completion of the portico with its extraordinary inscription and the subsequent dedication of the Pantheon is assumed to have taken place in the first two years after Hadrian's return from the eastern Mediterranean in 125 CE.[63]

As noted before, the developments in building activity—and by extension the changes in coinage—coincided with one of the two non-imperial third consulships of Hadrian's reign. M. Annius Verus received this notable honor in 126 CE, thereby serving as consul for the third time around the same time the Pantheon was dedicated.[64] Simpson, as mentioned above, used the third consulship of Verus as the basis for his argument, as it may well be linked to the fact that Agrippa, too, for his outstanding service for the state was honored with the same distinction. However, Agrippa was much more than a *privatus* who happened to have obtained the third consulship. He was also the one to have won Augustus two of his most important victories in securing his position at Naulochus and Actium, for which he was awarded the distinctive honor of a rostral crown.[65] Moreover, and perhaps of more importance for the present argument, Agrippa was responsible for many of the numerous embellishments bestowed upon the

63. It may also be noted that in the inscription of Septimius and Caracalla that was placed below the Agrippa inscription during their restoration of 202 CE, COS III is also found. Although the reference to the third consulship is placed just below the *cos tertium* part of Agrippa, it is used less emphatically as it simply appears as part of Septimius's regular titulature. It may therefore be doubted whether this instance of COS III was meant to have a similar impact as that found on Hadrian's coinage. On this inscription see C. Witschel and E. Thomas, "Constructing Reconstruction. Claim and Reality of Roman Rebuilding Inscriptions from the Latin West," *Papers of the British School at Rome* 60 (1992), 135–137; Boatwright, "Hadrian," 20–21.

64. As was also argued by Simpson, "The Pantheon's Inscription," 154.

65. This was still remembered in the second century CE, as among the restitution coins of Trajan we find the rostral-crowned head of Agrippa: *RIC* II, Trajan 818, a restoration of *RIC* I², Augustus 414. For Agrippa on restitution coins, see in more detail n. 69.

city of Rome in the Augustan age. In addition to the monuments on the Campus Martius, Agrippa managed the water regulation in the city, which was in itself an enormous enterprise.[66] This was still remembered a few decades before Hadrian's reign by Frontinus, who listed among the various contributions of Agrippa the maintenance of the water systems as one of his main responsibilities after was appointed as Rome's very first *curator aquarum*.[67]

Agrippa was therefore not just worthy of emulation for any Roman senator, but emperors too had every reason to connect themselves with this great benefactor of Rome. And they sometimes did. In coinage, for example, we see that even though few emperors had ever felt the need to refer to him in their regular coinage—which given the limited number of references to past emperors can hardly be surprising—he appeared in the restitution coinage of almost all of the emperors who linked their name to this phenomenon of restriking old coin types.[68] And although perhaps not to the same extent as Augustus, Agrippa can also be connected with Hadrianic policy and representation. Hadrian's contested military record makes it unlikely that he meant to bring Agrippa's naval successes into memory, yet his building activities in Rome make a link with Agrippa appropriate. Although we have seen before that the restoration of the *monumenta Agrippae* may well in large part have been a continuation of Trajanic policy, its completion gave Hadrian ample opportunity to associate himself with the persons that had given their names to many of the structures at the Campus Martius. Of equal interest is the fact that the flooding of the Tiber was still an issue at the beginning of the second century CE. This had the consequence that the age of Hadrian saw the implementation of an elaborate system of dykes and elevations to deal with this problem.[69] These waterworks provided Hadrian with another connection to Rome's first *curator aquarum*.[70]

66. Roddaz, *Marcus Agrippa*, 148–152; Haselberger, *Urbem*, 120–125.

67. Front. *Aq.* 9–10, 97–98. Note that Frontinus in the opening phrase of *Aq.* 10 makes mention of Agrippa's third consulship as he speaks of the construction of the Aqua Virgo.

68. *RIC* II², Titus 470; *RIC* II², Domitian 825; *RIC* II, Trajan 817–818. Only Nerva did not strike restitution coins with the head of Agrippa, as he only restored coins with the head of Augustus. For a detailed treatment of restitution coinage, see H. Komnick, *Die Restitutionsmünzen der frühen Kaiserzeit. Aspekte der Kaiserlegitimation* (Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2001). Besides Agrippa's appearance in Augustan coinage during his lifetime, his only other attestation in regular imperial coinage was in the above-mentioned series of his grandson Caligula: *RIC* I², Gaius/Caligula 58.

69. Boatwright, *Hadrian*, 66–73.

70. It is in the light of Hadrian's connection with Agrippa rather intriguing that Hadrianic coinage is notable for an increased attention to Neptune. This deity was intimately connected with Agrippa due to the latter's naval successes and waterworks, an association that is underlined by the fact that Neptune figured as the reverse image on the coins. However, a

As far as constitutional titles and political honors are concerned, Agrippa seems a rather poor figure to emulate. Instead, emperors logically sought to connect themselves to the constitutional precedent of Augustus by their frequent references to the supreme pontificate, the tribunician power and the honorific *pater patriae* title. Yet the consulship was a different matter. That there was such a constitutional basis in the first place was basically the consequence of the solution that made an end to Augustus's consecutive nine consulships. Hence, his total of thirteen consulships can hardly be regarded as an example worthy of emulation. That the Flavians thought otherwise was not well received at the beginning of the second century CE. For even though Pliny is likely to have mainly targeted Domitian in his *Panegyricus* when speaking of the futility of the practice of obtaining the consulship perpetually, this also reflected negatively on the consular tenures of his father Vespasian (*cos IX*) and his brother Titus (*cos VIII*).[71] Writing slightly later, Suetonius, too, listed the seventeen consulships of Domitian among the many things that had made him an emperor of infamous repute.[72] An excessive number of consulships, then, had rather negative connotations in the first half of the second century CE, and even more so when held *in absentia*. It is true that Trajan held the office as often as six times during his lifetime, but only because he did so dutifully, with deference to the Senate, and while present in Rome. Pliny even makes the latter explicit by bringing it to our attention that Trajan's motivation for refusing the third consulship before had been that he could not serve as an effective consul because of a projected absence.[73]

The latter seems quite relevant for Hadrian, whose *Wanderlust* is among the most notable characteristics of his reign. It may thus be speculated that at some time during his journey of 121 to 125 CE, the emperor deemed it unlikely that

connection with Agrippa was among the many associations that Neptune could potentially forge. It is perhaps a safer option to place Neptune in the context of Hadrian's many travels. On the frequent appearance of Neptune under Hadrian see the "Types" section of *RIC* II³, Hadrian (pp. 36–59). For the various meanings Neptune could denote when appearing in imperial coinage see D. Shotter, "A Rare Find: a Neptune As of the Roman Emperor, Nerva," *NC* 173 (2013), 86–87. Note (following n. 64) that Neptune again rose to prominence in the coinage of the early Severans, but here too a direct connection with the Pantheon seems hard to establish, as the dating of the coins that feature the sea-god does not correspond to Severan building activity at the Campus Martius.

71. Plin. *Pan.* 58.

72. Suet. *Dom.* 13.3.

73. Plin. *Pan.* 60. Unfortunately, we only have an account of the *moderatio* shown by Trajan in accepting his fourth consulship, but we may assume that similar sentiments would have featured upon the bestowal of the fifth and sixth consulship.

he would be consul for a fourth time. Irrespective of whether this was because of the incompatibility of his projected journeys and the expectation of being consul while in Rome, a less favorable standing with the Senate, or simply a lack of interest, he decided to make the most of the fact that he had been consul three times. And who better to bring to mind than Agrippa, Rome's great benefactor, who was also elected for a third consulship. That the form in which the Pantheon inscription celebrated Agrippa's third consulship (*cos tertium*) differed from that found on Hadrian's coinage (*cos III*) may be because it was a verbatim rendering of an earlier inscription, or to at least create the impression that it was.[74] This differing form notwithstanding, the coinciding propagation of the third consulship in coinage and through the monumental inscription bore a strong message, one that reflected quite well on the man who coincidentally also had been consul three times and had taken great pains to embellish the city of Rome.[75] Indeed, Hadrian could boast an even more impressive form of *moderatio* than that for which Trajan was so excessively praised, not comparing himself to one of the illustrious emperors, but to the humble yet exemplary figure of Agrippa. The message is likely to have been reinforced by the third consulship of M. Annius Verus. This not only showed that senators could be rewarded with high distinction if they proved themselves beneficial to the state, it also put them on equal footing with the man at the top of social pyramid. An idea of the emperor as *primus inter pares* could not have been communicated more delicately. That in his coinage Hadrian's bust was increasingly shown bare-headed would also have underlined his modesty, although this development only seems to have reached its summit after 128 CE.[76]

74. For the imperial period it had become customary to indicate the number of consulships with a numeral, but during the Republic it was written in full. This is neatly illustrated by an episode recounted by Aulus Gellius (*NA* 10.1.7), in which we find Pompey contemplating the proper form to refer to his third consulship, for which he eventually found the solution of abbreviating it as *cos tert*. Also see Boatwright, "Hadrian," 25, who suggests the *tertium* variant on the Pantheon may have been a way for Hadrian to shine his own light on the matter.

75. If as suggested above the inscription replaced a previous inscription of Domitian that only mentioned the last Flavian emperor, we would also expect a reference to his many consulships in the text that was replaced. Although we do not have a definite date of the Domitianic reconstruction, by the time the fire destroyed the Agrippan structure Domitian already held his eight consulship. "Restoring the original inscription" with its emphatic inclusion of third consulship thus implicitly set Domitian's extravagance against the virtue of Agrippa and—by extension—that of Hadrian.

76. For the link between bare-headed portraits and the idea of *primus inter pares*, see C. H. V. Sutherland, *Coinage in Roman Imperial Policy, 31 B.C.–A.D. 68* (London: Methuen, 1951), 156; C. E. King, "Roman Portraiture. Images of Power?" in *Roman Coins and Public Life under*

It has been demonstrated before that the imperial authorities at times utilized various media to communicate the same political message.[77] Whether the various *cos III*-themed developments were part of a similar strategy may be hard to answer. Indeed, although we do know that Hadrian held his fourth *congiarium* at roughly the same time, it is impossible to establish whether these cash-handouts were held in conjunction with the dedication of the Pantheon.[78] Since basically all of the Hadrianic coins struck from 124 CE bear the COS III legend, however, a concerted effort in getting the message across was hardly necessary. Indeed, coin circulation itself would have accomplished the same goal, as many Romans would have seen the head of Hadrian accompanied by the reference to his third consulship in gold, silver or bronze. Hence any additional third consul—be it past or present—quite naturally would have led many to connect it to the ever-present legend that was paired with the effigy of the emperor. If Dio's account is true, and Hadrian occasionally appeared underneath the monumental Pantheon inscription on which a third consulship reference was also prominent, this would have been the real life counterpart of the combined effect of obverse and reverse that was normally restricted to coins.[79] It was meant to create the impression that Hadrian and the third consulship were two sides of the same coin.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply indebted to my colleagues of the research project Constraints and Tradition as well as Nathan Elkins, Fleur Kemmers, Shawn Ragan, and Claire Stocks, whose comments and suggestions greatly helped to improve this article. Any remaining errors and omissions are my own responsibility.

the Empire, ed. G. M. Paul and M. Ierardi (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999), 130–131.

77. See C. F. Noreña, "Medium and Message in Vespasian's Templum Pacis," *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 48 (2003), 25–43, who demonstrated that the dedication of the Templum Pacis under Vespasian found expression in an increasing number of *denarii* featuring Pax.

78. The fourth *congiarium* was propagated on *sestertii* that belong to the series that belong to the issues struck between 124–127 CE. For the importance of *congiaria* as occasions to highlight a ruler's generosity, see H. Kloft, *Liberalitas principis: Herkunft und Bedeutung* (Cologne/Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1970), 89–95; C. F. Noreña, *Imperial Ideals in the Roman West. Representation, Circulation, Power* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 85–86. On Hadrian's *congiaria* in particular also see *RIC* II², Hadrian pp. 40–42.

79. Dio 69.7.1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abdy, R. A. "Capita aut Capita? The Double Heads (and Double Tails) Coins of Hadrian," in *Studies in Ancient Coinage in Honour of Andrew Burnett*, edited by R. Bland and D. Calomino, 143–160. London: Spink, 2015.

———. *The Roman Imperial Coinage.* Volume II—Part 3. *From AD 117–138 Hadrian; with a Section on Medallions by P. F. Mittag.* London: Spink, 2019.

Alföldy, G. *Der Obelisk auf dem Petersplatz in Rome. Ein historisches Monument der Antike.* Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1990.

———. *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Volume VI. Part 8, Fas. 2. *Titulos Imperatorum Domusque eorum Thesauro Schedarum Imaginumque ampliato.* Berlin: De Gruyter, 1996.

Beckmann, M. "The Gold Coinage of Hadrian, AD 130–138." *American Journal of Numismatics* 31 (2019): 145–188.

Bellen, H. "SAEC(ulum) AVR(eum). Das Säkularbewusstsein des Kaisers Hadrian im Spiegel der Münzen." In *Politik, Recht, Gesellschaft. Studien zur Alten Geschichte*, edited by H. Bellen, 135–150. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1997.

Bennett, J. *Trajan Optimus Princeps. A Life and Times.* London: Routledge, 1997

Birley, A. R. *Hadrian. The Restless Emperor.* London: Routledge, 1997.

Bloch, H. "I bolli laterizi e la storia edilizia romana." *Bullettino della Commisione Archeologica Comunale di Roma* 64 (1937–1938), 1–353.

———. *I bolli laterizi e la storia edilizia romana. Contributi all'archeologia e alla storia romana.* Rome: Comune di Roma, Ripartizione antichità e belle arti, 1947.

Boatwright, M. T. *Hadrian and the City of Rome.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.

———. "Hadrian and the Agrippa Inscription of the Pantheon," in *Hadrian. Art, Politics and Economy*, edited by T. Opper, 19–30. London: British Museum Press, 2013.

Broucke, P. 2009. "The First Pantheon. Architecture and Meaning (Abstract)." In *The Pantheon in Rome. Contributions to the Conference Bern, November 9–12, 2006*, edited by G. Graßhoff, M. Heinzelmann, and M. Wäfler, 27–28. Bern: Bern Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science.

Charles, M. "'Calvus Nero.' Domitian and the Mechanics of Predecessor Denigration." *Acta Classica* 45 (2002): 19–49.

Coarelli, F. "Il Pantheon, l'apoteosi di Augusto e l'apoteosi di Romolo." In *Città e architettura nella Roma imperiale: atti del Seminario del 27 ottobre* 1981 nel *25° anniversario dell'Accademia di Danimarca*, edited by K. De Fine Licht, 41–46. Odense: Odense University Press, 1983.

Davies, P., D. Hemsoll and M. Wilson Jones. "The Pantheon. Triumph of Rome or Triumph of Compromise?" *Art History* 10 (1987), 133–153.

DeLaine, J. "The Pantheon Builders. Estimating Manpower for Construction." In *The Pantheon. From Antiquity to the Present*, edited by T. A. Marder and M. Wilson Jones, 160–192. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Dressel, H. *Untersuchungen über die Chronologie der Ziegelstempel der Gens Domitia.* Berlin: G. Reimer, 1886.

———. *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Vol. 15. Part 1. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1891.

Galimberti, A. "The Emperor Domitian." In *A Companion to the Flavian Age of Imperial Rome*, edited by A. Zissos, 92–108. Malden, MA: Wiley/Blackwell, 2016.

Ghini, G. "Thermae Agrippae." In *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae.* Vol. 5, edited by in E. M. Steinby, 40–42. Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1999.

Godfrey, P., and D. Hemsoll. "The Pantheon. Temple or Rotunda?" In *Pagan Gods and Shrines of the Roman Empire*, edited by M. Henig and A. King, 195–209. Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology, 1986.

Gruben, D., and G. Gruben. "Die Türe des Pantheon." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung* 104 (1997): 3–74.

Grüner, A. "Das Pantheon des Agrippa: architektonische Form und urbaner Kontext." In *The Pantheon in Rome. Contributions to the Conference Bern, November 9–12, 2006*, edited by G. Graßhoff, M. Heinzelmann and M. Wäfler, 41–68. Bern: Bern Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science, 2009.

Guey, J. "Devrai-on dire: le Panthéon de Septime Sévère? A propos des estampilles sur briques recueillies dans ce monument notamment en 1930 ou en 1931 et depuis." *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire* 53 (1936): 198–249.

Hammond, M. "Imperial Elements in the Formula of the Roman Emperors during the First Two and a Half Centuries of the Empire." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 25 (1957): 17–64.

Haselberger, L. *Urbem Adornare. Die Stadt Rom und ihre Gestaltumwandlung unter Augustus = Rome's Urban Metamorphosis under Augustus.* Translated by A. Thein. Portsmouth, RI: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 2007.

———. "The Pantheon. Nagging Questions to no End." In *The Pantheon in Rome. Contributions to the Conference Bern, November 9–12, 2006*, edited by G. Graßhoff, M. Heinzelmann and M. Wäfler, 171–186. Bern: Bern Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science, 2009.

Heilmeyer, W.-D. "Apollodorus von Damaskus, der Architekt des Pantheon." *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 90 (1975): 316–347.

Hetland, L. M. "Dating the Pantheon." *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 20.1 (2007): 95–112.

———. "New Perspective on the Dating of the Pantheon." In *The Pantheon. From Antiquity to the Present*, edited by T. A. Marder and M. Wilson Jones, 79–98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Hill, P. V. "The Dating and Arrangement of Hadrian's 'COS III' Coins of the Mint of Rome." In *Mints, Dies and Currency. Essays Dedicated to the Memory of Albert Baldwin*, edited by R. A. G. Carson, 39–56. London: Methuen, 1971.

Innes, D. C. "The Panegyricus and Rhetorical Theory." In *Pliny's Praise. The Panegyricus in the Roman World*, edited by P. Roche, 67–84. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Jones, B. W. "Designation to the Consulship under the Flavians." *Latomus* 31.3 (1972): 849–853.

———. "Domitian's Attitude to the Senate." *American Journal of Philology* 94.1 (1973): 79–91.

Kienast, D. "Hadrian, Augustus und die eleusinischen Mysterien." *Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte* 10 (1959–1960): 61–69.

———. *Römische Kaisertabelle: Gründzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990.

King, C. E. "Roman Portraiture. Images of Power?" In *Roman Coins and Public Life under the Empire*, edited by G. M. Paul and M. Ierardi, 123–136. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.

Kloft, H. *Liberalitas principis: Herkunft und Bedeutung. Studien zur Prinzipatsideologie.* Cologne/Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1970.

Komnick, H. *Die Restitutionsmünzen der frühen Kaiserzeit. Aspekte der Kaiserlegitimation.* Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2001.

La Rocca, E. "Agrippa's Pantheon and its Origin." In *The Pantheon. From Antiquity to the Present*, edited by T. A. Marder and M. Wilson Jones, 49–78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Loerke, W. C. "Georges Chédanne and the Pantheon. A Beaux-Arts Contribution to the History of Roman Architecture." *Modulus* 4 (1982): 40–55.

Lyasse, E. *Le Principat et son fondateur: l'utilisation de la référence à Auguste de Tibère à Trajan.* Bruxelles: Latomus, 2008.

MacDonald, W. L. *The Pantheon. Design, Meaning, and Progeny.* London: A. Lane, 1976.

Metcalf, W. E. *The Cistophori of Hadrian.* New York: American Numismatic Society, 1980.

Morford, M. P. O. "Iubes Esse Liberos: Pliny's Panegyricus and Liberty." *American Journal of Philology* 113.4 (1992): 575–593.

Noreña, C. F. "Medium and Message in Vespasian's Templum Pacis." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 48 (2003): 25–43.

———. *Imperial Ideals in the Roman West. Representation, Circulation, Power.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

———. "Self-fashioning in the Panegyricus." In *Pliny's Praise. The Panegyricus in the Roman World*, edited by P. Roche, 29–44. Cambridge MA: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Opper, T. *Hadrian. Empire and Conflict.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2008.

Roche, P. "Pliny's Thanksgiving. An Introduction to the Panegyricus." In *Pliny's Praise. The Panegyricus in the Roman World*, edited by P. Roche, 1–28. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Roddaz, J.-M. *Marcus Agrippa.* Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 1984.

Shotter, D. "A Rare Find: a Neptune As of the Roman Emperor, Nerva." *Numismatic Chronicle* 173 (2013): 85–97.

Simpson, C. J. "The Pantheon's Inscription, CIL 6.896. Its Date of Composition, Cultural Context, and "Message"." *Athenaeum* 97 (2009): 150–157.

Spiers, R. P. "Monsieur Chédanne's Drawings of the Pantheon." *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects* 2 (1895): 175–182.

Stevenson, T. "Roman Coins and Refusals of the Title Pater Patriae." *Numismatic Chronicle* 167 (2007): 119–141.

Sutherland, C. H. V. *Coinage in Roman Imperial Policy, 31 B.C.–A.D. 68.* London: Methuen, 1951.

Syme, R. "Hadrian and the Senate." *Athenaeum* 62 (1984): 31–60.

Thomas, E. "The Cult Statues of the Pantheon." *Journal of Roman Studies* 107 (2017): 146–212.

Virgili, P., and P. Battistelli. "Indagini in piazza della rotonda e sulla fronte del Pantheon." *Bullettino della Commisione Archeologica Comunale di Roma* 100 (1999): 137–154.

Walker, S. "Bearded Men." *Journal of the History of Collections* 3.2 (1991): 265–277.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. "Civilis Princeps. Between Citizen and King." *Journal of Roman Studies* 72 (1982): 32–48.

Wilson Jones, M. *Principles of Roman Architecture.* New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2000.

———. "The Pantheon and the Phasing of its Construction." In *The Pantheon in Rome. Contributions to the Conference Bern, November 9–12, 2006*, edited by G. Graßhoff, M. Heinzelmann and M. Wäfler, 69–87. Bern: Bern Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science, 2009.

———. "Who Built the Pantheon? Agrippa, Apollodorus, Hadrian and Trajan." In *Hadrian. Art, Politics and Economy*, edited by T. Opper, 31–49. London: British Museum Press, 2013.

———. 2015. "Building on Adversity: the Pantheon and the Problems with its Construction." In *The Pantheon. From Antiquity to the Present*, edited by T. A. Marder and M. Wilson Jones, 193–230. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Witschel, C., and E. Thomas. "Constructing Reconstruction. Claim and Reality of Roman Rebuilding Inscriptions from the Latin West." *Papers of the British School at Rome* 60 (1992): 135–177.

Woytek, B. and M. Blet-Lemarquand. 2017. "The C.L. CAESARES Denarii *RIC* I² Augustus 208. A Pseudo-Augustan Unsigned Restoration Issue. Corpus, Die Study, Metallurgical Analyses." *Revue numismatique* 174: 183–248.

Ziolkowski, A. "Was Agrippa's Pantheon the Temple of Mars in Campo?" *Papers of the British School at Rome* 62 (1994): 261–277.

———. "Pantheon." In *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*. Vol. 4, edited by E. M. Steinby, 54–61. Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1999.

———. "Prolegomena to any Future Methaphysics on Agrippa's Pantheon." In *Res bene gestae. Ricerche di storia urbana su Roma antica in onore di Eva Margareta Steinby*, edited by A. Leone, D. Palombi and S. Walker, 465–476. Roma: Edizioni Quasar, 2007.

———. 2009. "What did Agrippa's Pantheon Look Like? New Answers to an Old Question." In *The Pantheon in Rome. Contributions to the Conference Bern, November 9–12, 2006*, edited by G. Graßhoff, M. Heinzelmann and M. Wäfler, 29–39. Bern: Bern Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science, 2009.