

“The Main Aspects of Political Propaganda on the Coinage of the Roman Republic”

-András Alföldi-

((1956) - in Carson, R.A.G and Sutherland, C.H.V. (eds) *Essays in Roman Coinage Presented to Harold Mattingly*, Oxford, 63-95)

András Alföldi’s article defines Roman Republican coin typology. His scheme can be roughly paraphrased. In the third century BC, Rome minted “public” types. By the end of the second century BC, “family” types commemorating the deeds of the ancestors of the moneyers began to be depicted. In the first century BC, “personal” types that refer to leading figures (Caesar, Antony, Octavian, and so on) overtook these “family” types. Numismatists employ this tripartite division without question. However, how accurate are these classifications? Some of these classifications are empty labels. The specific employment of the term “personal” inevitably results in the cataloguing of the Octavianic CAESAR DIVI F(ilius) and IMP(erator) CAESAR *aurei* and *denarii* of c.32-27 BC as the first Roman “imperial” coins. Do you think we should move away from the broad generalizations that plague these typological classifications and create new terminology that would better describe these coin types?