Femina princeps

Livia's position in the Roman state

BRÄNNSTEDT, LOVISA

2016

Document Version:
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

FEMINA PRINCEPS

Femina princeps

Livia's position in the Roman state

LOVISA BRÄNNSTEDT

LUND
UNIVERSITY

Classical Archaeology and Ancient History
Department of Archaeology and Ancient History

Published with support from

Joint Faculties of Humanities and Theology

Folke Vestergaard och Emelie Jensens testamente

Harald och Tonny Hagendahls minnesfond

Herbert & Karin Jacobssons Stiftelse

Ingenjören C.M Lericis stipendium

Stiftelsen Fil. dr. Uno Otterstedts fond

Stiftelsen Helge Ax:son Johnson

Stiftelsen Olle Engkvist Byggmästare

Stiftelsen Sven Kristenssons resestipendiefond

Stiftelsen landshövding Per Westlings minnesfond

Department of Archaeology and Ancient History

Cover design and typesetting by Henning Cedmar Brandstedt

Photo, The Great Cameo of France, © Carole Raddato flickr.com/carolemage

Photo-license (CC BY-SA 2.0) creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/2.0

Printed by Media-Tryck, Lund 2016

ISBN 978-91-87833-84-7 (print)

ISBN 978-91-87833-85-4 (electronic)

To my parents

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis has been some happy years in the making, and it is with great pleasure that I thank the numerous scholars whose generosity with their time and ideas has made my work better than it would have otherwise been. Most heartfelt thanks must first go to Eva Rystedt who has not only spent much time reading and commenting on every page of draft, but has carefully encouraged me in the clarifying and shaping of my thoughts on the subject of Livia Drusilla and the political culture of the early principate. Eva's support has reached beyond the call of duty, as she has kept on shepherding this project even after her retirement. For this I am immensely grateful. My deepest gratitude goes also to my second supervisor, Gunhild Vidén, whose unfailing support and sound advice gave me the confidence needed to embark the project of working with a large body of epigraphic material.

The members of the higher seminar of Classical Archaeology and Ancient History, under the guidance of Anne-Marie Leander Touati, have been most generous in giving me the benefit of their comments and constructive criticism. I am grateful to Nicolo Dell'Unto, Anna-Stina Ekedahl, Carole Gillis, Fanny Kärfve, Karin Lundqvist, Hampus Olsson, Richard Olsson, and Johan Vekselius for stimulating discussions. Special recognition is owed to Örjan Wikander who read the whole manuscript and provided sharp-sighted comments, to Henrik Gerding for sharing his knowledge about ancient mausolea and to Renée Forsell for checking on my progress during the last weeks of finishing this book.

I wish to extend my warmest thanks to everyone involved in the FocusRome network and Ida Östenberg in particular. Ida, together with Jonas Bjørnebye and Simon Malmberg, generously invited me to the Moving City conference in Rome and encouraged me to explore Livia's

performative movement in the city. Thank you, Ida, for your support throughout, and for many stimulating talks. Thanks are also due to Anna Blennow and fellow epigraphists in Inscripta: our meetings have been among the highpoints of these years. I am thankful to Isak Hammar and Ulf Zander who invited me to write about fig fiction and Livia in popular culture, a topic not included in this thesis, but nevertheless fascinating. Towards the end of this project, Lewis Webb became an inspiring fellow-speaker on female public participation and status display in ancient Rome, and I look forward to future collaborations and discussions relating to *feminae imperiosae*. I thank Jenny Wallensten and Margaret Woodhull, who both generously let me consult their forthcoming articles, and Johanna Akujärvi for taking time to discuss Dio's syntax with me. Finally, a big thank you to Elisabet Göransson, Fanni Faegersten, and Cajsa Sjöberg for cheerful support along the way.

In September 2006, at the beginning of my undergraduate studies, Allan Klynne invited me to participate in the Prima Porta Garden Archaeological Project carried out by the Swedish Institute in Rome. Not only did I get the chance to spend time in Livia's villa, but I also met dear friends and colleagues: Ragnar Hedlund and Erika Lindgren Liljenstolpe. Profound thank goes to Ragnar, who acted as a discussant on the penultimate draft of this dissertation and offered inestimable comments on the text.

I have had the privilege of writing parts of this thesis at The Swedish Institute in Rome. I wish to thank the entire staff for their help and interest in my work, and the Ingenjören C.M. Lericis stipendium for the grant that enabled me to spend a term in Rome. Thank you also everyone that I have encountered at the institute for the many interdisciplinary discussions, both at seminars and in the kitchen.

I would like to express my gratitude to Janet Fairweather for improving my English, and to Henning Cedmar Brandstedt for turning the digital files into an actual book. It has been a joy and a comfort to work with both of you. Needless to say, all existing faults are mine alone. Moa Ekbom deserves my profound thanks for not only reading and commenting upon a draft of this book, but for writing some very witty messages and being a constant source of cheer and inspiration.

I would like to thank the staff at the Department of Archaeology and

Ancient History at Lund University collectively for creating such a warm and social environment. Thank you, all you great people, for enriching my daily life and always making me laugh over lunch! Thank you Katarina Botwid for being an excellent roommate and benefactress, Helene Willhelmsson for introducing me to the art of knitting, and Stella Macheridis for making the strongest coffee. An extra special thank you goes to Fredrik Ekengren for many fruitful discussions about all things Roman (and barbarian), for all the laughs, and for always bringing milk to the coffee. During the final stage of work, I sadly lost a dear friend and colleague, Ing-Marie Nilsson. Among my most cherished memories from the past years are our conversations on history, archaeology, sci-fi movies and everything in between. I miss you, Ing-Marie.

The staff at the Joint Faculties of Humanities and Theology deserves my warm gratitude for their unceasing help, among them the lovely librarians, and Marie Hoen in particular, for calmly locating any book or journal required for this work. I am thankful also to Susanne Gustafsson, Adèle Persson, and Jesper Olsson. I am particularly grateful for being entrusted to represent the Doctoral Union in the board of Lund University, the board of the Joint Faculties of Humanities and Theology, and several other forums. Thank you everyone involved, the experience has been truly educative about academia, and great fun.

Gratefully acknowledged for financial support are: Folke Vestergaard och Emelie Jensens testamente, Harald och Tonny Hagendahls minnesfond, Herbert & Karin Jacobssons Stiftelse, Stiftelsen Fil. dr. Uno Otterstedts fond, Stiftelsen Helge Ax:son Johnson, Stiftelsen Olle Engkvist Byggmästare, Stiftelsen Sven Kristenssons resestipendiefond, and Stiftelsen landshövding Per Westlings minnesfond. Thank you all.

❦

There is actually more to life than Livia, and on that note I would like to thank all the mermaids in my synchronised swimming team, Atlas Backstroke Babies, and my fellow knitters in Stickklubb Malmö, and Swedish Yarn Mafia. A special thank you to Nene Ormes, Loe Ormes,

Luisa Carbonelli, Olle Jonsson, and The Cocktail Club (Fridays would not be the same without you). Moah Christensen, I am happy and proud that we both defend our thesis this year, and I believe it to be most auspicious that it coincides with Frölunda winning the Swedish Hockey League.

I think with great fondness of Kristina Wollter, Linda Randsalu Wendrup, Sofia Rydberg, and The Senior Staff. Many thanks to Emma Ohlsson, Anders Fransson, Gustav Linder, Anna Engström, Anna-Karin Rennemark, Maria Lindén, and Torbjörn Wixe for Midsummers, New Years, and Thursday nighs. A super-special thank you to Johanna Ludvigsson for proving that you actually can have a gang consisting of just one person. A shout-out also to Åsa Thormählen, Elin Bäckersten, Lina Johansson, Petter Forkstam, Felicia Christensen and Charlotte Frey Svidén for steadfast friendship throughout the years, and to Emma Hagström Molin and Jonas Nilsson, comrades from the first day of university studies, and my very own triumvirate.

In line with the thinking of the Romans I would like to use the word *familia* rather inclusively and express my love and gratitude to all my aunts, uncles, cousins (big and small), and in-laws. You are all very important to me. The most heartfelt thanks goes to Michael Rübsamen for being a constant source of love, generosity, and awesomeness. And for never complaining, no matter how much sport I watch. Last, and first, I thank my parents for their love and support. To them I dedicate this work, in partial return for so much more.

Lovisa Brännstedt

LUND, MAY 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

Femina sed princeps, in qua Fortuna videre
se probat et caecae crimina falsa tulit:
qua nihil in terris ad finem solis ab ortu
clarius excepto Caesare mundus habet.

But a woman pre-eminent, in whom Fortune
proves herself clear-sighted and has borne false charges of blindness,
a woman than whom the universe holds nothing more illustrious on earth
from the sun's rising to his setting, save only Caesar.

Ovid *Ex Ponto* 3.1.125-28[1]

In the Roman society women were traditionally associated with the domestic sphere, yet Livia Drusilla, the second wife of the emperor Augustus, managed to live at the centre of political life for nearly seventy years. In the quotation above the Roman poet Ovid combines the words *femina* and *princeps* to laud her. The passage is drawn from a poetic letter he wrote to his wife while in exile, urging her to pray for his return not to the traditional gods, but to Livia, the *femina princeps*.[2] The adversative *sed* is used by Ovid to make a distinction between various disagreeable female characters from Greek mythology and the approachable Livia, but it also highlights a tension between a formally powerless *femina* and the powerful male concept of a *princeps*. The phrase serves to illustrate her paradoxical position and forms the point of departure for the present study, which will explore the creation and consequences of this paradox, investigating how and why Livia's position in the Roman state was established.

1 Loeb translation revised by Janet Fairweather.

2 Livia is referred to as *femina princeps* also in Ov. *Trist*. 1.6.25 and Macrob. *Sat*. 2.5.6. The *Consolatio ad Liviam* refers to her as *Romana princeps* (line 356).

Aim, sources and previous scholarship

The aim of this study is to present a thorough analysis of the foundations of Livia's position in the Roman state. 'State' does not here indicate the modern concept of nation-state, but the conglomerate of ideas and institutions which in the thinking of the Romans formed the sometimes rather fluid *res publica*. In what manner Augustus was the driving force behind the establishment of himself as *princeps*; how he based his position on both his *potestas* (legal power) and *auctoritas* (personal authority), skilfully claiming to restore the moral foundations of the republic without actually restoring the *res publica* in all its transactional workings: all this has been subjected to intense scrutiny.[3] Livia's position, on the other hand, has often been discussed in terms of her personality and influence, the strength of a woman behind the scenes or her role as simply a vehicle for the transmission of the imperial blood-line. That modern writing about Livia has concentrated on these themes may partly be explained by the fact that the literary sources, on which the main works on her career are based, focus on her person rather than her position. The tendency can be noted already in the first study of Livia, which is included in the eighteenth-century work of Serviez (1758) on imperial women, *Les impératrices romaines*. The first scholarly treatments of Livia were all German: *Livia: Gemahlin des Kaisers Augustus* by Joseph von Aschbach (1864) followed by *Livia* by Hugo Willrich (1911) and the Pauly-Wissowa entry by Lotte Ollendorf (1926). In 1934, Robert Graves published his novel *I, Claudius*, followed by the sequel *Claudius the God* in 1935. Graves was a classicist, and his novels owe much to the work of Tacitus and Suetonius. The books by Graves, and the BBC adaptation of them, first broadcast in 1976, have had a far-reaching influence both upon the scholarly works on Livia and upon the prevalent impression of her in the popular tradition.[4] The biographies about Livia written since the publication of *I, Claudius*, including *Livia Drusilla – Iulia Augusta: das politische Porträt der ersten Kaiserin Roms* by Claudia-Martina Perkounig (1995), *Livia. Macht und Intrigen am Hof des Augustus* by Christiane Kunst

3 Among the most influential studies on the age of Augustus are Zanker 1988; Galinsky 1996; Levick 2010; Galinsky 2012 and Richardson 2012.

4 For Livia and *I, Claudius* see Joshel 2001; Brännstedt 2015b.

(2008), and, in English, *The Family and Property of Livia Drusilla* by Eric Huntsman (diss., 1997) and *Livia, first lady of imperial Rome* by Anthony A. Barrett (2002)[5], have to a large extent been about discussing, and disarming, the image of Livia as a scheming stepmother.[6]

Livia is one of the most famous women of the classical civilization, yet remarkably few books are devoted to her. Now that we know how the age of Augustus saw both constitutional innovations and a remodelling of the social structure of the *res publica*, it is time to discuss Livia's position as a constituent part of the early principate. The aim of this thesis is to analyse how her traditional female roles as wife, mother and patroness were transformed as the principate developed, how Livia increased in status as the wife of the first emperor and mother to the second, and how the role as *diva* was invented for her. This study, therefore, has a chronological structure, so that it may be demonstrated how the content and enactment of Livia's role-set altered in accordance with changes of the imperial politics, the expectations of certain individuals and groups, and a course of events that neither Augustus nor Livia could control, including the deaths of individual members of the imperial family.[7] Works on Livia, and on the age of Augustus in general, often suspend their chronological narratives half way through, giving way to thematic accounts. However, as was stressed by J. A Crook in his entry on the age of Augustus in the *Cambridge Ancient History*: 'Augustus did, indeed, 'found' the Roman Empire; but the danger of succumbing to the thematic temptation is that it makes the institutions he initiated look too much the product of deliberation and the drawing-board, whereas they need to be seen as arising, incomplete and tentative, out of the vicissitudes of a continuing political story.'[8] It could be argued that the same perspective should be

5 Included in the work by Barrett is a survey of the source material concerning Livia which have proved useful for this study.

6 In addition to the biographies, the article *Recherches sur la position juridique et sociale de Livie, l'épouse d'Auguste* by Regula Frei Stolba (1998) and the works of Marleen B. Flory (1984, 1988, 1993, 1996, 1998) have been of great importance for the studies on Livia.

7 Cf. Hölscher 2008 p. 45.

8 *CAH* 10 p. 70. For this view see also Osgood's (2012) review on Richardson's *Augustan Rome 44 BC to AD 14: the Restoration of the Republic and the Establishment of the Empire* (2012).

adopted also for consideration of the development of Livia's position.

A chronological study of Livia's position needs to be based on a multifarious collection of material from which assorted pieces of evidence originating from different categories of sources can be placed side by side and then used to delineate the course of events. The life of Livia is comparatively well documented and this study makes use of literary texts, inscriptions, statues, coins, and gems. The textual and visual media had different purposes and operated under distinct criteria; however, only by examining them in relation to each other can we adequately perceive the pattern of how Livia's position in Roman society developed. Scholars who have indicated the need for such a study include Nicholas Purcell, who in his ground-breaking article on Livia and the womanhood of Rome, noted in 1986 that 'Livia's position in Augustus' *res publica* was an extremely complex one, which needs detailed analysis, and for which there is considerable underused evidence.'[9]

An account of the different categories of sources follows below, beginning with the ancient authors. Even though we lack any words written by Livia herself she is frequently commented upon in the literary sources. A prominent Roman woman is in ancient literature either depicted as traditional *matrona*, owing her importance to her male relatives and roles as wife and mother, or, if her influence is seen as exceeding that appropriate for her gender, she runs the risk of being portrayed as scheming and even dangerous to society.[10] Livia is characterised in both ways. The historian Tacitus is foremost among her critics.[11] He wrote at length about Livia in his *Annales*, describing her as an ambitious but ruthless character, whose

9 Purcell 1986 p. 96. See also Kampen 2009 p. 23: 'Her [Livia] primary identity as wife and mother is clear from texts, statue groups, coins, and inscriptions, but the ways in which she helped to construct Augustus as a father, as well as to construct a *domus augusta* (imperial household, perhaps) and a set of emotional relations has gone unexplored until recently. By the same token, her role in supporting the emperor and helping him to build his traditionalist political program has only begun to be acknowledged.'

10 For women in Roman literature see Vidén 1993. For gender-performance in Tacitus see Späth 2012. For Roman views of prominent women in a public context see Bauman 1992; Hillard 1992; Fischler 1994.

11 For scholarship on Tacitus see Mendel 1957; Syme 1958; Syme 1970; Rutland 1978; Syme 1981; Martin 1981; Woodman 2009; Milnor 2012; Pagán 2012.

desire for power made her operate outside the accepted social norms for women. Tacitus frequently applies the word *noverca*, stepmother, to her. Livia was indeed the stepmother of Augustus' daughter Julia, and in a sense also of Julia's sons Gaius and Lucius, however, the word *noverca* had come particularly to suggest a woman who was prepared at all costs to further her own children at the expense of her step-children.[12] The negative portrait of Livia appears furthermore to have been used in order to discredit Tiberius, for a popular way of undermining a man's authority was to ridicule him for being under a woman's thumb. Thomas Strunk has recently suggested that *Annales* 1. 1-15, commonly seen as an account of Augustus' rise to power and how that power was transferred to Tiberius, can be read as account of how Livia wielded her own power and was an agent for political change when she bypassed the traditional, male Roman institutions such as the Senate, and even the *Princeps* himself, in order to place her son on the throne.[13]

Unlike Tacitus, Suetonius for the most part follows a tradition that favours Livia.[14] He wrote biographies, and appears to have been interested in Livia primarily for what she could reveal about Augustus and Tiberius, or for her place in their dynastic plans.[15] Suetonius recounts nothing of greed for power or crimes and poisoning, and it can be noted that he does not characterise Livia as *noverca*. Another important literary source is the Roman history written in Greek by Dio Cassius.[16] While he rarely mentions his sources, Dio accumulates a wealth of information on the history of the early empire. He writes in an annalistic fashion, grouping together all the events of the year no matter where in the world they took place. His judgements on Livia are diverse: she is portrayed as the wife who gives Augustus sound advice, yet he repeats rumours such as the suggestion that Livia was involved in the deaths of Gaius and Lucius.

12 Vidén 1993 p. 19. See *noverca* in *OLD*.

13 Strunk 2014 pp. 139-140.

14 For scholarship on Suetonius see Wallace-Hadrill 1983; Power and Gibson 2014. For Suetonius' account on Livia and Augustus' marriage see Langlands 2014. I found the introduction to Osgood's *A Suetonius Reader* (Osgood 2011) useful as a general overview.

15 Vidén 1993 pp. 66-90.

16 For scholarship on Dio see Millar 1964; Swan 2004; Gowing 2009.

Among those most favourably disposed towards Livia we find Velleius Paterculus, who was a military commander under Tiberius, reaching the position of *praetor* in 16 CE.[17] His *Historiae Romanae* present a brief account of Roman history, in which Livia and Tiberius are held in high esteem. Velleius' adulatory account of Tiberius' reign has received much criticism in modern times. However, granted that he makes little attempt to scrutinise his sources, Velleius is valuable as a contemporary reflection of the early principate. The same can be said of Ovid, who was exiled to Tomi on the Black Sea in 8 CE, for unknown and much debated reasons.[18] As his hope of recall depended on the good will of the imperial family, Ovid heaps flattery upon Livia and other of her family members, too. (The flattery was of no avail: he remained in exile until he died in about 17 CE.) In addition, Philo and Pliny the Elder, though of lesser importance as sources for Livia's career, have supplied some data useful for the discussion of specific topics. Lastly, Seneca the Younger's *Consolatio ad Marciam* and the anonymous *Consolatio ad Liviam* have proved to be important for a discussion of the public aspects of Livia's *mater*-role.[19]

How can literary sources be used as a basis for the understanding of

17 The *Historiae Romanae* seem to have been brushed aside due to their ingratiating approach to Tiberius' reign, and Velleius has received less scholarly attraction than other Roman historians. However, I found Lobur's chapter on Velleius and the unified political culture of the early principate useful (Lobur 2008 pp. 94-127), together with Welch 2011.

18 For scholarship on Ovid see: Boyd 2002; Habinek 2002; Hardie 2002; Herbert-Brown 2002; Williams 2002; Green 2004; Knox 2009; Wiseman and Wiseman 2011.

19 The *Consolatio ad Liviam*, composed in elegiac couplets, consists of 474 lines and is preserved in a number of late, and highly corrupt, manuscripts. The dating of the *Consolatio* is much disputed. Richmond (1981) argues that it is from CE 12-37, Purcell (1986) places it in the Augustan, or possibly Tiberian, age, while Schrijvers (1988) suggests that it is inspired by the death of Germanicus in CE 19. Fraschetti (1996), on the other hand, argues that it is contemporaneous with the death of Drusus, while Schoonhoven (1992) dates it to CE 54, following the death of Claudius. Buxton (2014) suggests that an Augustan date should be considered, and that Drusus and Tiberius are overlooked as the foremost princes of the imperial house at that time. Jenkins (2009) dates the poem to the age of Tiberius, but sums it up by the words (p. 2): 'So while the exact date of the *Consolatio* is unknown, its primary ideological tensions are thoroughly 'Augustan' in that the poem juggles multiple, and often mutually conflicting, representations of proper female imperial behaviour.'

Livia's position? To what extent do they give a 'true' account of the events which they record? Normally, it was the deeds of great men that formed the story of the Roman past.[20] Writings concerned with Livia seem to some extent to have functioned as just one of many ways of characterizing Augustus and Tiberius, and they have a tendency toward a stylisation of her gender roles. To emphasise Livia's chastity and *pietas* was a way in which writers such as Ovid and Velleius could laud Augustus indirectly, while the negative characteristics attributed to her, such as her greed for power, may be presented as reflecting the degeneration that Tacitus sees afflicting the imperial age. However, even if Livia is included in the accounts of ancient authors primarily as a means of framing the history of the beginning of the empire, they have the potential to inform us something about the opportunities which existed for her to engage in political activities, including the distribution of benefactions and her building initiatives. The more flattering accounts, such as Ovid's exile poetry, are useful in so much as they provide important reflections of the imperial politics, the concept of *domus Augusta* for instance, or the addressing of Livia as divine.

While the literary sources focus on Livia's influence and describe her as plotting behind the scenes, the eighty-eight freestanding sculptures and seventy-six inscribed statue-bases, together with twenty likenesses on gems, testify that she was highly visible throughout the Roman empire. In 1886, Johann Bernoulli compiled the first list of Livia-portraits, upon which later scholarly studies have been based, including *Iulia Augusta: Untersuchungen zur Grundlegung einer Livia-Ikonographie* by Walter H Gross (1962), Rolf Winkes' *Livia, Octavia, Julia. Porträts und Darstellungen* (1995) and *Portraits of Livia: imaging the imperial woman in Augustan Rome* by Elizabeth Bartman (1999). Winkes enumerates five portrait-types, and classifies the many spin-offs based on these models. Bartman, who divides Livia's portraits into four types, provides a comprehensive catalogue and analysis of Livia's portraits on sculptures and cameos, discussing the progression of their styles, themes and types. Livia's portraits (as well as those of other imperial women) have been further discussed by Susan Wood in *Imperial*

20 For women in Roman historiography see Milnor 2009b.

women: a study in public images 40 B.C.-A.D. 68 (1999), and by Annetta Alexandridis in her work *Die Frauen des römischen Kaiserhauses. Eine Untersuchung ihrer bildlichen Darstellung von Livia bis Iulia Domna* (2004).

Though the number of coins with images of Livia is comparable to the total number of depictions of Livia in other visual media, they have received less scholarly attention.[21] Only two studies have been devoted to such coins: *Die Frauen des römischen Kaiserhauses und ihre Ehrungen im griechischen Osten anhand epigraphischer und numismatischer Zeugnisse von Livia bis Sabina* by Ulrike Hahn (1994) and more recently Terence Harvey's *The visual representation of Livia on coins of the Roman empire* (diss., 2011). In the present study, however, coins are considered important in terms of visual communication, and whether a member of the imperial family is or is not depicted on coinage is presumed to speak of his or her authority, or lack thereof. Rome had official imperial mints, such as the ones in Rome and Lugdunum, but many provincial cities continued to issue coins independently.[22] Coins with Livia's image were not struck in imperial mints during Augustus' lifetime. However, they were selectively issued in the provinces from early in his reign. About ten coin-types of Livia were issued in Rome while some hundred and seventy examples originate from the provinces.

Lastly, about 190 inscriptions with references to Livia have survived, excluding those that record her name only as a part of her slaves' and freedmen's nomenclature. The Augustan age apparently saw a huge increase in epigraphic output and Livia's name occurs on many different types of inscribed items: plaques affixed to public monuments; statue-bases; calendars; dedications offered to various divinities; *senatus consulta*; imperial edicts and letters.[23] Epigraphy, just as much as sculptures and coins, provides evidence of the central place that the imperial family occupied in Roman society.[24]

21 Harvey 2011 p. 3.

22 Howgego 1995 p. 75. For recent scholarship on the images of the imperial family on provincial coins see Horster 2013. Imperial coinage and its reception have been the subject of several studies: e.g. Crawford 1983; Metcalf 1993; Ando 2000; Noreña 2001; Hekster 2003; Duncan-Jones 2005; Hedlund 2008; Manders 2012.

23 Beltrán Lloris 2015 pp. 131-148.

24 Beltrán Lloris 2015 pp. 131.

Unlike the literary sources sculptures and, to some extent, coins, the corpus of Livia-inscriptions has not been thoroughly studied. In this study, therefore, special emphasis will be placed on the epigraphic material and the collected inscriptions are thematically arranged in tables. In the tables I present what I consider to be the most plausible interpretations, while alternative readings and uncertainties are discussed in the main text. As for the provenance of the inscriptions: the tables give the region or province, in order to guide the reader, while the exact findspots are discussed in the main text. There are of course both advantages and disadvantages in working with an extensive corpus of epigraphic material. The chief advantage is that it offers a comprehensive view of Livia's position as it was reflected in inscriptions from throughout the empire: the chief disadvantage is that I have not been able to look at all the inscriptions myself, and photographs have not always been available, as they are in the case of sculptures and coins. Some inscribed objects have disappeared since the time of their publication and I have generally had to rely on previous editorial work with regard to textual restoration. For this reason, I have rarely included consideration of heavily damaged inscriptions, especially if Livia's name is entirely restored.

To be able to present a thorough analysis of the foundations of Livia's position a holistic approach to sources is a prerequisite. This study is therefore based on an inquiry of the complete corpus of literary, sculptural, numismatic and epigraphic sources concerning Livia. In order to collect the relevant Latin and Greek texts I have used the databases available through the Packard Humanities Institute, and the digital version of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. For scholarly editions of texts, the most recent Teubner editions (*Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*) are used throughout the study, except for the *Consolatio ad Liviam* where I follow the edition of Schoonhoven. All quotations in Greek and Latin have been compared with the texts as printed in the latest *Loeb Classical Library* volumes from where the translations are drawn, unless otherwise stated. The translations have been reformatted to make them relate more closely to the Greek or Latin. The numbering of Dio's work follows the Loeb edition. With regard to sculptures and sculpture-dedications, the collections of portraits published in the works by Winkes

and Bartman, along with *Dynastic commemoration and imperial portraiture in the Julio-Claudian period* by Charles Brian Rose (1997), have proved particularly useful for this study. In the case of more recently discovered statues not mentioned in the works above, the data are assembled from other sources, which are consequently cited. I have used the first volumes of *Roman Imperial Coinage* and *Roman Provincial Coinage* as the main sources for the identification of numismatic examples of Livia's portrait. The catalogue of inscriptions which I have compiled for this study has been based on an inquiry into the existing corpora of Greek and Latin inscriptions, primarily the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, the *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, the *Inscriptiones Graecae*, the *Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes* and the databases in which they are published, together with the *L'Année épigraphique*. The abbreviations used in this study follow *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. The publications drawn upon have inevitably been numerous. There may be others, yet to be investigated, which might prove of relevance, but it is hoped that the material so far collected will be amply sufficient to fulfil the aim of this study.

Approaching Livia's position in the Roman state

The large and heterogenous collection of source material requires to be examined within a theoretical framework. To begin with, what does the term 'position' imply? Following the sociologist Robert Merton, 'position' can be explained as determined by one's particular status in society and can be used to describe both the formal and informal rank that an individual holds. [25] Attached to a 'position' is a role, or a pattern of behaviour, that may be oriented towards what Merton calls a 'reference group', a collective which has particular expectations of the position-holder. An individual can possess more than just one status and one role at a time, and these multiple roles and statuses are often interrelated. This study will focus on Livia's positions as the wife of a triumvir, wife of the first *princeps*, mother to the second, and matriarch of the imperial family. To these positions three

25 Merton, Reader and Kendall 1957, with further elaborations in Merton 1968. See also Kendall 1975. For a discussion on roles and role models in the Roman world based on Merton's work see Bell 2008.

principal roles were attached: *uxor* and *mater* (which are so closely interrelated that they compose one single role), *patrona*, and *diva*.

By adhering to patterns of behaviour in line with collective expectations, it is likely that Livia was aided in orienting and integrating her persona into society, especially as regards her performance in the public arena. Furthermore, such expected modes of behaviour assisted the subjects to assign her an appropriate place within the empire's social and ethical system. Livia's position depended on her capacity to play the roles attached to it consistently throughout her life, whether they mirrored her 'authentic' self or not. An important theoretical presumption is that one's position is not static, but requires constant validation to keep it upwardly mobile. This validation of Livia's position will be discussed in terms of honours and the patterns that were established to enable subjects to express their loyalty to the imperial power.[26]

Studying Livia's roles and the way in which those roles were expressed, rather than her as an individual, is more fruitful as a method of gaining knowledge about the early principate. Discussion of her standing in terms of identity, a concept that to a large extent is a creation of the twentieth century, runs the risk of being anachronistic.[27] Its seems best, therefore, to avoid such an approach, though that is not to suggest that Livia lacked her own personal ambitions and goals. I follow Tonio Hölscher when he emphasises that roles are more beneficial to study than identity: 'The concept of 'roles' is of a much more rational character. It is not based on an unquestionable core of an individual or collective self but on social conventions. Roles are not self-centred but communicative and socially oriented. They may be judged, as good or bad, on the basis of ethical categories, without questioning the individual or the community in its inner self.'[28]

26 Important studies on the imperial rule as a two-way process of communication are Lendon 1997 and Ando 2000.

27 For malaise regarding 'identity', when it comes to studies of the Roman society, see Hölscher 2008. Roles, rather than identity, are important not only for the understanding of the Roman society, but also for the pre-modern world in general. See Geertz 1980; Christian 1987; Rietbergen 2006; Illouz 2012 pp. 18-58.

28 Hölscher 2008 p. 54.

The theoretical framework which provided a model for the approach adopted in this study was devised with a man's position in mind: the roles of a Roman emperor have been frequently discussed. But it is suitable, too, for Livia, who was acting in what to a large extent was a male political culture.[29] Political status in the Roman society can hardly be separated from the construct of gender based on perceived differences between sexes.[30] Scholarship on gender-based social roles and power-relationships has until recently focused on the concept of male domination in society.[31] On the basis of literary sources scholars have made the assumption that women derived their main position from their relationship to one or more prominent men, and that, whatever their achievements, they were subordinate to that defining relationship.[32] Consequently, works on Livia's position in the principate have focused predominantly on her relationship to Augustus and Tiberius. However, the validity of this view has been questioned and scholars have begun to re-conceptualise male hierarchical models of power.[33] While it can be generally agreed that dominant groups tend to develop their own sets of norms, it could be argued that élite women in Roman society was one of those dominant groups, and that male members of the imperial family might to some extent take advantage of the position held by their female relatives.[34] The fact that Livia was married to Augustus and mother to Tiberius was fundamental for her position: still, it should not be ruled out that she was a participant in the establishment of the imperial power. This is the main reason behind the choice of theoretical framework; it allows a complex approach to Livia's position and the process whereby female imperiality became a part of the new political order. In Roman society there was no such thing as a sharp defining line between the domestic and the public spheres or between family and state: a considerable range of activities at varying degrees of

29 For discussions on the roles of the Roman emperor cf. Millar 1977; Zanker 1979; Hölscher 2008 p. 44-45. For political culture as a general concept see Pye 1965; Verba 1965. For a discussion on Roman political culture see Hammar 2013 pp. 50-51 with references.

30 For gender in antiquity see Scott 1986; Lampen 1996; Rodgers 2003; Connell 2009.

31 Spencer-Wood 1999.

32 Harvey 2011 p. 77.

33 Milledge-Nelson 1999; Spencer-Wood 1999.

34 Kampen 1991; Corbier 1995; Scheer 2006; Harvey 2011 pp. 77-78.

distance from these antithetical opposites took place in the nebulous area between them.[35] This study is based on the assumption that Livia's role-set developed through exploiting a variety of stations in that nebulous area, both in the relatively uncontroversial areas of the possible female sphere, and also some verging on the male one.[36] Evidence of the transformation of Livia's roles of *mater* and *uxor*, *patrona*, and *diva* will serve to shed new light on the interplay between tradition and invention that characterised the age of Augustus.

Livia's role-set serves both as a theoretical and methodological framework. The three roles give a clear structure of this study, being discussed in one chapter each. The chapters are chronologically arranged in order to analyse how Livia conformed to the pattern previously exhibited by prominent women and how her roles eventually came to be transformed as a consequence of the development of the principate. In the last and concluding chapter I will summarize the conclusions reached about Livia's three roles and discuss them together so as to present a thorough analysis of the stages in the development of her position in the state. The study spans a hundred years, from Livia's birth in 58 BCE up until her deification in 42 CE. As chronological development is the main focus, no geographical limitations have been imposed. The literary texts, inscriptions, sculptures and coins that form the basis of the discussion originate not only from the city of Rome, but from all parts of the empire, and sometimes even beyond its bounds. It remains now to introduce Livia's principal roles one by one.

Livia was, in the first place, a wife and a mother. A woman performing these two interconnected roles held a venerable position in the Roman society, particular because of her ability to produce legitimate descendants for her husband's family, and she was commonly honoured by both her husband and adult sons.[37] During the late republic women appear to have

35 Russell 2016 provides a thought-provoking discussion of private and public as fluid concepts in (republican) Rome.

36 Purcell 1986.

37 During the 1990's, many important works have added to our knowledge about the composition and dynamics of the Roman family: see Rawson 1986; Dixon 1988; Corbier 1991; Bradley 1991; Evans 1991; Kertzer and Saller 1991; Rawson 1991; Treggiari 1991; Dixon 1992; Saller 1994; Rawson and Weaver 1997; Gardner 1998; Saller 1998.

been able to transform traditional domestic roles as wives and mothers into more outspoken and powerful public roles.[38] The Civil Wars saw individuals such as Terentia, Fulvia, Octavia and the wife in the *Laudatio Turiae* taking an active part in the progress of events.[39] Certain traditional female tasks also took on greater political significance during the same period. Marriages, for instance, which were often left to a mother to arrange, became increasingly political, as power became concentrated in the hands of fewer and fewer families.[40] Central to this study is the change from republic to empire, from competition between aristocratic families within an oligarchy to the supremacy of one family. Special attention will be paid to the way in which Livia's role as *mater* evolved in parallel with the development of an imperial family.[41] The works by Beth Severy (2002), and Kristina Milnor (2005), which discuss the importance of the family and explore topics relating to domestic and moralised privacy in the political ideology of the Augustan age, are of great significance for a study of this development.

Livia's position gave her the additional role of *patrona*. Patronage had been central to the social and political culture throughout the Roman republic and the role of *patrona* was not unfamiliar to republican women belonging to the higher social strata. They had been in charge of tasks such as household economy, supervision of various types of production; storage of goods, and the distribution of different kinds of information.[42] A large amount of historical, sociological, and ethnological research examines patron-client relations and friendship.[43] While an egalitarian form of relationship is characterized by friendship, patron-client relationships can be understood as implying inequality between those involved. Patronage

38 Milnor 2009b p. 278.

39 Hemelrijk 1999; Treggiari 2007; Brannan 2012; Osgood 2014.

40 Milnor 2009b p. 278.

41 For this development, that will be extensively discussed in Chapter 2, see Severy 2003; Gruen 2005; Judge 2008; Kleiner and Buxton 2008; Simpson 2008; Buxton 2014.

42 For female patronage and political involvement during the late republic see Dixon 1983.

43 Tenbruck 1964; Wolf 1966; Eisenstadt and Roniger 1984; Allan and Adams 1998; Bell and Coleman 1999; Beer 2001; Schinkel 2003; Rapsch 2004.

served to facilitate the exchange of goods and services such as economic aid, to enhance the status and social standing of those involved, and to give support in legal and political matters. The goods and services exchanged were often convertible, and economic aid might be repaid by career-advancement. A favour did not need to be returned immediately, and one important function of patron-client relations was to organise resources and guarantee them for future needs, an arrangement which was important in a pre-modern society like the Roman.

Two controversial positions which had been adopted in scholarship relating to patronage during the early empire call for further discussion. In his posthumously published book *Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats* (1964) Anton von Premerstein argues that patronage as a political factor suffered a decline in the empire, as the emperor monopolised the resources that traditionally led to close relationships, such as the right to nominate candidates for elections. This was the predominant view until the publications of works by Richard Saller (1982) and Andrew Wallace-Hadrill (1989), who argue that patron-client relations kept their importance within the upper social strata in the Roman empire. Saller stresses how the aristocracy even exerted patronage by virtue of their role of facilitating access to imperial benefactions. More recently Aloys Winterling (2009) has pointed out how the ancient sources contradict both positions taken with regard to patronage and has argued that in order to understand the significance of *clientela* in imperial Rome, one needs to take into account performative and symbolic dimensions of the phenomenon, in addition to the instrumental.

The study of female patronage poses a particular problem since the terms describing the role of a benefactor are rooted in a male reference system. The word *patrona,* meaning 'patroness', is derived from the masculine noun *patronus*, a term which, being a derivative from *pater*, refers to an essentially male authority. The rights and obligations of a *patronus* and a *patrona* were moreover not necessarily the same. That said, *patrona* is a perfectly classical term and hence ideal for use in the discussion of Livia's role as benefactress, given that one of the main purposes is to

discuss Livia's position within the basically male political culture.[44] Livia's patronage embraced both the Roman and the Hellenistic part of the empire, but the concept of patronage, derived from Latin *patronus*, lacked a precise equivalent in Greek: the term 'euergetism', derived from Greek *euergetes,* covers all different kinds of action of goodwill from an individual towards his or her fellow citizens. For the sake of consistency, the term patronage will be used to describe all of Livia's activity as a benefactress, but when Greek sources use other terms, attention will be drawn to the fact.

If *uxor*, *mater* and *patrona* were traditional republican roles suitable for a Roman woman to hold, the role of *diva* was not. However, ancient religion was to a high degree polytheistic. The Romans did not worship their gods just *qua* gods in general: worship was performed to those gods who were particularly of relevance for those performing the act, or for the Roman state. The pantheon can hence be seen as a non-absolute status-system, subject to relativistic human judgements. However, to be given divine worship was the highest possible honour that one could be given.[45] The lack of ruler-cult relating to Roman republican leaders before Julius Caesar is readily explained by the fact that the republic did not have any single ruler with such strong and permanent power: Caesar and members of the Julio-Claudian family were the first human individuals in Rome, since the days of the pre-republican kings, with a position that invited divine honours.[46]

Simon Price first articulated the dominant view on imperial worship in 1984.[47] He sees it as a form of negotiation, a way in which subjects across the empire could define their own relationship with a new political reality,

44 I agree with Nicholas Purcell when he writes: 'I would like to think that by seeing Livia and the *matronae* in male terms in a male world we can add something to the study of ancient women; and that by regarding her as 'just another example of a woman but one who happened by good luck to find herself in a position of great influence' we would be still playing the game of Stuart Hay, Cassius Dio and Valerius Maximus.' (Purcell 1986 p. 97.)

45 For divinity as a relative rather than an absolute division between men and gods see Gradel 2002.

46 Gradel 2002 p. 33.

47 Other important works on the imperial cult include Beard, Price and North 1998; Clauss 2001.

an emperor whose power and charisma made him appear as both a man and a god. In this view, the emperor is located between the human world and the divine, and regarded by his diverse subjects as occupying a variety of stations along the continuum between these two polar opposites. While Price focus on the eastern part of the empire, Duncan Fishwick (1987-2005) has produced studies of all facets of ruler-cult in the western provinces, and Ittai Gradel (2002) on emperor-worship on the Italian peninsula. In line with the findings of Price, Fishwick and Gradel, the divine worship that Livia received will be approached as an honorific practice, different in degree, but no different in kind from 'secular' tributes. It will be viewed as an honour which formulated her position while at the same time making public the existence of a social hierarchy involving her and her worshippers. Account will be given both of the various kinds of worship that Livia received across the empire, and of her formal deification and incorporation in the state cult in 42 CE.

II. MATER AND UXOR

This chapter consists of an interpretation of Livia's role as *uxor* and *mater*. Its analytical method presupposes that the role was not static but subject to change due to Livia's shifting positions within the rising empire. The structure of the chapter is hence one of chronological progression from Livia's birth in 58 BCE to her deification in 42 CE. There is an emphasis on literary sources in this chapter in so far as they provide a historical framework within which coins, inscriptions, and sculptures may be studied as evidence for the response to Livia's evolving role.

Early years and marriage to Octavian

Livia's birth-date in 58 BCE[48] is established by inscriptions of the post-Julian period as *a.d. III Kal. Febr*. i.e. the third day before the first of February (by inclusive reckoning).[49] This date is commonly given as January 30 on

48 The year of Livia's birth has to be calculated back from the year of her death, placed in 29 CE by both Tacitus and Dio (Tac. *Ann*. 5.1.1, Cass. Dio 58.2.1), since it is not explicitly to be found in the ancient sources. While Tacitus only attests that Livia had reached an extremely old age (*aetate extrema*), Dio specifies that she lived for eighty-six years. As Dio asserts that Livia had passed her eighty-sixth birthday in 29 CE and Dio normally refers to the completion of whole years in this context (see 56.30.5 on Augustus, 58.28.5 on Tiberius and 60.34.3 on Claudius), she must have been born on the twenty-eighth day of January in 58 or 59 BCE, depending on when in 29 CE she died. (See Barrett 1999 for a more extant discussion). C. Fufius Gemius was one of the consuls of 29 CE, and Tacitus (*Ann*. 5.1.2) describes how Tiberius mentions him, as a consul, in the letter he wrote to the senate to explain why he did not attend his mother's funeral. Fufius should have left his office on 30 June, and it is confirmed in the epigraphic material that he, and his colleague L. Rubellius Geminus, were replaced by L. Nonius Asprenas and A. Plautius no later than 6 July (*CIL* IV. 15555, *ILS* 6124). This places Livia's death on the first half of the year.

49 *AFA* XXXIV; XLIII.

the basis of the Julian calendar and our modern calendar system, although actually January 28 would be more correct, given that in the republican calendar used at the time of Livia's birth January only had 29 days.[50] Livia belonged to one of the oldest and most distinguished families in Rome, the *gens Claudia*. Her father, M. Livius Drusus Claudianus (hereafter referred to as Drusus Claudianus), was born a Claudius Pulcher but was later adopted into the Livian family, probably by M. Livius Drusus.[51] It is not established from where her mother, Alfidia, had her origin: Suetonius asserts that she was from Fundi, while preserved inscriptions indicate a connection to Marruvium.[52] Livia was their only known surviving child.

Livia was born at a time of social and political change in Rome.[53] Drusus Claudianus was deeply involved with the politics of the first Triumvirate; first as a *praetor* in 50 BCE and as a supporter of Caesar's until the latter's assassination in 44 BCE, when he sided with the 'Liberators'. About this time Livia married her first husband: her kinsman Tiberius Claudius Nero, whom Cicero described as 'a youth of high birth, ability, and unselfish character'.[54]

50 In 58 BCE the third day (inclusive) before the Kalends of February must have meant the twenty-eighth day of January. When the Julian calendar reform was introduced, Livia simply went on celebrating her birthday on the third day before the Kalends, except that this date now denoted a different day; January 30 (Suerbaum 1980 pp. 327-355; Feeney 2009 p. 156). The Julian reform was a problem for anyone born between *Ides* and *Kalends* in the second half of the month, but there were several solutions. Like Livia, both Mark Antony and Augustus were born on non-existing days in the Julian calendar. However, they kept their birthdays as before even if this meant celebrating them on a different date. If Livia had done likewise, she would have celebrated her birthday on the fifth day before the *Kalends* of February, thus keeping the original day, twenty-eight days into the month, sixteen days after the *Ides*, and redescribing it according to the Julian calendar.

51 Drusus Claudianus' nomenclature is inconsistent in the literary sources, but his complete name is established by inscriptions. Barrett 2002 p. 7.

52 Suetonius (*Tib*. 5; *Cal*. 23) refers to Livia's mother as Aufidia, but inscriptions from Baetica, Marruvium and Samos indicate that her name was Alfidia. For Livia's maternal origin see Wiseman 1965 and Linderski 1974.

53 For recent works on the age of Augustus see Eck 2007; Levick 2010; Galinsky 2012; Richardson 2012.

54 Cic. *Fam*. 13.64.2. Cicero wrote this characterization in a letter to his wife Terentia when he was away governing Cilicia and at the same time trying to find his daughter Tullia a man to marry. But the messenger arrived too late and Terentia and Tullia had already decided to choose another up-and-coming man, Publius Cornelius Dolabella.

The 40s was a prosperous decade for Tiberius Nero. He became *quaestor* to Julius Caesar in 48 BCE and successfully commanded his fleet in the Alexandrian War. He was rewarded with a priesthood after the victory over the Egyptian navy and later entrusted with the founding of Roman colonies in Gaul.[55] Tiberius Nero was elected *praetor* in 42 BCE and his star was on the rise when he married Livia. The exact date for their wedding is unknown, but the earliest year in which Livia could contract a legal marriage would have been 46 BCE. However, Tiberius Nero was in Gaul 46-45 BCE to arrange settlements for Caesar's veterans, so the *terminus post quem* for the marriage would be 45 BCE.[56] Their eldest son, Tiberius Claudius Nero, was born on the 16th November 42 BCE, which suggests a date between 45 BCE and early 42 BCE for their wedding.[57]

Livia's married life with Tiberius Nero turned out to be tumultuous due to the civil war that broke out of following the death of Caesar. Drusus Claudianus fought alongside Brutus and Cassius against Octavian and Antony at the battle of Philippi and a sad blow struck Livia just a month before her son Tiberius was born, when her father chose to commit suicide instead of being captured by the victors. From this time, 42 BCE, Antony and Octavian held the supreme power. They divided the empire, with Antony in control of the east and Octavian the west. Antony entered a relationship with Cleopatra VII of Egypt. However, after his brother Lucius Antonius had risen against Octavian and been defeated at the battle of Perusia in 40 BCE, he agreed to marry Octavian's sister Octavia to seal the alliance between him and Octavian, which resulted in the so-called Peace of Brundisium.

Tiberius Nero was of republican sympathies like his father-in-law and joined Lucius Antonius and Fulvia at Perusia to fight against Octavian. Livia and the now two-year-old Tiberius followed him when he set out to

55 Suet. *Tib*. 4.

56 Suet. *Tib*. 4. Treggiari 1993 p. 129 n. 24.

57 For the date of Tiberius' birth see Suet. *Tib*. 5. Suetonius asserts that some people believed Tiberius to have been born in Fundi in the following or preceding year because of his grandmother's origins, but that he in fact was born in November 42 BCE on the Palatine Hill in Rome. Suetonius refers to both the *fasti* and the *acta publica* and his statements are confirmed in a surviving inscription from the *Feriale Cumanum*. (*ILS* 108 = *EJ* p. 54.)

battle, but their luck did not last long. Perusia fell and the couple had to flee first to Praeneste and then to Naples to fight Octavian in Campania. When Octavian's troops broke into Naples, Tiberius Nero and Livia sailed to Sicily where they met Marcus Libo, the father-in-law of Sextus Pompeius.[58] But as a confrontation with Anthony came closer, Octavian sought to draw near Sextus Pompeius, who therefore had to repudiate Tiberius Nero to avoid an unnecessary provocation. Once again Tiberius Nero, Livia, and their infant son had to hurry away, this time to join Antony in the east.[59] At some point during this turmoil Tiberius Nero was proscribed.[60] Livia followed her husband into exile, and the couple passed through Sparta, where the *gens Claudia* had been patrons for a long time.[61]

Sextus Pompeius and the Triumvirs settled their differences by the Treaty of Misenum. The pact granted amnesty to those who had been loyal to Sextus Pompeius; Tiberius Nero and Livia could thus return to Rome and they arrived in the late summer or early autumn of 39 BCE, after having been on the run for four years.[62] Dio recounts how Octavian met Livia when she had returned to Rome and instantly fell in love with her,[63] and how, furthermore, he divorced his wife Scribonia on the very day she gave birth to their daughter Julia.[64] It is likely that their marriage did not end solely because of Octavian's new-found interest in Livia, but also, in part, because of the growing conflict between him and Sextus Pompeius; for

58 Suet. *Tib.* 4.

59 Osgood 2006 pp. 172-173; Osgood 2014 pp. 71-74.

60 Tacitus (*Ann*. 6.51.1) gives an account of how the young Tiberius went into exile following his proscribed father, *proscriptum patrem exul secutus*, but does not provide any information on when exactly Tiberius Nero was proscribed.

61 Suet. *Tib*. 6. Livia's patronage on Sparta will be discussed in Chapter 3.

62 Suet. *Tib*. 4; Tac. *Ann*. 5.1.1; Vell. Pat. 2.75.

63 This happened, according to Dio (48.34.3), at the same time as Octavian started to clean shave after having grown a mourning beard in honour of Caesar. He does not give a more precise date but Marleen Flory 1988 (p. 344) suggests that Octavian shaved off his beard, and celebrated the occasion with both private and public festivities, around the time of his birthday in September. Dio could be proven wrong when it comes to the clean shaving as coins depicting a bearded Octavian were minted in 38 BCE. However, Dio's chronology for the meeting of Livia and Octavian seems plausible, as it is known from a calendar from Verulae that they got married on January 17, 38 BCE.

64 Cass. Dio 48.34.3.

Scribonia was related to the latter. Regardless of the possible love and attraction between them, Livia was a good catch. Her father was dead and she had no brother, so by marrying her Octavian did not enter a close relationship with any one powerful male individual, as had happened in the case of his previous marriage and engagements. However, the marriage gave Octavian the opportunity to create an alliance with the surviving republican nobility in Rome, and, through their clients, with local élites around the empire.[65] After the Peace of Brundisium and the amnesty given, he may have thought the time ripe for the marriage, even though it was not uncontroversial to divorce during pregnancy, as a consequence of which he sought the blessing of Rome's pontifical college.[66]

Livia divorced Tiberius Nero and was betrothed to Octavian in the autumn of 39 BCE.[67] She gave birth to her second son, Drusus, on 14 January 38 BCE, and the marriage between her and Octavian was celebrated just three days later, on 17 January.[68] It may be noted that at the time of their marriage Octavian was twenty-five and Livia not yet twenty. The relatively small difference in age might be of some relevance to how their relationship would develop.

The first public privileges

The first clear shift in Livia's role as *uxor* and *mater*, following her marriage to Octavian, is marked by the privileges bestowed upon her in 35 BCE. She and her sister in-law, Octavia, received the sacrosanctity of tribunes of the people and the removal of *tutela mulierum*, which meant that they acquired the freedom to take financial actions. Statues of Livia and Octavia were erected, perhaps as a mark of the occasion. Dio, our only source, gives this account:

65 Bartman 1999 p. 57.

66 Cass. Dio 48.44.2; Tac. *Ann*. 1.10.5. Syme 1939 p. 229; Levick 1976 p. 15; Flory 1988 p. 345.

67 Tacitus seems to have associated the abduction of Livia by Augustus and the founding of the principate, see Strunk 2014.

68 *EJ* 46.

> καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐπινίκια ψηφισθέντα οἱ ἀνεβάλετο, τῇ δ᾽ Ὀκταουίᾳ τῇ τε Λιουίᾳ καὶ εἰκόνας καὶ τὸ τὰ σφέτερα ἄνευ κυρίου τινὸς διοικεῖν, τό τε ἀδεὲς καὶ τὸ ἀνύβριστον ἐκ τοῦ ὁμοίου τοῖς δημάρχοις ἔχειν ἔδωκεν.[69]
>
> The triumph which had been voted to him he deferred, but granted to Octavia and Livia statues, the right of administering their own affairs without a guardian, and the same security and inviolability as the tribunes enjoyed.

This was the first grant of privileges made to distinguish Livia, together with Octavia, from other women of the Roman aristocracy. In the passage quoted above, Dio recounts that Octavian decided to defer his triumph but grant privileges to his wife and sister. Dio's syntax indicates that the same agent that had voted in favour of the triumph, had voted to confer the privileges. It was normally the Senate which voted honorific statues like these to subjects, as a mark of outstanding actions.[70] This honour, combined with the grant of the tribunician *sacrosanctitas* and the removal of *tutela*, was an extraordinary measure and a distinct sign of political recognition, especially if all these grants were conferred by the Senate. The three privileges deserve to be discussed one by one.

Sacrosanctitas

The *sacrosanctitas* was a particularly remarkable privilege owing to the air of magistracy surrounding it.[71] Octavian had received the sacrosanctity of a tribune of the plebs some years earlier, probably in the early thirties BCE, in connection with the celebration of an *ovatio* and the announcement that the Civil Wars were over.[72] It was a singular honour and novel in two respects: it demonstrated that it was possible to separate the power of an office from the office itself and that a power that went with an exclusively plebeian office could be assigned to a patrician. Two different groups of Romans were sacrosanct: the tribunes of the plebs and the Vestal Virgins.

69 Cass. Dio 49.38.

70 In Dio, the emperor normally either rejects or grants voted (ψηφισθέντα) by the Senate. Cf. 56.17.2 and 60.3.2.

71 Purcell 1986 p. 87. See also Scardigli 1982.

72 App. *B Civ.* 5.132; Cass. Dio 49.15.6. Richardson 2012 p. 58.

Although Livia received the tribunician *sacrosanctitas,* I would like to argue that its association with Vesta was helpful in making her new and remarkable privilege fit into the political context of the late republic, as it at least gave the impression that its conferment had taken place within a pre-existing political framework that allowed the honouring for women. However, the sacrosanctity of Livia and Octavia should not be taken as exactly analogous to that of the Vestal Virgins who received it out of respect for their religious function and their chastity.[73]

Why did Octavian have this grant, unprecedented for females outside the Vestal sisterhood, bestowed upon both his wife and his sister? There are several possible reasons. Firstly, the Civil Wars had brought about insecurity, violence and death, and the *sacrosanctitas* might have been granted to protect Livia and Octavia against the insults which their positions as wife and sister of Octavian could have provoked.[74] Secondly, the women close to the Triumvirs played an important part in the promotion of Octavian and Antony's power.[75] Thirdly, it released Livia and Octavia from some of the social control otherwise imposed on Roman women.[76] Furthermore, it is possible that the key to understanding the honours is Octavia, not Livia, as Dio's order of words might reflect.[77] She was as at this time as prominent as Livia, and in greater need of the *sacrosanctitas*. Just before the grants were given, Octavia had visited Athens, where her husband had renounced her in favour of Cleopatra.[78] It is reasonable to assume that the granting of *sacrosanctitas* upon her would be

73 That Livia and Octavia's sacrosanctity was not analogous to that of the Vestal Virgins was first acknowledged by Willrich in 1911, p. 54, followed by Hohl 1937 and Winkes 1985 p. 58, although Winkes stresses that there were parallels to both the Vestal Virgins and the tribunes of the plebs.

74 E.g. in the *Annales*, Tacitus presents a hostile version of the marriage of Livia and Octavian that Flory (1988) traces back to propaganda of Antony.

75 Cf. Zanker 1990 pp. 33-77.

76 Purcell 1986 p. 85. Livia was the only empress who was granted this privilege. From 8 CE the law of *maiestas* protected the whole imperial family, including protection of verbal insults, which probably made the *sacrosanctitas* useless.

77 Scardigli 1982.

78 Purcell 1986 s. 85; Flory 1993 p. 294; Bartman 1999 p. 62. Octavia and Antony did not divorce until 32 BCE.

a way for Octavian to protect his sister from further insults and to capitalise on her rejection, as it had evoked compassion in Rome.[79] By giving these honours to his sister Octavian could point a contrast between himself and Antony. The extension of the *sacrosanctitas* to Livia seems logical in order to keep the honours of the wives of the Triumvirs equal.

We do not know to what extent Livia's *sacrosanctitas* was invoked to protect her since we have little knowledge of insults directed towards her. One rather obscure incident was recorded by Dio to mark Livia's wit and character: some naked men appeared in front of her and were to be put to death in consequence, but Livia saved them by saying that to chaste women, such men are like statues.[80] It could be argued that it was Livia's position as *sacrosancta* that required the men to be killed because of their nakedness in front of her.

Tutela mulierum

It is my belief that the removal of the *tutela* was as important as *sacrosanctitas* in terms of Livia's position. The Vestal Virgins were the only women who were not subject to tutelage, and it is reasonable to assume that the association with them legitimised not only her *sacrosanctitas*, but also her freedom from *tutela*. Up until 35 BCE, Livia had to seek the sanction of her tutor – since the time of their wedding, Octavian – for financial transactions. He could choose to validate them by his *auctoritas* as her *tutor* and *paterfamilias*, or not. Typically, Roman women were subject to *tutela*, even those whose fathers and husbands were dead. However, women had taken steps towards an improved financial standing during the late republic. Many *matronae* in practice had their property under their own control, even if they formally had a *tutor*. This development had consequences. During the civil wars the Triumvirs forced women to contribute financially to the war by taxes and penalties.[81] It was a new source of income for the Triumvirs, and it could also have enabled them

79 Bartman 1999 p. 62.
80 Cass. Dio 58.2.4.
81 App. *B.Civ*. 4.32-34; Val. Max. 8.3.3. Osgood 2006 p. 82-88.

to control, and take advantage of, the wealthy and powerful women who during the Civil Wars supported their brothers, husbands, and sons.[82] The freedom of *tutela* given to Livia can be seen in this light, although in her case the release from tutelage was an officially granted privilege. Furthermore, it allowed her to manage a large household independently, as will be discussed in the next chapter.

Public statues

The commemorative statues of 35 BCE were the first known visual representations of Livia. Unfortunately they are not preserved and, since Dio does not provide any further information, it is not possible to tell where they were erected, or what they looked like.[83] That Dio does not enter more deeply into the subject could be due to the fact that public images of women were much more common in the Rome of his time than during the late republic.

It may be worthwhile to consider the honorific statues of mortal women that existed in Rome in 35 BCE in order to understand those of Livia and Octavia. They depicted Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi, and legendary

82 Osgood 2006 p. 82-88. Their support was to a large extent financial, as in the cases of Terentia, the wife of Cicero, who supported her husband both during his exile in 59-58 BCE and the Civil Wars. Cf. Cic. *Fam*. 14.1-4.

83 Bartman (1999 pp. 64-67) has tried to retrieve the appearance of the statue, most likely life-size and made of bronze, by studying possible marble versions of it. She argues that the so-called Marbury Hall type emanates from this statue. Of all the types of Livia-portraits the Marbury Hall type is closest to traditional Roman portraits of females, since it represents Livia as a dignified republican *matrona*. This early portrait of Livia would have been consistent with traditional Roman portraits of women known from a funeral context. The Marbury Hall type has survived only in a small number – nine – which seems appropriate. They were in all probability not widespread, rather strategically placed in Rome and wherever they were erected throughout the empire. It has been suggested by Flory 1993 (p. 295) that the statues were erected alongside the statue of Cleopatra in the temple of Venus Victrix to present a moral antithesis to the Egyptian queen.

women such as Claudia Quinta and Cloelia.[84] What these women have in common is that they received their statues in exchange for an act of service to the state, in much the same way as men had been honoured by statues for their virtuous deeds.[85] Claudia Quinta and Cloelia had done their noble deeds in a distant past, and the statue of Cornelia was probably erected after her death, and it could have regarded as less provocative to give visible public honours to dead women than to living ones.[86] None of the statues have survived, except for a base that records a statue to Cornelia, found on the site of the porticus Octavia.[87] The statues of Livia and Octavia perhaps recalled by visual allusion the monuments to these women: they cannot, however, automatically be understood or explained by them. In 35 BCE neither Livia nor Octavia had performed any great deed that could have qualified for a statue. The statues of them had, more likely, the function of communicating their position as the wife or sister of the Triumvir: their privileges served as substitutes for meritorious actions. To

84 The statue of Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi, erected at the end of the second century BCE is the first honorific statue of a woman for which we have more solid historical evidence. (Plut. *C. Gracch*. 4.3-4; Plin. *HN* 34.13. See also Coarelli 1978 pp. 13-28.) Both contexts and dates are obscure concerning the bronze statues of Gaia Cecilia (Tanaquil), wife of the fifth Etruscan king Lucius Tarquinius Priscus, and Cloelia, the heroine from the war between Rome and Clusium in 508 BCE who saved a group of hostages from the Etruscan king Porsenna. They are supposed to have been erected (Festus 276; Livy 2.13.11; Plut. *Mor.* 250f.) together with a statue of Claudia Quinta, the Vestal Virgin famous for dragging to shore a boat containing the stone of the Magna Mater after it had become stuck fast in the Tiber (Val. Max. 1.8.11; Suet. *Tib*. 2; Bartman 1999 p. 63.) The latter statue is shown on later sacred monuments in Rome. Claudia was claimed to be a distant relative of Livia and maybe her image came to the minds of those looking at the recently dedicated statues of Livia and Octavia.

85 See Livy 2.13.6-11 and Sen. *Dial.* 6.16.2.

86 For the statue of Cornelia see Dixon 2007 p. 56-59. Hemelrijk (2005) argues that since the statues are commented upon in written sources from the Augustan period or later, they represent an invented tradition of public statuary for women in the republic which served to justify the extraordinary grant of public statues to Livia and Octavia rather than reflecting an ancient practice.

87 The statue of Cornelia was eventually erected in the portico of Octavia, but we do not know whether the original statue from the end of the second century BCE survived until the age of Augustus, or if a copy was displayed in the portico. Dixon 2007 p. 62. For the inscription on the statue base see *CIL* VI.10043.

erect statues of the wives, daughters, and mothers of prominent men was common in the Greek East: Octavia, Fulvia, and Cleopatra were all honoured in this way.[88] Awareness of this custom might have prompted Octavian to counter with the statues of Livia and Octavia, adjusted to a Roman context, but nevertheless following a Hellenistic traditional practice.[89]

The decision to honour Livia and Octavia together has been interpreted as avoidance of the singling out of one woman for public recognition.[90] However, it could be misleading to see the joint privileges and pairing of Livia and Octavia as merely a strategy for not elevating one woman. The promoting of pairs would eventually be an important feature of the Augustan politics: Marcellus and Tiberius received honours together as did Tiberius and Drusus, the latter were also associated with Castor and Pollux.[91] Augustus adopted Gaius and Lucius at the same occasion, and when Augustus later adopted Tiberius, Tiberius adopted his nephew Germanicus. At the end of his life Augustus made Livia and Tiberius joint heirs in his will. Thus, it seems reasonable to assume that the pairing of honours and privileges was done on positive rather than negative grounds, that is to say, in the hope of achieving rather than avoiding something. The grant of *sacrosanctitas* to Livia and Octavian could be interpreted as another example of pairing. However, Octavian obtained his *sacrosanctitas* prior to Livia, perhaps to avoid appearing like a Hellenistic ruling couple. Another reason why Livia's *sacrosanctitas* was granted subsequent to Octavian's could be the fact that his leadership was developing step by step during this period. Many political actions at this juncture in time can be seen as attempts to define and understand Livia and Octavian's positions in the state. Until now, Livia had held an essentially apolitical standing. But the *sacrosanctitas* indicated that she was taking her first steps out of the domestic sphere: she would not have needed public protection if she was not expected to fulfil a public role.

88 Cass. Dio. 50.5.3; Plut. *Ant*. 86.9; Sen. *Suas*. 1.6.

89 Flory 1993 p. 296.

90 For this view see Bartman 1999 p. 62.

91 For the association of Drusus and Tiberius with Castor and Pollux see Champlin 2011.

Imperial wife

Antony divorced Octavia in 32 BCE and returned to Cleopatra in the east. Octavian managed to secure the support of the Senate for the annulment of Antony's power and for a declaration of war against Egypt and Cleopatra. The power-struggle between Octavian and Antony ended in 31 BCE at the battle of Actium with the defeat of Antony and Cleopatra, who both committed suicide. Octavian, the victor of the Civil Wars, refashioned himself into the restorer of the republic who was seeking to bring back law and order to Rome. He gave back his powers to the Senate in 27 BCE and received the honorific name Augustus in return.[92] It did not signify any specific powers or offices, rather the elevated position of its bearer. The political system that was established acquired the name of the principate (*principatus*) with Augustus as its first *princeps*.[93]

The granting of the privileges in 35 BCE seem to have been an isolated event rather than the first step towards the establishment of a public role

92 For Octavian's nomenclature and the name Augustus see Syme 1958 pp. 172-188; Richardson 2012 pp. 80-81. 'Augustus' does not have a single meaning but evokes several associations. Its etymological root was *augere*, 'to increase or augment', and it also had a connection with the sacred sphere of augury. Dio (53.16.8) asserts that the name implies that Augustus was more than human, and that the Greeks hence used the word *sebastos* to address him. Livy (*Praef*. 7; 1.7.9; 5.41.8; 8.6.9; 8.9.10) uses *augustior*, the comparative form of the adjective *augustus* to point a contrast with the adjective *humanus*. Ovid (Fast 1.605-12) draws a similar distinction with regard to *augustus* and stresses that the ancestors referred to things holy as *augusta*. Ovid (ibid.) further affirms that *augustus* had the same root as both *augurium* and *augere*. See also Suet. *Aug*. 7.2.

93 Augustus remained consul and hence held the foremost power in the Senate and the state. The bases of his power were at this time his consulship, the command over several important provinces and the legions stationed there, the loyalty of the army and his clients, his vast fortune, his position as *divi filius* and the protection of the Praetorian Guard in Rome. Augustus resigned from the consulship in June 23 but did not lose his consular *imperium* which he held *pro consule*, because, although he had held the office twice more after 23 BCE, in 5 BCE and 2 BCE when Gaius and Lucius, respectively, his adopted grandsons, came of age, in order to introduce them to the public life, he also retained the power of tribune of the people, though not the office, and this gave him the legal tools needed for legislative initiatives and the right to convene the Senate. For a detailed account of this period see Richardson 2012 pp. 80-135. The term *principatus* appears for the first time in Velleius Paterculus' history, written under the reign of Tiberius. Cf. 2.89.6; 2.124.2; 2.129.1.

for Livia as *mater* and *uxor*. No evidence of such a standing can be found in the city of Rome during the first twenty years of Augustus' sole rule. The *Ludi Saeculares*, celebrated in 17 BCE, featured an unusual degree of participation by women, children, and families in the celebration. For example, one hundred and ten *matronae* (one for each year of the *saeculum*) conducted banquets and offered special prayers to Juno on the Capitoline.[94] However, neither Livia nor any other member of Augustus' own family is mentioned in the preserved as having been present, although we should not entirely discount the possibility that they participated in the celebrations.[95] Though Livia was no doubt fulfilling an important function as wife and mother within the imperial family, her role was not publicly displayed. Why was this?

One of the reasons might have been Augustus' family politics**,** reinforcing the view of Augustus as the moral restorer of the *res publica,* both through rhetoric and through the programme of legislation that was enacted in 19 BCE.[96] This legislation drew attention to the relationship between individuals, their family members, and the state. Everything from adultery and the private display of wealth to the seating in the theatre was regulated, and marriage and childrearing were encouraged.[97] The aim of Augustus' family legislation seems to have been actively to make proper family behaviour part of a citizen's duty. The Roman wife and mother was expected to be virtuous, loyal, and domestic. It is worth noting that motherhood was rewarded: a freeborn woman who had three children, or a freed woman who had four, was released from *tutela*.[98] Roman family roles began to be politicised, including those of women, and this development may well have provided impetus for the change in Livia's role

94 *CIL* VI.32323.100-110; 134-138.

95 Cf. the Secular Games celebrated under Septimus Severus, in which Julia Domna took an active part, Gorrie 2004 p. 63.

96 For Augustan family politics see Treggiari 1994 pp. 86-98; Severy 2003 p. 50; Milnor 2008 pp. 186-238; Richardson 2012 pp. 118-124. Augustus would later describe himself, in the *Res Gestae* (*RGDA. 6*), as a guardian of law and customs (*curator legum et morum*).

97 Cf. Apul. *Apo*l. 88; Cass. Dio 54.30.1; Gai. *Inst*. 1.178; Livy. *Per.* 59; *Dig*. 37.14.6.4; Suet. *Aug*. 27; 34; Ulp. 38.11.1.1. Rawson 1987 pp. 83-114; Edwards 1993 pp. 111-112; Severy 2003 p.50.

98 Gai. *Inst*. 1.145; 194.

as *uxor* and *mater* that would eventually follow.

The post-war rhetoric reflected the same trend as the legislation, and the question of female behaviour came to form a part of the public discourse. The Civil Wars, and especially the years following Caesar's death, had forced women to participate more openly in the political life. Individuals such as Hortensia, Servilia, Fulvia, and the wife commemorated in *Laudatio Turiae* had raised the issue of female political participation. Livia, Octavia and Cleopatra were deeply engaged in the conflict between Octavian and Antony and, as has been previously discussed, received a good share of public attention. However, during the first years of Octavian's sole rule the Civil Wars and the social crisis came to be understood as caused by disrespect for traditional Roman values and failures in norms and customs, such as the yearning for luxury, the unchastity of women and the Hellenization that was seen as a threat to the superiority of Roman culture.[99]

The negative attitude towards female political participation that was reinforced by such thinking is reflected in the stories of Mark Antony, Fulvia, and Cleopatra which emerged from the literary circles around Octavian. Writers such as Propertius, Horace and Virgil contributed to the largely negative image of Cleopatra, 'the harlot queen of licentious Canopus' as Propertius calls her. [100] Plutarch, although writing about a century later, confirms the post-Actium rhetoric when depicting Antony as controlled by his wife Fulvia, who was deeply engaged in military activities, and his foreign mistress, Cleopatra.[101] These literary tropes were conducive to representation of the Civil Wars as being fought against not

99 Edwards 1993 pp. 3-5; Severy 2003 p. 35.

100 Prop. 3-11.39. Cf. Horace: *Carm.* 1.37; *Epod.* 9; Virgil: *Aen.* 8.912-68. Even though Horace refers to Cleopatra as a woman out of control, he acknowledged her strength in dying nobly by her own hand. Octavian seems to have treated Cleopatra in a similar paradoxical way as he both mounted a successful propaganda war against her and paid her honour such as splendid burial in Alexandria and a gilded statue of her in the Temple of Venus Genetrix in Rome. For a discussion on Cleopatra's impact on Rome see Kleiner 2009.

101 For an explicit contrast between Cleopatra and Octavia see Plut. *Ant.* 54. For a discussion of Plutarch's *Life of Antony* see Pelling 1988.

only Antony, but against a female ruler and effeminate foreigners.[102] Horace gives voice to the political currents in *Carmen* 3.6, dated between 30-23 BCE, and blames contempt for religion and men's lack of control of their wives' sexuality for the military weakness of the Romans: 'Generations prolific in sin first defiled marriage, then family, and the home. From this source is derived the disaster which has engulfed our fatherland and its folk'.[103]

Augustus' political ambition to strengthen morality by reasserting the gendered lines between male and female, public and private, as reflected both in the post-war rhetoric and in the family legislation, might be one reason why Livia's role as *uxor* and *mater* was not publicly advertised. Another consideration is the nature of Octavian's early reign. There are no indications that he claimed any paternal role of the state when he presented himself as the restorer of the republic and its virtues, nor that he had any overt dynastic ambitions for his family.[104] Emphasis on Octavian as *pater* would have implicitly highlighted Livia as *mater*, but, as Beth Severy aptly puts it: 'such a familial model of government would have been antithetical to the manner in which the problems that had caused the Civil Wars were coming to be understood, namely, as a series of transgressions of critical social boundaries, including that between family and state.'[105]

However, the Mausoleum of Augustus, probably erected 28-23 BCE, has been interpreted as a statement of explicitly dynastic ambition.[106] The

102 Severy 2003 pp. 33-44.

103 Hor. *Carm*. 3.6.17-20. *Fecunda culpae saecula nuptias / primum inquinavere et genus et domos / hoc fonte derivata clades / in patriam populumque fluxit.*

104 The view that Augustus was aiming at establishing a dynasty early in his reign has been challenged in modern scholarship. See Severy 2003; Gruen 2005; Judge 2008; Simpson 2008; Buxton 2014.

105 Severy 2003 p. 44.

106 For dynastic ambitions see Davies 2004 pp. 102-119. The architectural model for the Mausoleum has been thoroughly studied, and the discussion leans towards three different building types: the Etruscan tumulus, the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus, and, although its appearance is unknown today, the tomb of Alexander the Great. Etruscan tumulus: Castagnoli 1958 p. 116; Mausoleum of Halicarnassus: Richard 1970; tomb of Alexander the Great: Bernhard 1956. See also Davies 2004 pp. 61-67 for a discussion on the Mausoleum as a *tropaeum*.

main reasons for taking this view are Octavian's decision to erect a tomb rather than any other building, and its close proximity to monuments with dynastic connotations, such as the Ara Pacis. The Mausoleum is a complex building, most likely drawing on numerous sources of inspiration which do not need to be detailed here. What is important for the discussion of the development of Livia's role as *mater* and *uxor* during this period is the question whether or not the monument reflects Octavian's ambition to establish a dynasty. The Mausoleum was constructed in the early twenties BCE as a political tool in the aftermath of the Civil Wars.[107] Antony declared in his will, which Octavian illegally made public, his wish to be buried in Alexandria rather than Rome.[108] Octavian manifested his commitment to the city of Rome, in contrast to Antony, by erecting a monumental tomb there. The purpose of the Mausoleum was probably to consolidate Octavian's power and visually to convey, among other messages, a reminder that Octavian was the conqueror of Egypt, for the obelisks that were shipped to Rome validated his victory. Octavian's admiration of Alexander the Great is attested by Hellenistic influences on the architecture.[109]

One of the main reasons why the Mausoleum has been interpreted as a dynastic monument is its location.[110] The Campus Martius would eventually become the important area in the city where monuments such as the Ara Pacis and the Horologium would be erected. Livia and the imperial family were to be shown in the friezes of the Ara Pacis, and the altar links Augustus, along with his family, to Rome's peaceful settlement of the world. However, the altar was not inaugurated until 9 BCE and hence cannot offer a possible explanation to why the Mausoleum had been erected about twenty years earlier. The reliefs on the Ara Pacis rather

107 There are two main theories regarding the time of construction of the Mausoleum. Kraft (1967 p. 200) and von Hesberg (1994 p. 54) suggest that it was conceived in 32 BCE and finished in 28 BCE while Shipley (1931 p. 49), Richard (1970 pp. 380-384) and Davies (2004 p. 50) argue that it was built in 28-23 BCE.

108 Plut. *Ant*. 58.4-8; Cass. Dio 50.3.5.

109 C.f. Cass. Dio 51.16; Suet. *Aug*. 18; 50, Tac. *Ann*. 2.59. Malaise 1972; Roullet 1972; De Vos 1980; Coarelli and Thébert 1988.

110 Davies 2004 pp. 102-119.

suggest that the Mausoleum might have taken on a dynastic charge that had grown progressively stronger and was fully developed by 9 BCE, as shown in the reliefs on the altar. It is noteworthy that the sources do not comment upon Livia's presence at the ceremony of 29 BCE when the doors to the Temple of Janus were shut, to mark the fact that the state was not at war any longer.[111] The connection between peace and the imperial family does not seem yet to have been established when the Mausoleum was erected. What appears to have been most important during the early years of Octavian's rule was the consolidation of his own position and concern for the security of his closest family. It remains uncertain if Octavian could have had a political heir and successor in the twenties BCE. His position was at this time not wholly carved out, and inseparable from him as a person.[112] Someone might inherit his estate, but not his political standing and the authority that he had gained by his claim to be *divi filius* and restorer of the republic.

The question of dynasty apart, the Mausoleum should be viewed against the backdrop of an established republican tradition of tomb-building, even if its extraordinary dimensions exceeded its republican precedents.[113] In general, a tomb could have the purpose of establishing or maintaining a family's position in society. One particular reason for Octavian's choice of erecting a funeral monument rather than a public building could have been the fact that a tomb was a privately funded monument. Constitutionally speaking, Octavian was a private citizen at the time of the construction of his mausoleum. To use a tomb, especially one of such size, as a public expression of status funded by private means, was in accordance with the traditional behaviour for Roman élite families.[114]

111 *RGDA* 13, Livy. *Per*. 1.19, Cass. Dio 51.20.4-5.

112 Dio (53. 30. 1-2) relates how Augustus in 23 BCE, on what he thought was his deathbed, gave the signet ring to Agrippa while he handed down the documents of state to his fellow consul Piso. When he had recovered, Augustus made a show of demonstrating that he had not named a successor in his will. For an extensive discussion on Augustus' heirs and successors see Severy 2003 pp. 68-77.

113 See Davies 2004 pp. 5-8.

114 Davies 2004 p. 7.

Motherhood in public view

During the last decade BCE Livia begins to appear more frequently in the preserved sources, and I would like to suggest that her role as *mater* and *uxor* at this time was becoming an integral part of Augustus' political program, and being made publicly manifest on a large scale. In this section, an investigation of the main circumstance that allowed Livia a public role as *mater* of an imperial house, in defiance of republican traditions, will be followed by a discussion of two examples of how the role came into public view.

Augustus as pontifex maximus

The appointment on March 6, 12 BCE of Augustus as *pontifex maximus* was crucial for the development of Livia's *mater*-role.[115] This office, transmitting old-time religious traditions, was associated with the duties of a father acting as the religious head of his family (*paterfamilias*); and, by way of these duties on the part of the father, also with those of the mother. Among the duties of the *pontifex maximus* was the task of overseeing the Vestal virgins and the state cult of Vesta, the goddess of the hearth. The connection between the cult of Vesta and Augustus was further emphasised by the decision of the *Princeps* to create a shrine to Vesta within the walls of his own house on the Palatine Hill; for he chose not to inhabit the *domus publica* near the temple of Vesta on the Forum where the *pontifex maximus* normally lived.[116] The merging of the state hearth with Augustus' home was completed by the housing of statuettes of his own family gods in the Palatine shrine of Vesta.[117] The imperial hearth was the hearth of Rome and Augustus' religious role was identified as that of a father to his family. Strengthening the paternal connotations of Augustus' leadership, the appointment of him as *pontifex maximus* would also have favoured Livia's impact as *mater* along with *uxor*.

115 Augustus as *pontifex*: *RGDA* 10; Ov. *Fast*. 3.419-20.
116 Cass. Dio 54.27.3; Ov. *Fast*. 4.949-54.
117 *CIL* 1² 1 p. 317; Ov. *Met*. 15.864. Severy 2003 p. 100.

The Ara Pacis Augustae

One of the earliest public manifestations of Livia as *mater*, *uxor* and member of the imperial family is the *Ara Pacis Augustae*, a monument that allowed Augustus' role as *pater* to come decidedly to the fore.[118] The altar was commissioned on 4 July 13 BCE to celebrate Augustus' felicitous return from the provinces of Hispania and Gaul, and consecrated on 30 January 9 BCE to honour the established peace.[119] The altar proper is inside a large marble precinct wall. The upper section of the altar bears a frieze showing animals being led to sacrifice. On the north and south sides, the precinct-wall is decorated with friezes showing a procession, made up by priests, senators and members of the imperial family, and on the west and east sides with reliefs displaying mythological motives. The appearance of women on publicly commissioned commemorative art had hitherto been extremely rare and the Ara Pacis is the earliest known relief in Rome both commissioned by the state and depicting identifiable mortal women and children. It is also one of the first instances since the Civil War when Augustus' female relatives are brought into public view, and their visibility illustrates the paternal dimension of Augustus' leadership.

Livia is often identified as the prominent female figure in the procession scene on the south frieze, even though the frieze is not fully preserved and controversy still surrounds the identification.[120] Although a conclusive identification of Livia is not possible, it is likely that she was included in the imperial family depicted on the precinct-walls, and that the general implication that peace was guaranteed by them would have been understood by the greater part of the public. Augustus is depicted as both father of his own *domus*, in the circle of his private family, and as the

118 Much has been written about the monument: Ryberg 1949 pp. 77-101; Kleiner 1978 pp. 753-785; La Rocca 1983; DeGrummond 1990 pp. 663-677; Rose 1990 pp. 453-467; Elsner 1991 pp. 50-61; Galinsky 1992 pp. 457-475; Galinsky 1996 pp. 141-155; Pollini 2012 pp. 204-247. Kleiner 1992 p. 119 and Rose 1997 p. 104 offer useful summaries of the vast bibliography of the altar. For a discussion of the Ara Pacis and Augustus' *pater*-role see Severy 2003 pp. 104-112.

119 *RGDA* 12.2.

120 Cf. Kleiner 1992 p. 98; Bartman 1999 p. 88; Wood 2000 p. 100; Severy 2003 pp. 104-112; Rehak 2006 p. 127.

highest religious representative of the whole of Roman society, the *pontifex maximus*, surrounded by senators and state priests. The imperial *domus* and the civic and religious community had merged together, and the cult of the state hearth had become fused with the *di Penates* of the imperial house, with Augustus supervising both.

The west end of the precinct wall includes a panel showing Aeneas, founder of Rome and of the Julian family, which illustrates Augustus' divine descent, through Aeneas, from Venus.[121] Aeneas is depicted sacrificing to the *di Penates*, thus doing for the first time what Augustus as *pontifex maximus* did in real life.[122] Aeneas is assisted by his son Iulus; Romulus and Remus are being discovered by their foster father Faustulus, and on the far side of the altar is a central female figure seated together with two babies, surrounded by symbols of fertility. It may be noted that the Julian family claimed kinship at least to Aeneas, Iulus, Romulus and Remus. The idea of family and decorous family behaviour, including joyful motherhood and child-rearing, are stressed in various ways by the pictorial program of the altar. In the presentations of the imperial family the focus is precisely on family as a unit; no individual is singled out as Augustus' heir.[123]

The Ara Pacis has a special bearing on Livia: the consecration day of the altar and her fiftieth birthday coincided. The *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* records that the Senate ordered the magistrates, priests and Vestal Virgins to perform an annual sacrifice at the altar on this particular day.[124] The Vestal Virgins most likely served as models for the public role of Livia, both as caretakers of the sacrifices at the altar, and as women already established in public positions, when she established herself as their fertile counterpart, the *mater* of the Roman state. The consecration of Ara Pacis

121 Rehak 2006 (pp. 115-120) argues that it is Numa, rather than Aneneas, who is depicted.

122 Severy 2003 p. 107.

123 Severy 2003 p. 111.

124 *RGDA* 12.2: 'When I returned to Rome from Spain and Gaul, having settled affairs successfully in these provinces, in the consulship of Tiberius Nero and Publius Quinctilius, the senate decreed that an altar of Augustan Peace should be consecrated, in thanks for my return, on the Field of Mars, and ordered magistrates and priests and Vestal Virgins to perform an annual sacrifice there.' Trans. Cooley 2009. See also Ov. *Fast.* 1.719-22.

on Livia's birthday should, in my opinion, be regarded as a public recognition of her. Yet it was a low-key one, which is characteristic of this period when the exact character of Livia's roles as *mater* and *uxor* was still merely being hinted at.

The death of Drusus

Unlike the pictorial program of the Ara Pacis and its consecration day, the next example of the public manifestation of Livia as *mater* was not a product of conscious political planning, rather the opposite: it was the sudden death of her younger son, Nero Claudius Drusus, who died in an equestrian accident on 14 September the year 9 BCE while on campaign in Germany.[125] The grief that followed was extensive, as Drusus was popular among both subjects and soldiers, and Livia was given various public gestures of sympathy as consolation. She received a new set of privileges: the *ius trium liberorum,* even though she had only given birth to two living children, and a grant of public statuary.[126] They are the first recorded privileges given to her in Rome since 35 BCE. A statue of the deceased person was normally erected to comfort the survivors, but in this case the sculptures granted were representations of Livia herself, not Drusus.[127]

Livia had actually already been in possession of the greatest benefit of the *ius trium liberorum* – namely the freedom of *tutela* – since 35 BCE. The question arises why she was granted this right if she did not gain any practical advantage by receiving it; also whether she was intended to be consoled by statues of herself. I would like to suggest that the privileges corresponded to her new public role as *mater* of the imperial family, recognising as they did that the mother of a military hero who was a stepson of the *Princeps* deserved public honours because of his services to the Roman state. Augustus granted the (celibate) Vestal Virgins the *ius trium liberorum* at the same time, the Vestals being regarded as women of great merit, whose task was regarded as fundamental to the continuance and security of

125 Cass. Dio 55.1.5; Tac. *Ann.* 3.5.2.

126 Cass. Dio 55.2.5-6.

127 Flory 1993 p. 299. Livia commissioned images of Drusus for both private and public areas, see Sen. *Dial.* 6.3.2.

Rome.[128] Livia's *merita* are the subject of a trope in the anonymous *Consolatio ad Liviam*, which maintains that Livia did not need to give birth to three children as she had brought forth so many virtues through her two sons (*tot bona per partus quae dedit una duos*).[129] Another line of the poem asserts that she was augmented in status by the birth of her sons (*es fetibus aucta duobus*).

Already in republican times, the commemoration of motherhood was a common feature of Roman cemeteries and expressed by both statues and inscriptions. However, Livia was the first mother to have such commemoration made by a Senatorial decree, a far greater honour than a private family monument, and an indication of the increased mixing of familial and state affairs in this period. The public nature of Livia's motherhood is testified by the fact that she was named *Drusi mater* on inscriptions throughout her life.

Table 1. Livia as mother of Drusus
Livia's name has been edited in order to produce nominatives.

Name form	Region/province	Date	Citation
Livia mater Drusi Germanici	Samnium	Before 14 CE	*CIL* IX. 3304
Livia mater Drusi Germanici	Sicilia	After 4 CE	*CIL* X. 7340
Iulia Augusta mater Drusi Germanici	Baetica	After 14 CE	*CIL* II. 2038
Iulia Augusta Drusi Germanici mater	Etruria	After 14 CE	*CIL* XI. 7416
Iulia Augusta mater Neronis Claudi Drusi	Aemilia	After 14 CE	*CIL* XI. 1165

Four out of five inscriptions can firmly be assigned to a date after the death of Drusus, as Livia is referred to as Julia Augusta, indicating that both Drusus himself and Livia's position as his mother were being kept in remembrance. Livia's role as *uxor* of the *Princeps* was still important, but the unexpected death of Drusus marked Livia as *mater*, despite the fact that she did not bear Augustus any children who lived. In contrast, it should

128 Livia had been pregnant a third time by Augustus, but the pregnancy ended in a stillbirth (Suet. *Aug*. 63.1; Plin. *HN*. 7.13.57). Cass. Dio (55.2.6.) stresses that someone who was involuntarily childless could receive the grant. Vestal Virgins: Cass. Dio 55.2.6-7; 56.10.2.

129 *Cons. ad Liv*. 82. See also Plin. *Ep*. 2.7.5 on how the possibility that the great deeds which sons may accomplish can be an incentive for bearing children.

be noted that Antonia, the grieving widow of Drusus, received no public honours that we know of.[130]

Drusus' death was treated as a matter of both private mourning and public performance, and this development reveals important changes in the relationship between Livia as *mater* within the imperial family and in Roman society. The change became manifest in the very scale of Drusus' funeral procession, when his body was carried from the camp back to Rome. Augustus went to Ticinum to meet the funeral cortège together with Tiberius, who had returned to the Italian mainland from the Balkans when he heard that his brother had fallen gravely ill.[131] The historiographers, such as Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio, do not mention Livia's participation in the funeral procession. However, the *Consolatio ad Liviam* and Seneca's *Consolatio ad Marciam* comment upon her presence.[132] Lines 167-220 in the *Consolatio ad Liviam* describe two parades, one imaginary and one real. The poet lends his voice to Livia and has her dream of a triumph of Drusus. She imagines herself going forth across the Italian peninsula to escort him back to Rome: *obvia progrediar felixque per oppida dicar*.[133] But the awakening is rough. Drusus never held the triumph, and instead of a victory procession, Livia was forced to lead the funeral train of her son – *funera pro sacris tibi sunt ducenda triumphis.*[134] She is represented as the head of both the imaginary and the real parade. Seneca, for his part, describes how Livia made a long journey through the Italian cities alongside Drusus' bier. She stopped and wept by all the countless pyres that flamed throughout the land, for on each she seemed to be losing her son afresh. But this public act of sorrow changed character when Livia reached Rome, and Drusus had been laid to rest. Then she laid away her sorrow and did not, according to Seneca, grieve any more than was respectful to Augustus

130 We may discount a few lines devoted to her in the *Consolatio ad Liviam*. Bartman 1999 p. 81.

131 Suet. *Tib*. 7.

132 For Livia's participation in the funeral procession see Brännstedt 2015a pp. 38-39.

133 *Cons ad. Liv*. 33. *Consolatio ad Liviam* is the only ancient text in which Livia speaks in her own persona.

134 *Cons. ad. Liv*. 27.

and fair to Tiberius, seeing that they were still alive.[135] Livia seems to have performed her gender-role, and her role as *mater,* in a traditional way on her deceased son's journey through Italy, but assumed the restraint that suited her position as wife of the *Princeps* when back in Rome, thereby proving her *gravitas*.

Both *consolationes* pictured the death of Drusus as a defining moment for Livia's public role as *mater*. She is addressed both as grieving mother, and as the *princeps romana,* a public and powerful member of the imperial family.[136] One passage especially in the *Consolatio ad Liviam* highlights a growing shift in Livia's gendered role as *mater,* as it points both to her domestic virtues and to her extraordinary public position.[137]

Quid tibi nunc mores prosunt actumque pudice
omne aevum et tanto tam placuisse viro?
Quidque pudicitia tantum instituisse bonarum,
ultima sit laudes inter ut illa tuas?
Quid, tenuisse animum contra sua saecula rectum,
altius et vitiis exeruisse caput?
Nec nocuisse ulli et fortunam habuisse nocendi,
nec quemquam nervos extimuisse tuos?
Nec vires errasse tuas campove forove
quamque licet citra constituisse domum?

What now avails thy character, thy whole life chastely lived,
thy having so pleased so mighty a lord?
And what with chastity to have crowned such a sum of dignities
that it is the last among thy praises?
What avails it to have kept thy mind upright against thy age,
and to have lifted thy head clear of its vices?
To have harmed none, yet to have had the power to harm,
and that none feared thy might?
That thy power strayed not to the Campus or the Forum, and that thou
didst order thy house within the bounds permitted thee?

135 Sen. *Ad. Marc*. 3.1-2.
136 Cf. *Cons. Ad. Liv.* 356. Jenkins 2009 p. 6.
137 *Cons. ad Liv*. 41-50.

The first lines praise Livia's traditional mores and her *pudicitia* and how she lives her life in chastity to please her husband, just as a traditional Roman woman would do. But then the poet shifts his attention to Livia's potential power and, by deploying the verb *nocere* twice in line 47, indicates what she could have done if she had wanted to. The phrase *nervos tuos*, followed by *vires tuas*, in the next line are equally loaded with association to that kind of power we know from a certain male-dominated political world.[138] After that, the author struggles to find a way to express Livia's power and simultaneously praise her as a model *femina*, eventually bringing the passage to a close by remarking that her power never reached the *campus* or the *forum*, the domain, that is, of male political power. It could have done so, but Livia kept it wisely within the walls of the *domus*. It is clear from the poem that the *femina princeps* had gained her position by being both a private *mater* and holding a public position, and that she was a woman worthy of pre-eminent sons, worthy of a pre-eminent husband (*principibus natis, principe digna viro)*.[139]

Bridget Buxton suggests that the panel on the Belvedere altar which shows a male in a triumphal chariot ascending to heaven, depicts Drusus, and that the woman with two children waving him on is Livia with Gaius and Lucius Caesar.[140] The altar can be dated to 12-2 BCE in view of the inscription on the sculpted *clipeus*.[141] During that time only two significant male members of the imperial family were honoured with major funerals: Agrippa and Drusus. However, none of Agrippa's martial achievements or trophies is represented, and this fact, together with the references to the Trojan origins and destiny of Aeneas' family on the other panels, makes Drusus the most likely candidate for the central figure. The references to his death as a

138 *Nervus* in the plural could mean both political power and strength, sexual powers and virility; it could also refer to the male sexual organ. See *nervus* in *OLD*. Cf. Cic. *Phil*. 5.32: *experietur consentientis senatus nervos atque vires*.Velleius (130.5) gives a characteristic of Livia very similar to this: *cuius potentiam nemo sensit, nisi aut levatione periculi aut accessione dignitatis*. See the discussion about the *Senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre* in Chapter 4. See also Jenkins 2009 pp. 14-18.

139 *Cons. ad Liv.* 344.

140 Buxton 2014.

141 *CIL* VI. 876. Buxton 2014 with references.

triumphal journey in the *Consolatio ad Liviam* and Ovid's *Fasti* provide further evidence that the man in the *quadriga* is, in fact, Drusus, and that it is Livia, rather than Antonia, who remains on the ground, observing him ascending.[142]

Female head of the *domus Augusta*

Drusus' death is worth dwelling upon some more. His funeral procession in Rome included statues of both Julian and Claudian ancestors, even though he had not been adopted into the *gens Iulia*.[143] Augustus delivered the funeral speech at the Circus Flaminius, and Tiberius in the Forum Romanum.[144] Drusus was then carried by *equites* to the Mausoleum of Augustus, where he was interred.[145] Marcellus and Agrippa had previously been buried in the Mausoleum and so it seems to have been conceived of as a monument for Augustus' family in broadly inclusive terms. The *Consolatio ad Liviam* represents Livia as hoping that Drusus' bones will be interspersed with hers – ashes among ashes, bones among bones – and not with his ancient, paternal, ancestors.[146]

During the last decade BCE a new terminology came into use to describe the imperial family: *domus Augusta*.[147] The word *domus* can refer to a physical house and its inhabitants or a human family which included both paternal and maternal cognate relations, unlike the paternal *familia*. *Domus* is less restrictive than *gens* or *familia* since it does not describe an official family unit.[148] It was given a new meaning when used together with

142 Buxton 2014 p. 118.

143 Tac. *Ann*. 3.5.2. Flower 1996 pp. 242-243.

144 Cass. Dio 55.2.2; Suet. *Claud*. 1.5.

145 Cass. Dio 55.2.3; Suet. *Claud*. 1.3.

146 *Cons. ad Liv*. 161-4: *Quod licet, hoc certe, tumulo ponemur in uno / Druse, neque ad veteres conditus ibis avos / miscebor cinerique cinis atque ossibus ossa / hanc lucem celeri turbine Parca neat.*

147 Flory 1996; Severy 2003 pp. 213-227; Milnor 2008 pp. 39-40; Seager 2013.

148 The Romans had several conceptions of family, such as the *gens*, the *familia* and the *domus*. *Gens* normally refers to individuals sharing a nomen, while a *familia* consists of persons either linked agnatically or forming part of the same household; these may include slaves and freedmen. See Rowe 2002 p. 19.

the adjective *Augusta*. *Domus Augusta* was a concept with two sides: it referred both to an abstract imperial house with future dynastic ambitions, and a well-defined unit of people. It did not represent the biological family of Augustus, rather the artificial dynasty which he had created, inclusive of women. However, not all family members were a part of the *domus Augusta*. Augustus' daughter Julia, Agrippa Postumus and Claudius seem to have been omitted and, accordingly, not buried in the mausoleum.

Domus as a description of Augustus' family appears to have been used for the first time in 2 BCE when Augustus was given the title *pater patriae*. On that occasion, if we may believe Suetonius, the consul Valerius Messala uttered the following prayer: *quod bonum faustumque sit tibi domuique tuae, Caesar Auguste*.[149] The notion that the peace and concord of the Roman society was guaranteed by the imperial family came to the fore when Messala went on to say that by praying for the *domus* of Augustus he and the whole body of senators felt that their were 'praying for lasting prosperity for our country and happiness for our city.' After 8 CE, when he was in exile, Ovid began to use the word *domus* to describe the imperial family, making it clear that he is thinking in dynastic terms when he predicted that 'that house' (*domus illa*) will rule for ever (*perpetuo*).[150] It is worth noting that *domus* appears eleven times in the *Consolatio ad Liviam*, and is the final word of the poem.

Preserved monuments, such as the Arch of Ticinum, dating from 7/8 CE, visually publicize the concept of the *domus Augusta*.[151] Inscriptions and sculptures (now lost) attached to the arch commemorated Augustus, Livia, the late Gaius and Lucius, also Tiberius, Germanicus, Drusus, Germanicus' sons: Nero, Drusus, and Claudius.[152] Information concerning the arrangement of the inscriptions and statues indicates that Augustus

149 Suet. *Aug*. 58.

150 Ov. *Trist*. 4.2.10.

151 Seager 2013.

152 *CIL* V. 6416 = *ILS* 107 = *EJ* 61. Stuart 1936; Seager 2013 pp. 42-43. The inscriptions are only preserved in the Einsiedeln MS no. 328 and were restored by Mommsen. The Einsiedeln scribe copied the inscriptions from left to right but Mommsen rearranged the horizontal lines of the MS into vertical columns in accordance with the way in which the inscriptions once appeared on the arch. See *CIL* V. 6416.

and Livia, the only woman commemorated on the arch, were the central figures of the monument, flanked on each side by four members of the imperial family. The nomenclature of the inscriptions is revealing as an illustration of the concept of the *domus Augusta*. Augustus is described as *divi f.*, while a dedication to Livia is expressed by the words *Drusi f. uxori Caesaris Augusti*. Gaius, Lucius and Tiberius are called *Augusti f. divi nepot.* while Germanicus and Drusus are described in a similar way, as *Ti. f. Augusti nepot. divi pronepot*. Julia and Agrippa Postumus are excluded while Claudius is a part of the family unit, but the only one who is referred to in a way which makes no reference to Augustus, namely, as *Drusi Germanici f.*[153] No distinction is drawn between Julian and Claudian origins: all, except Livia and Claudius, are described as descended from Augustus.

Coins are another medium visually communicating the concept of the *domus Augusta*. By an examination of Livia's representation on coins in partnership with other family members light can be cast on her position within the newly created unit. The practice of minting coins with jugated portraits originated in the Hellenistic period, and the Ptolemaic monarchs especially were depicted together with female family members. Jugate and facing portraits did not feature on coins minted in Rome until 55 CE, when Nero was depicted together with his mother, Agrippina Minor.[154] The coins depicting Livia, originating from various provincial mints, appear to convey messages such as the importance of her role as Augustus' *uxor* and female counterpart. The first example of Livia's jugate portrait appears on coins, minted in Ephesus during the early Augustan period, which feature her together with Augustus.[155] Coins of Nysa and Smyrna from around 10 BCE likewise show the imperial couple jugated.[156] Livia is

153 Seager 2013 (p. 43) suggests that this marked Claudius out as peripheral.

154 *RIC*[2] 1-2; 6-7.

155 *RPC* 1.432; 2581-2583; 2595. Ephesus had minted coins with jugate style portraits during the Second Triumvirate, see RPC 1.2569-2573 (Octavian and Antony) and 2202 (Octavia and Antony). Note that paired portraits are a type distinct from the instances where Livia appears on the reverse and a male relative on the obverse. The jugate format presents two portraits in profile with one portrait partially superimposed upon the other. This form is more common than face to face in portraits in which Livia appears in tandem with someone else. Harvey 2011 p. 178.

156 Nysa: *RPC* 1.2663. Smyrna: *RPC* 1.2464; 2466.

paired on coins with Augustus – both when he was alive and after his death – and also with Gaius and Lucius, Tiberius, Drusus Minor, and Claudius.[157] She appears together with a female relative only once that we know of: a coin issued at Pergamum depicts her on the obverse and Julia on the reverse.[158]

The numismatic evidence illustrates Livia's role as *mater* and the dominant female in the imperial family. She is presented as mother to Gaius and Lucius in place of their biological mother, Julia. Julia's image features on only a few coins; just once she is shown together with her son Gaius, while Livia's image is paired with either Gaius, Lucius or both on coins from nine provincial mints.[159] Other female members of the imperial family appear on coins only on rare occasions. The dynastic ambition of the *domus Augusta* can be seen on coins of the mint of Magnesia ad Sipylum in Lydia as early as from 2 BCE with the jugated portraits of Livia and Augustus on the obverse and heads of Gaius and Lucius facing each other on the reverse.[160]

I would like to suggest that Livia's position as *mater* and female head of the *domus Augusta* offered her space to expand her role into new political arenas. The discussion so far has shown that Livia's role as *uxor* and *mater* followed the accepted patterns for Roman women belonging to the upper social strata. However, a shift in Livia's role can be seen in her during the last decade BCE and it is now time to investigate how Livia crossed a highly gendered boundary between the civic and military spheres.

The evidence for participation by Livia in triumphal celebrations begins the last decade BCE with the banquets that Livia and Julia gave for the women of Rome on the occasion of Tiberius' military victory in 9 BCE, and the banquet planned by Livia and Antonia for Drusus' intended triumph.[161] This is the first recorded evidence for female sponsorship of a

157 The portraits of the male members of *domus Augusta* such as Marcellus, Gaius, Lucius, Drusus, and Tiberius all resembled Augustus' portrait-type, as a mark of kinship. Women of the imperial dynasties came eventually to adopt facial features that belonged to the reigning emperor, but Livia was never shown with any of Augustus' precise features, only a formal resemblance. Bartman 1999 pp. 24-25.

158 *RPC* 1.2359.

159 *RPC* 1.5415.

160 *RPC* 1.2449.

161 Cass. Dio 55.2-4. For Livia's involvement in triumphal arrangements see also Brännstedt 2015a pp. 39-40.

victory celebration. Literary accounts of Roman triumphs in the republican period show that sons rode with their fathers during the *pompa triumphalis*.[162] In Augustus' threefold triumph of 29 BCE, Tiberius and Marcellus rode the trace-horses, a practice that continued into the imperial period.[163] None of the literary accounts from the republican period suggests that Roman women had any role in the triumphal procession, except as participants in the general thanksgiving to the gods or as spectators on the parade route.[164] However, in the *Epistulae ex Ponto,* Ovid presents a bold prophecy of a future triumph and, in connection with it, an admonition to Livia to prepare a chariot and a procession for the triumph: *quid cessas currum pompamque parare triumphis, / Livia*?[165] In the *Consolatio ad Liviam*, the poet stresses that the preparation of the chariot would have been Livia's special responsibility, if Drusus had returned to Rome as a victor, and not as a dead body on a bier.[166] The chariot might have been decorated with gold, ivory or other precious materials. However, Suetonius describes how Augustus' father had a dream in which he saw his yet unborn son standing in a *currus laureatus*, a chariot adorned with laurel.[167] Marleen Flory has suggested that there is a possible link here with the legend of Livia and a hen and a laurel branch dropped into her lap.[168] According to the legend, Livia planted the branch, and, as it grew into a grove, it provided the laurel needed for the triumphal wreaths of the imperial family.[169] If Flory's hypothesis is true, the decoration of the chariot with the mystical laurel

162 See Flory 1998 pp. 489-494 with references.

163 Suet. *Tib*. 6.4.

164 Female prisoners of war walked in the parade or were represented by effigies or paintings. See Plut. *Aem*. 33, *Pomp*. 45.4; App. *Mith*. 12.117; Cass. Dio. 15.21.8. Östenberg 2009 pp. 135-144. A relief from Nicopolis depicting Octavian's triumph in 29 BCE shows two children, a boy and a girl, in his triumphal chariot. However, controversy still surrounds their identification. See Zachos 2003 pp. 65-92.

165 Ov. *Pont.* 3.4.95. 'Why dost thou hesitate, Livia, to make ready a car and a procession for a triumph?' *Currus* can signify both a triumph and a triumphal chariot (OLD: *currus*). See also Ov. *Tr*. 4.2.47.

166 *Cons. ad Liv.* 26-27.

167 Suet. *Aug*. 94.6.

168 Flory 1998.

169 Cass. Dio 48.52; Plin. *HN* 15.137; Suet. *Galb*. 1.

might have been a part of a public event that included Livia, preliminary to the start of the parade. When the triumph was celebrated the triumphator replanted the branch which had been cut and it took root again.[170] There are other aspects of the legend that have a bearing on Livia's connection to the triumphal celebrations: it was an eagle that had dropped the hen into Livia's lap, and the hen produced a brood of chicks, *pulli*, that might have been used in augury preceding military campaigns.[171]

When Ovid in *Tristia* envisions Tiberius' future triumph over Pannonia, he places Livia in the midst of the ceremony:

> *cumque bonis nuribus pro sospite Livia nato*
> *munera det meritis, saepe datura, deis,*
> *et pariter matres et quae sine crimine castos*
> *perpetua servant virginitate focos.*[172]
>
> with her good daughters-in-law Livia is perchance offering
> for the safety of her son
> gifts, as she will often do, to the deserving gods,
> and in her company the matrons also and those who without stain,
> in eternal virginity keep watch over the hearth of purity.[173]

Ovid and the author of the *Consolatio ad Liviam* both warrant Livia's participation in the major *pompae* by approaching their ceremonial as a family matter. Ovid, additionally, associates Livia with the Vestal Virgins, who had long-established public functions. The lines quoted above are composed with poetic license, but even so Ovid's vision provides important clues to Livia's central position in this stately, male, military celebration. I believe it reflects a development within the army that started in the penultimate decade BCE, when the highest military commands began to be given only to men of Augustus' family.[174] The young men of the family had all been trained in military life from an early age, and the generation

170 Suet. *Galb*. 1.
171 Flory 1998 pp. 349-352.
172 Ov. *Tr.* 4.2.11-14. Note that the triumph was never actually held.
173 Loeb translation revised by Janet Fairweather.
174 For this development see Severy 2003 pp. 79-95.

of Tiberius and Drusus and likewise the next generation, that included Drusus the Younger, Agrippa Postumus, Gaius, Lucius and Germanicus, had a monopoly on the leadership of the Roman army – and its victories.[175]

This intensified participation of the imperial family in triumphal arrangements was also given visual expression at the Temple of Augustus and Roma in Leptis Magna where a statue-group was erected to honour Germanicus and Drusus the Younger. This included statues of the two men in triumphal chariots, together with their wives and mothers. In addition, colossal statues of Augustus, Livia, Tiberius, and Dea Roma were erected.[176] According to the *Tabula Siarensis,* the arch (now lost) erected in 15 CE in honour of Germanicus by the consul C. Norbanus Flaccus in the Circus Flaminius at Rome included statues dedicated to *divus* Augustus and to the *domus Augusta*.[177] Flory argues that this means that a statue of Livia was included in the decoration of the arch, suggesting that the *domus Augusta* in this case was made up by Augustus, Livia, Tiberius, Germanicus, and Drusus, much as in the household shrine dedicated to the imperial family that Ovid claimed to own.[178] It would then be the first known dynastic group of statues in Rome that included both living and dead members of the imperial family, and thus representing the history of the

175 In return the imperial family was celebrated in ceremonies and at camp shrines. Two artefacts found in connection to military camps – an embossed bronze scabbard showing Livia flanked by Tiberius and Drusus (Rheinisches Landesmuseum no. 4320), and a terracotta drinking cup from Vetera in present-day Germany with busts of Livia and Augustus (Rheinisches Landesmuseum no. 22534a) – bear witness of the close ties between the legions and the imperial family.

176 See Wood 1999 pp. 110-111.

177 *TS* 106-108: *statuae diuo Augusto domuique Augus[tae.* The circus Flaminius was in 19 CE the site of important imperial monuments such as the theatre of Marcellus, the portico of Octavia, and the library of Marcellus. For the arch see Castagnoli 1984 and *LTUR*. For a discussion on the *domus Augusta* and the death of Germanicus see Chapter 4.

178 Ov. *Pont*. 2.8.1-10. Flory 1996. For the shrine see pages 143.

power that Augustus held.[179]

From Livia Drusilla to Julia Augusta

The political tendency of the last decades of Augustus' reign towards identifying him as father of the empire and Livia as its mother became fully manifest when he died. His funeral included both the imperial family, and people representative of society in various formal capacities. *Decuriones* of local cities and colonies carried Augustus body from Nola, where he died, to Bovillae.[180] Statues of Augustus were carried before the funeral train, together with *imagines* not only of members of the imperial family, but of illustrious Romans from Romulus and onwards.[181] Senators, their wives, and the praetorian guard took part in the procession in Rome, while priests, knights and foot-soldiers paraded around the bier when it had reached the pyre.[182]

Livia took as an active part in the funeral of Augustus, as previously in that of Drusus. This time, of course, her role was that of the grieving wife. She held a banquet in honour of her deceased husband, in accordance with a traditional Roman custom: the arrangement of feasts in connection with the funeral of family members.[183] However, the banquet that Livia hosted included senators and equestrians and was approved by a senatorial decree, unlike the banquets that she had held in 9 BCE. The splendour surrounding Augustus' death not only honoured him, but also confirmed the standing of the imperial family.

Augustus was declared divine by the Senate, an act in which Livia played a pivotal part. She is said to have bribed the witness to the apotheosis, the senator Numerius Atticus, who swore that he saw Augustus on his way to

179 Rose Cat. 35. The imperial family had appeared on the relief on the Ara Pacis, but with generalised portrait types and not as a statuary group. Julius Caesar is left out of the multifigured groups prior to Augustus' death. He only features twice on coins minted under Augustus and neither of these issues bears his name or his characteristic portrait; the *sidus Iulium* above his head is the only sign of his identity (*BMCRE* 1, 13, nos. 69-73; 26, nos.124-5; *RIC*^{2} 1, 66, nos. 338-9.) Rose 1997 pp. 11-12.

180 Suet. *Aug*. 100.2.

181 Cass. Dio 56.34.2-3.

182 Tac. *Ann*. 1.8; Suet. *Aug*. 100.2-4. See also Beard, North, and Price 1998 pp. 208-209.

183 Cass. Dio 56.46.5.

heaven.[184] Most of the mourners left after Augustus' body had been incinerated on the Campus Martius, except for Livia. She remained at the funeral pyre together with the most prominent of the equestrians for five days, a telling picture of both her loyalty – a virtue associated with her *mater*-role – and her conspicuousness in the public sphere. [185] When the five days had passed, Livia collected Augustus' ashes and placed them in his mausoleum nearby.

Augustus' will was read in the Senate the day after his body arrived in Rome.[186] Livia was instituted as one of his heirs in the first degree, receiving one-third of his estate while Tiberius, the other principal heir, received two-thirds. The testament might appear to be in accordance with the Roman tradition whereby children were preferred as heirs in law and custom, and wives might receive a share of one-half or less. However, because of Augustus' position in the Roman state and the paternal nature of his reign, Livia's inheritance dramatically increased her political standing. The most remarkable part of Augustus' will was, at least from Livia's point of view, the posthumous adoption of her as his daughter, and the conferring on her of the name Augusta.[187] Moreover, Livia was appointed *sacerdos* of *divus* Augustus.[188] From 14 CE and onwards she was no longer Livia Drusilla, but Julia Augusta, *divi filia.*

If Drusus' funeral in 9 BCE is to be regarded as a watershed for Livia's public role as *mater* and *uxor*, Augustus' death and funeral in 14 CE established her standing in a way unprecedented for a Roman woman. Unfortunately, little is known about the adoption of women and nothing is known about neither testamentary adoption of wives, nor about the transfer of an honorific title from a man to a woman. Livia's situation was most likely without precedent. It remains to investigate in the next section

184 Cass. Dio 56.46.2; Suet. *Aug*. 100.4. There is a parallel with the claim of Julius Proculus, who had provided similar testimony for Romulus. Cf. Livy. *Per*. 1.16; Ov. *Fast*. 2.499.

185 Cass. Dio 56.42.4. See also Tac. *Ann*. 1.8; Suet. *Aug*. 100.2-4.

186 Cass. Dio 56.32.1.

187 Cass. Dio 56. 32; Suet. *Aug*. 101; Tac. *Ann*. 1.8; Vell. Pat. 2.75.3. None of the authors give any detailed information about the legal consequences of Livia's new position. For a discussion on the meaning of Augusta in the Julio-Claudian period see Flory 1996.

188 Cass. Dio 56.46.1-2.

the consequences of Augustus' death and testament, beginning with the adoption and the conferring on Livia of his own family name. There will follow a discussion of her new function as *sacerdos*.

Divi filia

The circumstances surrounding Augustus' will are discussed by Velleius Paterculus, Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio, but none of them gives any detailed information about the legal consequences of his adoption of Livia and nor does any ancient jurist. Dio only notes that she took part in the proceedings concerning the honours given to Augustus when he had died, 'as if she possessed full powers.'[189] Financial considerations do not seem to have been a major motivation for the adoption: the limit on the proportion of a legacy that a woman could receive according the *lex Voconia* was less than one half of the total estate.

What could Augustus have intended by adopting his wife as his daughter? There might of course have been several considerations. Livia's role as *patrona* became stronger when she became Augustus' daughter, as she would not otherwise have had any direct ties to the clients of Augustus as his widow, at least not formally. In her capacity as his daughter, however, she was now connected to a large and important *clientela*, and, in a symbolic way at least, to the Roman people itself. She also inherited the loyalty of Augustus' freedmen and slaves. This aspect of the adoption will be discussed in the following chapter.

Livia, on being adopted as the 'daughter of a god', rose higher in religious standing, even though she was not declared divine until 42 CE. As will be discussed in Chapter 4, Livia was given divine worship in some places long before the official deification, and there are many references to her almost superhuman status, no doubt further bolstered by her new position as *divi filia*. Augustus might have foreseen that the Senate would declare him divine after his death, and thought it more appropriate for Livia to be the daughter of a god rather than the wife of a god, *divi filia* rather than *divi uxor*.

The adoption emphasised Augustus' esteem for Livia and could have

189 Cass. Dio 46.47.1.

been made in the hope of protecting her. Augustus, maybe more than anyone, knew how bloodstained an accession to power could be, and Tiberius' succession was not to be taken for granted. Some scholars have interpreted the adoption as a way of stressing a physical connection between Augustus and Tiberius, given that it promoted Livia as the person who was the link in the line of succession from her husband to her son.[190] Livia was indisputably important in stabilising and legitimating the succession, but adoption was already recognized as a valid way of creating familial connection between men, and Livia does not seem to have played a crucial role when Augustus adopted Tiberius in 4 CE. As has previously been demonstrated a distinction between the Julian and the Claudian family was not emphasised within the *domus Augusta.* It does not seem, then, that the radical change of Livia's position brought about by her adoption could have been made only with a view to securing Tiberius' Julian identity. Why, then, did Augustus adopt Livia?

I believe that a key to an understanding of the adoption is the fact that it was posthumous. Testamentary adoption was a way whereby a testator could provide his testamentary heir with financial resources and attributes of his social standing, such as slaves, freedmen, and political connections.[191] If Augustus wanted to make sure that Livia would inherit a part of his power and *auctoritas*, the adoption might have been a necessity. To take on the testator's family name was a common condition if a posthumously adopted heir was to receive a bequest.[192] Augustus' previously adopted sons Gaius, Lucius, Tiberius and Agrippa Postumus, had been adopted while Augustus was still alive, and received the regular Iulian *cognomen* Caesar rather than Augustus. Tiberius had been adopted in 4 CE, but did not receive the title Augustus until Augustus' death ten years later. There is an emphasis in the sources for Livia's adoption on the bestowal of the imperial nomenclature. Tacitus states that Livia was adopted into the Julian family and the Augustan name: *Livia in familiam Iuliam nomenque Augustum adsumebatur*.[193] Suetonius recounts that Augustus conferred his name on

190 Huntsman 1997 p. 197; Barrett 2002 pp. 150-151; Kampen 2009 p. 29.
191 Lindsay 2009 pp. 79-86.
192 Lindsay 2009 p. 82.
193 Tac. *Ann.* 1.8.

Tiberius and Livia, who were appointed as his chief heirs: *heredes instituit primos: Tiberium ex parte dimidia et sextante, Liviam ex parte tertia, quos et ferre nomen suum iussit.*[194] It is noteworthy that both Livia and Tiberius were required to bear the name as a part of Augustus' will, even though Tiberius had been adrogated already in 4 CE.

Livia's nomenclature on inscriptions further indicates that it was the title Augusta that was emphasised rather than her position as Augustus' daughter. I have collected 191 inscriptions that both record Livia's nomenclature and are reasonably well dated.[195] These exclude any that only record her name as a part of the nomenclature of her slaves and freedmen, but it could be worth mentioning that Livia's freedwomen became known as Julia, while her freedmen normally took the *nomen* Julius, but the *praenomen* of her biological father, Marcus. This might have been a way to distinguish them from the freedmen of Augustus. Also excluded are inscriptions recording her name as a

Table 2. Livia's Latin nomenclature after 14 CE
The names have been edited in order to produce nominatives.

Name form	Region/province	Citation
Augusta	Baetica	*CIL* II. 1667
Augusta	Etruria	*CIL* XI.3303
Augusta	Latium et Campania	*CIL* X. 8060
Augusta	Latium et Campania	*AE* 1937, 5
Augusta	Samnium	*CIL* IX. 3661
Augusta Iulia	Samnium	*CIL* IX. 366
Iulia Augusta	Gallia Lugdunensis	*AE* 1980, 638
Iulia Augusta	Samnium	*AE 1976,185*
Iulia Augusta	Apulia et Calabria	*CIL* IX. 787
Iulia Augusta	Baetica	*CIL* II.2108
Dea Livia Augusta	Sicilia	*CIL* X. 7464
Iulia Augusta	Latium et Campania	*CIL* X.1620
Iulia Augusta	Creta et Cyrenaica	*CIL* III.12037
Iulia Augusta	Creta et Cyrenaica	*CIL* III.8
Iulia Augusta	Samnium	*AE* 1998, 422
Iulia Augusta	Dalmatia	*CIL* III. 9972

194 Suet. *Aug*. 101.2.

195 For Latin inscriptions to officiants devoted to the cult of Livia which also records her nomenclature see table 9.

Iulia Augusta	Galatia	*AE* 1967, 491
Iulia Augusta	Samnium	*AE* 1988, 422
Iulia Augusta	Latium et Campania	*CIL* XV. 7814
Iulia Augusta	Lucania et Bruttium	*Inscr. It. 3 fasc.* 1,113
Iulia Augusta	Lusitania	*CIL* II.194
Iulia Augusta	Gallia Narbonensis	*CIL* XII. 4249
Iulia Augusta	Sicilia	*CIL* X. 7501
Dea Iulia Augusta	Galatia	*AE* 1941, 142
Diva Augusta	Africa Proconsularis	*AE* 1948, 13
Diva Augusta	Apulia et Calabria	*CIL* IX. 1155
Diva Augusta	Baetica	*CIL* II. 6278
Diva Augusta	Baetica	*CIL* II. 1571
Diva Augusta	Latium et Campania	*CIL* X. 1413
Diva Augusta	Latium et Campania	*CIL* X. 6309
Diva Augusta	Latium et Campania	*CIL* X. 6172
Diva Augusta	Latium et Campania	*CIL* XIV. 399
Diva Augusta	Gallia Narbonensis	*CIL* XII. 1845
Diva Augusta	Numidia	*CIL* VIII. 6987
Diva Augusta	Rome	*AE* 1969/70, 1
Diva Augusta	Transpadana	*AE* 1982, 415
Diva Augusta	Transpadana	*AE* 1988, 607
Diva Augusta	Venetia et Histria	*Inscr. It.10.5 pars.* 1, 247
Augusta Iulia Drusi filia	Picenum	*CIL* VI. 882a
Iulia Augusta Drusi filia	Latium et Campania	*CIL* X. 799
Iulia Augusta Drusi filia	Baetica	*CIL* II. 2038
Augusta Iulia Drusi filia	Etruria	*CIL* XI. 7416
Augusta Iulia Drusi filia	Etruria	*CIL* XI. 7552a
Augusta Iulia Drusi filia	Etruria	*CIL* XI. 3322
Augusta Iulia Drusi filia	Lucania et Bruttium	*CIL* X. 459
Iulia Drusi filia Augusta	Samnium	*CIL* IX. 4514
Iulia Augusta Divi Augusti filia	Aemilia	*CIL* XI. 1165

part of the titles of her priests and priestesses. The larger part of the corpus can be dated to after 14 CE, which testifies to Livia's increasing status after the death of Augustus. 47 out of the 191 are Latin inscriptions dating to after the death of Augustus, and it is only to these that I will refer in the discussion that follows, since *Sebaste*, the Greek equivalent of Augusta, was applied to Livia during Augustus' lifetime. Thus her name in Greek was not connected to the will of Augustus, except in the sense that it anticipated it.

All of the 47 inscriptions refer to Livia as Augusta or Julia Augusta, with the exception of an inscription from Sicily, dating from the age of Claudius, in which she is called Dea Livia Augusta. While the epigraphic sources use Augusta consistently, Tacitus alone, of the major literary sources, regularly uses her new name. Suetonius employs a combination of her original name and new title and calls her Livia Augusta. Surviving state documents, such as the *Tabula Siarensis* and the *Senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre* use Augusta or Julia Augusta as Livia's official name and she is also referred to as Augusta in the Roman calendars (not included in table 2). After Livia was deified in 42 CE, she was consistently called Diva Augusta. Legends on coins reflect the same trend: Livia is not featured on coins minted in the western provinces until after the death of Augustus, but all of the 18 coin types minted after 14 CE whose legends bear Livia's name refer to her as Augusta or Julia Augusta.

While the name Augusta was widely accepted, instances where Livia is referred to as Augustus' daughter are of rare occurrence. Only three examples are known. The *Fasti Praenestini* record how Livia herself, together with Tiberius, dedicated a statue in Rome to their father Augustus near the Theatre of Marcellus in Rome, bearing the inscription: *sig(num) divo Augusto patri ad theatrum Marc(elli) Iulia Augusta et Ti. Augustus dedicarunt*.[196] The inscription is significant not only because it identifies Augustus as Livia's father, but also because Livia's name precedes that of Tiberius.[197] Furthermore, two inscriptions attached to sculpture-groups speak of Livia as the daughter of Augustus. They are from Velleia (Latin) and Aphrodisias (Greek) respectively, and date to the reign of Caligula.[198] The inscription from Velleia refers to Livia as the mother of Tiberius and Drusus, and could have been formulated so as to stress Caligula's ancestry, as both the adoptive and natural fathers of Germanicus were called to mind. No coin-inscriptions, either in Latin or in Greek, refer to Livia as the daughter of Augustus.

196 *CIL* I^2 pp. 230-239 = *AE* 1898 no. 14 = *AE* 1922 no. 96 = *AE* 1953 no. 236 = *AE* 1993 no. 144 = *AE* 2002 no. 181 = *AE* 2007 no. 312.

197 Tacitus (*Ann*. 3.64) asserts that Tiberius was offended by how Livia had placed her name before his, and took it as derogation from the imperial dignity.

198 Velleia: *CIL* XI. 1165, Aphrodisias: *AE* 1980 no. 877.

Livia continued to be referred to as the daughter of her natural father, Drusus Claudianus. Though he had been dead for over half a century, Livia is called *Drusi filia* in nine Latin inscriptions dating to after 14 CE, possibly as an expression of her *pietas* to her father's memory. One of the inscriptions belongs to an aqueduct that Livia erected in Etruria and, as we know that the *Drusi* were associated with the town of Fidenae, it is possible that Livia's paternal ancestry was emphasised in regions with which the *Drusi* were connected. This is further indicated by the fact that Livia is called *Drusi filia* in an inscription belonging to the temple to Fortuna Muliebris on the Via Latina that she restored before the death of Augustus.[199]

It is clear from the epigraphic evidence that while Livia's new name won general acceptance, her position as Augustus' daughter was never reinforced or commemorated to any major extent. This indicates that the adoption was necessary in order to transfer the title from Augustus to Livia but, once the adoption was ratified the nomenclature, *Augusti filia* was not intended to be emphasised. If the main motivation behind the adoption was to secure the title for Livia, what, then, was the significant implication of the name Augusta?

Augusta

The conferring of the title Augusta upon Livia has attracted more scholarly attention than her adoption. In 1972 H-W Ritter divided all suggestions as to the significance of Livia's assumption of the *cognomen* Augusta into three categories: 1) The title was meant to increase her status; 2) Livia stretched the intent of Augustus' will in an attempt to achieve an actual co-regency, and 3) Augustus himself intended Tiberius and Livia to succeed him as joint rulers.[200] I lean towards the first option. The second is impossible to discuss without being too speculative, and the third is possible, but even if Augusta no doubt was a prestigious *cognomen* and marked Livia's position in the Roman state, it should be pointed out that

199 The aqueduct and the temple to Fortuna Muliebris will be discussed in Chapter 3.

200 Ritter 1972 pp. 313-318. Ritter himself supported the view that the title was meant to increase Livia's status.

even for Augustus this *cognomen* had been a mark of his authority but carried no formal power. Livia as Augusta was not the equal to Tiberius in terms of specific constitutional powers such as the *tribunicia potestas* or the consular *imperium*, only in the *auctoritas* that was implicit in the august title due its very etymology.[201] Hence it is reasonable to assume that the title Augusta indicated Livia's position more than her actual legal power, even if it was not purely honorary.

I find it telling that Augustus did not give Livia this name during his lifetime. Perhaps it would have made them, Augustus and Augusta, into what would have looked too much like a Hellenistic ruling couple. This was already happening in the eastern part of the empire, where Livia had by now been named *Sebaste* in a large number of inscriptions. The same was not desirable in Rome. However, even if Augustus did not wish to share his name with Livia during his lifetime he took measures to make sure that she would receive it after his demise. Augustus seems to have taken no chances when he wrote his very precise testament and he must have made the provisions needed to ensure that the adoption would be legal. He could have made good use of his position as *pontifex maximus*, as the high priest was in charge of issues concerning adoption and testamentary succession. There was a compelling precedent in his own testamentary adoption by Julius Caesar and he would have been aware of its political benefits. Given that the promotion of people in pairs had been an important feature of policy throughout the reign of Augustus, we need not be surprised that both his principal heirs, Livia and Tiberius, were, after his demise granted his august *cognomen*. One should not forget that the name Augustus did not have a single, uncomplicated meaning, but evoked several associations. Augustus undoubtedly understood its power, and was aware that the female equivalent would raise Livia to a level far beyond traditional honours. Even if it is not possible to pin down the exact significance of Livia's new position as Augusta, the conferring on her of Augustus' own title was groundbreaking. The importance of the *cognomen* is confirmed by the fact that it was used by subsequent empresses, and institutionalised as a title by the Senate during the reign of Caligula. Even

201 See n. 92.

though the position of empress was to be redefined, and many imperial women did not present themselves in the same manner as Livia, the use of the title continued throughout Roman antiquity.

Sacerdos

Livia held her first formal office at the age of seventy-two, when she was appointed *sacerdos* of the divine Augustus.[202] She already had, however, much of the status of a priestess through her acquisition of all the privileges of the Vestal Virgins. If we assume that Augustus anticipated his deification, Livia's appointment might have been planned when Augustus was still alive. The cult of the deified Augustus had no absolute need of a priestess, since a *flamen*, the *Sodales Augustales* or the Arval Brothers, who dealt with sacrifices, would have sufficed to serve it. Livia's appointment as *sacerdos* therefore appears to have been a political choice.

For Livia to hold an office in the religious sphere, where women were admitted to a larger extent than in other political arenas, would have been less offensive to the more conservative Romans than her holding of any other kind of office would have been. Women had functioned as priestesses at provincial and local levels long before Livia's appointment. True, most of the major priesthoods of Rome were all-male institutions, but the Vestal Virgins were an important exception to this rule. As a priestess, Livia, together with Tiberius, undertook the building project of a temple to the new god and Livia also held annual games to Augustus on the Palatine, the so-called *Ludi Palatini*.[203] They were held on 17th January, the anniversary of her wedding-day. Thus, her position as *sacerdos* gave Livia a new political platform.

Livia's new office was publicly advertised and reflected by the way in which she moved within the cityscape of Rome.[204] Dio writes that she was

202 Cass. Dio 56.46.1-2. Cesarano 2012 pp. 93-107.

203 Cass. Dio 56.46.3; Plin. *HN*. 12.94. Dio attributes the temple to Tiberius while Pliny only mentions Livia. This confusion could stem from the possibility that two different buildings existed: a temple begun in 14 CE and a *sacrarium* begun in 22-23 CE, later inaugurated by Caligula as a temple in 42 CE.

204 Brännstedt 2015a.

granted a *lictor* in respect of the exercise of her sacred office.[205] In 42 BCE, the Senate had voted to allow the Vestal Virgins one *lictor* each, and it is safe to assume that this already established practice helped legitimise Livia's escorted movement.[206] It was the *lictor curiatus* who walked alongside a Vestal Virgin, a special kind of *lictor*, whose main task was religious, rather than the secular one of carrying before senior magistrates the symbolic bundle of rods tied around an axe. The *pontifex maximus* was in charge of the *lictores curiati*, who furthermore escorted *flamines* and were present at various sacrifices. I suggest that Livia was granted a *lictor curiatus* rather than an ordinary *lictor*, but it remains uncertain whether he escorted her only when she performed her religious duties or also when she participated in public ceremonies.[207]

Mother of the state

In the previous discussion we have seen how the family became the medium through which imperial power was transmitted from Augustus to Tiberius. Even though Augustus represented his relationship to Rome as that of a father to his family, it was only after Tiberius' accession to power that the idea of the *res publica* corresponded with an imperial family. However, Tiberius had neither a wife, nor a sister or daughter and, while he could not be the new father of the state without a family, Livia continued to proclaim the female virtues within the political program.

In recognition of this, an increased emphasis on Livia's *mater*-role developed around the time of Tiberius' accession. She had only infrequently

205 Cass. Dio 56.46. Tacitus (*Ann*. 1.14.2) asserts that Tiberius refused his mother this right. The statement of Tacitus may however be seen as a case of his having used Livia to discredit Tiberius. Agrippina would later be given the same privilege as the priestess of Claudius. See Tac. *Ann*. 13.2.3.

206 Cass. Dio 47.19.4.

207 As a curiosity it can be mentioned that when a *lictor* walked ahead of a magistrate, everyone except the Vestal Virgins and *matronae* had to stop and make way. But when Livia, who was said to be the Vesta of chaste matrons, passed their way, we may assume that everyone stepped aside. Plin. *HN* 9.114; Sen. *Controv.* 1.2.3. Vesta of chaste matrons: Ov. *Pont.* 4.13.29.

appeared on public images and in public ceremonies in Rome during the reign of Augustus. She was displayed on the Ara Pacis and represented in a limited number of public statues, but Livia's image was absent from the Forum Augustum, dedicated in 2 BCE, and she was not featured on coins struck in Rome. However, Livia's presence in the form of sculptures, coins, and literary references increased dramatically during the reign of Tiberius. She was often publicized with references to her motherhood, and to her position within the *domus Augusta*, and these aspects of her public *persona* call for further exploration.

The Senate appears to have wished to give Livia the title *mater patriae* or *parens patriae* at the time of Augustus' death, twelve years after he had been recognized as *pater patriae*.[208] The title would have established her as the mother of the state in an official sense, if Tiberius had not refused to allow it. But even though Livia was not officially granted the title, it still echoed through the empire. *Dupondii* of Lepcis Magna in North Africa bear the title *mater patriae*.[209] They were minted under Tiberius, after 22-23 CE, and featured the head of Tiberius laureate on the reverse and on the obverse Livia, veiled and seated with a *patera* in her right hand and a sceptre in the left, with the legend *Augusta mater patria* (sic). An inscription from Anticaria in Baetica dating to the reign of Tiberius honours Livia with the remarkable title *genetrix orbis*.[210] A copper *dupondius* of Colonia Romula in Spain minted in 15-16 CE features the head of Augustus radiate on the obverse with a star above his head and a thunderbolt in the right field and with the head of Livia laureate on the reverse. Her head is resting on a globe, with a crescent above and the legend *Julia Augusta genetrix orbis*. This representation of Livia and the accompanying legend deserves special attention. The crescent moon associates Livia with the moon goddess Luna, while Augustus' radiate crown and the presence of the star above his head links him with Luna's counterpart, the sun god Sol.[211] The title *genetrix* connects Livia with Venus Genetrix, the divine ancestor of

208 Cass. Dio 58.2.1-6; Tac. *Ann.* 1.14.1-4.

209 *RPC* 1 no. 849-850 (note the slightly different legend on the obverse).

210 *CIL* II. 2038; *RPC* 1 no. 73. Augustus is called *pater orbis* by Ovid. (*Fast.* 2.139).

211 Luna and Sol can be found on coins of the republic as well, see *RRC* 303-301 and 474-475.

the Julian family, which would have seemed convenient to the issuer, given Livia's adoption into *gens Iulia*, and her position as mother of the emperor. Adjuncts such as the crescent moon and thus the association to Luna were quite conventional by the time, but the globe is exceptional, as it would seem to associate Livia with world rule.[212]

The so-called Grand Camée de France, the largest imperial cameo to have survived, clearly exhibits Livia's position in the *domus Augusta*.[213] The imagery of this gem has provoked a number of interpretations, but it has been established beyond doubt that the two figures at the centre are Livia and Tiberius.[214] They appear in the middle level, seated in throne-like chairs. Livia is provided with divine accessories such as a floral crown and a bouquet of wheat and poppies. In the upper level *divus* Augustus hovers above them together with deceased family members, while the lowest level depicts captive enemies of both sexes. Natalie Kampen has suggested that the juxtaposition between Livia in the middle panel and the barbarian women and children on the lower register created a contrast between the dynastic continuity of the imperial family that Livia's presence implied, and the defeated community.[215] The so-called Vienna gem communicates a similar message.[216] It shows Livia holding the bust of the deceased and defied Augustus and, as argued by Kampen, it depicts her simultaneously as his wife, widow, daughter, priestess, and mother of his heir.[217] Most noticeable are the huge arms and hands of Livia and the small scale of the bust she holds; the presentation of Livia and the figurine of Augustus accentuates an apparent reversal in the normal Roman gender-order of man supreme and woman subordinate.[218] Iconographic references to

212 An adjunct is the technical term for an object that is part of the image on a coin, but not represented as in direct contact with the subject figure, rather it is placed in the field of the design. For adjuncts associating Livia with divinity see Chapter 4.

213 Paris, Bibliothèque National, Cabinet des Mèdailles inv. 264. Megow 1987 no. A 85; Winkes 1995 pp. 145 no. 71; Mikocki 1995 pl. 8; Wood 1999 pp. 137-138.

214 Wood 1999 pp. 137-138 with references.

215 Kampen 1991 p. 235.

216 Kunsthistorisches Museum IX A 95; Bartman Cat. 110; Kampen 2009 pp. 23-37; Megow 1987 no. B 15 pl. 10.

217 Kampen 2009 pp. 23-37.

218 Kampen 2009 p. 24.

Magna Mater and Ceres signify maternity and fecundity, while Venus points to Livia's adoption into the Julian gens. The divine references together with indicators of Livia's matronly virtue, such as the *stola* that she wears, and her demonstration of piety to her deceased husband, construct Livia as the partner of the deified Augustus, continuing his political project with the cooperation of her son.[219] A carved gem is a medium with a restricted and knowledgeable audience, but the message that the Grand Camée and the Vienna gem convey is repeated in various other media. As Augusta, the widow, daughter, and priestess of the divine Augustus, Livia was more closely tied to her husband than ever. Ovid calls to her as *coniunx sacerdos* while Velleius refers to her as *sacerdos ac filia*.[220] Livia was the link between her divine husband and the Roman people, and his blessings came to them through her mediation.[221]

We have previously seen how Livia's position as Augustus' counterpart and the female head of the *domus Augusta* was expressed on coins during the last decade BCE. If we look at coins struck from 14 CE and onwards, Livia's portrait is jugated with Tiberius on coins from two Asian mints, namely, Aphrodisias-Plarasa and Tripolis, and one from the kingdom of Judaea.[222] All the face-to-face portraits originate from the age of Tiberius. They come from mints of Asia: Mastaura, and Pergamum, the latter displaying on the reverse a temple with four columns enclosing a statue of Augustus.[223] All coins with joint portraits of Livia and Tiberius bear the legend *Sebastoi,* which indicates that they might be seen as united in their authority and both holding the same kind of position.[224] An example of dynastic ambitions can be seen on an *as* from Tarraco in Spain, minted in 22-23 CE, on which Livia is paired with her grandson Drusus, while

219 Kampen 2009 p. 37.

220 Ovid: *Ex Pont*. 4.9.107. Velleius: 75.3.

221 Grether 1946 p. 245; Cesarano 2012 p. 96.

222 Aphrodisias-Plarasa: *RPC* 1. 2842. Tripolis: *RPC* 1. 3054. Judeaa: *RPC* 1. 4951. The coins with Livia and Tiberius follow the same representational guidelines as those featuring Livia and Augustus, with the difference that Augustus wears a laurel wreath while Livia does not, whereas both she and Tiberius are laureate when they appear together.

223 Mastaura: *RPC* 1. 2673. Pergamum: *RPC* 1.2369.

224 Harvey 2011 p. 330.

Tiberius is depicted on the obverse.[225]

Livia is the only imperial female who was featured on eastern issues during the reign of Tiberius. The most exceptional pairing of Livia's portrait is shown on a coin issued in Smyrna 29-35 CE on which Livia is facing a personification of the Roman Senate on the obverse.[226] The reverse offers an explanation of the unusual paring: it features an image of the temple in Smyrna that was dedicated to Livia, Tiberius, and the Senate. The obverse is generally understood as the head side of a coin, often bearing the portrayed or symbol indicative of the issuing authority. If the numismatic evidence from the last decade BCE pointed to Livia's role as *mater* and the dominant female in the imperial family, her appearance on the obverse of coins suggests that her position in this period was elevated above all other Roman women. Such coins present her implicitly not only as the female head of the family, but also as a symbol of the authority of the *domus Augusta,* and, indeed, of Rome.

Livia's enhanced status is further confirmed by a sharp increase in the number of statues that commemorated her empire-wide. For the first time, she is portrayed on a colossal scale, and more inscribed statue bases to Livia survive from the reign of Tiberius than any other period.[227] The couple Livia and Tiberius is the most popular family configuration among the surviving statues and inscriptions from the Tiberian era, and, to my mind, its popularity reflects their positions as the two most important representatives of the imperial power at that particular time.[228]

Words and phrases to describe Livia's new position developed along with the visual representations. The Augustan name seems to have become a unifying feature of the imperial house when both Tiberius and Livia had received it, and Ovid's poems emphasise how Rome was ruled by the *domus Augusta*, and not by one man.[229] Ovid had previously designated the imperial house by use of the name Caesar, but shifted to Augustus after the accession of Tiberius. Even if the phrase *domus Augusta* may be

225 *RPC* 1. 233.
226 *RPC* 1. 2469.
227 Bartman 1999 p. 102.
228 Bartman 1999 p. 109.
229 Cf. Ov. *Fast*. 1.529-30.

considered to have sprung from palace propaganda, and Ovid's fawning on the imperial family, it came to be recognized as a political entity during the reign of Tiberius: it is referred to in official documents such as the *Senatus consultum de Pisone Patre* of 20 CE. The senatorial document, which will be discussed at length in Chapter 3, provides a picture of how the imperial family was recognised as a part of the Roman government at the time.[230] Livia receives praise based on her traditional behaviour within the family and her position as mother of Tiberius, the new *princeps*. The real novelty however, is that the language of an official senatorial decree has been modified to reflect the changed political situation.

The evidence tells, moreover, of how the motherhood of Livia came to be seen as one of the key factors upholding not only the imperial family, but also the Roman state. A circumstance that allowed this association to come decidedly to the fore was the fact that Livia fell seriously ill just when she was to reach her eighties in 22 CE.[231] Her sickness was treated as a matter of great public concern. When she had recovered the Senate decreed acts of thanksgiving, *supplicia,* to the gods and *ludi magni* to be arranged by the four great priestly colleges.[232] The *Sodales Augustales* assisted them to make the celebrations even more solemn. The equestrians made an offering in a temple to Fortuna Equestris at Antium, a city south of Rome. Besides receiving these honours Livia gained the right to travel in a *carpentum* in the city, and, whenever she entered the theatre, to be seated with the Vestals.[233] This was quite the contrary to the restriction of Augustus that dictated that women should take their place on the very highest seats.

230 *Domus Augusta*: *SCPP* 350; 478. Livia's virtues: *SCPP* 432-434.

231 Tac. *Ann*. 3.31.2; 3.64.3.

232 *Supplicatio* can be translated as both 'propitiation' and 'thanksgiving', but as these *supplicia* were carried out after Livia had recovered from her illness, the latter is the correct translation in this context.

233 Livia was most likely carried in a litter before she was allowed to travel in the *carpentum*. To own a litter and the appropriate number of bearers was associated with high status and Livia was presumably using such transportation to the public rites in which she participated. In antiquity a distinction was drawn between the two-wheeled *carpentum* and the four-wheeled *pilentum*. The former was used exclusively by the wealthiest and most socially prominent people within the empire. During the Augustan age this meant the Vestal Virgins and Livia.

Now, with the rights to ride the *carpentum* and to sit together with the Vestals at the theatre, she was more than ever intimately associated with Vesta. This was evident not least from her new mode of transport within Rome. Wives of senators were typically carried in litters, as a mark of their rank and status. Livia presumably used such transportation until 22 CE. *Carpenta* were up to that date used exclusively by the Vestal Virgins. Livia's newly gained right to travel in such a carriage emphasised her connection to the Vestals in a very visible way.

Coins of 22 or 23 CE depict the *carpentum*, decorated by Victories and other figures, drawn by two mules and bearing the legend *SPQR Julia Augusta*. This is the first reference to Livia by name on a coin issued in Rome and it is the first coin to commemorate the public position of a woman.[234] One might therefore have expected that such coins would bear her portrait, but she is actually not to be seen on the coins: instead they depict the covered *carpentum*. The same series also includes coins depicting a female bust and the legend *Salus Augusta*.[235] *Augusta* is used as an adjective agreeing with *salus* ('health') but, as well as qualifying this noun, it identifies the woman portrayed. It both alludes to the current situation in 22 CE when Livia had recently recovered from illness, and communicates the message that Livia was the protector of the well-being of the Roman state.[236]

Deified by Claudius

Livia's long life came to its end in 29 CE, when she fell ill and passed away at the age of eighty-six. Her great-grandson Gaius gave the funeral oration and Livia was then laid to rest in the mausoleum of Augustus. A year of

234 Harvey 2011 p. 240.

235 *RIC*^{2} 47. For similar provincial coins, see *RPC* 1154, 1567-1568, 1779 and 2840. See also *EJ* 137 and Harvey 2011 pp. 240, 335-337.

236 For the identification of Livia on the coin, see Wood 2002 pp. 109-110. This connection is confirmed by a *dupondius* from the age of Tiberius, minted in the colony Emerita Augusta in modern-day Spain (*RPC* 1 no. 39; Harvey 2011 p. 336). The obverse shows Livia's portrait and the legend *Salus Augusta*, while the reverse presents a seated Livia, this time with the legend *Julia Augusta.*

mourning was decreed, to be observed by all women.[237] Livia's funeral was simple, and, according to Suetonius, Tiberius declared that his mother would not have wanted to be given divine honours.[238] However, the Senate, although not allowed by Tiberius to deify Livia, voted that an arch should be erected in her name. It was a singular honour for a woman, never repeated, and not brought to completion even in Livia's case, since Tiberius, having promised to pay for it himself, thus removing the honour from the public sphere, never, in fact, did so.[239] Flory points out that the arch may have been a substitute form of deification, since no arches existed for mortal women, whereas arches existed that contained statues of goddesses and were votive offerings to female deities.[240] It took thirteen years after her demise before Livia was granted divine honours, in fulfilment of a proposal made by Claudius in 42 CE. What were his reasons for having Livia deified?

Claudius was the grandson of Livia and a scion of the Claudian branch only, not the Julian. Hence Claudius' ties to Augustus were through Livia. In modern scholarship this has been the only explanation given as to why Claudius deified his grandmother, thirteen years after she had passed away.[241] However, it is questionable whether this explanation conveys the whole truth of the matter. This chapter has shown that there was no distinction drawn between the Julian and Claudian origins within the *domus Augusta*. Furthermore, an explanation that emphasises Claudius' biological connection to Livia underplays the fact that adoption, not biology, was the primary route for political succession in the early empire.[242] Germanicus, Claudius' older brother, was a case in point. When Augustus adopted Tiberius, Tiberius adopted Germanicus and they both received the name Caesar. After Germanicus' untimely death in 19 CE, his sons

237 Cass. Dio 58.2.

238 Tac. *Ann*. 5.1.4: *funus eius modicum*.

239 Cass. Dio 58.2.3.

240 Flory 1995 p. 132.

241 Cf. Flory 1995 p. 133; Bartman 1999 pp. 127-128; Flory 1998 p. 130; Wood 1999 p. 84; 176; Kampen 2009 p. 23; Osgood 2011 p. 56; Stafford 2013 p. 232.

242 See Simpson 2008 pp. 358-362.

came to be seen as possible successors to Tiberius.[243] I would like to propose that the chief reason for Livia's deification is to be found in her role as *mater* and her central standing in the *domus Augusta*. Heavenly worship can be seen as the logical extension of Livia's position, already an exalted one in her lifetime, as matriarch of the *domus Augusta,* and the question to ask is not why she was deified, rather, why she was not deified until the reign of Claudius?

We cannot know whether Tiberius' refusal of divine honours for his mother was an act of a spiteful son or a statement that his view of the concept of power did not include a deified family. The fact that the political structure had changed in such a way as to emphasise the family as the medium through which imperial power was transmitted had enabled Tiberius to successfully inherit the leadership of the Roman state, and perhaps because of this very success he saw no need to deify Livia when she died in 29 CE. It was Drusilla, sister of Caligula, deified by her brother in 38 CE, who consequently became the first *diva* in Rome's imperial family. She received her own shrine and priesthood, but her cult lasted only as long as her brother held power.[244]

Claudius' takeover as *princeps* of the Roman empire on 24 January 41 CE was less stable than the accessions of his predecessors. His predecessor, Caligula, had not marked him out as a successor, nor was he a distinguished person within the imperial family. He received the support of the Praetorians, who forced the Senate to accept their acclamation of Claudius as *imperator,* but his position was precarious. Suetonius gives a vivid account of the two tumultuous days when the authority of the principate was thrown in to question.[245] Following the assassination of Caligula, the people gathered in the Forum while the consuls brought the state treasury to the Capitol and the Senate assembled in the Temple of Jupiter, debating if the old freedom of the republic should be restored. According to Suetonius, Claudius took various measures to obliterate the memory of the days when the Senate had thought of changing the form of

243 Osgood 2011 p. 9.

244 Cass. Dio 59.11.2-3; Suet. *Calig*. 24.

245 Suet. *Calig.* 56-60; *Claud.* 10. See also Cass. Dio 59.29-60.2.1 and Joseph. *AJ*. 19.1-273. Osgood 2011 pp. 29-46 provides a useful account for the course of events.

government.[246] To strengthen his position Claudius appears to have affirmed his relation to members of the imperial family. Tiberius, Drusus and Germanicus were honoured together with Antonia, who received the name Augusta. However, the utmost mark of respect was given to Livia, who received divine honours decreed by the Senate. Why did Claudius choose to elevate Livia to a position above, and set apart from, the rest of the family?

If Claudius wanted to strengthen his position by a deification of one of his ancestors, Livia was a good choice. Augustus was already *divus*, and Claudius could hardly have the Senate paying Caligula divine honours. Livia, on the other hand, was already Augusta, *divi filia*, and formerly *sacerdos* of the cult of *divus* Augustus. Furthermore, she was a strong symbol of unity and family concord and closely linked to the well-being of the Roman society. The impact of Livia's *mater*-role finally reached its climax when she was deified close to what would have been her hundredth birthday, on the anniversary day of her wedding to Augustus.

The deification of Livia in many ways had a special bearing on the establishment of Claudius' emerging dynasty. Five days before Livia had been declared divine, Claudius had received the title of *pater patriae*. This measure reasserted the paternal leadership once established by Augustus, and correspondingly, Livia's deification reasserted her role of exalted motherhood. Furthermore, Claudius' son, Tiberius Claudius Germanicus, had been born less than a year prior to the deification. Claudius' position as emperor appears to have been boosted by the arrival of a potential successor: coins had been minted to celebrate his birth with the obverse *Spes Augusta*, the Augustan hope. In 43 CE, Claudius celebrated a triumph as a reward for his conquest of Britain, and was granted the honorific name Britannicus by the Senate. He refused it for himself, but accepted it on behalf of his infant son. On the same occasion his wife, Messalina, was given the right to sit with the Vestal Virgins at games and to travel in the *carpentum*, privileges previously granted to Livia.[247]

If we seek a reason why Livia's cult lived on while Drusilla's did not,

246 Suet. *Claud*. 11.
247 Cass. Dio 60.22.2; Suet. *Claud*. 17.3.

apart from the consideration that Drusilla did not have the same position in the state as Livia, it was that the cult of Livia was integrated with Roman customs and presented in a way that did not violate traditional practices. The deified Livia was reunited with her divine husband in his temple, and the Vestal Virgins, with whom Livia had been in life closely associated, provided for her cult.[248] Coins were struck for *Divus Augustus* and *Diva Augusta*, the divine parents of the Roman people.[249]

Conclusions

On the basis of the Claudian family's accrued economic, cultural, and social capital Livia held the position of a woman of the political nobility from the time of her birth. She acquired the roles of *uxor* and *mater* when she married her kinsman Tiberius Nero. Moreover she performed her part as loyal wife so assiduously that, with the two-year old Tiberius in tow, she even voluntarily followed her husband in his exile. After Livia divorced Tiberius Nero and was betrothed to Octavian in the autumn of 39 BCE, her role as wife at first remained essentially the same: she supported her new husband, who was fighting on the opposite side in the war.

I have demonstrated that the first discernible sign that Livia's *uxor*-role had changed when, from being a woman of the élite, she became the wife of one of the triumvirs, was manifested in the privileges bestowed upon her and Octavia in 35 BCE, namely the sacrosanctity of the tribunes of the people and freedom of financial action. A close reading of the account of Dio, the only source for the privileges, points to the fact that they had been first voted by the Senate, and only then granted by Octavian. This is an important observation as it suggests that the first concession to distinguish Livia from other women of the Roman aristocracy was made within the customary transactional workings of the republic, in a way similar to that employed when *sacrosanctitas* had been granted to Octavian some years earlier. Furthermore, statues of Livia and Octavia were erected as a mark of the occasion. When Livia was granted this first set of privileges she had

248 Cass. Dio 60.5.2; Suet. *Claud*. 11.2.
249 *RIC* 128 no. 101. Flory 1995 p. 133.

not performed any great deeds that could qualify for a statue: it seems that the privileges themselves were what served as substitutes for meritorious actions. I have argued that the granting of the privileges was an isolated event rather than the first step towards the establishment of a public role for Livia as *mater* and *uxor*, and we have seen how Augustus' claim to have restored the republican values was not compatible with the assigning of a prominent public position to his wife.

It is interesting, then, to compare the privileges that Livia received as wife of Octavian the triumvir with those bestowed upon her in 9 BCE when Drusus died. On the latter occasion the *ius trium liberorum* and a grant of public sculptures were bestowed upon her by senatorial vote as consolation for the loss of her son. Livia gained fewer practical advantages from the privileges which she received when Drusus died as the greatest benefit inherent in the *ius trium liberorum* was the freedom of *tutela*, which she had possessed since 35 BCE. The Senate seems rather to have been applying to a woman traditional ideas about publicly granted statues as based on *merita*: Livia was being honoured as a mother whose son had been of such value to society that she deserved overt recognition. I have argued that this publicizing of Livia's role as *mater* during the last decade BCE should be viewed against the backdrop of how Augustus' leadership began to be re-envisaged as a paternal role.

In the friezes of the Ara Pacis the imperial couple are shown mingling with the rest of the family, senators, and state priests. The imperial family is represented as a unit: no individual is singled out as more prominent than another. However, we have seen how Livia became established as the leading female when the imperial family began to be referred to as *domus Augusta* during the last decade BCE. Using coins as my main sources, I have demonstrated that, whereas other females feature in numismatic discourse only on rare occasions, Livia figures frequently and is even represented as mother to Gaius and Lucius, in preference to their biological mother, Julia. This fact, together with preserved monuments such as the Arch of Ticinum and the inscriptions once attached to it, confirms that the *domus Augusta* did not represent the biological family of Augustus, rather the artificial dynasty that had been created, and that no distinction was made between Julian and Claudian origins. The position as matriarch

of the *domus Augusta* allowed Livia to expand her *mater*-role into new political arenas not customarily accessible to women, even if they belonged to the upper social strata. This became manifest when she took part in triumphal arrangements as a consequence of the imperial family's monopoly of the leadership of the army, and its victories.

Augustus' death in 14 CE radically changed Livia's position in the state, as she was instituted as an heir in the first degree, receiving one-third of Augustus' estates, also being adopted as his daughter and appointed *sacerdos* of her now divine husband. Taking into consideration all the reasonably well-dated inscriptions that refer to Livia's nomenclature, I have argued that the posthumous adoption was necessary in order to transfer the title Augusta from Augustus to Livia, but that, once it was ratified, her position as Augustus' daughter was not intended to be emphasised. This is demonstrated by the fact that, while the inscriptions consistently call her Augusta, she is rarely referred to as daughter of Augustus. The new title Augusta marked Livia's elevated position in the state, and her impact on public consciousness, as evidenced by sculptures, coins, and literary references, dramatically increased during the reign of Tiberius. We have seen how family became the medium through which imperial power was transmitted. This political structure would not have been possible for Augustus to establish without a consort. In recognition of this, an increased emphasis on Livia as *mater* developed around the time of Tiberius' accession. Her new position as mother of the state is highlighted by titles such as *mater patriae* and *genetrix orbis* that appear on coins, and likewise by the imagery of the Grand Camée de France which depicts Livia seated in a throne-like chair next to Tiberius, provided with accessories such as a floral crown and a bouquet of wheat and poppies. Coins struck from 14 CE and onwards feature Livia jugated with Tiberius, or even on the obverse, without being accompanied by a male counterpart, revealing how far perceptions of the *res publica* had moved in the direction of incorporating female leadership.

The privileges that Livia received as Augusta were concerned with the performative dimensions of her newly acquired public role. As priestess, she was accompanied by a *lictor* in the exercise of her sacred office, and her exalted position would be further reflected in the way she moved in the cityscape when, in 22 CE, she was granted the right to travel in a *carpentum*,

and to be seated with the Vestal Virgins when she entered the theatre. Livia literally and figuratively transcended the boundaries of the traditional female sphere, but the enlarging and re-shaping of Livia's role as *mater* was not done without tension, and the coalescing of the state with an imperial family complicated Livia's gendered role as *mater*. I would like to argue that the reason why the Vestal Virgins were often used as role-models for Livia, was that, in this way, the new dimensions of her role could be seen as fitting into a career-framework for women already existing in the Roman state. It was a well-chosen reference, as the Vestal priestesses blurred the lines of the female-male dichotomy, using markers from both categories to bolster their position. Their dress and sexual purity linked them to chaste matrons, but the right to have lictors accompanying them when walking around in the Roman cityscape, and their privilege of being seated with the senators at games, gave their position, like Livia's, a quasi-masculine dimension.

In the course of her lifetime, Livia slowly accumulated the honours of the Vestals, beginning with the *sacrosanctitas* and removal of *tutela* in 35 BCE. The association between the cult of Vesta and Augustus was strengthened by his decision to create a shrine to Vesta within the walls of his own house on the Palatine Hill. It was implied by the housing of statuettes of Augustus' family gods in the shrine of Vesta, that the state hearth and the imperial home were now merged together. I have argued that the Ara Pacis had a special bearing on Livia as the consecration day of the altar and her fiftieth birthday coincided, and the Vestal Virgins catered for the annual sacrifices performed on that day. Livia and the (celibate) virgins were granted the *ius trium liberorum* later the same year, 9 BCE. When Livia was appointed *sacerdos* in 14 CE she was granted a *lictor* in connection with the exercise of her office. In 22 CE Livia gained the right to travel in a *carpentum* and to be seated with the Vestals at the theatre and, when she was deified in 42 CE, the Vestal sisterhood provided for her cult.

I would like to end this chapter by highlighting one of the paradoxes that characterised Livia's position: the fact that her role as *mater* was so strongly emphasised despite the fact that she never bore Augustus any children. The more ground-breaking shifts in Livia's position, such as her adoption by Augustus, and later her deification by Claudius, have been explained by modern scholars in terms of her biological connection to

various family members. However, the emphasis on blood-lines underplays the fact that adoption was the primary route for political succession in the early principate. Hence Livia's posthumous adoption was not primarily made in order to create a genealogical connection between Augustus and Tiberius. Tiberius had already been adopted by Augustus in 4 CE, an event in which Livia does not seem to have played a crucial part. Moreover, this chapter has shown that there was no distinction drawn between the Julian and Claudian origins within the *domus Augusta*. Consequently, I argued that the reason why Claudius deified Livia was not so much because of his blood-ties to her, as because of her position within the *domus Augusta* as its principal ancestress. By deifying Livia, a strong symbol of unity and family concord, and closely linked to the well-being of Roman society, Claudius was able to strengthen his own standing. That the deification had a special bearing on the establishment of Claudius' emerging dynasty is confirmed by the fact that he had received the title *pater patriae* only five days earlier.

III. PATRONA

This chapter presents an analysis of Livia's role as *patrona*. My aim is to discuss the role in terms of both continuity and change, that is to say: I am interested in determining to what extent Livia acted in line with republican *patronae*, and at the same time I aim to investigate how the changing political structure of the early principate allowed her to act as an imperial *patrona*. Previous research about *patronae* and female benefactors has often classified their support and actions as either public patronage, that is, the support given to communities, or as private patronage, that is the support given to individuals within the context of personal relationships.[250] However, it seems inappropriate to divide the discussion of Livia's patronage in such a way, as her position implied that all her actions had a public dimension. Furthermore, consciousness by Livia and her contemporaries of a dichotomy between private and public patronage is generally unlikely: a relationship between a patron and a client had both public and private aspects which the Romans themselves never appear to have tried to separate. The present analysis of Livia's role as *patrona* will instead focus on the development of her patronage, given to both single individuals and selected groups and collectives, as well as to a more general public. Her patronage will be discussed in terms of the exchange of services and goods, and in terms of performance, as in the case of her presidency over banquets. A discussion of the public acknowledgement of Livia's role as a *patrona*, and the honours she received in return for her benefactions concludes this chapter.

250 Eg. Dixon 2001 pp. 89-106; Bielman 2012 p. 238.

Prerequisites of patronage

Slaves and freedmen

The basis of Livia's patronage and wielding of power was her household and property. As has been observed in the previous chapter, Livia had received freedom from tutelage already in 35 BCE and could from that date onward independently manage her own household. Due to accidents of survival the evidence for Livia's *familia* is better than for that of anyone else in the Julio-Claudian family, Augustus not excluded. Her *columbarium,* the so-called *Monumentum Liviae,* was excavated in 1726 and published a year later by Francesco Bianchini and Antonio Francisco Gorio in separate publications.[251]

The *columbarium* was erected during the final years of the Augustan age and was in use until after Livia's deification in 42 CE.[252] Little is left of the building today: only a few remains can still be seen near the church of *Domine, quo vadis* on the Via Appia.[253] The building is identified as Livia's *columbarium* on the basis of the preserved inscriptions. According to the plates in the edition of Gorio, the *columbarium* contained some large and freestanding monuments and at least 550 *aediculae,* small niches. Each niche had space enough for two *ollae*, which means that as many as 1100 individuals could have been buried there, including children and slaves and freedmen of Livia's freedmen.[254] Each niche had a small marble plaque attached to it, generally giving the name and occupation of the person whose ashes were laid to rest. The *columbarium* was run by a *collegium*, though some inscriptions record that Livia was responsible for the giving of an *olla* or the putting up of an inscription, and the *columbarium* most likely had financial support from its *domina,* as would have been expected even of a republican woman exercising patronage. The *columbarium* itself

251 Bianchini 1927; Gorio 1927. For more recent scholarship on the household of Livia see Treggiari 1975 and Hasegawa 2005. As Treggiari has already listed all the inscriptions from the *columbarium*, I have not thought it necessary to tabulate the same data here.

252 Slaves with the nomenclature *divae liberti* are attested. See *CIL*.VI.4159; 8955.

253 Most of the preserved inscriptions are displayed in the Capitoline Museums.

254 In some cases relatives or friends shared a niche, and sometimes even the same *olla.* See *CIL* VI.3945; 3946; 3992; 8944.

can be seen as a monument commemorating Livia's roles as a compassionate *mater* and powerful *patrona*.

90 inscriptions from the *columbarium* commemorate slaves and freedmen who had an established connection to Livia's household. Those commemorated ranged from the steward to the slave who looked after Livia's clothes while she visited the baths. However, the picture of Livia's household is distorted by several factors: not all her staff-members were buried in the monument, the tombs of those with the most prestigious positions being found elsewhere, in private burial places.[255] More often than not, the inscriptions do not mention the occupation of the slaves, perhaps because they did not have a specified task or could afford only the simplest inscriptions. The marble plaques do not record when a person passed away, which makes it hard to determine time-frames. It is possible to look at the nomenclature of the *liberti* and see if they refer to Livia Drusilla, Julia Augusta or Diva Augusta, but only a rough chronology can be arrived at by this method, and we cannot leave out of account the possibility that a person may have had an epitaph composed before he or she died, or that there might have been a delay between the decease and the time when the epitaph was put in place. Epitaphs like these normally mention the position that one held at the time of demise, and this fact obstructs attempts to map promotion among slaves and freedmen. Thus, the *columbarium* cannot provide a complete record of Livia's personnel, and it is not possible to pinpoint her staff as it existed at one single moment in time. Furthermore, there was no sharp division between the household of Livia and those of other family members. Though the larger part of those buried in the *columbarium* worked for Livia herself, there are examples of epitaphs commemorating slaves and freedmen of other family members, or even belonging to individuals outside the imperial family.[256]

It would be superfluous to comment in this section the width of the range of personnel included in Livia's *familia* as this will become apparent when its individual members are mentioned in various discussions

255 Treggiari 1975 pp. 57-60.

256 Cf. *CIL* VI. 6213 commemorating an individual working for the *gens Statilia.*

throughout the chapter. However, I would like to draw attention immediately to one aspect of the *familia* that can help us understand Livia's position in the Roman state, and the nature of the early principate, namely how the administration of imperial rule developed out of the customary practice of large aristocratic households.[257] Livia did not have a public residence from where she carried out her duties, and neither did Augustus. No personnel, with the exception of the praetorian guard and the lictors, were employed by the state to assist the imperial couple. Financial management provide an illustration of this phenomenon. Though the *aerarium*, the republican treasury deposited at the temple of Saturn in Rome, was still functioning during the principate and there existed in theory a distinction between public funds and funds belonging to the imperial family, it is not easily spotted in practice.[258] Livia's financial resources were taken care of by members of her own staff. Four *dispensatores* are recorded among those commemorated in extant inscriptions: Calamus, Licinanus, Urbanus, and Ceryllus.[259] They were assisted by *arcarii* (keepers of the chest), of whom three are attested in the *columbarium*: Amiantus, Sabinus, and Hilarius.[260] Furthermore, three *tabularii* (keepers of records and accounts) are recorded: Nisus, Pelops Scaplianus, and Philadelphius.[261] Livia had a slave, Hyberbolus, *ad possessiones,* a job-description unrecorded in relation to any imperial personage other than Livia.[262] When Livia paid for the construction of public buildings, she supported the community of Rome with her private money. The slave Bromius held the position of *custos rationis patrimonii* and administered the accounts of her inheritance from Augustus.[263] When Augustus died, Livia and Tiberius inherited his slaves and freedmen, of

257 For this development see Severy 2003 pp. 140-157.

258 Millar 1964 p. 33.

259 Calamus: *CIL* VI. 3965b; Licinanus: *CIL* VI. 3968; Urbanus: *CIL* VI. 4237; Ceryllus: *CIL* VI. 3966. A *dispensator* could act as a steward but his basic job would be the management of money, especially disbursements. See Treggiari 1975 pp. 49-52.

260 Amiantus: *CIL* VI. 3937; Sabinus: *CIL* VI. 3938; Hilarius: *CIL* VI. 8722.

261 Nisus: *CIL* VI. 4250; Pelops Scaplianus: *CIL* VI. 4358; Philadelphius: *CIL* VI. 9066. Pelops Scaplianus and Philadelphius were probably jointly owned by Livia and Tiberius.

262 *CIL* VI. 4015.

263 *CIL* VI. 3962.

whom many were involved in civil administration, thus inheriting parts of the government.[264]

The members of the imperial households developed a special position due to their proximity to the imperial family, and a new centre of imperial bureaucracy grew up within the state.[265] It was established alongside the old republican institutions, such as the senate and the magistracies, which continued to exist. It therefore seemed possible for Livia and Augustus to establish a new administrative organisation, without depriving the aristocracy of its ruling functions.[266] Those who were at the top of this new hierarchy were most often of quite low status in the traditional order and were thus not rivals to the emperor or the old aristocracy. However, a tension seems to have arisen when senators had to approach slaves and freedmen for imperial benefactions. Tacitus condemnation of the Julio-Claudian emperors for what he regarded as an inappropriate amount of power held by freedmen – and imperial women – due to their proximity to the emperor, needs to be viewed against this backdrop.[267]

Property and legacies

Livia's household in Rome was only a part of her slave-holdings, as she possessed great estates elsewhere. They were important sources of income that Livia could use to obligate friends and clients and thereby create relationships of dependency. The existing evidence does not allow us to quantify Livia's wealth, but it does give a general impression of its scale by demonstrating her ownership of revenue-producing estates. The villa in Prima Porta is perhaps Livia's best-known estate, due to the discovery on

264 To take over slaves and freedmen would remain an important form of continuity between emperors. See Weaver 1972 pp. 2-7; Severy 2003 p. 208 (Tiberius); Osgood 2011 pp. 41-42 (Claudius).

265 The imperial slaves and freedmen often married those of higher status than themselves (though, if they were still slaves, their marriage was regarded as mere cohabitation, *contubernium*), see Weaver 1972 pp. 42-80.

266 Winterling 2009 pp. 28-33.

267 The ability to keep control of his freedmen would eventually come to be regarded as characteristic of the ideal emperor, cf. Plin. *Pan*. 88.1-2. Saller 1982 p. 67.

the site of the heroic marble statue of Augustus, the so-called Augustus of Prima Porta, and the illusionistic fresco of a garden view painted on the walls of one of the subterranean rooms. Prima Porta is located on the *ager Veientanus*, on the right bank of the Tiber. The villa could have been a part of the properties of the *Drusi*, a branch of the *Livii* that was associated with the nearby town of Fidenae.[268] Suetonius reports that Livia revisited her property in Veii *(Liviae…Veientanum suum revisenti…)* directly after her marriage to Octavian, which suggests that Livia owned the villa in Prima Porta before 38 BCE, perhaps as a part of her inheritance of Drusus Claudianus.[269] However, it is not possible to tell whether Livia inherited the property directly from her father, or retrieved it later from Octavian after a hypothetical confiscation.

Besides the villa, Livia owned brickworks in Campania. They were probably part of a great estate, and stamped tiles bearing the names of persons belonging to her *familia* have been found at Herculaneum and Stabiae.[270] The presence of house-slaves on Capri and at Scolacium in Lucania suggests that Livia had possessions there.[271] A *procurator* of Livia and Tiberius, a certain Cornelius Mansuetus, is attested on the island of Lipari, just north of Sicily.[272] The joint ownership of Livia and Tiberius could imply that they had inherited the estates from Augustus, as appears to be the case with another estate in the area of Tusculum.[273] Sextus Afranius Burro, perhaps best known as the commander of the praetorian guard just before the accession of Nero, was Livia's procurator in Gallia

268 Klynne 2002 p. 11. Reeder (2001 pp. 29-34) suggests that the place which Cicero calls *Drusi hortos* in a letter dating to 45 BCE (Cic. *Att*. 12.31) could be synonymous with the villa at Prima Porta. The villa of Livia is a modern name: the sources commonly refer to it as *ad Gallinas*.

269 Suet. *Galb.* 1. The sources for the villa, and specifically for the episode with Livia and the hen, are Plin. *HN* 15.136-37; Cass. Dio 48.52.3-4; 63.29.3; Aur. Vict. *Caes*. 5.17.

270 *CIL* X.8041; 8042; 8060.

271 Capri: *CIL* VI. 8958, see also *CIL* VI. 8489. One attested freedwoman of Livia, her *ornatrix* Juno Dorcas, died in Rome but was born *a Caprensis*. Scolacium: *AE* 1972 nr. 147.

272 *CIL* X.7489. *Procurator* could be used for a number of different offices, among which the manager of imperial properties was one.

273 *CIL* XV.7814.

Narbonensis.[274] Livia furthermore owned copper deposits in Gaul, and Pliny the Elder attests the quality of the *aes Livianum*.[275] She must have acquired considerable property in Thyateira in Asia Minor during Augustus' lifetime, and the Livian treasury, with its own procurator, is attested in epigraphic material from the third century CE, when it appears to be still in use.[276] Livia owned large estates in Egypt, including vineyards, vegetable farms, granaries, grain lands, papyrus marshes and olive and wine presses.[277] One part of the estates was situated in the Arsinoite district where a famous portrait of Livia was found. The find-spot has given its name to her most popular portrait-type, the Faiyum type.

Livia jointly owned estates with Germanicus at Bakkhias and, after his death in 19 CE, his share would have passed to his children.[278] The sources speak of joint ownership between Livia and the children of Germanicus of a great expanse of papyrus marshes at Theadelphia, and of grain lands at Philadelphia together with a treasury at Tebtynis.[279] Livia's last acquisition of properties in Egypt is recorded as late as in 28 or 29 CE, when she is said to have owned lands for cultivating wheat and barley at Euhemeria.[280] All of Livia's estates were most likely looked after by slaves owned by her, but information about the personnel involved with her properties outside Rome is scarce in comparison to the rich evidence for her Roman entourage obtainable from the epigraphic texts from the *columbarium.*

Apart from gathering the revenues from her properties, the easiest way for Livia to acquire extra capital appears to have been to be named in people's wills. Sometimes the last attempt of a client to repay *beneficia* given was only symbolic of good-will, but, in general, bequests contributed substantially to Livia's vast income. It became customary from the age of

274 *ILS* 259.

275 Plin. *HN*. 34.3-4. Pliny ranks the quality of Livia's copper as the second best, second only to the Sallustianum that was mined in the Alpine region. Davies (1935 p. 3 n. 7) suggests that Livia's copper-mine was located in the Rhône area.

276 *IGRom* 4.1202; 1213 (= *ILS* 8853).

277 Cass. Dio 51.5.5.

278 *P. London* II.445.

279 Theadelphia: *P. Med.* 6; Philadelphia: *P. Sorbonn*. 2364; Tebtynis: *PSI* 1028; *SB* 10536.

280 *PRyl.* 126.

Augustus and onwards for imperial *amici* and *clientes* to name the emperor in their wills.[281] It is likely that Livia benefited from a special provision enacted, before 9 CE, to allow certain women to inherit property worth more than 100.000 sesterces.[282] The practice seems to have varied from emperor to emperor whether they accepted bequests only from friends and subjects he knew in person, or were happy to be named in any will whatsoever.[283] However, even if Caligula and Nero tried to widen the circle beyond their personal friends and acquaintance and strove to be included in the wills of people from various other sectors of society, no emperor tried to be named in the wills of all his subjects.[284] The testamentary evidence preserved for Livia suggests that she was only named in the wills of people she knew in person, as was the case for Augustus and Tiberius.[285]

The inscriptions from the *Columbarium Liviae* are informative about the custom of naming Livia as heir. Some of her servants have names that connect them to other distinguished Romans, although we cannot know if Livia inherited them directly from their original owners. The freedman Timotheus Maronianus could possibly have belonged to Publius Vergilius Maro, the poet Virgil. However, he is recorded as being the freedman of Julia Augusta, so it is possible that Timotheus Maronianus had been bequeathed first to Augustus, who had passed him on to Livia in his will.[286] Anna Liviae Maecenatiana and Parmeno Liviae Maecenatiana seem both to have belonged to Maecenas, while Castor Agrippianus had once been owned by Marcus Agrippa but jointly inherited by Livia and Tiberius, probably from Augustus.[287] The freedman Eros Maecilianus might have been acquired from

281 Saller 1982 pp. 71-73.

282 Cass. Dio 56.10.2.

283 According to Pliny (*Pan*. 43.1-2) Trajan re-established the right and freedom of people to name whomever they wished in their wills, with the result that the *amici* of the emperor still named him, while those who did not know him passed him over. Millar 1977 154-155; Saller 1982 p. 71-72.

284 Saller 1982 p. 72.

285 Rogers 1947 p. 140; Saller 1982 p. 72.

286 *CIL* VI.3952. According to the *Vita* by Donatus, Virgil named Augustus as heir to a quarter of his property. See Millar 1977 p. 154 with references.

287 Anna Liviae Maecenatiana: *CIL* VI. 4095; Parmeno Liviae Maecenatiana: *CIL* VI. 4016; Castor Agrippianus: *CIL* VI. 5223.

the *triumvir monetalis* Marcus Maecilius Tullus while Pelops Scaplianus, Philadelphus Scaplianus and Servilia Scapula perhaps once belonged to Quintus Ostorius Scapula, who was one of the first pair of praetorian prefects in 2 BCE and later the prefect of Egypt.[288] The kingdom of Amyntas of Galatia was incorporated into the Roman empire upon the king's death in 25 BCE and Augustus inherited many of his personal possessions.[289] At least one of his slaves, Marcus Livius Augustae Anteros Amyntianus, was bequeathed to Livia.[290] He held the position *a supellectile* that indicates that his responsibility was to look after works of art and fine furniture, and king Amyntas might have left a fine collection to Livia that Anteros looked after.[291]

Salome, the sister of Herod the Great, left Livia the town of Jamnia together with Phasaelis and Archelais, two estates with extensive date-palm plantations.[292] We can for once actually trace the progression of events: Herod had given the lands to Salome in his will. Augustus, who added the royal residence in Ascalon to the estates, had confirmed this. According to Josephus the whole area produced an annual revenue of sixty talents.[293] When Livia inherited the land, she actually expanded Roman territory by virtue of the legacy. The property was later passed on to Tiberius when Livia died, and then to Caligula.[294] King Herod himself left 500 talents to Livia, the children of Augustus and his friends and freedmen.[295]

To sum up the discussion so far: it has been shown that Livia did not lack opportunities for accumulating wealth, and that she possessed a wide range of slaves and freedmen who managed her household and economic resources. It remains to consider how Livia's patronage was carried out and what kind of *beneficia* she could distribute.

---

288 Eros Maecilianus: *CIL*. VI. 4124; Pelops Scaplianus: *CIL*. VI. 4350; Philadelphus Scaplianus: *CIL*. VI. 9066; Servilia Scapula: *CIL*. VI. 5226; Ostorius Scapula: Cass. Dio 55.10.10. Birley 1981 p. 42.

289 Barrett 2002 p. 176.

290 *CIL* VI. 4035.

291 Huntsman 1997 p. 164.

292 Jos. *Ant*. 18.2; *BJ* 2.9.1.

293 Jos. *Ant*. 17.8.1; 11.5.

294 An imperial *procurator* of Jamnia is attested in an inscription from the reign of Tiberius: *AE* 1948 no. 141.

295 Jos. *BJ*. 1.32.7; *Ant*. 18.6.1.

Mediator and supporter

Individuals

One of the most vivid pictures of Livia in the public consciousness today is perhaps her function as mediator and adviser to Augustus. There is a good reason for this: mothers had prominence and influence within the traditions of a Roman family and acted as an intercessor for those outside the family with the relatives within.[296] Livia's function as mediator and advisor is frequently commented upon in the literary sources, and Suetonius even reports that Augustus spoke from notes when having important conversations (*sermones graviores*) with her.[297] There are several examples of Livia's support given to members of her family such as the advice (*consilium*) she gave to Livilla as to whether she ought to marry after the death of her husband or not.[298] After Drusus died in 9 BCE, Antonia lived together with Livia.[299] So did Claudius for a long time, as well as Caligula, to whom Livia's estates in Judaea were ultimately passed.[300] Tacitus reports how Julia received Livia's support in her exile: 'There she (Julia) tolerated her exile for twenty years, sustained by the charity of Augusta; who had laboured in the dark to destroy her step-children while they flourished, and advertised to the world her compassion when they failed.'[301] Tacitus may be cynical, but he has a point: the public advertisement of Livia's charity was important.

The first recognition of Livia's potential as *patrona* outside the imperial family came about in the immediate aftermath of the battle of Actium in 31 BCE. Dio and Plutarch relate the same episode telling how Cleopatra was convinced that Octavian planned to take her to Rome and show her

296 Dixon 1988 pp. 168-209.
297 Suet. *Aug*. 84, see also Suet. *Claud*. 4.
298 Tac. *Ann*. 4.40.3.
299 Val. Max. 4.5.3.
300 Claudius: Cass. Dio 60.2.5. Caligula's estates: *AE* 1941 nr. 105.
301 Tac. *Ann*. 4.71.6: *Illic viginti annis exilium toleravit Augustae ope sustentata, quae florentes privignos cum per occultum subvertisset, misericordiam erga adflictos palam ostentabat.*

off in his triumph.[302] The queen asked Octavian for the clemency that would permit her to take her own life rather than having to face the humiliation of being included in the spectacle, but Octavian showed no mercy. Cleopatra then turned to Livia, hoping that she would intercede on her behalf. However, Livia remained loyal to her husband and decided not to. The authenticity of this event is dubious, but indicates how female intervention was an integrated part of political life during the republic, both in Rome and in the Hellenistic East.

During the first decades of Augustus' sole rule Livia would be further involved in the politics of the eastern provinces. We have previously seen how she received legacies from Herod the Great and his sister Salome. The relationships between Livia, Augustus, Salome, and Herod exhibit many aspects of patronage. On a journey to the eastern provinces, Livia and Augustus passed through Asia Minor in 20 BCE.[303] It is likely that while they were in Syria, Herod and Salome came to greet them. Livia and

302 Cass. Dio 51.13.3; Plut. *Ant*. 83.4. In Plutarch's version, Cleopatra puts her hopes in both Livia and Octavia.

303 Augustus set out on a tour of the east in September 22 BCE that would keep him away from Rome until 19 BCE. One purpose of his journey was to negotiate the return of the legionary standards lost to the Parthians by Crassus and Antony. Furthermore, Augustus may have felt the need to secure the support of the subjects in the eastern part of the empire, which had previously been under Antony's rule. Livia probably accompanied Augustus on this journey. It is possible to trace her presence through the marks which her patronage have left in both the literary and the epigraphic records, such as the freedom given to Samos. (Dio Cass. 54.6-10.) A senatorial debate held in 21 CE may provide further evidence. A dispute took place in the Senate following a proposal to force the wives of Roman governors not to accompany their husbands. Drusus the Younger spoke against the motion, arguing that Livia often travelled west and east together with Augustus: *quoties divum Augustum in Occidentem atque Orientem meavisse comite Livia!* (Tac. *Ann*. 3.34.6). As discussed in the preceding chapter, Livia followed Augustus to northern Italy in 9 BCE to bring back the body of Drusus the Elder to Rome, and she accompanied him to Campania in 14 CE, but none of those journeys took her outside Italy. It is possible that Livia travelled with Augustus to Gaul and Spain in 27-24 BCE, though there is no evidence to prove it. Horace (*Carm.* 3.14) only comments upon Livia's participation in the offerings made when Augustus returned. There remains the journey in 22-19 BCE which was the only eastern trip that Augustus undertook after the battle of Actium. Cass. Dio 54.6-10. Barrett 2002 pp. 36-38. See also Sen. *Ad. Marc* 3.4, where Livia is called 'the constant companion of your husband' (*adsiduus viri tui comes*) by the philosopher Areus.

Augustus were escorted to Judaea, where they received a ceremonial welcome.[304] The *profectio* and the *adventus* were indeed important rituals on imperial travels.[305] Rituals of this sort, together with visual records such as statues and inscriptions, formed an essential part of patronage and emphasised its performative nature. Livia would eventually adorn the temple in Jerusalem with golden vials, libation bowls and other sumptuous offerings, worth no less than five hundred talents, out of her own resources.[306]

Josephus accounts for the *amicitia* between Livia and Salome when he writes how Livia advised Salome not to marry the man she loved, the Nabataean Arab Syllaeus, whom Herod disapproved of, as he refused to convert to Judaism.[307] Josephus narrates how Salome took Livia's advice both because she was the wife of Augustus, and also because of her helpful counsels on other occasions. He further writes how Antipater, the son of Herod, plotted against his father. Antipater was said to have forged letters written by Salome to Livia and then bribed Acme, a Jewish freedwoman of Livia, to pretend that she had found the letters among Livia's belongings and then sent them to Herod.[308] These stories are dubious, but highlight the long-term nature of patronage-relationships and how these could include the exchange of not just goods but also services, such as the giving of advice or aid in political conflicts. Judaea was not made an integral part of the Roman empire until 6 CE, but the support of Herod was already providing Rome with a gateway to the east early in the principate of Augustus.[309]

Beginning from the last decades BCE we can find evidence for Livia's support of individuals outside the imperial family who resided in the city of Rome. Among the sources for Livia's life it is rare to find two that speak

304 Octavian had met Herod before, on a journey in the year 30 BCE. Herod had at that time arranged entertainments at Akko-Ptolemais for Octavian and the whole of his army. He had furthermore provided the troops with water and wine for their travel through the desert, and he finally escorted Octavian all the way to Antioch. Jos. *BJ*. 1.20.2; *Ant*. 15.6.7.

305 Millar 1977 p. 31.

306 Philo *Leg.* 291; 319-320.

307 Josp. *BJ*. 1.566.

308 Jos. *BJ* 1.641; 661; *Ant*. 17.134-41; 188.

309 Richardson 2012 pp. 44-45.

of the same incident, but one anecdote that does have double attestation relates how Cn. Cornelius Cinna Magnus secured an amnesty through her patronal influence. Seneca places his conspiracy in 16-13 BCE when Augustus was in Gaul, while Dio reports that it happened in CE 4 when Augustus was in Rome.[310] Though they give different accounts of the incident, both Seneca and Dio write how Livia advised Augustus to be merciful to Cinna.[311] Her intervention is recounted in a similar way in both narratives. The discussion between Livia and Augustus takes place in a domestic context where they have an extensive dialogue on the concept of clemency. In both accounts Livia prefaces her remarks with words meaning, 'If you are willing to receive the advice of a woman' (*muliebre consilium* in Seneca), and in both accounts Augustus follows her advice.[312] These literary scenes can serve as illustrations of Livia's enactment of her *patrona*-role in her capacity as wife of the *Princeps*. The setting is a traditional scene from republican times: the wife who listens to her husband and gives him advice. However, the topic discussed is unusual. Due to Augustus' unprecedented political position, Livia guides him as to how to handle conspiracies against him, and the empire. She appears to be aware of the ethic of reciprocity and how *clementia* could turn into *beneficia.* Dio lends his voice to Livia:

> For those who are treated in a forgiving spirit, they not only repent, because they are ashamed to wrong their benefactors again, but also repay them with many services, hoping to receive still further kindnesses; for when a man has been spared by one who has been wronged, he believes that his rescuer, if fairly treated, will go to any lengths in his benefactions. Hear me, therefore, dearest, and change your course.[313]

Cinna too, seemed to be aware of the reciprocity of patronage, as in his will he made Augustus his sole heir. Apart from clemency, Livia appears to have been able to secure citizenship for her clients. Suetonius recounts how

310 Sen. *De Clem.* 1.9.6-7; Cass. Dio 55.14-22. Seneca refers to him as Lucius Cinna while Dio calls him Gnaeus Cornelius. For the episode see also Severy 2003 p. 149.

311 For Dio's use of Seneca see Millar 1964 pp. 78-79.

312 Sen. *De Clem.* 1.9.6; Cass. Dio 55.14.2.

313 Cass. Dio 55.14-22.

Livia asked Augustus for that favour on behalf of a Gaul from a tributary province.[314] Livia's asking of favours from Augustus is commonly looked upon as pillow-talk and scheming. However, in the same passage Suetonius records how Tiberius likewise had requested citizenship for a Greek client of his. No accusations of feminine pillow-talk are appropriate here. It appears that Tiberius and Livia might ask Augustus for much the same sort of favour, and quite likely for the same reason: their proximity, both physical and emotional, to the emperor. Clients seem often to have preferred to submit petitions to the *Princeps* through family members. The same procedure had not been uncommon in republican families, but approaches to the *paterfamilias* through indirect channels became even more important during the early empire, when power was concentrated in the hands of just one family.[315] Ovid appears to have hoped that the indirect approach would be effective when he urged his wife to plead with Livia, expecting that she in turn could present his petition to Augustus. It is worth noting that Ovid advises his wife to choose with care the right time to approach Livia, as he expected her to be dealing with many petitions, and to have only rare moments of leisure.[316]

Livia kept on distributing the same kind of *beneficia* under the reign of Tiberius as under that of Augustus. She asked for clemency on behalf of the senator Quintus Haterius, who was said to have offended Tiberius.[317] Haterius tried to present his apologies to Tiberius, but failed to soften him. He then appealed to Livia, and, according to Tacitus, was saved by the urgency of her prayers.[318] Suetonius gives a glimpse of Livia's patronage when he recounts how she urged Tiberius to appoint a newly-made citizen to the *decuriae*, indicating that this kind of appointment was among the

314 Suet. *Aug.* 40.3. Augustus refused both requests, but offered the Gaul freedom from tribute instead.

315 Saller 1982; Wallace-Hadrill 1989 pp. 63-88; Severy 2005 p. 236.

316 Ov. *Pont.* 3.1.114-166. Wood 1999 p. 2.

317 Tac. *Ann.* 1.13.6.

318 Tac. *Ann.* 1.13.6.

beneficia that Livia was capable of securing for a client.[319] Suetonius further points to Livia's ability to provide support for career-advancement by stressing how Otho's grandfather became a senator *per gratiam Liviae Augustae*, in whose house he was reared.[320]

In the early Tiberian period, the senatorial decrees concerning the death of Germanicus in 19 CE suggest that Livia's patronage and her position within the imperial family were recognised as a part of the Roman government. Germanicus had set out to Asia in 17 CE, entrusted with the *imperium maius,* in order to re-organise the provinces and kingdoms. He apparently fell into conflict with the governor of the province of Syria, Cn. Calpurnius Piso. When Germanicus fell ill, Piso was accused for having poisoned him. The death of Germanicus is described at length in Tacitus' *Annales*, in the *Lex Valeria Aurelia* (*LVA*) and in two decrees of the Roman Senate, the *Senatus consultum de memoria honoranda Germanici Caesaris* (*SCGC*) and the *Senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre* (*SCPP*). The decrees were distributed across the empire and shorter fragments of especially the *SCPP* have been discovered during the course of the twentieth century.[321] The so called *Tabula Siarensis* (*TS*) found in Seville in 1992 is a set of bronze tablets that includes the three documents, although it is not completely

319 Suet. *Tib*. 51.1-2. Tiberius is said to have refused, declaring that he would do it only on condition that Livia would allow an entry to be made in the official list that it was forced upon him by his mother.

320 Suet. *Oth*. 1.

321 Six individual copies (A-F) of the *SCPP* exist. Copy A contains almost the complete text, even if it is broken into twenty-three fragments, and copy B around 17 percent of the text, while copies C-F are small fragments. The copies were uncovered by treasure hunters and sold to private collectors (the Museum of Seville bought copy A from an anonymous private collector in 1990) and the contexts in which the copies were found are poorly documented. The publication of the *SCPP* is a collaboration of Spanish and German scholars. The text is published in both Spanish (Caballos et al. 1996) and German (Eck et al. 1996) with translations into Spanish and German respectively. For English reviews and translations see Griffin 1997; Barnes 1998; Meyer 1998; Potter 1998; Yakobson 1998; Champlin 1999. *AJP* 120.1 1999 is devoted to papers from *APA* in Chicago that discusses the *SCPP*. See also Richardson 1997; Cooley 1998; Flower 1998; Damon 1999; Lebek 1999; Eck 2000; Eck 2002; Rowe 2002; Mackay 2003; Lott 2012.

preserved.[322] The instructions for display included in the *SCGC* do not mention that the documents should be put up together. However it is quite natural to group them together, and Tacitus does not separate their content in his account.[323]

Livia's role as *patrona* comes to the fore in a passage about Munatia Plancina, the wife of Piso, who was a friend of hers.[324] Plancina was accused with her husband for the death of Germanicus. However, the Senate spared Plancina after Tiberius had interceded on behalf of her at the request of Livia. The Senate judged that both Livia's wish to save Plancina's life, and Tiberius' great devotion towards his mother should be supported and indulged because:

> Julia Augusta deserves the best from the republic, not just because of the birth of our *princeps*, but also on account of her many great favours to men of every order, she being someone who, although she ought rightly and deservedly to be most influential in the case of anything she sought from the senate, used this influence most sparingly.[325]

While Tacitus implies that Livia had access to a female network, operating outside the male channels of communication, which she used to save Plancina, the decree shows that her patronage was openly recognised by the Senate. Because of Livia's position as mother of the emperor, her influence, and her many benefactions, she was reckoned to merit the right to grant clemency, a core imperial virtue. After Livia's death Plancina had

322 It was brought to light by farmers and the exact find-spot and the archaeological context are unclear. See Gonzáles 1984 (with a Spanish translation); Fraschetti 1988; Gonzáles 1988; Nicolet 1995; Crawford 1996 no. 37 (with an English translation); Sánchez-Ostiz 1999 integrates all the textual suggestions up until 1999 and has the most extensive *apparatus criticus;* Lott 2012.

323 Tac. *Ann.* 2.83. The similarity between *SCPP* and the *SCGC* and the *Annals* suggests that Tacitus was aware of, and used, the senatorial decrees when he wrote about the death of Germanicus.

324 The friendship between Livia and Plancina is confirmed by Tacitus (*Ann*. 2.43.5).

325 *SCPP* 432-435. The translation by Lott has been slightly reformatted. *Iuliae Aug(ustae), optume de r(e) p(ublica) meritae non partu tantum modo principis nostri, sed etiam multis magnisq(ue) erga cuiusq(ue) ordinis homines beneficis, quae, cum iure meriotoq(ue) plurumum posse in eo, quod a senatu petere<t> deberet, parcissume uteretur eo.*

no patron who could defend her and, charged with 'well-known' crimes, Tacitus recounts that she committed suicide in 33 CE.[326] Livia is praised for another imperial virtue, namely, her *moderatio* both in the way she exercised power, and displayed grief.[327] According to the inscription, the reason for the fact that Livia restricted her sorrow was that she did not want to influence Piso's trial, not because she did not mourn Germanicus. It is not possible to know whether Livia grieved or not, but it can be noted that *moderatio* is one of the primary virtues ascribed to members of the imperial family in the *SCPP*. The document further acknowledges that Germanicus' children managed to control their sorrow thanks to the teachings of Livia and Tiberius.[328]

Livia's *patrona*-role as it is formulated in the *SCPP* is not novel, Roman mothers had traditionally wielded influence on behalf of their male relatives. However, it was due to the position of the imperial family that Livia was able to operate within the political sphere of the Senate when she asked her son for a favour on behalf of her friend.[329] The *SCGC* relates that the Senate discussed honours for Germanicus in December 19 CE, and in a family council at which Tiberius, Livia, Drusus Caesar and Antonia, Germanicus' mother, were present.[330] Dio describes how Livia and Tiberius shared the task of vetting the honours proposed for Augustus upon his death, but does not refer to this as taking place at a council.[331] The explicit reference to the *consilium* in the *SCGC* is hence worth noting, as it confirms the previously mentioned blending of the imperial family with the Roman state. A *paterfamilias* could consult a *consilium*, an informal group of family members, when he was about to make an important family decision. The *consilium* of Tiberius was made up by Livia,

326 Tac. *Ann*. 6.26.3.

327 *SCPP* 449-453.

328 *SCPP* 463-468.

329 Severy 2003 pp. 237-239.

330 The honours that were decided upon were arches at Rome, in Syria, and in Germany, monuments at Antioch and Daphne, commemorations on October 10, and a change to the date of the Augustal games so that the last day of the theatrical shows would fall on the eve of the death of Germanicus.

331 Cass. Dio 56.47.

his son Drusus, and Germanicus' mother, Antonia. Agrippina is not included, probably because she had not yet arrived back in Rome. It was a *consilium* which appears to have overlapped with, but was not identical with, the *domus Augusta*. It is possible that the *consilia* of the emperor changed according to the topic and the advice needed.

The *SCPP* in its entirety can be seen as a commemoration of the *domus Augusta*. It provides an *exemplum* of what would happen to someone who dared to be disloyal to the imperial family. Piso's punishment for such disloyalty, *neclecta maiestate domus Aug(ustae*), was that his death should not be mourned, all images of him should be torn down, his funeral mask should not be displayed among the masks of the Calpurnian family, and his named erased from inscriptions. [332] The Senate hence gave instruction for, and controlled, both Germanicus' and Piso's place in the communal memory: Germanicus was to be commemorated, Piso disgraced.[333] The *SCPP* contains directions as to where its text was to be set up: in Rome; in the most important city of each province – which Siarum was not – and in the winter quarters of every legion, with the aim of communicating what would happen if someone dared to rebel.[334] The soldiers are encouraged to show their loyalty to the *domus Augusta* since they should know that the welfare of the empire has been placed in the care of that dynasty.[335] The *exemplum* of Piso could perhaps explain why a small community of Siarum in Baetica erected an exhaustive copy of the senatorial decrees: either out of loyalty to the *domus Augusta*, or out of fear.

In Rome, the *SCGC* was displayed on bronze at the mausoleum of Augustus, and a copy was placed in the temple of Apollo on the Palatine, where the Senate regularly met.[336] It is worth noting that it stood alongside the *Res Gestae*, Augustus' autobiography, in which he does not make any reference to Livia. While the *Res Gestae* presents a male-centered image of the imperial power, the *SCGC* complicates that picture and underscores how Livia's position had become more manifest during the reign of

332 *SCPP* 349-350.
333 Lott 2012 p. 28.
334 *SCPP* 165-173.
335 (…) *scirent salutem imperi nostri in eius domus custodia posita <m> esse{t}*
336 Lott 2012 p. 20.

Tiberius. The two documents, published in 14 and 19 CE respectively, furthermore demonstrate how epigraphy ensured that the dynastic charge of the Mausoleum grew progressively stronger.

Communities

I have so far been exploring Livia's support of individuals: it is now time to investigate to what extent her patronage included larger groups of people. Samos is one of the communities where we find most evidence for Livia's patronage. Livia and Augustus spent two winters on the island when they were on a tour of the eastern part of the empire in 22-19 BCE.[337] The preserved sources bear witness to Livia's role as *patrona* for the Samians, who had been clients to the Claudian family for a long period of time. In a letter from Augustus to the subjects of Samos he explained why he could not give them the privileges of freedom, even though Livia had been active on their behalf:

> Imperator Caesar Augustus, son of divus Julius, wrote to the Samians underneath their petition:
>
> You yourselves can see that I have given the privilege (*philanthrôpon*) of freedom to no people except the Aphrodisians, who took my side in the war and were captured by storm because of their devotion to us. For it is not right to give the favour of the greatest privilege of all at random and without cause. I am well-disposed to you and should like to do a favour to my wife who is active in your behalf, but not to the point of breaking my custom. For I am not concerned for the money which you pay towards the tribute, but I am not willing to give the most highly prized privileges to anyone without good cause.[338]

The letter is not preserved on Samos, but at Aphrodisias, in the form of an inscription. This is due to the fact that the Aphrodisians mounted any important archives on the wall of their theatre, including documents of communication between the emperor and various cities, as long as they

337 Cass. Dio 54.6-10.

338 *IGRom* 4.976. Trans. Reynolds 1982 p. 104.

contained favourable references to themselves.[339] The *terminus post quem* for the inscription is late 39 BCE, as Augustus uses his praenomen *imperator*, and the *terminus ante quem* is 20-19 BCE when the Samians in fact received their freedom.[340] Hence the wife referred to in the inscription could not be Scribonia whom had Augustus divorced in the earlier part of 39 BCE. The inscription emphasises the public nature of Livia's patronage, and her role as patroness of the Samians appears to have been established to the extent that Augustus felt the need to demonstrate that he did not reject the Samian request without good reason, and also felt obliged to apologize in public when he did not accede to Livia's requests.

Sparta was another community rewarded for its support of Livia. The Lacedaemonians had given Livia and Tiberius Nero a warm welcome during their flight at the time of the Civil Wars as they were *in tutela Claudiorum*, under the tutelage of the Claudii.[341] The visit of Livia and Augustus exhibits the reciprocal nature of patronage: Sparta was given the island of Cythera in exchange for its previous support of Livia, and the imperial couple attended a public banquet during their journey in 22-19 BCE as a way of thanking the Spartans for the loyalty which they had shown.[342] When she visited the communities in the Greek East, Livia renewed the patronal relationships of the Claudii. Correspondingly, in the aftermath of the Civil Wars, there seems to have been a need for the Greek cities to manifest their, sometimes newly found, loyalty towards the

339 For Roman inscriptions at Aphrodisias see Reynolds 1982.

340 The document speaks of Aphrodisias as having been taken by storm in the war (*en to polemo*). Reynolds argues that the war refers to the War of Labienus or Actium, and thus dates the inscription to before 31 BCE, mainly because a general allusion to a war without further specification would be confusing if the document was issued after the battle of Actium. (Reynolds 1982 p. 105). The fact that Augustus is called *Augustos* (sic) should imply a date in or after January 27 BCE, but, since Augustus was normally translated into Greek as *Sebastos*, Reynolds suggests that it was added later on by someone at Aphrodisias, maybe during the third century CE, when transliteration of the Latin name was frequently used. Reynolds 1982 pp. 104-105. When the Samians actually received their freedom is recorded by Cass. Dio (54.9).

341 Suet. *Tib*. 6.

342 Cass. Dio 54.7. Augustus had yet another reasons to be grateful to Sparta: the city was one of few in the Peloponnese that had not supported Antony.

Augustan regime. Both Samos and Sparta had supported the opposing side in the Civil Wars and it appears plausible that their ties to Livia were important in order to create alliances with Augustus and the new regime.

Livia's devotion to Samos and Sparta demonstrates how a patronage-relationship could be of a long-term nature and even inherited from generation to generation. The Samians persisted in honouring Livia as their benefactress with various public honours, among them a statue-group of her parents.[343] It was most likely erected after the death of Augustus, since Livia is referred to as Julia Augusta. Livia's natural parents were not included in the dynastic ambition of the imperial family in any period of the Julio-Claudian rule, and their appearance on Samos ought, most probably, to be seen as an honour of Livia and the *gens Claudia*.[344] There is a specific indication of this in the attached inscription that honours Alfidia and Drusus Claudianus for being the parents of Livia, 'a woman who has been the cause of the greatest benefits to the world.'

Livia's role as patron of individuals and communities is emphasised in the *columbarium* material. She had a number of slaves and freedmen concerned with petitions and correspondence, including the clerk of the stores Corinna (*librarius*) and those with the position *a manu*/*ad manum*, who took dictation.[345] Livia had three such servants, the two slaves Faustus and

343 *IGRom* 4. 982; 983; Rose Cat. 93.

344 A group from Marruvium, present day San Benedetto, features both Livia's biological parents, Drusus Claudianus and Alfidia, and Tiberius' biological father, Tiberius Nero. *(CIL* IX. 3660 = *ILS* 124; 125; 125a. Rose Cat. 23). The group dates after 14 CE because Livia and Tiberius are referred to as Augusta and Augustus. This is the only surviving dedication to Tiberius Nero. There is no known link between Marruvium and the imperial family other than loose connections such as the fact that M. Livius Drusus, Livia's grandfather, was a friend of O. Poppaedius Silo, the general of Marruvium during the Social Wars (Wiseman 1965 p. 334; Linderski 1974 p. 464 n. 8; Rose Cat. 23). A statue of Alfidia was erected at Tucci in Baetica (*CIL* II. 1667). The attached inscription is damaged so we cannot know if it once included a dedication to Drusus Claudianus as well. Alfidia was additionally honoured with an image of Felicitas in her hometown of Fundi, by a decree of the Senate (Suet. *Tib*. 5).

345 *CIL* VI. 3979.

Epander, and the freedman Ismarus.[346] The *ostiarii*, the doorkeepers, controlled the clients' access to Livia and perhaps repelled unwanted callers. Four are attested: Antaeus, Amphio, Hilarus and Demosthenes.[347] The evidence for Antonia's household speaks of a slave *ab admissione* who decided who should be admitted, and *rogatores* in charge of issuing invitations, and it is likely that Livia employed the same kind of personnel.[348] Six of Livia's *cubicularii* are known, responsible for allowing a select number of guests to enter the *cubiculum*, the private study/bedroom.[349] In charge of the *cubicularii* was the supervisor (*supra cubicularios*) Amarantus, a freedman.[350]

Imperial patron

To sum up the discussion so far: it has been shown that Livia was capable of distributing *beneficia* such as to advice-giving, mediation between her clients and the emperor and the securing for them of benefactions like citizenship and appointment to various offices. Furthermore, Livia appears to have served as a mediator between Augustus and certain communities, such as Samos. Given the kind of *beneficia* that Livia distributed, her *patrona*-role was essentially the same one that her republican counterparts had exercised, but she worked on a different scale, and with more public visibility, due to the unprecedented power of the imperial family.

However, already during the middle and late republic the system of patronage and *clientela* had entered what Karl-Joachim Hölkeskamp refers

346 *A manu/ad manum*: *CIL* VI. 4448; 4242; 3980. There are also two known slaves *a manu* owned by other members of Livia's staff (*CIL* VI. 3966; 4243). Though a freedman had the right to employ his own secretary, it is possible that such servants worked for their owner's *domina*. See Treggiari 1975 pp. 50-51.

347 *CIL* VI. 3965; 3995; 8964; 3997.

348 *CIL* VI. 33762; 33794; 4026. Treggiari 1975 p. 51.

349 *CIL* VI. 3957-3961; 4231. A hierarchy in the running of the bedroom developed during the late republic and early empire. Cicero had only one *cubicularius* with him as govenor in Cilicia, Caesar had two while kept prisoner by the pirates. See Treggiari 1975 p. 52 with references.

350 *CIL* VI. 8766.

to as its 'third phase'.[351] By this time certain patrons had such large *clientelae* that it was not possible for them to have a close and frequent contact with all individual clients, due to considerations both of numerical size and geographical distance. The lack of social proximity had to be compensated for by other media of communication between such patrons and their clients. We have so far been considering clients with whom Livia had some kind of personal relationship: it remains to investigate how she acted as *patrona* for larger bodies of clients.

Winterling has emphasised the performative and symbolic dimensions of patron-client relations: how they required continuously renewed enactment and manifestation, such as the *salutatio*.[352] The sources do not offer much scope for a discussion of Livia's ritualised morning reception, but they do comment upon Livia's displaying of her *clientela* to the public. Macrobius refers to this phenomenon in his *Saturnalia,* observing how the very different entourages of Livia and Julia caught the people's attention at a set of gladiatorial contests. The retinue accompanying Livia consisted of men of weight and standing (*gravibus viris*) while Julia was surrounded by 'a gaggle of youths of decidedly dandified appearance.' Augustus slipped Julia a note pointing out the difference between the entourages of the two first ladies (*principes feminas*), to which she wittily wrote back, 'these young men will grow old with me, too.'[353] The joke is primarily about Julia and what was appropriate public behaviour for the emperor's daughter. However, the episode incidentally emphasises how being surrounded by (the right kind of) friends and clients boosted Livia's position and social significance. As Winterling has argued, the possession of a large number of friends and clients was valued and sought for its own sake, while it could also in general symbolize the likelihood of political success, offer the prospect of economic support, and indicate social standing. The preserved inscriptions from the *monumentum Liviae* supports the view that public appearance mattered. Livia had several slaves and freedmen occupied with taking care of her clothes, hairdressing and make-up. Apart from those *a*

351 Hölkeskamp 2010 p. 101. For the development of the system of patronage and *clientela* see pp. 36-38.

352 Winterling 2009 p. 46.

353 Macrob. *Sat*. 2.5.6.

veste or *ad vestem*, in charge of the upkeep and storage of her clothes, Livia had four, possibly even five, *ornatrices*, together with her freedman Cnidus, with the title *ab ornamentis sacerdotalibus*, who took care of Livia's ceremonial vestments and accoutrements for religious occasions.[354]

At what kind of occasions did Livia fulfil a public role as *patrona*? She seems to have followed a Hellenistic tradition when she started to support target groups in the city of Rome by throwing public feasts. To preside over an official banquet was among the activities required of Greek potentates, male or female.[355] However, public banquets in Rome had in the past been exclusively male events, with the sole exception that Vestal Virgins participated in the banquets held for the college of pontiffs. The reason for the lack of female participation is likely to have been that to preside over a banquet required time spent in the public eye and was a manifestation of wealth and prominence. To let a woman act as a hostess in this way would thus not have fitted into the Roman political tradition.

Nevertheless, presidency over banquets became one of Livia's first public manifestations of patronage in the city of Rome. Her first own public banquet, without Augustus' immediate involvement, was thrown in 9 BCE in honour of Tiberius' equestrian triumph.[356] It was still marked by gendered separation: while Tiberius feasted men, Livia, together with Julia, held a dinner for women at the same day.[357] Two years later, 7 BCE, Livia and Tiberius jointly dedicated the *porticus Liviae* (see below) and, while Tiberius gave a banquet to the Senate as part of the celebrations, Livia gave one – this time without a female co-host – for women, and Dio specifies that she did so on her own account.[358]

Even if we only know of two public banquets thrown by Livia, the

354 *A veste* and *ad vestem*: *CIL* VI. 3985; 4041; 4042; 4043; 4251. *Ornatrices*: *CIL* VI. 3993; 3994; 8944; 8958. *CIL VI.* 8800 is uncertain. *Ab ornamentis sacerdotalibus: CIL* VI. 8955, and maybe *CIL VI.* 3992.

355 Bielman 2012 p. 243. To throw banquets was an important part of the emperor's duty, see Lendon 1997 p. 133.

356 The first example of Livia taking part in a public dinner is from the thirties, when Dio (49.15.1) reports that she and Octavian held a banquet in the temple of the Capitoline Jupiter on the anniversary of the battle of Naulochus.

357 Cass. Dio 55.2.4.

358 Cass. Dio 55.8.2.

inscriptions from the *columbarium Liviae* indicates that she might have given several others, apart from those held in a more private context. Included in her household was a freed *opsonator*, Aphareus, who was in charge of the food preparation.[359] Livia had three bakers (*pistores*): Licinianus, Philadelphus and one whose name unfortunately is not fully preserved.[360] No assistant kitchen staff are attested in the epigraphic material, but it appears highly unlikely that Livia's household would have lacked a team of cooks and waiters. The explanation that comes to mind for the omission of assistant kitchen staff from the record is that minor positions in the kitchen were just steps in one's career and therefore not mentioned in funeral inscriptions, or else they were performed by servants without a specified task. A certain degree of shared use of slaves and freedmen occurred within the imperial family, and that could be yet another possible reason for the lack of cooks and waiters working specifically for Livia. Perhaps for the same reasons few entertainers are recorded in the preserved inscriptions, but we do find mention of the *lector* Panaenus and the *comoedus* Vinicius.[361] Livia appears, like many other Romans, to have enjoyed having small children, *delicia*, as attendants, and a freed boy called Prosopas is attested. Furthermore, Pliny mentions her freedwoman Andromeda, who was famous as the smallest woman of her time.[362]

The banquets Livia hosted were *beneficia* given to a select group of individuals, presumably belonging to the upper political strata. However, Livia also carried out patronage on behalf of the imperial family in relation to people of lower social standing. Dio writes that she helped families to rear children and pay their daughters' dowries.[363] Likewise Livia gave assistance to victims of various conflagrations, and Dio notes specifically that this support was given by her, and not only by Tiberius.[364] The only

359 *CIL* VI. 8945.

360 *CIL* VI. 4011; 4012; 4010 (*CIL* VI. 4010 is damaged and it is only possible to read the last letters of the name: —*cinismus*).

361 Panaenus: *CIL* VI. 8786. Vinicius: *CIL* VI. 10102.

362 Plin. *HN*. 7.75.

363 Cass. Dio 58.2.

364 Cass. Dio 57.16.2.

known female intervention in this domain and on this scale in the period before Livia was that of the wealthy Busa who, according to Livy, had distributed money, wheat and clothing to the Roman soldiers after their defeat at Cannae in 216 BCE.[365] I would like to suggest that what Livia did when she provided dowries and supported child-raising outside of her immediate circle was to use her economic resources to reinforce Augustan family values and to act like an exemplary *patrona.* In this aspect of her patronage we see an instance of how the *domus Augusta* came to function as an imperial institution that allowed Livia to extend familial privileges outside her own household and act as a representative of the community. Livia is the first known woman in the Greco-Roman world to have sponsored, in addition to banquets, public games.[366] This happened for the first time when she, together with Augustus and Tiberius, gave a gladiatorial show in memory of Tiberius Nero, Livia's first husband.[367] One should distinguish between funding games and presiding over them, but Livia must surely have been present in the public eye during the games.

However, I would like to argue that Livia's most publicly demonstrated beneficence and largesse was manifested in form of public buildings. Architectural patronage by men had been common in the political competition of the late republic, and Rome was teeming with monuments erected by victorious generals.[368] Epigraphic evidence also speaks of female architectural patronage during the late republic, but only on a modest scale. Women seem to have focused on small religious facilities rather than massive monuments.[369] Anne Bielman notes that the scope for women to make religious benefactions appears to have been more restricted in Rome than in Greece; the founding of a sanctuary by a woman is extremely rare

365 Val. Max. 4.8.2. Female aid in replenishing supplies was however not uncommon later on in the imperial period.

366 The funding of athletic games, *agonothesia*, remained a male privilege in both Greece and Rome throughout the Hellenistic period. The first known women to be a co-host of games was Hekataia from Thaos who placed two gladiators she owned against two of her husband's. See Bielman 2012 p. 241.

367 Cass. Dio 48.44.5, see also Suet. *Tib*. 6.4.

368 Cf. Hölkeskamp 2010 pp. 98-106.

369 Woodhull 1999 p. 8.

in republican Italy.[370] The background to Livia's building-patronage is more likely to be found in the Greek East than in Rome. During the Hellenistic era there are several examples of wealthy women who independently chose to finance public buildings.[371] As priestesses and benefactresses, they had a wide range of opportunities to spend their wealth for the public good, and we have previously seen how Livia herself adorned the temple in Jerusalem. In the Hellenistic world wealthy women appear to have been regarded as equals to their male counterparts in the sense that both groups were seen as providers of public services.[372] A similar development is discernible in Rome during the age of Augustus when monumental patronage fell into the hands of the imperial family, as a consequence of the new political order. Augustus continued the tradition of architectural patronage from early in his career, with the primary focus on civic buildings benefiting the public. Livia is not attested as having participated in the building activity conducted during the years immediately following the battle of Actium, nor in the restoration of temples mentioned by Augustus in his *Res Gestae*. Her architectural patronage appears rather to have started with the construction of *Porticus Liviae,* which was inaugurated in 7 BCE, and to this project we now turn.[373]

The *Porticus Liviae* was erected upon the former estate of Vedius Pollio, who was known for his taste for luxury.[374] When he died in 15 BCE, Pollio bequeathed the larger part of his estates to Augustus, among them his extraordinary house on the Esquiline Hill.[375] Having inherited Pollio's land

370 Bielman 2012 p. 240.

371 Bielman 2002; Bielman 2012 p. 239.

372 Bielman 2012 p. 247.

373 Because of all the uncertainty that surrounds the so called *Macellum Liviae* I will not take it into consideration. Besides commissioning the buildings discussed above, Livia as *sacerdos* was involved in the erection of the temple to *divus* Augustus. In addition, R. E. A. Palmer (1974 p. 140) argues that Livia was responsible for the restoration of the Temple of Pudicitia Plebeia, and of Pudicitia Patricia.

374 Cass. Dio 54.23.1-6. For a useful discussion of the Porticus Liviae see Milnor 2008 pp. 56-65.

375 Ovid describes it in the *Fasti* as follows: *urbis opus domus una fuit, spatiumque tenebat, quo brevius muris oppida multa tenent.* (The single house was like the fabric of a city; it occupied a space larger than that occupied by the walls of many a town.) *Fast*. 6.640-642.

on the *Mons Oppius*, Augustus now had the opportunity to make his presence felt by the building of various monuments in the north-eastern region of the city.[376] Pollio's house was razed to the ground and a portico was erected on the spot on which the house once stood, bearing the name *Porticus Liviae*. No physical remains of the portico have survived, except for two *cippi*, but its name is recorded on the *Forma Urbis Romae*.[377] The portico is shown as having a rectangular shape, about 120 x 90 m, internally fronted by a double colonnade. It enclosed a garden, as porticos often did during the period of the late republic and early empire.[378] It rose from the slopes of the Esquiline, overlooking central Rome, and its wide-open plan contrasted effectively with the narrow streets of the neighbourhood. It could be reached by a flight of stairs from the Argiletum, which was one of Rome's principal thoroughfares, bringing pedestrian traffic from the Forum through the Suburra.[379]

The literary references to the portico speak of its rich art collection, Strabo even refers to it as one of the great spectacles of Rome.[380] Pliny the Elder writes about a single vine-stock in the portico which had grown so large that it could produce a dozen amphorae of wine, while Pliny the Younger describes how he met his friends in the portico, about a century after it was built, and further recounts that the Senate gathered here on occasion.[381] The choice of building a portico associated the imperial family with beneficence towards the public, in contrast to the private *luxuria* which Pollio's land had previously symbolized. This is attested by the two preserved *cippi* bearing the inscription: *[imp Caesar Augustus] [ex*

376 Woodhull 1999 p. 74.

377 The site was excavated in 1939 by Coloni, but has never been published. Excavations overseen by Panella in 1984 (Panella 1987 pp. 620-626) have yield some limited information about the *porticus*. Woodhull 1999 p. 41. *Forma Urbis*: Nos. 10l; 10p; 10q; 10r; 11a; figs. 11 and 12.

378 Barrett 2002 p. 201.

379 Woodhull 1999 p. 43.

380 Strabo 5.3.8. See also Cass. Dio 54.23.5; 55.8 and Suet. *Aug*. 29.4. Dio and Suetonius lay no emphasis on Livia as the main benefactor behind the portico.

381 Plin. *HN* 14.11; Plin. *Ep*. 1.5.9. The regionary catalogues mention the *Porticus Liviae* in Region III, indicating that it was still in use during late antiquity.

pri]vat[o] in [publicum] restitui[t].[382] However, the desire to promote public beneficence did not necessarily demand Livia's participation in the project. What aspects of the building made it suitable for receiving her patronage?

The decision to erect a portico in Livia's name could have been influenced by the prior existence of Octavia's portico near the Circus Flaminius, for the two buildings shared the same basic design.[383] The portico of Livia might have been a way to maintain parity between her and Octavia, although the work on Octavia's portico began in 27 BCE, twenty years prior to Livia's. However, it is important to note that the *porticus Liviae* was more than merely a portico: it also included a shrine to Concordia.[384] Ovid states that Livia alone both dedicated and paid for the *aedes*, unlike the portico, which Augustus had paid for.[385] Why did the shrine specifically call for Livia's patronage?

Concordia was the guardian of both political stability in the state, and marital health. Concord as the personification of political accord had been the object of several shrines and was honoured especially as having saved Rome when it had suffered from the discord of civil war.[386] Livia's shrine celebrated her marriage to Augustus, and was the first to be built to Concordia in the aspect of marital felicity. However, the ambiguity between Concord as a virtue of both matrimony and political stability was probably not unintentional. While Livia and Tiberius jointly dedicated the portico in January 16, 7 BCE in conjunction with Tiberius' triumph, the

382 *CIL* VI. 31572 = VI. 1262. For the location of the *cippi* see Gatti 1888 and Lanciani 1893 and *Porticus Liviae* in the *LTUR* (C. Panella).

383 Richardson 1992 s.v. 'Porticus Octaviae;' *LTUR*; Woodhull 1999 p. 77.

384 In the *Forma Urbis* there is a square structure that could possible be the *aedes*, and it has been noted by Coarelli how this structure is similar to that of the Ara Pacis, although *aedes* is a broad term which can refer to anything from a small shrine to a large temple. Nos. 10q. Coarelli 1974 p. 206. Platner and Ashby 1929 (p. 423) have identified it as a fountain. Note that the shrine within the *porticus Liviae* is to be distinguished from the temple of Concordia at the western end of Forum Romanum that Tiberius restored 7-10 CE.

385 Ov. *Fast.* 637-638. *Te quoque magnifica, Concordia, dedicat aede / Livia, quam caro praestitit ipsa viro.* To thee, too, Concordia, Livia dedicated a magnificent shrine, which she presented to her dear husband.

386 Severy 2003 pp. 132-133.

aedes was dedicated six months later, on June 11.[387]

The dedication took place in a period when the calendar was crowded with rites and cults concerning women and family life.[388] This fact has been examined by Flory, who stresses how the date of the dedication coincided with the celebration of Mater Matuta.[389] Furthermore, the Vestalia occurred on June 9, and the inner sanctum of the temple of Vesta was open for *matronae* between the 7th and 15th. Margaret Woodhull argues cogently that the location of the portico was as important as the time for the dedication. It stood directly opposite the shrine of Juno Lucina, a goddess concerned with pregnant women and safe childbirth.[390] The cult of Juno Lucina was furthermore associated with the Vestal Virgins, who in archaic times had made votive offerings of their hair to the goddess. According to Macrobius, the offering were made on the same day that the sacred fire of Vesta was renewed.[391]

Apart from the *Porticus Liviae*, Livia restored the temple to Bona Dea on the north-east side of the Aventine.[392] The cult of Bona Dea increased in popularity during the age of Augustus, when most of the provincial and

387 Cass. Dio 55.8.1.

388 On June 11, the Matralia, the festival in honour of Mater Matuta, took place. The same day was the *dies natalis* of the goddess's temple on the Forum Boarium. (Ov. *Fast.* 6.479-807. On the temple to Mater Matuta and the Matralia see also: Fest. 297M; Plut. *Quaest. Rom*. 267E; *De frat. amor*. 492D; Tert. *De Monog*. 17; Varro *Ling.* 5.106.) June 11 was also the *dies natalis* of the temple to Fortuna Virgo. (Ov. *Fast.* 6.569.) The two temples were closely linked together, as they were erected side by side in the area of Sant' Omobono, fronting the Forum Boarium (Livy. 24.47.15; 25.7.6; Ov. *Fast*. 6.569-636; Plin. *HN* 8.194; 197). This fact is reflected in Ovid's *Fasti* as well: the *aedes Concordiae*, the Matralia and the feast of Fortuna are treated as one unit.

389 Flory 1984. For the Vestalia see Ov. *Fast*. 6.249-468; 713-714.

390 Woodhull 1999 p. 75-76. See also Richardson 1992 and *Iuno Lucina, aedes* in *LTUR*.

391 Macrob. *Sat*. 1.12.6.

392 Bona Dea is the honorific pseudonym of a goddess whose name is unknown. She seems to have had several characteristics and functions, among them both chastity and fertility. She was also considered responsible for the guardianship of the Roman state and its inhabitants, and her worship was carried out *pro salute populi Romani.* To judge from the ancient sources she appears to be an amalgam of the defining characteristics of female deities such as Terra, Ops, Ceres, Damia, and the Magna Mater. In addition, she was identified as the sister, wife or daughter of Faunus. For Bona Dea see Brouwer 1989.

municipal temples were founded. Among them were the temples at Tergeste, Ostia, Portus and that of Augusta Bona Dea Cereria at Aquileia, whose epithet, Cereria, alluded to the large granary at Aquileia.[393] The cult that was carried out on the temple on the Aventine involved both *matronae* and the Vestal Virgins, who performed the rites to the goddess together. These included the Bona Dea festival which was celebrated twice a year: on the anniversary of the foundation of her temple on the Aventine on 1 May, and in the home of the wife of a magistrate *cum imperio*, that is, a consul or a praetor, on a night early in December. The latter festival was open only to a small group of prominent *matronae* and was supervised by the Vestal Virgins. On this special occasion no male representative of the Roman state was in attendance to oversee matters, as it was the custom for his wife or mother to conduct the ceremonies.[394] The worship of Bona Dea was nevertheless a state affair, described with words such as *publica sacra*, and its feasts were listed in the official calendar.[395] Ovid gives an account of the temple: its location, its dedicator, and its restorer:

Quo feror? Augustus mensis mihi carminis huius
ius dabit: interea Diva canenda Bona est.
Est moles nativa loco, res nomina fecit:
appellant Saxum; pars bona montis ea est.
Huic Remus institerat frustra, quo tempore fratri
prima Palatinae signa dedistis aves.
Templa Patres illic oculos exosa viriles
leniter acclini constituere iugo
dedicat haec veteris Crassorum nominis heres,
virgineo nullum corpore passa virum:
Livia restituit, ne non imitata maritum
esset, et est omni parte secuta virum.[396]

393 Brouwer 1989 pp. 400-428.
394 Brouwer 1989 p. 254.
395 Brouwer 1989 p. 254.
396 Ov. *Fast*. 5.147-158, Wiseman & Wiseman translation revised by Janet Fairweather. For the locus of the temple see also Cic. *de dumo sua* 53.136-137 and *Bona Dea Subsaxana* in *LTUR*.

> Where am I being taken?
> The month of August is the rightful claimant to this song of mine:
> In the meantime, I must sing of the Good Goddess.
> There is a natural outcrop; the thing gives a name to the place:
> they call it the Rock. It forms the good part of a hill.
> It was on this that Remus had taken his stand in vain
> at the time when you, birds of the Palatine, gave your first omens to his brother.
> There, on a gently sloping ridge, the Fathers set up the temple that
> hates the eyes of men.
> Its dedicator is an heiress of the ancient name of the Crassi,
> whose virgin body has known no man.
> Livia restored it, so that she should not fail to imitate her husband,
> and she followed him in every respect.

The Senate is said to have founded the temple and thus ratified and supported the cult, and Ovid's mention of the virgin who dedicated the temple connects the cult to chastity, suggesting that this was an important feature of the worshippers of Bona Dea. These statements might have seemed especially important for Ovid to make, given the ridicule that surrounded the cult after a well-known scandal, reference to which is found even in the earlier work of Ovid himself.[397] The scandal had taken place in 62 BCE when Publius Clodius Pulcher had dressed up as a woman and managed to sneak into the December rites of the goddess. The rites were performed in the house of Caesar, since his wife Pompeia was hosting the feast.[398] The same Clodius Pulcher also happened to be a kinsman of Livia's.[399] It was perhaps easier for Livia to restore the reputation of the cult than for Augustus who, although he was *pontifex maximus* at this point of time, could not, as a man, participate in the rite. It is worth noting that, in this entry of the *Fasti,* Livia is referred to by name for the first time in the Augustan poetry.[400]

397 Cf. Ov. *Ars. Am.* 3.638.

398 The Senate thought so seriously about his action that a court was erected to try Clodius. Cicero (whose wife Terentia had hosted the festival the previous year) testified for the prosecution and seems to have been deeply absorbed in the case and did his best to discredit Clodius. Cicero's findings amount to a exhaustive report. Cf. Cic. *Dom.* 105; *Har. resp*. 17.37.38; *Att.* 1.13.3; 1.16. Herbert-Brown 1994 pp. 134-145.

399 Suet. *Tib*. 4. Cic. *Dom*. 105 (Clodius as a descendant of Appius Caecus.).

400 Horace refers to Livia once, but not by name. *Carm*. 3.14.5.

Livia's restoration of the temple to the goddess on the Aventine was a benefaction to Rome's *matronae* and the Vestal Virgins, adding prestige to their cult. However, the worshippers of Bona Dea were not limited to one social level. Even though upper-class matrons carried out the December rite, the majority of the worshippers would not have been of noble birth.[401] One of Livia's own freedwomen, Philematio, was a worshipper of Bona Dea.[402] This is not surprising, given the popularity of the cult and the fact that freedmen similarly often manifested their loyalty not only to their former master, but to his gods. What is conspicuous however, is that Philematio was a *sacerdos* of the cult. Though she could have held her priesthood elsewhere, it is possible that there was a sodality of Bona Dea within the household of Livia, of which Philematio was a priestess.[403]

Livia's third religious building-project was the restoration of the temple of Fortuna Muliebris located at the fourth milestone on the Via Latina.[404] It is not possible to date the temple to a specific year, but remains of the building have been discovered and an inscription on a massive marble fragment records its patroness: *Livia [Dr]usi f(ilia) vxs[or Caesaris Augusti]*.[405] Livia's nomenclature indicates that the temple was restored before 14 CE. Her filiation is written before the name of her husband, and, as was observed in Chapter 2, it was not uncommon that Livia was presented as both the daughter of Drusus Claudianus and wife of Augustus. The length of the marble block seems to have been equivalent to about a third of the façade of the temple and the inscription incorporated Livia's name as benefactress into the fabric of the building.[406]

Like the *aedes Concordiae* and the temple to Bona Dea, the cult of Fortuna Muliebris was connected to female cults and traditional

401 It is worth noting that one third of the dedications to the goddess were from men. Brouwer 1989 p. 258.

402 *CIL* VI. 2240 = 4003.

403 Brouwer 1989 p. 378.

404 For the topographical location for the temple see Canina 1854 pp. 59-61; Ashby 1907 p. 79 and Gigli 1981 pp. 547-563. The temple does not counts as part of the Augustan building program in Rome, and is thus not discussed in the *LTUR*.

405 *CIL* VI. 883.

406 Gigli 1981 p. 556.

womanhood. The original temple was said to have been erected by the Senate in 493 BCE in honour of the political acts of the women who dissuaded Coriolanus from attacking Rome during the war between the Romans and the Volscian troops. According to the legend, Coriolanus was halted by his mother, wife and a group of Roman matrons who had set out from the city.[407] The fact that Dionysius of Halicarnassos especially writes at length and in detail about Fortuna Muliebris testifies to an Augustan interest in the cult. The location of the temple is not unimportant, as those who travelled to Rome along the Via Latina found themselves in close proximity to the sanctuary. The temple of Fortuna Muliebris was restored during the Severan age and the following lines were added to the inscription: (…) */impp C[aes]s Severus et Anto[ninus Augg et Geta nobilissimus Caesar]/ et [Iulia] Aug mater Aug[g] … [restituerunt]*.[408] The juxtaposition between Livia and Julia Domna draws attention to the contrast between how the two women are portrayed. While Livia's name appears first, Julia Domna receives mention only after the names and titles of Severus and his son. However, the word-order positions Julia Domna within the Severan family and emphasises her roles as imperial *mater* and *patrona,* roles that were, in fact, similar to Livia's.

Besides these temples, the products of Livia's building patronage included an aqueduct. It is recorded in an inscription: *[Au]gusta Iul[ia Drusi f. Divi Augusti] [a]quam vicanis [vici Matrini s(ua) p(ecunia) dat].*[409] The inscription is thought to have belonged to a concrete aqueduct that served the settlement of Vicus Matrini along the Via Cassia in Etruria.[410] It is possible that the aqueduct was needed to supply one of Livia's estates with water, or that she had specific ties to the region, but we lack the evidence to prove such connections. Whereas the building-projects previously discussed connected Livia to traditional female cults, the sponsorship of an aqueduct had stronger connections to the masculine political world. Aqueducts were expensive structures to build and in the

407 Livy. 2.40.1-12; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 8.55-56; Plut. *Cor*. 37.3; Val. Max. 1.8.4.

408 *CIL* VI.833. The extent of the Severan repair is difficult to determine from the scanty remains. For the political implications of the restoration see Gorrie 2004.

409 *CIL* XI.3322.

410 Wilson 2004 p. 750.

republic the censors or other magistrates had carried out their construction using public money. However, when Agrippa had the *Aqua Julia et Tepula* erected in 33 BCE, and the *Aqua Virgo* in 27 BCE, his own *familia* provided the work force.[411] During the empire aqueducts were constructed by the emperor himself or by wealthy citizens who wanted to expand their influence.

Woodhull suggests that, just as we often regard the monuments of men as reflections of their position within the Roman society, that is, as manifestations of power gained through military power, political expertise and maybe also élite birth, so too we ought to consider how women's patronage reflected their responsibilities in public life.[412] I suggest that what made it possible for Livia to erect an aqueduct was her position as a giver of care to society in general. The public buildings which she erected, including the aqueduct, all alike showed concern for the well-being of the community for which they were built. Embodied within Livia's building-patronage were themes relating to motherhood, but such was the new political order at Rome, in which the *domus Augusta* was increasingly making its presence felt through monuments, that that the female head of that house could become engaged in a kind of building-patronage that previously had been exclusively in the hands of men. In return Livia acquired permanent visibility in the city and a publicly acknowledged power, in much the same way as the male members of the imperial family.

In the centre of a web of honours

If obligations were mutual within the Roman patron-client system, what did Livia receive in return for the *beneficia* she distributed? Her relationship with the ruling family of the Judaean kingdom can serve as an example. We have previously seen that Livia was named in the wills of both Herod and Salome. Several of Herod's children and grandchildren had been sent to Rome for their education, including his sons Philip and Antipas.[413]

411 Millar 1977 p. 193. Agrippa bequeathed the slaves to Augustus upon his death, and Augustus assigned the *familia* to be the property of the state.

412 Woodhull 1999 p. 2.

413 Cf. Jos. *Ant*. 15.342-343; 16.6; 78-86; 17.80-82; 19.360.

Upon the death of Herod in 4 CE, Philip was appointed ruler of the north-eastern part of the kingdom and chose to demonstrate his ties to Rome by issuing coins with heads of Livia and Tiberius jugated.[414] His brother Herod Antipas ruled Galilee and Perea as a client king of Rome, after being nominated to the throne by Augustus. One way in which Antipas demonstrated his loyalty towards the imperial family was by changing the name of the city of Betharamphtha, on the east bank of the Jordan, to Livias.[415] It is not known when the name-changing took place, but it was presumably before 14 CE, as the city was first referred to as Livias, and then Julias, in line with the changes to Livia's nomenclature.[416]

Betharamphtha was not the only city to bear Livia's name. Augusta in Cilicia Pedias was founded in 20 CE, and the fact that the local coins feature the head of Livia indicates that its name derives from hers.[417] One coin-type minted there is especially is worth noting as it portrays Livia with a Capricorn, a symbol that was normally associated with Augustus, as it was his birth-sign, and came to be a token of his imperial rule. To feature Livia and the capricorn on the same coin indicates that in this city which now bore her august name, Livia was perceived as symbolizing the imperial power.[418] She appears to have been important for Augusta's self-representation for a long time, as coins with Livia's portrait were struck there down to the period of Trajan.[419]

Given how Cleopatra was disparaged for her gender and foreign-ness in the political rhetoric that emerged from the circles around Octavian, one might assume that he would have taken steps to remove from power any other queen within the empire he controlled.[420] However, the rulership of the Pontic, region established under Antony's triumviral control, was left untouched by Octavian. He acknowledged the rule of Antony's nominee, Polemo I as (client) king of Pontus. Rome aided Polemo in 19 BCE to seize

414 *RPC* 1.4951.
415 Jos. *Ant.* 18.2.1.
416 Livias: Plin. *HN*. 13.44; Ptol. *Geog*. 5.16.9. Julias: Jos. *Ant*. 20.159, *BJ* 2.252; 4.438.
417 Plin. *HN*. 5.93. Coins: *RPC* 4006-11; 4013-14.
418 For Augustus and Capricorn see Suet. *Aug*. 94.12 and Galinsky p. 115.
419 *RPC* 1.591.
420 Kearsley 2005 p. 100.

the Cimmerian Bosporus, located in the Crimean area. Polemo married Dynamis queen of Bosporus, granddaughter of Mithridates Eupator, in what appears to have an attempt to pacify his new subjects. The effort to unify their kingdoms came to an end when Dynamis, supported by Sarmatian warriors, expelled her husband. The reasons for this are shrouded in mystery, but despite Dynamis' separation from the pro-Roman Polemo, she remained loyal to Rome, and to Augustus and Livia. She dedicated a statue of Livia in 9-8 BCE. It was erected in a temple to Aphrodite in her hometown Phanagoria, and Dynamis calls herself *philoromaios* and honours Livia as her *euergetis* in the attached inscription.[421]

The expelled Polemo remarried, his new bride being Pythodoris, grandchild of Mark Antony. Eventually in 8 BCE, he died in battle while fighting in the Bosporus. Pythodoris succeeded him and refounded the cities of Sebaste (formerly Cabeira) and Sebasta (formerly Megalopolis), as homage to Augustus and Livia.[422] In 8-6 BCE she dedicated a bronze statue to Livia at Hemonassa, a former Greek colony that was part of her Bosporus kingdom. The epigraphic language of the attached inscription is familiar; Pythodoris expresses her gratitude, calling Livia her own *euergetis*.[423] Furthermore, given Livia's ties to the Bosporan rulers, the fortress city of Liviopolis on the southern shore of the Black Sea was probably founded, or renamed, in her honour.[424]

The examples above are all of *beneficia* rendered to Livia by individuals whom she knew in person. However, in most cases we do not know whether an honour is given by clients with whom Livia had an established relationship, or not. This is the case with a decree from Mytilene dating to 27-11 BCE, and thus an early expression of honours given to the imperial family.[425] The first part of this decree records sacrifices and festivals in

421 *IGRom* 1.902. Dynamis also dedicated statues to Augustus, naming him *euergetes* and herself *philoromaios*: *IGRom* 901; 1.875.

422 Cass. Dio 49.25.4; Strabo 12.3.29, 8.16; *RPC* 3803-3807.

423 *SEG* 39.695; Bartman EpigCat. 13.

424 Plin. *HN*. 6.11. Barrett 2002 p. 207.

425 *OGI* 456. It must date to after 27 because the cognomen Augustus is used, but not after 11 BCE since the decree refers to Octavia. For Rome and Mytilene see Rowe 2002 pp. 124-153. On the date see Dittenberger in *OGI 456*.

Mytilene in honour of Augustus and the second part concerns an embassy to Rome with the mission to thank Augustus, the Senate, the Vestal Virgins, Livia, Octavia, Augustus' children, relatives, and friends.[426] It was proposed that a plaque or a stele bearing a copy of the decree should be erected not only on the Capitol, but also in Augustus' home, a proposal indicative of the growing importance of the imperial family in Roman politics.[427] Awareness of this new political order comes to the fore in a Messenian decree that records how the magistrate Publius Cornelius Scipio, *quaestor pro praetore* of Achaia, proposes honours for the *domus Augusta*, wishing that the house should be safe for all time.[428] Even if we do not know why Scipio proposed these honours, the inscription is a clear illustration of how the language of imperial rule spread across the empire. Livia's role as female head of the *domus Augusta* is emphasised in an inscription from Thasos which once formed part of a monument dedicated to Livia, Julia, and Julia the Younger. Whereas the Julias were esteemed as benefactresses thanks to the efforts of their ancestors, Livia is recorded as a benefactress (*euergetis*) in her own right.[429] Livia's universal qualities as *patrona* come to the fore in an inscription from Assos that refers to her as *euergetis tou kosmou*, benefactress of the world.[430] The title is comparable with some others discussed earlier, such as *mater patriae* or *genetrix orbis.* The empire is now understood to be co-terminous with the world.

Not all subjects, of course, were in the position to rename cities, issue coins or send an embassy in order to express their loyalty towards Livia. What other boons were possible? The form of honour given depended on the position and financial resources of the client, and on local traditions within the vast area of the Roman empire. As has been made clear by modern scholarship on the Augustan age, Rome in that period had no central propaganda agency or institution promoting particular visual

426 Lines 54-60. The children are probably Gaius and Lucius, which suggests a date between 17 BCE and 11 BCE.

427 Lines 48-53.

428 *SEG* 23.206, see especially lines 3-10.

429 *IGRom* 1.835. Rose Cat. 95; Bartman Epig.Cat. 23.

430 *IGRom* 4.250.

formulae or prescribing certain honorific themes.[431] The initiative was always in the hands of those who wanted to honour and thank the emperor, either for whatever deeds he had performed, or for particular personal reasons. To dedicate a statue became one of the most common expressions of loyalty and honour throughout the empire. As has been mentioned in the introduction to this study, eighty-eight freestanding sculptures in stone of Livia are preserved, together with seventy-six inscriptions attesting to the former existence of such statues. A statue and its inscribed base formed a unity, together expressing the message of the monument, and they should ideally be studied together.[432] However, only two portrait-sculptures of Livia are preserved together with their matching inscriptions. So it will be to dedicatory inscriptions alone that I will now turn in order to investigate how clients to Livia could participate in political life by associating themselves with the imperial family. Out of the seventy-six extant inscriptions I will discuss here the twenty-nine that are dedicated to her without crediting her with divine status, while the remaining forty-seven inscriptions will be treated in Chapter 4.

Details of individuals who dedicated statues are recorded in the preserved material, and these confirm that Livia's clients belonged to different social strata, not only the highest. Dating from the reign of Tiberius a partly preserved inscription from Athens speaks of how a woman who was 'daughter of Asklepiodorus' dedicated a statue to Livia Augusta (sic), her *euergetis*.[433] At Smyrna, the freedman Tiberius Claudius set up sculptures of Livia and Tiberius, together with a bilingual inscription.[434] The former master of this Tiberius Claudius was most likely Tiberius Claudius Thrasyllus, also known as Thrasyllus of Alexandria, who received his Roman citizenship from the emperor Tiberius.[435]

Public administrative bodies account for twelve of the dedications, though we might assume that there often were personal motives behind the dedications, and that there were particular individuals who shouldered

431 See Zanker 2010 pp. 108-109.
432 Cf. Fejfer 2014 p. 4.
433 *IG* 2/3. 3241 = *AE* 1929 no. 73; Bartman EpigCat. 33.
434 *CIL* III. 7107; *IGRom*. 4. 1392.
435 Levick 1976 p. 18.

Table 3. Epigraphic records of sculptures dedicated to Livia
For the sake of clarity the Greek Sebaste is translated to Augusta.

Livia's nomenclature	Dedicator	Province/Region	Citation
Livia	Mazaeus and Mithridates	Asia	*ILS* 8897
Livia	Pythodoris	Pontus	*SEG* 39.695
Livia	Queen Dynamis	Pontus	*IGRom* 1.902
Livia Augusta	[---] daughter of Asklepiodorus	Achaea	*AE* 1929, 73
Augusta	Ti. Claudius	Asia	*CIL* III.7107
Iulia Augusta	Albiorix	Asia	*IGRom* 3.157
Iulia Augusta	M. Cornelius Proculus, *pontifex Caesarum*	Baetica	*CIL* II.2038
Iulia Augusta	[---] of Feronia	Samnium	*AE* 1976, 185
Livia	The union of [---]	Macedonia	*SEG* 23.472
Livia	The *polis* of the Epidaurians	Achaea	*IG* 4.1393
Livia	The *demos* of Epidaurus	Achaea	*IG* 4.1394
Livia	The Lindians	Cilicia et Cyprus	*Lindos 2.2 Inscriptions* (191) 739, 387
Livia	The Norici, Ambilini, Ambridri, Uperaci, Saerates, Laianci, Ambisonti, and Helvetici	Noricum	*Carinthia* 156 (1966) 467, 126
Livia	The *demos*	Achaea	*IG* 12.5,628
Livia	Superaquani, out of public funds	Samnium	*CIL* IX. 3304
Livia	From public funds	Latium et Campania	*CIL* XIV. 3575
Livia Drusilla	The *demos* of Athens	Achaea	*SEG* 24.212
Livia Augusta	The *demos* and the *boule*	Asia	*Belleten* 29 (1965) 593, 3
Iulia Augusta	The Cyrenaeans	Creta et Cyrenaic	*CIL* III.8
Iulia Augusta	The Cyrenaeans	Creta et Cyrenaic	*SEG* 38.1887
Livia		Hispania Tarraconensis	*CIL* II. 3102
Livia		Apulia et Calabria	*CIL* IX. 1105
Augusta		Samnium	*ILS* 157
Iulia Augusta		Etruria	*CIL* XI. 7552a
Iulia Augusta		Picenum	*CIL* VI. 882a
Iulia Augusta		Creta et Cyrenaica	*CIL* III.12037
Iulia Augusta		Creta et Cyrenaica	*Inscriptiones Creticae* I 137, 55
Iulia Augusta		Apulia et Calabria	*CIL* IX.787
Iulia Augusta		Samnium	*CIL* IX.4514

the economic burden of setting up a statue in the name of the people.[436] Inscriptions of these types closely follow the same line, whether they originate from the western or eastern provinces. The earliest statue-dedications to Livia set up by a community originate from Greece, one from Eleusis and another from Ioulis.[437] At both places the statue of Livia was erected alongside one of Augustus. Because *Sebastos* does not appear in the dedication to Augustus, the statues can be dated to between 31-27 BCE. Rose suggests that the statues from Eleusis were probably set up shortly after Augustus and Livia's initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries in 31 BCE.[438] The people (*demos*) of the cities made both dedications. In the eastern provinces, it was most commonly the *demos* that dedicated sculptures of Livia. A statue was dedicated to her in this way at Lindos during the principate of Augustus, and at Epidaurus Livia was honoured with sculptures twice during the same period.[439] During the reign of Tiberius Livia received two sculptural dedications at Cyrene, and one at Eleae, where she was honoured by both the *boule* and the *demos*.[440] The *boule* and the *demos* of Megara made a similar dedication, although the identification of Livia is not certain as the base, on which the inscription is carved, has been reused.[441]

In the western provinces, the Superaquani erected a statue of Livia out of public funds during the age of Augustus, and a similar dedication has been found at Tibur.[442] An inscription was found at Magdalensberg in the 1950s, in the so-called House of Representatives, recording that eight

436 Fejfer 2008 p. 47.

437 Eleusis: *SEG* 24.212; *AE* 1971 no. 439; Rose Cat. 71; Bartman EpigCat. 1. Ioulis: *IG* 12.5 no. 628; Rose Cat. 86; Bartman EpigCat. 2.

438 Rose Cat. 71. For the Eleusinian mysteries see Cass. Dio 51.4.1.

439 Lindos: *Lindos* 2.2 (1941) 739 no. 387. Epidaurus: *IG* 4.1393; 1394.

440 *SEG* 38.1887; Bartman EpigCat. 42. *IGRom* 1.1033; *CIL* III.8 (bilingual); Bartman EpigCat. 41. Elaea: *Belleten* 29 (1965) 593 no. 3; Rose Cat. 111; Bartman EpigCat. 44.

441 *IG* 7.65; *CIG* 1 no. 1070; Bartman EpigCat. 59. See Bartman for comments on the re-use of the statue base.

442 Superaquum: *CIL* IX. 3304; Bartman EpigCat. 22. Tibur: *CIL* XIV.3375; *ILS* 1. 118.

Norican *civitates* made a joint dedication to Livia.[443] Bartman suggests that it was possibly erected in 9 BCE when Livia went to Ticinum to accompany the body of Drusus back to Rome, or in connection with Augustus' trip to Gaul in 10 BCE. It is worth noting that Noricum was not made a Roman province until the age of Claudius.

Aside from the dedications from individuals and collectives, nine Latin honorific dedications are preserved from which the names of those who once made them are missing.[444] Out of the nine, one is from the age of Augustus, one is of Caligulan date, while the rest were commissioned during the age of Tiberius. Though the incomplete survival of the inscriptions means that we cannot know the reason for their dedications, it appears that the several individuals and communities responsible for them claimed enough of a patronal relationship with Livia to consider it appropriate to honour her in various ways. By the very act of making a dedication, subjects acknowledged and reinforced the imperial power. Imperial patronage established a system whereby the clients of Livia could maintain, and possibly even extend, their own position as *patroni* by distributing *beneficia* to members of their local society. According to Pliny the Younger, to set up a statue in the Roman Forum was something as fine and distinguished to have one's own statue set up.[445] Public games and feasts – events that Livia herself presented in Rome – are examples of the *beneficia* that Livia's clients gave in her name all around the empire. In Ancyra, an inscription carved into the left anta of the Temple of Roma and Augustus records how a certain Albiorix, son of Atepox, in 19-20 CE gave a public feast and set up statues of Livia and Tiberius.[446] Albiorix hence bolstered his position both by acting as a client of Livia in having a statue of her erected, and as a patron in his local community through giving a public feast. The statue and the inscription served as reminders of his benefactions.

443 *CAH* 580; Bartman Epig.Cat. 15. The *civitates* were the Norici, Ambilini, Ambridri, Uperaci, Aerates, Laianci, Ambisonti, and Helvetici.

444 *CIL* II.3102; III. 12037; VI. 882a; IX. 787; IX. 1105; IX.4514; XI. 1165; XI. 7552; *Inscriptiones Creticae* I 137 no. 55.

445 Plin. *Ep.* 1.17.4. See also Fejfer 2008 pp. 47-48.

446 *IGRom* 3.157; Bartman EpigCat. 30.

An inscription from the south gate of the Agora at Ephesus dating to 3 BCE provides a further illustration of this phenomenon:

> *Imp. Caesari divi f. Augusto pontifici*
> *maximo cos. XII tribunic. potest. XX et*
> *Liviae Caesaris Augusti*
> *Mazaeus et Mithridates patronis*[447]
>
> Mazaeus and Mithridates [dedicated this] to their patrons
> Imperator Caesar Augustus, son of a god,
> pontifex maximus, twelve time consul,
> holder of the tribunicia potestas for the twentieth time,
> and Livia, wife of Caesar Augustus.

Mazaeus and Mithridates were freedmen of Augustus and Agrippa respectively. The inscription belongs to one of two monuments that were joined together as one. The left bay was dedicated to Livia and Augustus by Mazaeus and the right to Julia and Agrippa by Mithridates. A series of statues of members of the imperial family were set above the triple-bayed arch, together with Venus Genetrix and several swans. The last line, *Mazaeus et Mithridates patronis*, was written across both bays, and repeated in Greek translation on the central bay.[448] We do not know what favours Mazaeus and Mithridates had received from the imperial family, if any. However, they appear to have used praise of the imperial family as a medium of political self-representation in their local context. In their capacity as clients of Livia and Augustus, they spend their wealth for the public good, thereby obtaining public honour. One important driving force behind the process of erecting imperial monuments was the dynamic competition among members of the élite, which at this time was a relatively open group, and also among upwardly mobile freedmen.[449] We have seen how both corporate bodies and individual citizens competed among themselves to eulogize Livia, as a crucial criterion for one's position was proximity to the imperial family. Praise and honour contributed to the

447 *ILS* 3.2.8897. Rose Cat. 112. Translation by author.
448 Rose Cat. 112.
449 Zanker 2010 p. 109.

legitimisation of Livia's *patrona*-role, and represented the other side of the reciprocal relationship with her clients: imperial power relied upon honours given by those subject to it.

Conclusions

At the beginning of this chapter it was established that Livia had the financial means to carry out patronage, thanks to her revenue-producing estates and the fact that she was commonly named as a legatee in wills. As has been discussed in Chapter 2, she received the freedom of tutelage in 35 BCE, which gave her direct access to her wealth, and inscriptions from the *columbarium Liviae* testify that she had a wide range of slaves and freedmen who managed her economic resources. The questions addressed have been what kind of *beneficia* she distributed and how her patronage developed over time.

It has been shown that Livia's *patrona*-role initially depended on her position as a member of the Claudian family, which became very useful during the civil war when she and Tiberius Nero found shelter at Sparta where the community was in *tutela Claudiorum*. I have demonstrated how Livia's patronage began to be oriented towards specific individuals and communities in the eastern part of the empire from the time of her marriage to Octavian in 38 BCE and onwards, satisfactorily meeting the expectations of subjects in areas where women traditionally had carried out patronage to a greater extant than in Rome. This is highlighted by a journey Livia and Augustus undertook 22-19 BCE. The imperial couple spent two winters on Samos, and among the benefactions which Livia granted to the community was freedom from taxation. During the same journey, Sparta was given the island of Cythera in recognition of its previous support, and Livia and Augustus attended a public banquet in order to thank the Spartans for the loyalty they had shown. It has been argued that the forming of a personal bond to Livia became a way for Greek cities to demonstrate their loyalty to the Augustan regime, even if they had supported the opposite side during the Civil Wars. The long-term nature of patronage-relations is demonstrated by how Samos and Sparta kept on honouring Livia as their benefactress throughout her life and beyond. Her Claudian background was still highlighted, as Livia's natural

parents, though not normally treated as important to the dynastic ambitions of the imperial family, were honoured down to the reign of Tiberius.

A conclusion that can be drawn from the preserved sources is that, while Livia acted as an intermediary in the distribution of non-material benefactions such as clemency, citizenship or career-advancement, she could hand out material *beneficia*, such as banquets, economic support to individuals or sumptuous gifts to temples, without the need of Augustus or Tiberius as middlemen. Another conclusion is that it took longer for Livia's patronage to be established in Rome than in the eastern provinces. When it did, during the last decade BCE, it was covered with references to a more traditional gendered role as *patrona*. For instance, Livia provided individuals outside the imperial family with dowries for marriage and financial support for childrearing.

As the wife of the *princeps*, Livia acted as patroness to a very considerable body of clients, scattered across the empire, with whom it was not possible to have a close and frequent contact. Lack of social proximity was compensated for by publicly demonstrated euergetism and largesse, manifested primarily in form of building projects. Livia's civic patronage heralds the opening up of a new role for imperial women: she is one of the earliest known examples of a female patron of public architecture in Rome. Livia acted as Augustus' female counterpart, supporting cults for the benefit of the women of the city, so that she, in the words of Ovid, could 'imitate her husband and follow him in every respect.' Livia began her building patronage in 7 BCE with the inauguration of the *Porticus Liviae* on the Esquiline Hill, followed by restorations of the temples to Bona Dea, and Fortuna Muliebris. During the reign of Tiberius, Livia's enhanced position enabled her to erect another kind of public building: an aqueduct. Like the temples, the aqueduct was directed towards the well-being of the community for which they were built. However, unlike the temples, the aqueduct was to benefit the population in the area as a whole, not only women. The same trend can be seen in Livia's role as hostess at public banquets. On two occasions, in 9 and 7 BCE, Livia gave banquets to the women in Rome while Tiberius feasted the men. However, when Augustus died in 14 CE she gave a banquet for the Senators, an illustration of how her *patrona*-role developed progressively as she occupied a variety of

stations along the way between the antithetical male and female poles.

Imperial patronage was already, in the time of Augustus and Tiberius, being deployed on a grand scale unprecedented in republican times and the exchange-relationship between between Livia and her clients could hardly be considered as on equal terms given the disparity of their resources. Livia was placed so high on the status-ladder that her clients were often left to acknowledge their gratitude and inability to repay in kind, and their *gratia* could only take the form of loyalty. Dedications of sculptures became a popular way to express loyalty and honour.

As a way of exploring Livia's *patrona*-role, I have examined twenty-nine inscriptions which commemorate dedications of sculptures to Livia without crediting her with divine status. Most of these dedications were made during the reign of Tiberius, as a response of Livia's aggrandized position as imperial patroness to a significant part of the population. The epigraphic material demonstrates that Livia's clients belonged to different social strata and that statues were erected by both individuals and public administrative bodies. Though the majority of her clients never set their eyes upon Livia, the dedications made her portrait a recognisable image throughout the empire, whether it was an accurate representation of her actual physical appearance or not. We cannot know how many people could fully read the messages of the statues and inscriptions, but the repetitive accumulation of the image and language most likely reinforced a sense of association with Livia and the imperial power.

Livia's role as patroness appears to have provided an *exemplum* for women to follow. In Pompeii Eumachia sponsored the building of a portico dedicated to Concordia Augusta, and the characterisation of Livia as *femina princeps* resonates in Asia Minor, where a benefactress might be honoured as *protē (tōn) gunaikōn*, meaning either 'foremost among (the) women' or 'first of (the) women.'[450]

450 Eumachia: *CIL* X. 810. *Protē (tōn) gunaikōn*: I. Assos 16; I. Priene 208; I. Mag. Maeander 158.

IV. DIVA

In this chapter on Livia's role as *diva*, I will treat the divine worship that she received as an honorific practice between religion and politics. The emergence and the continuance throughout the Roman empire of Livia's *diva*-role will be chronologically traced in order to investigate changes over time, local variations, and the different ways her cult became incorporated within the religious framework of the Greco-Roman world. The eastern and western part of the empire will be treated together in this study.

There is a large body of material associating Livia with divinity, made up by coins, inscriptions, and sculptures. I will divide it into three sections: 1) divine aspects of Livia as a mortal being and cult performed in her honour in a domestic context; 2) divinity resulting from assimilation between her and pre-existing deities; 3) worship of Livia as a goddess in her own right. The sections will each be chronologically structured. Then will follow an account of Livia's formal deification and incorporation in the state cult in 42 CE and an analysis of how her worship was carried out in terms of priests and priestesses, temples, rituals, and sacrifices.

A mortal being with divine aspects

In Roman society every man possessed a *genius*, a 'life force', attached to his person.[451] The corresponding 'life force' of a woman was referred to as the *iuno*.[452] Three honorific dedications to Livia's *iuno* are recorded: these are (in likely chronological order) from Falerii (Italy), El Lehs (Africa), and Aeclanum (Italy).[453] The honorific dedications probably belonged to statues of Livia that are not preserved.[454] The inscriptions read:

> *CIL* XI. 3076 (Falerii): *Genio Augusti et Ti. Caesaris iunoni Liviae Mystes l(ibertus)*
>
> *CIL* VIII 16456[455] (El Lehs): *Iunoni Liviae Augustae sacrum L. Passieno Rufo imperatore Africam obtinente Cn. Cornelius Cn. f. Cor. Rufus et Maria C. f. Galla Cn. [uxor] conservati vota l(ibentes) m(erito) solvont.*
>
> *CIL* IX. 1098 (Aeclanum): *Iunoni Augustae / M(arcus) Mummius Marcellin(us)*

CIL XI. 3076 feasibly dates to after 4 CE, as Tiberius is referred to as Caesar, but before 14 CE, because Augustus has not yet become *divus* and Livia is not named Augusta. The date of *CIL* VIII. 16456 should be the year of Lucius Passienus Rufus' proconsulship of Africa, that is 3 CE, but

451 A *genius* could not exist without being attached to someone or something: a *genius* might be of a man or of a place (*genius loci*). The living emperor's *genius* would eventually receive state cult in Rome, carried out by the Senate and the priestly colleges, but not during the Augustan period. The first example of *iuno*-worship within state cult is the Arval Brothers' sacrifice of a cow to Statilia Messalina in 66 CE (*CIL* VI. 2044). For scholarship on *genius* in Roman religion see Otto *RE* 7 1910; Wissowa 1912 pp. 175-181; Bömer 1966 pp. 77-133; Dumézil 1974 pp. 362-369; Schilling 1978; Fishwick 1991 pp. 375-387.

452 The male *genius* and the female *iuno* are explicitly equated in passages of Seneca and Pliny, and in a number of inscriptions. See Plin. *HN*. 2.16; Sen. *Ep*. 11.1. *CIL* XI. 3076 = *ILS* 116; *CIL* V. 5869; 5892 = *ILS* 6730-6731; *CIL* V. 6950; 7237; *CIL* VIII. 3695 (=*ILS* 3644); *CIL* XIII. 1735. The *iuno* has attracted considerably less scholarly attention than the *genius*, except in an article by Rives (1992).

453 *CIL* X. 1023 *Iunoni / Tyches Iuliae / Augustae Vener(iae)* is sometimes mistaken as commemorating the *iuno* of Livia whereas it is actually dedicated to the *iuno* of her slave Tyche.

454 See Bartman EpigCat. 4; 12; 27.

455 ILS 120 = EJ 127.

the inscription is likely to have been modified after 14 CE, as Livia is referred to as Livia Augusta.[456] *CIL* IX. 1098 plausibly dates after 14 CE in view of Livia's nomenclature.

At least one republican inscription attributes a *genius* rather than an *iuno* to a woman and others use the term *genius* with reference to both men and women in the same inscription.[457] There are furthermore republican examples of dedications to the *genii* of female divinities.[458] Scholarly interest in *iuno*-worship is limited, but James Rives has suggested that the development of the *iuno* should be placed between the Second Punic War and the age of Augustus.[459] The dedications to Livia's *iuno* are the earliest preserved of a total of about fifty known honorific *iuno*-dedications to women.[460] The earliest literary references to the *iuno* are from the admittedly hard-to-date Tibullan corpus, Seneca, and Pliny the Younger, so the term probably came into use during the Augustan period, given that there are references to the *genii* of women in the republican period.[461] Why was there a need for the *iuno*? One of the functions of the *genius* was to define the relationship between a patron and his slaves and freedmen. Rives argues that the development of the *iuno* was probably due to a perceived need for a female *genius* differentiated from that of at a time when women were becoming more able to own property and thus be the *dominae* of slaves and the *patronae* of *liberti*.[462] Hence the situations in which slaves and freedmen would wish to invoke the *genius* of a woman would have become more and more common. The name *iuno* for the female *genius* was likely chosen because of Juno's position as the goddess of women as

456 For the year of Rufus' proconsulship see Thomasson in *RE* Suppl. 13 (1973). For the dating of the inscription see Rives 1992 p. 37 n. 15.

457 For *genius* attributed to a woman: *CIL* VIII. 22770. For *genius* applied to both men and women: *CIL* III. 8129; 115110, V. 5892, VI. 18065,

458 *CIL* II. 2407; 2991; VI. 2345; 17833; *AE* 1901 nr. 75.

459 Rives 1992.

460 Rives 1992 p. 34.

461 Tib. 3.6.47-50; Sen. *Ep*. 110.1; Plin. *HN*. 2.16. It appears nowhere in Plautus – a good source for the popular religion of his time – in contrast to the *genius,* which does feature in his writings.

462 Rives 1992.

matronae.[463] It cannot be ruled out that Livia's position provided an impetus to the increasing worship of the *iuno* during the early imperial age, and that the cult developed parallel with the worship of the emperor's *genius*.

As the worship of a living person's *genius* or *iuno* was part of the house-cult where members of the *familia* ritually expressed their inferior position to the authority-figure set over them, dedications to the living emperor's *genius* have often been said to have been erected by slaves, freedmen or clients belonging to the lower social strata.[464] A well-known form of the *genius* cult is that of the *genius Augusti,* performed by each *vicus* in Rome, which imitated the cult of the *genius* of a *paterfamilias* within a household, often performed by slaves and freedmen.[465] It is indeed likely that a large part of the individuals who paid Livia divine honours were of poor and humble origins and could not have afforded inscriptions or monuments that would be archeologically traceable today. However, two of the three preserved dedications to Livia's *iuno* were made by individuals belonging to rather higher social strata. It is evident from the nomenclature of Marcus Mummius Marcellinus, Cornelius Rufus and Maria Galla that they were most certainly not members of Livia's household or freed by her, in fact, the inscriptions do not suggest any close personal ties at all. Why then did they not make dedications to Livia directly, but to her *iuno*?

Dedications and honorific inscriptions had long been a popular mechanism for expressing and defining the relationship between freedmen and patrons. When Livia became a wielder of great power but a distant

---

463 The association is made explicit in Plautus: *Amph*. 831-32. In Livy *matronae* were deeply involved with the cult of Juno, see 21.62.8; 22.1.18; 27.37.7-15; 31.12.5-10. Furthermore, the Matronalia of March 1 was linked to Juno, and the temple of Juno Lucina on the Esquiline had its foundation day on the same date. One hundred and fifty *matronae* prayed to Juno Regina in the *Ludi Saeculares* of 17 BCE (*CIL* VI. 32323 = *ILS* 5050.123f). See Rives pp. 45-46 for further discussion.

464 For the relation between household cult and emperor worship see Gradel 2002 pp. 38-44; 99-100.

465 For the cult of the *genius Augusti* see Fishwick 1987; Gradel 2002 pp. 162-197. The cult of the emperor's *genius* does not seem to have been a part of state cult during the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius. For house cult of the *paterfamilias' genius* see Boyce 1937; Orr 1978; Fröhlich 1991. Most scholarly attention is paid to the cult in Pompeii, where it is frequently attested in the archaeological material.

figure to many of her subjects, dedications became one way for people to establish a connection to her. Though worship of the *iuno* implied household cult and the worshipper hence ran the risk of being defined as a minor client, Livia's position in 3 CE was so elevated that individuals such as Cornelius Rufus and Maria Galla appear to have been able to make a dedication to Livia's *iuno* while keeping their place on the social ladder.

Apart from the dedications to Livia's *iuno*, to what extent was she given worship as a part of household cults? We have very little evidence at our disposal to help us to answer that question. The main literary sources for worship during the period, Suetonius and Dio, rarely deal with worship at an individual level, and the epigraphic material only records private cult to a very limited extent. However, Ovid, writing from the Black Sea, provides a description of a shrine (*sacrum*) in his house.[466] It included silver images of some sort, perhaps miniature portrait busts, of Augustus, Tiberius, Livia, and Germanicus, to whom he daily offered prayers and incense as to true gods (*dis veris*).[467] Ovid had reasons to be honey-tongued, but that does not necessarily mean that his possession of such images and the worship he performed were something exceptional.[468] Unfortunately, images like these are seldom preserved to the present day.[469] However, there exists an inscription from the same period testifying that a man of equestrian rank bequeathed five imperial silver images to his town, perhaps representing the same family members as featured in Ovid's shrine.[470]

---

466 Ov. *Pont.* 4.9.105-112.

467 Ov. *Pont.* 1.4.55-56 (offering of prayers and incense); 2.8.1-9 (images were sent to him by Cotta Maximus).

468 For later evidence concerning imperial cult in a domestic context see Fronto *Ep.* 4.12.6; Plin. *Ep.* 10.8.3.4; 4.1; Tac. *Ann.* 4.64.

469 Cf. Fronto's letter to the young Marcus Aurelius: 'You know how in all money-changer's bureaux, booths, bookstalls, eaves, porches, windows, anywhere and everywhere there are likenesses of you exposed to view, badly enough painted most of them to be sure, and modelled or carved in a plain, not to say sorry, style of art, yet at the same time your likeness, however much a caricature, never when I go out meets my eyes without making me part my lips for a smile and dream of you.' (*Ep.* 4.12.16). Even though Fronto was writing in the mid-second century, he might provide a glimpse of what imperial portraiture could have looked like in Julio-Claudian times as well.

470 *AE* 1978 no. 286.

Two life-size marble busts of Livia and Tiberius that have been unearthed at Ephesus are exceptional pieces of evidence for household cult devoted to her. The busts were placed in a marble niche inside a *domus,* together with a large bronze snake.[471] The portraits were most likely made during the Julio-Claudian period, but were still standing when the house collapsed in the third century CE. This might indicate that the cult of Livia was long-lived in a domestic context, or that she and Tiberius were at least familiar to the inhabitants as historical figures and their portraits felt to be worth keeping. Furthermore, a statue of Livia was found in the Villa dei Misteri in Pompeii, and a silver bust of her has recently come to light at Herculaneum.[472] It was found at the ancient shoreline, suggesting that someone trying to flee from the eruption in 79 CE lost it.[473] Even though the bust is heavily damaged, it can still be identified as Livia because of her distinctive iconography.[474] A silver bust of Galba, sharing some details of technique with Livia's, has also been found in the city and the connection between the two of them makes it tempting to think that they once belonged to the same shrine, even if we cannot know to what extent they were employed in a cultic context.[475] Another piece of evidence on worship within a domestic context is inadvertently provided by Tacitus in his account of one of the accusations brought against Falanius: the prosecutor alleged that Falanius had admitted a certain Cassius, mime and catamite, as one of the *cultores* of Augustus, who were maintained, after the fashion of fraternities, in houses everywhere.[476] This Tacitean evidence for associations of worshippers organized within major households could indicate that the domestic cult of Augustus, and perhaps occasionally of Livia, too, was more widespread than one might think.

Lastly, Livia's *numen* is another aspect of her that might have received

471 Rathmayr 2006 pp. 103-133.

472 Pompeii: Maiuri 1931 pp. 3-17; Bartman Cat. 27. Herculaneum: Borriello et al. 2008.

473 Bartman 2012 p. 417.

474 For a discussion of the portrait, together with other recent discoveries of early female portraiture see Bartman 2012.

475 Bartman 2012 p. 418.

476 Tac. *Ann*. 1.73.

worship. The *numen*, 'divine power', is different from the *genius* or *iuno* in that it belongs to a god or goddess and it is the force by which divinity manifests itself on earth.[477] The *genius* always belongs to something or someone and cannot stand alone.[478] The cult of imperial *numina* has been interpreted as a way of worshiping a living emperor without literally calling him a god (though it is hard to tell what exactly separated him from one).[479] The evidence of worship of Livia's *numen* is scarce, the only known instance where her *numen* is explicitly mentioned being in Ovid's poetry.[480] In a letter to Graecinus written early in 16 CE he gives instructions to his wife as to how attract the gods to her side: by lighting a fire on the altar, offering incense and wine to the gods and above all to the *numina* of Augustus, his wife, and offspring. The paucity of inscriptional evidence supports the notion that the cult of imperial *numina* never proved popular during the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius. It is attested only twice: at Narbo (12 CE), and at Forum Clodii in Etruria (18 CE).[481] These examples nevertheless illustrate well how the system of Greco-Roman religion was inclusive and open to new deities and rituals, and a how a number of forms of imperial worship emerged, some more successful than others. While the worship of Livia's *iuno* became one way of incorporating her within what was already established religious practice in the western part of the empire, other ways developed in the eastern part, and to these we will now turn.

Assimilated with divinity

One of the earliest ways of assimilating Livia with divinity was by association, that is, by dedicating sculptures of her to different gods.

---

477 See Fishwick 1969 for a distinction between *genius* and *numen*. Fishwick has published extensively on the imperial *numen*, see Fishwick 1989; 1992; 1994.

478 In the imperial age it could however stand for the divinity itself, see Gradel 2002 p. 235.

479 Tiberius dedicated, probably in 6 BCE, an altar on the Palatine at which sacrifices might have been performed to Augustus' *numen*. See Degrassi 1963 p. 401; Alföldi 173 pp. 42-44 (dating); *Contra*: Gradel 2002 pp. 234-250.

480 Ov. *Ex Pont.* 3.1.159-167; *Fast.* 1.536.

481 Narbo: *CIL* XII. 4333. Forum Clodii: *CIL* XI. 3302. The inscription from Forum Clodii also records celebrations of Livia's birthday, see pages 183.

Table 4. Sculptures dedicated to deities on behalf of Livia			
Deity	**Dedicator**	**Province**	**Citation**
Hera	The *demos*	Asia	*AM* 75 (1960) 105-106, 12
Hera	The *demos*	Asia	*AM* 75 (1960) 104-105, 11
Zeus Olympios		Cilicia et Cyprus	*IGRom* 3.984
The Muses	The *demos*	Achaea	*AE* 1928, 50
Athena Polias	Antonia Tryphaina	Pontus	*IGRom* 4.144
Hera Aphrodite[482]	Cossenia Paula	Aegyptus	*SEG* 38.1678

In the light of the preserved inscriptions, this appears to have been a solely Greek custom that developed during the mid-Augustan period. At Samos, the people manifested their loyalty to Livia by dedicating two sculptures of her to Hera, both to be erected at the Heraion, on account of her piety towards the goddess.[483] She is referred to as Drusilla, wife of imperator Caesar, which suggests a dating 31-27 BCE. The choice of using the name of Drusilla instead of that of Livia might have been made in order to emphasise her Claudian ancestry, as the Samians were clients of the Claudii. As has been mentioned in Chapter 3, Livia had special ties with these islanders and acted as patron on their behalf and it is likely that they, in return, made these dedications to publicize their connection to Livia and acknowledge the benefactions that she had bestowed upon them. However, an already established relationship, or an actual visit by the patron to a place, such as had occurred as in the case of Livia and the Samians, does not appear to have been a prerequisite for this kind of dedication. We know of dedications of statues of Livia to Zeus Olympios at Cyprus and to the Muses at Thespiae, places which Livia most likely never visited and with which she had no special bonds.[484] The epigraphic material indicates that this practice continued throughout Livia's life. A statue-base, or perhaps

482 The editor of *SEG* identifies Hera Aphrodite as Hathor.

483 Herrmann 1960 no. 12; Hahn 40, 324 no. 24; Bartman EpigCat. 3. Herrmann 1960 no.11; Bartman EpigCat. 20.

484 Cyprus: *IGRom* 3.984; Bartman EpigCat. 19. Thespiae: *AE* 1928 no. 50; Rose 149-151 Cat. 82; Bartman EpigCat. 24. The dedication to Livia is combined with the naming of several other members of the imperial family on a long block, erected in 16-13 BCE.

an altar, made of limestone, has been found near the Temple of Nero at Akoris in the Nile valley, recording how a certain Cossenia Paula in 29 CE made a dedication to Hera Aphrodite on behalf of Livia and Tiberius.[485]

Another way of associating Livia with a particular deity was to feature her on the obverse of a coin with the godhead on the reverse. During the early imperial period Rome had its official imperial mints, such as the ones in Rome and Lugdunum, but many provincial cities continued to issue coins independently.[486] The greatest number of Livia-promoting mints can be found in Asia, amounting to 36 per cent of the total.[487] All of the eastern mints combined make up to nearly 70 per cent of the total number of coins featuring Livia's image.[488] The earliest example of an association between Livia and a deity can be found on a coin minted in Egypt in 10/11 CE. It depicts Livia on the obverse and either Athena or Euthenia, the spirit of prosperity, on the reverse.[489] The great majority of these types of coins were minted during the reign of Tiberius. At Aphrodisias-Plarasa coins were struck depicting Livia on the obverse and either the temple of Aphrodite or a cult statue of the goddess on the reverse.[490] At Augusta in Syria, Livia is shown together with Tyche or Athena; at Oea she was featured with a bust of Minerva on the reverse.[491] At Magnesia ad Maeandrum a coin features Livia on the obverse and a cult statue of Artemis Leukophrys on the reverse, while a coin with Livia on the obverse

485 *SEG* 38.1678; Bartman EpigCat. 69. It is not possible to know for certain if Cossenia Paula dedicated a statue of Livia to Hera Aphrodite or just made a dedication to the goddess on her behalf, as the inscription could have been attached to either a sculpture base or an altar.

486 For recent scholarship on images of the imperial family on provincial coins see Horster 2013.

487 Harvey 2011 p. 124.

488 The remaining 30 per cent comes from the western part of the empire, including all African provinces except for Egypt. Harvey 2011 p. 124.

489 *RPC* 1 no. 5053; 5055. An undated coin from Mallus with Livia on the obverse and Athena Magarsis on the reverse may be of Augustan origin (*RPC* 1 no. 4016, see also *RPC* 1 no.1346 and 1348). Coins minted in Smyrna 10 BCE feature Augustus and Livia jugated on the obverse and Aphrodite Stratonikis on the reverse (*RPC* 1 no. 2464; 2466).

490 *RPC* 1 no. 2840; *RPC* 1 no. 2841.

491 Augusta: *RPC* 1 no. 833; 835. Oea: *RPC* 1 no. 4011. (Athena); *RPC* 1 no. 4009-4010 (Tyche). See also *RPC* 4013-4014, dating to the reign of Nero.

at Mysomakedones shows an image of Artemis Ephesia.[492] At Amphipolis Livia was paired with Artemis Tauropolos and coins from the Thessalian League show her together with Artemis or Demeter.[493] It is possible that various mints adopted Livia's portrait in order to equate her, more or less, with prominent local goddesses. However, she was not only paired with female deities: coins from both Apollonia Salbace and Nysa have Dionysos on the reverse, while a coin of Cibyra features Zeus.[494]

It is common for locally minted coins of this kind to feature the emperor on the obverse. As has been argued by Marietta Horster, this arrangement could represent a visualised acceptance of Roman rule as integrated into the local context, as well as a visual validation of local coins in the larger context of imperial coinage, given that they now resembled Roman denominations.[495] It is worth noting that Livia is the only female representative of the imperial family who is featured on the obverse, a mark, surely, of the extent to which she had come to symbolize the authority of Rome. The local reverses however, did not imitate those issued at imperial mints: instead, they made allusions to local deities and mythology. One sort of image found on the reverse of locally minted coins dating from the reign of Tiberius is of great importance for the discussion of how Livia came, through assimilation, to be regarded as divine.

Provided with divine accessories

The images in question depict Livia seated, or sometimes standing, holding divine attributes in her hands. Harvey has noted that there are two main varieties of pose on coins depicting the seated Livia: she is either seated facing right with her torso turned in profile away from the viewer or with her torso towards the viewer.[496] Each of these poses comes with a

492 Magnesia ad Maeandrum: *RPC* 1 no. 2699. Mysomakedones: *RPC* 1 no. 2568.

493 Amphipolis: *RPC* 1 no. 1634. Demeter: *RPC* 1 no. 1431. Larissa: *RPC* 1 no. 1434. Artemis: *RPC* 1 no. 1438.

494 Apollonia Salbace: *RPC* 1 no. 2865. Nysa: *RPC* 1 no. 2662-3. Cibyra: *RPC* 1 no. 2886.

495 Horster 2013 p. 247.

496 Harvey 2011 p. 193.

combination of hand-held attributes. The first pose shows the seated Livia holding a sceptre or a torch in her left hand, while the right hand holds a *patera*. The second pose features Livia holding the sceptre in her right hand while the left hand holds various attributes such as ears of grain and/or flowers or a branch. To be seated on a chair, stool or throne was an indication of a superior political position in Roman society, but what did these attributes represent?[497]

The sceptre is a symbol of the divinity and authority of the gods, while a similar object, the staff, was a symbol of monarchical, magisterial, and priestly authority very much in the tradition of Hellenistic monarchs.[498] The sceptre was the attribute of gods such as Jupiter, Juno, and Roma. It is worth noting that during his lifetime Augustus was not depicted carrying the sceptre on coins. *Divus* Augustus, Tiberius, and Livia are the only members of the imperial family to be represented holding the sceptre, making the connection between the three of them stronger, and perhaps even denoting Livia's and Tiberius' shared authority as successors of Augustus.

The attribute combined with the sceptre is the *patera*, a round, flat dish.[499] It was used as a sacrificial bowl to pour the *libatio* that was sprinkled upon the head of the sacrificial victim before it was offered. It was the attribute of various gods including Zeus/Jupiter, Juno/Hera and Ceres/Demeter and was also held by the personification of *Pietas*. The *patera*-and-sceptre combination was also shared by Vesta, who is shown on coins of 37-38 CE holding these attributes.[500] Furthermore, the *patera* was a symbol of priestly office, and it is plausible that Livia's position as *sacerdos* added to the legitimacy of her holding it. Because the *patera*, and the duty it represented, belonged to the high religious sphere Livia is always veiled when carrying it.

The second main type of pose clearly confers on Livia by assimilation the identity of a divine being, *diva*. She holds the sceptre in her right hand while the left holds attributes such as ears of grain and/or flowers or a branch. Ears of grain and/or flowers are often associated with Ceres/Demeter. Coins of this type were issued at Greek mints from Tiberius and

497 On being seated in Hellenistic and Roman art see Davies 2005.
498 Alföldi 1959; Harvey 2011 p. 200-201.
499 Harvey 2011 pp. 203-205.
500 *RIC* 1² 47.

onwards. The sceptre in Livia's hand is sometimes replaced with Ceres' torch. The torch would eventually become a symbol of the priestly office that was dedicated to *divus* Augustus and the subsequent *divi*. Antonia, the mother of Claudius, and Livia's successor as the priestess of *divus* Augustus, is featured on coins, issued about 41 CE, whose reverses show lighted vertical torches and the legend *sacerdos divi Augusti*.[501]

Livia is shown seated, wearing divine accessories, not only on coins, but also in other visual media such as the Grand Camée du France and the sardonyx cameo from Vienna.[502] Five statues of the seated Livia type have survived, three of them from her lifetime. One originates from Iponuba and depicts Livia in the guise of Abundantia or Fortuna.[503] She holds a cornucopia in her left arm, while her right arm is missing. A statue from Ephesus is even more damaged: Livia's head has been broken and reattached and she is missing her lower torso and legs, lower left arm, and entire right arm.[504] A statue from Paestum presents Livia seated on a chair or throne together with Tiberius.[505] Her left arm is raised, but her hand-held attribute is lost. However, to judge from the numismatic program, it is likely that she was supplied with either a sceptre or a torch.

Other ways of divinizing Livia on coins included the use of the *stephanos.* The *stephanos* is a high-rimmed band that could be either plain or ornate with embossed flowers or palmette motifs. Both kinds of *stephanai* were a part of the iconographic repertoire of goddesses such as Venus, Ceres and

501 *RIC*² 67.

502 Grand Camée du France: Paris, Bibliothèque National, Cabinet des Mèdailles inv. 264. Megow 1987 no. A 85; Winkes 1995 pp. 145 no. 71; Mikocki 1995 pl. 8; Wood 1999 pp. 137-138. Vienna: Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum IX A 95; Bartman Cat. 110; Kampen 2009 pp. 23-37; Megow 1987 no. B 15 pl. 10.

503 Bartman Cat. 50. The statue is only preserved above the hips, but Bartman suggests that it seems to represent the upper part of a pieced statue that once depicted Livia seated.

504 The statue was found in the Basilica of the upper Agora, along with a statue of Augustus, likewise seated. The pairing with Augustus could indicate an Augustan dating, while the colossal scale suggests a Tiberian. Bartman Cat. 60.

505 Livia's appearance on the statue is quite unorthodox as she is rendered according to the Salus type, while her hair is waved into sections, and her mouth is slightly larger than normal. However, the pairing with Tiberius makes the identification of Livia highly plausible. Bartman Cat. 24; Rose Cat. 26.

Juno, and their Greek equivalents, Aphrodite, Demeter and Hera.[506] Coins dating to the reign of Tiberius from Thessalonica and Pella-Dium in Macedonia show Livia wearing the ornate version.[507] It is likely that the *stephanos* visually linked Livia to the goddesses, and the connection is further stressed by a coin issued by the Thessalian League. It features Livia wearing the *stephanos* with the legend *Hera Livia*.[508]

Yet another way of divinizing by association was to insert an adjunct, that is, an object that is part of the image on a coin, but is not in direct physical contact with the subject figure.[509] One illustration of this can be seen on a *sestertius* issued at Thapsus in Africa on which the seated Livia in the guise of Ceres is accompanied with a *modius*.[510] This was an attribute not only of Ceres but also of personifications of Africa and of Annona (the yearly crop and the public grain-dole).[511] It is plausible that the *modius* of the coin refers to imperial control over the distribution of grain to the people. Other adjuncts that associate Livia's portrait with the divine sphere are the peacock and ear of grain represented together with her on coins minted at Oea.[512] They closely reassemble the 'Salus' *dupondius* issued in Rome in 22-23 CE (see p. 81), but the adjuncts appear to have been included in order to associate Livia with Juno/Hera (in the case of the peacock), and Ceres / Demeter (in the case of the ear of grain). I have previously mentioned the coin-type issued at Colonia Romula with the legend *Julia Augusta genetrix orbis*, and it is worth noting that in this case a crescent moon links her with Luna, the moon-goddess in Roman cult, while the obverse features Augustus as Sol with a radiate crown and a star above his head.[513]

All the coins that I have discussed in this section originate from the reign of Tiberius and were issued at provincial mints. Also of relevance is a series

506 Rose 1997 p. 76; Harvey 2011 pp. 165-169.
507 *RPC* 1 no. 1568.
508 *RPC* 1 no. 1427.
509 Harvey 2011 p. 173.
510 *RPC* 1 no. 795.
511 Harvey 2011 p. 212.
512 *RPC* 1 no. 833. The Oea mint also issued coins depicting Tiberius with adjuncts such as the eagle of Jupiter and the laurel branch, representative of Apollo.
513 Harvey 2011 pp. 175-177.

of coins minted at Rome in 15-16 CE, which has been the subject of much discussion.[514] These coins bear, on the obverse, portraits either of the deified Augustus or of Tiberius, both identified by name, commemorating the consecration of the former and the succession of the latter. The reverses show an unnamed seated female figure on an ornate chair, facing right with her feet resting on a stool. She wears matronly garb and her head is veiled. In her left hand she holds a sceptre and in her right a *patera*. Her identity is debated. Gertrude Grether suggested in 1946 that the seated figure is Livia, while other scholars have suggested that it represents either Vesta or Pietas.[515] Due to the lack of an identifying legend it is not possible to determine conclusively whether it is Livia or not, but on the basis of the provincial issues which contain legends identifying the seated woman with Livia, it is not unlikely that a viewer would connect the image with her.[516]

How should we understand the divine imagery employed in Livia's iconography? It would have been unthinkable for Livia in person actually to appear dressed like a goddess in public, yet divine imagery appears to have been a way of expressing a connection, even an overlap, between her and divinity.[517] In the image-types developed for the visual representation of Livia one may discern the influence of Hellenistic Greek traditions of depicting prominent women on coins. The prototypes of Hellenistic female portraits were probably portraits of goddesses, and similarly male portraits were derived from those of gods.[518] Attributes such as the diadem or the sceptre, suggestive of the divinity of rulers, also found their way into the iconography of Livia. At the same time, assimilation of Livia with particular goddesses can be seen as a way of integrating her into a local context. Provincial coins often circulated only in a limited area around the minting city: the viewers of such coins were not the imperial family but

514 *RIC* 1^2 no. 33-36.

515 Wood 1999 p. 89 (Pietas); Sutherland 1951 pp. 85-86 (Vesta); Grether 1946 pp. 235-236 (Livia).

516 For this view: Harvey 2011 pp. 183-185.

517 Philo in his *Embassy to Gaius* (98) specifies the function of divine accessories: 'these trappings and ornaments are set as accessories on images and statues as symbolically indicating the benefits which those thus honoured provide for the human race.'

518 Dillon 2007.

inhabitants and visitors and the neighbouring cities and villages.[519] Members of the local élites, in their capacities as magistrates or benefactors, were the people responsible for the financing of the coin-issues and the choice of coin- types.[520] This suggests that the perception of Livia as assimilated to divinity not only reflected an understanding of the imperial values that Livia represented in Rome, but was to a large extent influenced by local politics and traditions, like how she at Ephesus was paired with the Ephesian Artemis.

Paired with an already existing goddess

I believe that the practice of associating Livia with various deities was important for subjects across the empire as a means of defining their own relationship with the new imperial reality. Like the coin-images just discussed, inscriptions further testify to the way in which Livia was seen as located between the human world and the divine, and could be represented in a variety of stations along the continuum linking them. Sculptural dedications might be made to two different aspects of Livia: she might be paired with an already existing goddess as, for example, Livia Hera or represented as a new goddess as in Livia *Nea* Hera. I will discuss the two aspects separately, confining my attentions to those dedications which are definitely to Livia rather than to a personified abstraction. When *augusta* describes an abstract imperial virtue, as in the case of Concordia Augusta, it is ambiguous whether it alludes directly to Livia, or not. As Fishwick argues, the epithet *augusta* must in the first place apply to the abstraction, though it will naturally have had secondary reference to Livia.[521] Accordingly, I have left out from the discussion dedications that

519 Horster 2013 p. 258.

520 Weiss 2000, 2003; Horster 2013 p. 244.

521 Fishwick 1991 pp. 455-474 (for Livia see especially p. 465). It has been argued by Strack (1931) and Mattingly (1960) that the genitive relates the personification directly to the emperor, whereas the adjective implies a looser association with the imperial system in general. On this view *Pax Augusti* is the Peaceableness of Augustus, while *Pax Augusta* is the Imperial Peace (for this example see Fishwich 1991 p. 463). To what extent such a distinction between the genitival and adjectival forms was recognised by the general public is, of course, impossible to tell.

primarily seem to commemorate worship of imperial abstractions rather than Livia.[522]

Table 5. Livia paired with a pre-existing goddess
For the sake of clarity the Greek Sebaste is translated to Augusta.

Goddess	Dedicator	Province	Citation
Thea Livia Demeter		Pontus	*SEG* 33.1055
Augusta Thea Aphrodite	Livia	Asia	*SEG* 15. 532
Iulia Augusta Boulaia	The *boule* of the Areopagus	Achaea	*AE* 1938, 83
Thea Iulia Augusta Pronaia	The *boule* of the Areopagus, the *boule* of the Six Hundred and the *demos*	Achaea	*IG* 3.461
Augusta Pronoia		Asia	*IG* 12. 124, 20
Augusta Pronoia		Asia	*IGRom* 4.584
Augusta Hygeia		Achaea	*IG* 2/3 3240
Iulia Augusta Hygieia	The *demos* of the Athenians	Asia	*IG* 12. 65
Augusta Diana Paciliucifera	P. Licinius	Achaea	*Corinth* 8.2 (1931) 13, 15
Augusta Nikephoros	Antonia Tryphaina	Pontus	*IGRom* 4.144
Augusta Demeter Karpophoros	*Demetriastai* (priests and priestesses of the cult of Demeter)	Asia	*SEG* 4.515
Ceres Iulia Augusta	Lutatia (priestess of Livia)	Sicilia	*CIL* X.7501
Ceres Augusta	C. Rubellius Blandus	Africa	*IRT* 269
Ceres Augusta	L. Bennius Primus (*magister pagi*) and Bennia Primigenia (*magistra pagi*)	Etruria	*CIL* XI. 3196
Augusta Hera	The *boule* and the *demos*	Asia	*IG* 12 Suppl. 50
Iulia Hera Augusta		Macedonia	*IG* 11. 2.333
Iuno Augusta	Appuleia Quinta and her son Turpilius Brocchus Licinianus	Dalmatia	*CIL* III. 2904
Thea Tyche[523]		Achaea	*AE* 1929, 5
Tyche Iulia Augusta		Achaea	*SEG* 11.923
Hestia Livia		Asia	*Ephesos* 3.859a
Augusta Hecate	*Hiereus* (unknowm)	Lycia	*BCH* 10 (1886), 516, 6
Augusta Iulia Mnemosyne		Achaea	*SEG* 31.514

522 See n. 527 for the case of Ceres Augusta.

523 Kornemann, the editor of *AE*, states that the goddess is 'sicher Livia'.

Twenty-two out of twenty-eight preserved inscriptions exemplify how Livia was paired with a pre-existing goddess by the juxtaposition of their two names. The first known example, dating to the reign of Augustus, is from Cyzicus. Although fragmentary, the inscription refers to Livia as the goddess Livia Demeter (*Liouia Thea Demeter*).[524] In the same inscription Augustus is called Imperator Caesar the god Augustus (*Autokrator Kaisar Theos Sebastos*), which illustrates the fact that not all members of the imperial family recorded in one inscription were automatically paired with a traditional deity.[525] The rest of the inscriptions of this type date to the reign of Tiberius. The greatest concentration of evidence is found in cities in the eastern provinces. It seems that the imperial cult was to a large extent connected with urban life, and remained alien to the countryside. A few exceptions to this rule exist: Livia is called Ceres Julia Augusta at Gaulos in the Maltese archipelago and at Lepcis Magna.[526] An inscribed statue base from Nepi in modern-day Lazio speaks of Ceres Augusta, mother of the fields (*mater agrorum*).[527] The inscription from Gaulos is undoubtedly dedicated to Livia, as it reads *Cereri Iuliae Augustae divi Augusti matri Ti. Caesaris Augusti*, while the dedications to Ceres Augusta from Lepcis Magna and Nepet might refer to the imperial abstraction rather than Livia.

Livia does not appear to have had especially strong ties to one specific goddess, unlike other members of the imperial family, such as Drusilla, who was frequently linked to Aphrodite. Rather, it is a diversified picture of Livia's *diva*-role that emerges from the inscriptions. She is paired with Aphrodite once, at Chios, and with Juno in Zara.[528] She is twice referred to as Tyche of the city of Gytheum.[529] A damaged inscription from Imbros

524 *SEG* 33. 1055; *AE* 1983 no. 910; Bartman EpigCat. 7.

525 The name *Sebastos* could however imply divinity in itself, see Galinsky 1996 pp. 315-318.

526 Gaulos: *CIL* X.7501; Bartman EpigCat. 50. Lepcis Magna: *IRT* 269.

527 *CIL* XI. 3196; Hahn 77 no. 91; Bartman EpigCat. 63. Grether 1946 p. 239. Spaeth (1996 p. 170 no. 1.6) suggests that the epithet Augusta may have associated Ceres with the imperial house in general.

528 Aphrodite: *AE* 1957 nr. 263; *SEG* 15. 532. Juno: *CIL* III. 2904 = *ILS* 2.3089; Bartman EpigCat. 26. The inscription is attached to the base of a statue that was probably paired with a statue dedicated to Augustus as Jupiter (*CIL* III. 2905).

529 *AE* 1929 nr. 99-100.

recounts how the people of the Athenians dedicated a statue to Julia Augusta Hygieia, and Livia received a similar dedication in Athens.[530] In the same city, a marble base was found near the Bouleuterion, relating how the council of the Areopagus dedicated a statue of Livia.[531] The inscription is damaged and Livia's divine assimilation was first restored by James H. Oliver as [Artemis] Boulaia, as this deity was closely connected with the council of the Six Hundred.[532] However, Geoffrey C. R. Schmaltz has more recently suggested that her title is better restored as [Hestia] Boulaia as the prytany-cult of Zeus Boulaios and Hestia Boulaia is attested from the time of the early empire, while that of Artemis Boulaia is last attested in the 2nd century BCE.[533] Moreover, the cult of Hestia, Livia, and Julia is attested on the Acropolis, and Livia was given cult as Hestia in the prytaneion at Ephesus, while at Lampsakos she was referred to as Julia Augusta Hestia, the new Demeter.[534]

However, the connection between Livia and deities associated with women as home-makers and providers is just one of many. Among the more unusual pairings are goddesses such as Hekate in Tralles and Mnemosyne in Thespiae.[535] A possible further connection to Livia with Mnemosyne can be found in the same city: an inscribed poem has been preserved, in which a certain Honestus writes how Livia in wisdom was a fitting fellow-dancer with the learned Muses, whose mind has preserved the entire world.[536] At Corinth a certain freedman, P. Licinius, dedicated a statue to Augusta Diana Pacilucifera, while the priestess Antonia Tryphaena in Cyzicus refers to Livia using the epithet *nikephoros*.[537] By the west gate to the Roman agora in Athens, a statue-base was found recording

530 Imbrus: *IG* XII[8] 65; Hahn 330 no. 80; Bartman EpigCat. 53. Athens: *IG* 2/3 3240; Bartman EpigCat. 37.

531 *AE* 1938 no. 83; *EJ* 89; Hahn 327 no. 56; Bartman EpigCat. 34. See also Oliver 1965 and Schmaltz 2009 nr. 134.

532 Oliver 1965.

533 Schmaltz 2009 nr. 135.

534 Ephesus: *Ephesos* III no. 859 A. Lampsacus: *IGRom* 4.180.

535 Tralles: *BCH* 10 (1886) 516 no. 6; Thespiae: *SEG* 31. 514.

536 *SEG* 13.348; Bartman EpigCat. 65.

537 Corinth 8.2; *EJ* 130; Hahn 329 no. 69; Bartman EpigCat. 39. Cyzicus: *IGRom* 4.144; *SEG* 4.707; Bartman EpigCat. 43.

that the Council of the Areopagus and the Council of the Six Hundred, together with the people, dedicated a statue of the goddess Livia Pronoia.[538] Livia was also honoured as Sebaste Pronoia (equivalent to Augusta Providentia) on Lesbos and in Aezani.[539]

In addition to these honorific dedications simply pairing Livia with an already existing goddess, six inscriptions connect her to a traditional goddess by linking her name and the name of the deity together by interposing the term *nea*.[540]

Table 6. Livia as a new goddess
For the sake of clarity the Greek Sebaste is translated to Augusta.

Goddess	Dedicator	Province	Citation
Livia nea Hera	The *demos* and Roman businessmen	Asia	*IGRom* 4.249
Augusta Iulia nea Hera		Asia	*IGRom* 4.319
Livia nea Aphrodite	Paphos Augusta	Cyprus	*JHS* 9 (1888) 242, 61
Iulia Augusta nea Isis	[---] son of Apollonios,	Aegyptus	*IGRom* 1.1150
Iulia Augusta Hestia nea Demeter	The *gerousia,* and Dionysios, priest of the Augusti and treasurer of the people	Asia	*IGRom* 4.180
Iulia nea Demeter		Asia	*CIG* 2.2815

This appears to be a solely Greek practice, as no corresponding Latin inscriptions are known. A dedication from Assos records how the people, together with Roman businessmen, consecrated a statue at the gymnasium to Livia *Nea* Hera.[541] The inscription is either of late Augustan or early Tiberian date.[542] Livia is furthermore called the New Hera at Pergamum.[543] The city of Paphos dedicated a statue of the goddess Livia, the new

538 *IG* 2/3238 = *IG* III.461; *EJ* 128; Hahn 322 no. 5; Bartman EpigCat. 36.

539 Lesbos: *IG* XII Suppl. 124. Aezani: *IGRom* 4.584. The inscription from Aezani may date to after 41 CE.

540 Nock 1928; Wallensten forthcoming.

541 *IGRom* 4.249; Bartman EpigCat. 5; Hahn 323 no. 19; Rose 218 n. 51.

542 Hahn 323 no. 19 believes it to be of Augustan date, while Rose 218 n. 51 suggests it is Tiberian.

543 *IGRom* 4.319; Hahn nr. 74.

Aphrodite, probably after 15 BCE, when Paphos was renamed Sebaste Paphos.[544] At Aphrodisias, Livia was named *Nea* Demeter, and at Lampsakos she actually received two divine titles in the same inscription when she was honoured as Julia Augusta Hestia, the new Demeter.[545] Perhaps the most striking of all these inscriptions is a dedication in Egypt to the Great Goddess Thriphis, made in honour of Julia Augusta the new Isis.[546]

In earlier scholarship a distinction has not always been made between the two last categories, that is, for example, between Livia Hera and Livia *Nea* Hera.[547] However, two of the preserved *nea* inscriptions include references either to Augustus or to Tiberius, who are not given corresponding *neos* titles, and one must conclude from this that Livia was not called *nea* automatically to match her male companion.[548] If we assume that *nea* was inscribed for a reason, how should we understand that specific title? The dedications to Livia as a new goddess appear mainly on statue bases. Sadly, none of the statues are preserved so it is not possible to discuss to what extent the works of sculpture which they supported translated the epithet into visual terms. Instead the discussion must be based on epigraphic records alone.[549]

The word *nea* appears to be connected to the name of the goddess. It is not possible to pinpoint the exact meaning of the *nea* title, apart from the fact that it evolved as yet another way to assimilate Livia to an already existing goddess. The use of *nea* does not seem to imply that Livia was hailed as an incarnation of the goddess she was paired with. According to

544 *SEG* 30.1632; *SEG* 54.1557; *JHS* 9 1888 242 no. 61, Hahn 326 no. 49; Bartman EpigCat. 16.

545 Aphrodisias: *CIG* II.2815M; Hahn nr. 31. Lampsacus: IG*Rom* 4.180; *EJ* 129; Hahn 320 no. 60; Bartman EpigCat. 55.

546 *IGRom* I.1150; Hahn 330 no. 82; Bartman EpigCat. 38.

547 Cf. Price 1984b; Hahn 1994; Barrett 2002; Alexandridis 2004. By way of example, Barrett has chosen to translate *Ioulian Sebasten / Hestian nean Deme/tra* into Julia Augusta, new Hestia Demeter (*IGRom* IV.180; *EJ* 129). Barrett 2002 p. 285.

548 At Assos (*IGRom* 4.249) Livia is called the new Hera, the wife of the god Augustus. In Egypt (*IGRom* I.1150) Livia is referred to as Julia Augusta, the new Isis, while Tiberius is called Tiberius Caesar Augustus the Emperor, son of a god.

549 The *neos*/*nea*-term occurs in the numismatic record for later emperors and empresses, but not for Livia.

Jenny Wallensten, the traditional goddess is still the old one. If it were a question of incarnation it would the 'old Hera' that would be placed in a new vessel – Livia's body – and she would not be the 'Nea Hera'.[550] Furthermore, the dedication to Livia as Hestia, the new Demeter, makes incarnation seem unlikely, as she would simultaneously have had to host both goddesses. The use of the *nea* title was most likely a local initiative, as there is no indication that any of Livia's divine titles was ordered at the imperial level before the deification. The *neos*/*nea* title was in use during the Hellenistic period and the epigraphic sources record that both Ptolemaios XII (80-50 BCE) and Mark Antony bore the name of New Dionysos.[551] However, as has been pointed out by Wallensten, these Hellenistic inscriptions are different from the Julio-Claudian in so far as they record titles that appear to have been from the outset claimed by the rulers whom bore them, not voluntarily attributed to them by others. Ptolemaios is likely to have taken on the name as part of his titulature.[552]

To sum up the discussion so far: Livia was assimilated – either by 1) pairing her name with that of a goddess or by 2) linking her name and the name of the deity together, using the term *nea* – to: Hera (4 times), Demeter (3 times), Demeter Karpophoros (once), Ceres (3 times), Aphrodite (2 times), Tyche (2 times), Hygeia (2 times), Hestia (2 times), Hestia Boulaia, Juno, Diana Pacilucifera, Mnemosyne, Hekate, Isis, and she was given the epithets *nikephoros* and *pronoia* once each. All together the two different ways of assimilating Livia to divinities raise issues such as: How should we interpret the choice of deities and epithets? Why was there even a need to connect the name of an already established divinity to that of Livia? In order to answer these questions we need to broaden the discussion to cover both of the two different ways of pairing Livia with a traditional goddess.

The choice of pairing the emperor's wife with Hera, the consort of Zeus, is easy to understand, as is the assimilating of Livia to Demeter, the goddess

550 Wallensten forthcoming.

551 Ptolemaios: *SEG* 39 1705; 1710. Antony: *IG* II^2 1043. Cass. Dio (48.39.2) records how he referred to himself as *Neos* Dionysus and played on his ties the god. Wallensten forthcoming.

552 Wallensten forthcoming.

who presided over grains and fertility. Naming of these pre-existing goddesses in connection with her appears to point towards a specific characteristic or function perceived to be akin to some aspect of Livia's persona as empress. As a result, the dedication becomes more specific and nuanced than if it would have been if made 'only' to Livia as *thea* or *diva*. The case of Athens may serve as an example. In that city Livia was given, as Hestia Bouleia, Hygieia, and Pronoia, cult which accentuated some of her different characteristics and gave the Athenians the opportunity to worship her in various capacities. Hestia was the goddess of the hearth, associated with the right ordering of both domestic and public life, and the title Bouleia linked her with the prytany-cult. Hygeia was associated with the prevention of sickness and the continuation of good health and social welfare. Lastly, Pronoia linked Livia with the ability to foresee and make provision. The use of mythology to highlight her different characteristics can also be found in the literary sources. For example Ovid described Livia as:

> 'Caesar's spouse . . . who ensures by her virtue that the remote past
> surpasses not our own times in its praise of chastity;
> she who, having the beauty of Venus and the morals of Juno,
> has alone been found worthy to share the divine couch.'[553]

Like the images on the coins previously discussed, the assimilation between Livia and specific goddesses attested by inscriptions seems to have worked both empire-wide and on a local level. In some cases, the name of the goddess is more likely to have connected Livia with the actual status of a local deity than merely with the deity's characteristics. The presence in Athens of a dedication to Livia Hestia Boulaia made by the council of the Six Hundred at the Bouleuterion makes sense, given the importance of the prytany-cult of Hestia Boulaia. Likewise a pairing of Livia with the Ephesian Artemis indicates that Livia could be assimilated to a city's founding goddess. To bring Livia into relationship with a traditional goddess of a city was a way of bringing her into the life of the community.

553 Ov. *Pont.* 3.1.114-118. Loeb translation revised by Janet Fairweather.

A living goddess in her own right

Parallel in time with the dedications pairing her with other goddesses was the honouring of Livia as a divinity in her own right, as *diva* Augusta or *thea* Sebasta.

Table 7. Livia as a living goddess in her own right

Goddess	Dedicator	Province	Citation
Thea Livia	Tation	Asia	*AE* 1940, 184
Thea Livia Drusilla	The *demos*	Macedonia	*IGRom* 1.835b
Thea Iulia Augusta	[---] former *agoranomos*	Achaea	*SEG* 35.146
Thea Iulia Augusta	The *demos* of Myra	Asia	*IGRom* 3.720
Thea Iulia Augusta	Protoneika, by the testament of Iulia	Asia	*TAM* 5.2.904
Thea Iulia Augusta	Tatas Procla, by the testament of Iulia	Asia	*TAM* 5.2.905
Thea Iulia Augusta	Flavia Tatias, by the testament of Iulia	Asia	*TAM* 5.2.906
Iulia Thea Augusta		Achaea	*IG* 7.66

The first datable dedication to Livia as a goddess was made some time between 16 and 13 BCE, when she was referred to as goddess and benefactress in an inscription accompanying an imperial statue group dedicated by the people at Thasos.[554] Later in the reign of Augustus, in 3-10 CE, a statue to Livia as goddess was consecrated at Attouda in Caria.[555] In the reign of Tiberius, the former *agoranomos* at Athens dedicated a statue of the goddess Julia Augusta, and statue bases from Megara, Myra, and Thyatira record similar dedications.[556] Livia was furthermore called *thea* on coins minted in the Greek East.

It is noteworthy that Livia is more frequently referred to as divine in both legends on coins and in inscriptions, and more often paired with different

554 *IGRom* I.835b; Rose 158-9 Cat. 95; Bartman EpigCat. 23.

555 *MAMA* 6 no. 66; *AE* 1940 no. 148; Hahn 41, 324 no. 32; Rose 218 n. 51; Bartman EpigCat. 6.

556 Athens: *IG* 2/3 3239; *SEG* 35.146; Hahn 322 no. 6; Bartman EpigCat. 35. Megara: *IG* 7.66; Hahn 38.322 no. 9; Bartman EpigCat. 60. Myra: *IGRom* 3.720; Hahn 41. 326 no. 43; Rose 162-6 Cat. 102; Bartman EpigCat. 61. Thyatira: *TAM* 5.2.904; *IGRom* 4.1183; *AE* 1909 no. 189; Hahn 325 no. 36; Bartman EpigCat. 66.

deities, than were either Augustus and Tiberius. This is the case even when Livia's husband or son is mentioned in the same inscription as her, or featured on the same coin.[557] A common explanation as to why Livia's male counterparts are not called *theoi* to the same extent is that they might have wanted to subdue the association to divinity. However, it could be the other way round: Augustus and Tiberius' standing as emperors already implied divinity to a greater extent than Livia's position, and this could explain why Livia was more frequently linked with various deities, or referred to as divine. Furthermore, she had fewer formal titles than an emperor by which to be honoured. The inscription from Thriphis honours Tiberius Caesar Augustus the Emperor, son of a God, while Livia is called Julia Augusta, the new Isis, her pairing with Isis serving the function of a title.

If we turn our lens away from the provinces to Rome, we see that during Livia's lifetime no coins were struck in the city pairing her image with that of any deity; no dedications were made to her as divine, and no priests or priestesses are recorded as having performed cult to her. Associations between Livia and Ceres may have been implied by the dedication by Augustus of the Altar of Ceres Mater and Ops Augusta in Rome on August 10 in 7 CE.[558] Similarly, there might be a connection between Livia and the goddess who sits amid a scene of fertility and prosperity on the Ara Pacis, but no explicit identifications are made. However, the choice of Livia's birthday for the consecration of the Ara Pacis is interesting in terms of her cult. We know from the *Res Gestae* that the Senate ordered the magistrates, priests and Vestal Virgins to perform an annual sacrifice at the altar on its consecration day.[559] Ovid confirms that the annual sacrifices

557 Inscriptions eg: *IGRom* 1.835b; *AE* 1938 no. 83; *IGRom* 1.1150; *Corinth* 8.2 1931 13f. no. 15; *IGRom* 4.144; *CIL* X.7501. Coins e.g: *RPC* 1 no. 2338; *RPC* 1 no. 2496.

558 *CIL* 1^2 pp. 240 and 234; Wissowa 1912 p. 204; Platner-Ashby 1929 p. 110; Grether 1946 p. 226.

559 *RGDA* 12.2: 'When I returned to Rome from Spain and Gaul, having settled affairs successfully in these provinces, in the consulship of Tiberius Nero and Publius Quinctilius, the senate decreed that an altar of Augustan Peace should be consecrated in thanks for my return on the Field of Mars, and ordered magistrates and priests and Vestal Virgins to perform an annual sacrifice there.' Trans. Cooley 2009.

were carried out on the dedication day, i.e. Livia's birthday, and not on the anniversary of its foundation, July 4.[560] As a consequence of this, Livia's birthday was celebrated, with public funding, by the major priesthoods and the Vestal Virgins. A small frieze on the altar proper depicts a sacrifice. The figures carrying out the rites are anonymous so the scene does not appear to stand for a specific sacrifice, rather a recurrent celebration, which it is tempting to identify with the one held annually on Livia's birthday.

I would like to argue that Livia's religious standing in Rome was much enhanced during the reign of Tiberius when she was both priestess and daughter of a *divus*. When she fell ill in 22 CE, the Senate decreed *supplicia* to be made to the gods and *ludi magni* to be put on by the four great priestly colleges, assisted by the *Sodales Augustales*, when she had recovered.[561] *Supplicatio* was a bloodless rite, a collective prayer or thanksgiving to the gods, including sacrifice of wine and incense. The rites recorded in the *Fasti* in connection to Livia's, and other imperial, birthdays are always *supplicationes*.

However, blood sacrifices were made on Livia's behalf in Rome, as part of the state cult carried out by the Arval Brothers. They recorded all the rites that they had carried out during the past year, and inscribed them on *stelae* put up in their sacred grove, dedicated to Dea Dia, by the Via Campana, about 7 km west of Rome. [562] Among their rites was the annual vow and sacrifices for the safety of the reigning emperor, sometimes including his family members, and sacrifices on the days of their assumption of imperial powers and offices. Livia's birthday is recorded in the *acta* from 27 CE. The entry reads: *Taurus Statilius Corvinius promagister collegii fratrum Arvalium nomine natali Iuliae Augustae in Capitolio Iovi Optimo Maximo bovem marem inmolavit*.[563] There is no difference in intention

560 Ov. *Fast*. 1.709-710.

561 Tac. *Ann*. 3.64.3.

562 For the Julio-Claudian era, we lack the majority of the entries from the age of Augustus, that of Tiberius is better preserved and so is that of Caligula, while the records from Claudius' reign are very fragmentary. The entries from the reign of Nero are also quite well preserved, together with those from the year 69 CE (Gradel 2002 p. 20).

563 *AFA* XXXIII. The *acta* from 38 CE also record rites carried out on the birthday of Livia: *AFA* XLIII. For the Arval Brothers and their *Acta*, see Beard 1985; Scheid 1990; Gradel 2002 pp. 18-22.

between bloody and bloodless sacrifices, but in degree there was: the bloody ones were more costly and thus more prestigious, and the ox was the most honorific and costliest type of sacrificial animal.[564] During the principate it came to be the standard type of sacrifice within the state cult performed by the Arval Brothers. It is worth noting that the sacrifices were made on Livia's behalf to Jupiter, not Juno, indicating that it was not exclusively with female deities that she was associated.

Though Livia was not deified in Ovid's time, he prophesies her deification in the *Fasti*, a work nearly completed by the time of his exile in 8 CE: *Augusta novum Iulia numen erit*.[565] Furthermore, Hersilia's apotheosis in *Metamorphoses*, written around the same time, is a possible reference to Livia.[566] Hersilia's apotheosis is the only one of a 'historical' woman in the *Metamorphoses*, and it is the first account of her transformation into the goddess called Hora, and how she was given a place next to her already deified husband, Romulus.[567] There are compelling parallels between the words used to describe Hersilia and Livia in Ovid's poetry. Hersilia is described as the worthy wife to her husband Romulus, *coniunx dignissima*.[568] Livia likewise is defined as the deserving wife to Augustus, *coniunx digna*, and as the only one worthy to share the couch of great Jove (Augustus): *solo toro magni digna reperta Iovis*.[569] Furthermore, Hersilia figures in Livy's *History of Rome*, where she, as one of the most prominent of the Sabine women, convinced Romulus to spare the lives of the men who had attacked Rome, and even secured for the attackers the right of Roman citizenship.[570] Though Livy does not specifically link Hersilia to Livia, a contemporary reader might have noticed a subtle resemblance between Hersilia's past deeds and the benefactions and interventions that Livia would come to carry out.

564 Gradel 2002 pp. 15-18.
565 Ov. *Fast.* 1.536.
566 Ov. *Met.* 14.829-851. For Hersilia see Domenicucci 1991; Flory 1995.
567 Domenicucci (1991 pp. 221-228) suggests that the story of Hersilia's deification was invented by Ovid.
568 Ov. *Met.* 833-834.
569 Ov. *Ex Pont.* 1.4.55; *Fast.* 1.650. See also *Pont.* 4.13.29-32.
570 Livy 1.11.2. Cf. Gell. *NA* 13.23.13. Angelova 2015 p. 74.

A state goddess

Livia was not deified in Ovid's time, and had to wait until 42 CE before she could join her husband, 'the second Romulus' in the heavens.[571] In that year, on January 17, the Senate declared her divine following a proposal from Claudius.[572] When deified, Livia received what was needed for a state god: a new name – *diva* Augusta – plus a state temple and a priestly college.[573] The temple dedicated to *divus* Augustus in Rome, which Livia herself had been involved in erecting, was rededicated to house *diva* Augusta also, and her cult statue was placed by the side of that of Augustus.[574] The Vestal Virgins were charged with the task of making the appropriate sacrifices to the new goddess. The Arval Brothers made the following note on the worship given in the temple of *divus* Augustus on that occasion: *XVI k(alendas) Febr(uarias): [ob consecr]ationem Divae Aug(ustae) i[n] tem[plo novo] Divo Augusto bovem mar[em Divae Augusta] e vaccam.*[575] On this occasion, then, a bull was sacrificed to Divus Augustus and a cow to Diva Augusta.

With regard to the elapse of time between death and deification, Livia's case is unique. Did it matter that she had been dead for thirteen years before the deification? Livia's death *per se* did not make her a goddess and the same was true for all the emperors: it was a human act – the decree of the Senate – that made Livia a *diva*. The Senate had the absolute authority to deify and could, theoretically, decree divine honours to whomsoever they pleased. The fact that Livia's dead body was buried in the mausoleum of Augustus,

571 For Augustus and Romulus see Galinsky 1996 pp. 282; 316; 346.

572 Cass. Dio 60.5.2; Suet.*Claud*. 11.2; *Apoc*. 9.5.

573 The granting of the title *diva* was enough to turn Livia into a state divinity, but a temple and priests secured the continuation of the cult in the city. The cult of the *divi* who merely got the name, such as minor imperial relatives, was soon to be forgotten. One example is the cult of the first *diva*, Caligula's sister Drusilla, whose cult started to fade away soon after her brother's demise. Distinctions were drawn between levels of status and honour as time went on; some individuals became *divi* in name only, while others received a temple and dedicated priests and priestesses. Livia received the full set of honours.

574 Cass. Dio 60.5.2; *CIL* VI. 2032; 4222. The Temple of Divus Augustus was built somewhere between the Palatine and Capitoline hills, behind the Basilica Julia, although its exact location is unknown. See Claridge 2015 p. 93.

575 *AFA* lv.19.

seems not to have caused any embarrassment and a 'second funeral' appears not to have been held.[576] If we look at the *divi* in general their mortal remains were never placed in their temples, but in their mausoleums.

So, the time-lapse between death and deification appears to have mattered little to the Romans from a religious point of view. Even though no 'second funeral' was held, Livia's apotheosis was still seen as a matter for celebration. A major *pompa* was held in her honour in the city of Rome. Her image was carried around the circus in a chariot drawn by elephants on the day of her deification, and great games were arranged in the city.[577] As has been argued by Ittai Gradel, the consecration of Livia is probably the subject of a relief from Rome, the so-called 'Frieze of the Vicomagistri'.[578] Although the partially preserved relief resists a definite interpretation, it does underscore the grandness of early imperial ceremonies.[579] Magistrates and lictors are seen participating in the procession together with three bovine victims – a bull, a steer and a heifer – followed by attendants, *victimarii,* musicians, *camilli* and priests. The relief shows the *flamines augusti* together with four assistants who carry images of the *lares Augusti,* and the *genius Augusti* attending them. The three animal victims, according to their sex and order of appearance, seem to be pre-determined for the *genius augusti* (the bull), *divus* Augustus (the steer) and *diva* Augusta (the heifer). The relief further depicts attendants carrying statues of *lares* and the emperor's *genius*. This

576 In general, ashes of *divi* were buried, as were those of other humans. However, the difference between *divi* and mortal men was that the spirits of the *divi* were never worshipped at their tombs, where funeral sacrifices otherwise took place, but at their temples. Apparently, the spirits of the *divi* were not considered to live on in the grave, like those of normal humans. Instead they were divine and had thus ascended to heaven. The case of Livia, with her mortal remains already buried in the mausoleum of Augustus, would therefore not have presented an awkward problem, since a particular kind of funeral was not a prerequisite for deification. See Gradel 2002 pp. 322-323.

577 Suet. *Claud*. 11.

578 For the *Frieze of the Vicomagistri* see Ryberg 1955; Anderson 1984; Gradel 2002 pp. 165-186; Pollini 2012 pp. 309-368. The *diva* could theoretically also be Drusilla, as Caligula deified her before Livia received divine status. But, in contrast with Livia, Drusilla shared no cult with Augustus, the only *divus* during the reign of Claudius. According to Dio, Drusilla was worshipped both in her own temple and together with Venus Genetrix. Cass. Dio 59.11.1f.

579 For the problems of interpretation, see Pollini 2012 pp. 309-368 with references.

in particular suggests a connection to Livia's consecration: as has been mentioned in Chapter 2, Claudius had received the title *pater patriae* just five days before her deification.[580] His *genius* was presumably introduced into the state cult at this point of time, clearly articulating Claudius' position as emperor in terms of his being a *paterfamilias* for the whole of Roman society.[581]

There is no evidence suggesting that Livia's apotheosis was celebrated outside Rome, with the exception of an inscription from Ephesus. This records how a Claudian governor tried to restrict expenditure on the singing of hymns to Artemis, but specifically exempted the provincial choir of Augustus. He then declared that the choir of Livia, 'who has been given her long due divine honours', should be given the same status as that of Augustus, 'since the Senate and the god Augustus thought that she, who had been honoured by sacred law before she became immortal, was worthy of deification, and deified her.'[582] But it was in Rome that the act of deification and the related *pompae* were primarily important. The city was the scene where the state cult to Livia was performed and where the temple to her and Augustus was a permanent reminder of her new position as a state goddess.

As has been demonstrated, Livia was worshipped as divine long before the deification in Rome. I have previously argued that Livia's position as matriarch within the *domus Augusta* led to her deification in 42 CE. Beyond that, I would suggest that Claudius' decision to deify Livia, rather than any other distinguished kinsman, was due to the fact that the cult of Livia was long-established. It is plausible that a formalisation of what was already Livia's *de facto* divine status, brought about by worship of her clients, could have served to reinforce Claudius' own position. In the city of Rome, the celebration of Livia's apotheosis was useful as a way of strengthening his standing vis-à-vis the Senate and the people. Not long ago, the people had gathered in the Forum, and the Senate had also assembled, to debate whether the old freedom of the republic should be restored. By means of Livia's apotheosis, Claudius could quell the threat of unrest with imperial rituals and disciplined movement.

580 Cass. Dio 60.8.7.

581 Gradel 2002 pp. 187-188.

582 *I. Ephesos* 1a 18c. Trans. Price 1984 pp. 69-70.

Livia's position as state goddess gave rise to a new set of honours. The number of sculptures portraying Livia larger than life increases, and her physical appearance on sculptures changes, after she had become *diva*. The sculptures that originate from certain Claudian contexts suggest that a new portrait-type was introduced.[583] It features Livia's hair parted in the middle with wavy locks flowing to the sides and a face that is broadened and even more regular and classicised.[584] Her eyes are wide-set and slightly reduced in size as compared to previous portrait-types, but her tear-ducts are more pronounced, and her lips more tightly pursed and the upturned corners reduced. However, Livia kept her individual and established physiognomic features, such as the large flat eyes and small mouth and chin. It is noteworthy that Livia's sculptural poses as *diva* are comparable with those of her male contemporaries: she appears to have been released from several social restraints commonly imposed on women.[585] She had previously been shown wearing various garments but as *diva* she is solely portrayed in Greek raiment to resemble the goddesses of classical Greek and the Hellenistic world.[586]

Coins were struck in Rome, shortly after the deification, featuring on the reverse Livia seated, with the legend *Diva Augusta*.[587] The ears of grain or flower in her right hand and the torch in her left resemble the attributes of Ceres/Demeter. The obverse features a head of Augustus radiate, with the matching legend *Divus Augustus*. Both this coin-image of Livia and an enthroned statue of her from the headquarters of the *Augustales* of Rusellae have been taken to be copies of the lost cult-statue of Livia from the Palatine temple in Rome.[588] The Rusellae Livia is seated extending her left arm to hold a now lost attribute. However, as is stressed by Bartman, Livia on the Claudian coin is bareheaded while the Rusellae Livia is veiled, so it cannot be the case that both reproduced the same statue.[589] As has already

583 Bartman 1999 p. 131.
584 Bartman 1999 p. 131.
585 Bartman 1999 p. 48.
586 Bartman 1999 pp. 42-43.
587 *RIC* 1² no. 101.
588 Rose 1997 p. 40; Cat. 41; Cat. 45; Bartman Cat. 29. At Rusellae, a colossal enthroned statue of Augustus was discovered together with the statue of Livia. Rose (Cat. 41) argues that the statue of Augustus resembles the numismatic reproduction of his cult statue.
589 Bartman 1999 p. 131.

been observed, the motif of Livia seated was widespread and it is to my mind not possible to derive either the Roman coin-reverse or the Russellae Livia from one specific cult statue. Certainly the earlier coins and sculptures showing Livia seated did not have such a statue as their model.

Five dedicatory inscriptions relating to Livia have been preserved from the age of Claudius. They are all in Latin and originate from Colonia Julia Cirta, Corinth, Haluntium, Herculaneum, and Lepcis Magna.

Table 8. Dedications to Livia as a goddess during the reign of Claudius

Goddess	Dedicator	Province	Citation
Diva Augusta	Q. Marcius Barea and Coelia Potita (priestess of Livia)	Numidia	*CIL* VIII.6987
Diva Augusta		Achaea	*Corinth* 8.3 (1966) no. 55 pl. 8
Dea Livia Augusta	The *municipium*	Sicilia	*CIL* X.7464
Diva Augusta	L. Mammius Maximus	Latium et Campania	*CIL* X. 1413
Diva Augu(sta)		Africa proconsularis	*AE* 1948, 13

Furthermore, an inscription from Tlos announced the establishment of a cult devoted to Livia, including processions (*pompas*), sacrifices (*thusias*), and athletic competitions (*agōnas*).[590] Livia's position as chief ancestress is resonantly described in the inscription that states: 'she [Livia] created the race (*genos*) of the *Sebastoi* in accordance with the most sacred succession of the manifested gods, a house incorruptible and immortal for all times.'[591] A relief from Ravenna, once a part of a larger frieze that possibly had formed a part of the precinct wall of an altar, depicts Livia as *diva* together with *divus* Augustus, Germanicus, Drusus, and Antonia the Younger: the Claudian *domus Augusta*.[592] Livia wears a diadem and a small Cupid is

590 *SEG* 28.1227; *CIG* 4240d; *TAM* 5.549. *SEG* gives a reconstruction slightly different from that of *TAM*. The inscription is usually dated to the reign of Claudius but, as sacrifices to deceased emperors and empresses were uncommon in the Greek world, it might be Tiberian rather than Claudian. See also Angelova 2015 p. 10.

591 Trans. Price 1984b p. 88.

592 Rose Cat. 30. A fragment probably belonging to the frieze shows a sacrificial procession, suggesting rites carried out in honour of the imperial family. See Ryberg 1955.

placed on her shoulder, probably with allusion to Venus Genetrix. She and Augustus are represented as Venus and Mars, making this the first known example of conflation of imperial with Olympian iconography on historical reliefs from the western provinces.[593]

Object of worship

Priests and priestesses

There is no indication that any of Livia's divine titles were ordered at the imperial level before her deification. Who then were the agents behind all the dedications that included these titles? Livia received dedications from both men and women who appear to have acted without any formal authorisation. One of them was a certain Tation, resident at Attouda, who consecrated one of the first known statues to Livia as a goddess in 3-10 BCE.[594] At Corinth, the freedman P. Licinius dedicated a statue to Livia as Diana Paciliucifera, pointing out in the inscription that he is *philosebastos*.[595] There were no general restrictions as to who was allowed to erect imperial statues, as long as one could afford the cost and obtain permission from the local authorities responsible for the use of public space.[596] Testamentary gifts of imperial statues were common.[597] At Thyatira three sculptures of Livia as *thea* Julia Augusta were dedicated by three women, Protoneika, Tatas Procla and Flavia Tatias, in accordance with the will of a certain Julia.[598] Communities or their executive bodies are likewise represented in the epigraphic material relating to the divinized Livia. Some examples have already been mentioned: the people and Roman businessmen at Assos, the

593 Rose 1997 p. 40.

594 *MAMA* 6 no. 66; *AE* 1940 no. 148; Hahn 41, 324 no. 32; Rose 218 n. 51. Bartman EpigCat. 6.

595 Corinth 8.2; *EJ* 130; Hahn 329 no. 69; Bartman EpigCat. 39. For the term *philosebastos* see See Price 1984 p. 118; Buraselis 2000 pp.101-110.

596 Munk Højte 2005 p. 171.

597 Munk Højte 2005 pp. 176-177.

598 Protoneika: *TAM* 5.2.904; *IGRom* 4.1183; *AE* 1909 no. 189; Hahn 325 no. 36; Bartman EpigCat. 66. Tatas Procla: *TAM* 5.2.905; *IGRom* 4.1203; *AE* 1914 no. 195; Hahn 325 no. 35; Bartman EpigCat. 67. Flavia Tatias: *TAM* 5.2.906; Bartman EpigCat. 68.

council and the people at Mytilene, the Athenians at Imbros, as well as the Council of the Areopagus and the Council of the Six Hundred at Athens. The statue base, found near the Athenian Agora's gate of Athena Archegetis, which records the honour given to Livia as *thea* Augusta Pronoia, was granted by the public authorities, but paid for by a certain Dionysios when he was serving as *agoranomos*.[599]

The epigraphic material shows that priests and priestesses within the imperial cult were responsible for the majority of the dedications. It further demonstrates that Livia had officiants who viewed her in the three different ways mentioned above: some paired her with a traditional deity, some regarded her as somehow a new manifestation of a long-recognized goddess, and some simply thought of her as a goddess in her own right. The priestess Servilia Secunda at Ephesus served Livia as Augusta Demeter Karpophoros, while a certain Dionysius at Lampsakos was a priest of the Augusti who was devoted to the cult of Julia Augusta Hestia, the New Demeter.[600] However, most of the officiants regarded Livia as a goddess in her own right.

Table 9. Officiants devoted to the cult of Livia

Aspect of Livia	Title	Name	Location	Citation
Iulia	*Hiera*		Achaea	*IGRom* 4.39
Thea Iulia Augusta	*Hiera*	Lollia	Achaea	*IGRom* 4.984
Thea Augusta	*Hiera*		Lycia	*IGRom* 3. 1507
Thea Augusta	*Hiera*		Lycia	*IGRom* 3.540
Iulia Augusta	*Hiereus*		Asia	*AE* 1993, 1469
Augusta Hecate	*Hiereus*		Lycia	*BCH* 10 (1886), 516, 6
Augusta Nikephoros		Antonia Tryphaina	Asia	*IGRom* 4.144
Augusta Demeter Karpophoros		Servilia Secunda	Asia	*SEG* 4.515
Iulia Augusta Hestia nea Demeter	*Hiereus*	Dionysios	Asia	*IGRom* 4.180

599 *IG* II^2 3238.

600 Servilia Secunda: *SEG* 4.515; Hahn 328 no. 63; Bartman EpigCat. 45. Dionysios: *IGRom* 4.180; *EJ* 129; Hahn 44 no. 328; Bartman EpigCat. 55.

Augusta thea Aphrodite Livia	*Hiera*	Claudia Hedea	Asia	*SEG* 15 no. 532
Ceres Iulia Augusta	*Flamen*	M. Livius Quirina Optatus	Sicilia	*CIL* X.7501
Iulia Augusta	*Pontifex Caesarum*	M. Cornelius Proculus	Baetica	*CIL* II.2038
Iulia Augusta	*Flamen*	L. Anicius Paetina	Dalmatia	*CIL* III.14712
Iulia Augusta	*Flamen*	Cn. Cornelius Severus	Lusitania	*AE* 1915, 95
Iulia Augusta	*Flamen in perpetuum*	Julius Quintus	Lusitania	*CIL* II.194
Iulia Augusta	*Flaminica*		Samnium	*AE* 1988 no. 422
Iulia Augusta	*Sacerdos*	Insteia	Latium et Campania	*Inscr. It.* 10.3.1, 113
Diva Augusta	*Sacerdos*	Postumia Paulla	Venetia et Histria	*Inscr. It.* 10.5.1, 247
Diva Augusta	*Sacerdos*	Curtilia Priscilla	Umbria	*CIL* XI. 6172
Diva Augusta	*Flaminica*	Appia	Liguria	*AE* 1975, 403
Iulia Augusta	*Flaminica*	Catia Servata	Gallia Narbonensis	*CIL* XII. 1363
Diva Augusta	*Flamen provinciae*	[L? Po]mponius Capito	Lusitania	*AE* 1966, 177
Diva Augusta	*Sacerdos*	Iulia Laeta	Baetica	*CIL* II. 1571
Diva Augusta	*Sacerdos*	Cornelia Asprilla	Macedonia	*CIL* III. 651
Diva Augusta	*Sacerdos*	[Iu]lia Auruncina	Macedonia	*AE* 1991, 1428
Diva Augusta	*Sacerdos*	Iulia Modia	Macedonia	*AE* 1991, 1428
Diva Augusta	*Sacerdos*	[---]cula	Macedonia	*AE* 1991, 1428
Diva Augusta	*Sacerdos*	Maecia Auruncina Calaviana	Macedonia	*AE* 1991, 1428
Diva Augusta	*Sacerdos*	Octavia Polla	Macedonia	*AE* 1991, 1428
Diva Augusta	*Flaminica*	Coelia Potita	Numidia	*CIL* VIII.6987
Diva Augusta	*Flamen*	Albinus	Lusitania	*CIL* II. 473
Diva Augusta	*Flaminica*	Cantria Longina	Apulia et Calabria	*CIL* IX. 1153
Diva Augusta	*Flaminica*	Cantria Paulla	Apulia et Calabria	*CIL* IX. 1155
Diva Augusta	*Sacerdos*	Postumia Paulla	Venetia et Histria	*Inscr. It.* 10.5.1, 247
Diva Augusta	*Sacerdos*	Curtilia Priscilla	Umbria	*CIL* XI. 6172
Diva Augusta	*Flaminica*	Appia	Liguria	*AE* 1975, 403
Ceres Iulia Augusta	*Sacerdos perpetua*	Lutatia	Sicilia	*CIL* X.7501

In the following discussion I have chosen to consider all dedications that refer to officiants devoted to Livia, in order to give an over-all description of her cult. The inscriptions are by their nature honorific, specifying the offices held by the devotees mentioned, but seldom commenting upon their actual ritual functions. They are hard to date, as they do not record the year when the office-holder passed away. Livia's nomenclature can be used to a certain degree as an indicator of date: if she is referred to as Livia Drusilla, rather than as Julia Augusta, the inscription was most likely cut before 14 CE; but it has to be remembered that she was referred to as *diva* or *thea* already during her lifetime. The official deification went largely unnoticed in the epigraphic material, leaving most inscriptions of indeterminate date. Greece and Asia Minor have featured prominently in this chapter so far, due to the fact that the preserved material under discussion originated around the eastern Mediterranean. However, dedications made by, or in honour of, priests and priestesses of the imperial cult have been found all over the empire and Latin inscriptions account for over two thirds of the total number.

In the provinces, the priesthood was an important public function for both men and women.[601] It is often mentioned on their gravestones and the large numbers of statues erected for priest and priestesses is a testimony to their prominence. At Athens, a seat in the Theatre of Dionysos, just beneath the Akropolis, was reserved for a priestess of Hestia, Livia and Julia.[602] The priests and priestesses dedicated to Livia are referred to as *hiereus*/*hiereia* in Greek, *flamen*/*flaminica* or *sacerdos* in Latin. The epigraphic material testifies that Livia had both men and women employed within her cult. We have, for example, L. Anicius Paetinas, who was *flamen* at Salona, Cn. Cornelius Severus, *flamen* at Emerita Augusta in Lusitania, and Julius Quintus, also in Lusitania, who served as *flamen* for both Livia and Germanicus. [603] In some cases, Livia and Augustus were worshipped

601 For a comprehensive study of the public role of female priestesses in the Latin West see Hemelrijk 2015.

602 *IG* II^2 5096. There is also a seat 'of Livia', indicating further attendants of the cult (*IG* II^2 5161).

603 L. Anicius Paetinas: *CIL* III.14712. Cn. Cornelius Severus: *AE* 1915.no. 95. Julius Quintus: *CIL* II.194; *ILS* 6896.

together, as an inscription from Lusitania records: *Divo Augusto [et divae Aug(ustae)] / Albinus Albui f. flamen d[ivi Augusti et] / divae Aug(ustae) provinciae Lusitan[iae dedicavit]*.[604]

The (male) titles of *flamen* vis-à-vis *sacerdos* have frequently been debated.[605] It has been suggested that a *sacerdos* served the cult of a living ruler whereas a *flamen* served a deified one.[606] Chronological development has been proposed, too, the argument being that one of the titles superseded the other, though which superseded which is not agreed. Again, it has been stressed that *flamines* served in more densely urbanised or Romanised provinces and *sacerdotes* in those less so.[607] Finally, it has been suggested that the titles depended on the place in which the priest functioned; the *flamen* served when there was a temple, a *sacerdos* whenever there was an altar.[608] However, one thing is clear: the epigraphic material concerning the worship of Livia does not corroborate any of these assumptions. Her cult was cared for by both *sacerdotes* and *flaminicae* during the same time period, so no title seems to have superseded the other. Nor could it be a question about Romanisation, as *sacerdotes* for the cult of Livia are attested in highly Romanised regions such as the Hispanic provinces and the Italic mainland.[609] The titles seem rather to have been interchangeable, their use reflecting local preferences.[610]

Qualification of the titles discussed above by the addition of nouns in

604 *CIL* II.473 = *AE* 1997 777a = *AE* 1999 870. See also *CIL* XII.1845 (temple).

605 For an overview see Etienne 1958; Deininger 1965; Alföldy 1973 pp. 46-49; Fishwick 1987-92 vol I pp. 164-166; Delgado Delgado 1998; Fishwick 1987-92 vol III p. 188; Beard, North and Price 1998 p. 357; Hemelrijk 2005. The historical sources do not shed much light upon the question: Tacitus relates how Augustus wished *per flamines et sacerdotes coli,* and Suetonius reports that Tiberius *templa, flamines, sacerdotes decerni sibi prohibuit*; but neither author cares to explain the difference between *flamines* and *sacerdotes*. Tac. *Ann*. 1.10; Suet. *Tib.* 26.1. Gradel 2002 p. 277; Hemelrijk 2005.

606 Fishwick 1978 pp. 1214-1215.

607 The concept of 'Romanisation' is somewhat complicated, however, I agree with Hemelrijk that it can prove useful for understanding the complex processes of cultural integration, as long as one does not claim that the Roman culture was homogeneous, or dichotomise 'Roman' and 'native'. Hemelrijk 2015 pp. 19-21.

608 For an overview of this discussion see Hemelrijk 2005.

609 Hemelrijk 2005 pp. 140-141.

610 Hemelrijk 2005 p. 144.

the genitive or adjectives can be found in the inscriptions such as *flaminica provinciae* or *sacerdos perpetua*. To be a *flaminica provinciae* was most prestigious as women who held this office would have been elected by the provincial council.[611] The priest Quintus Julius was elected *flamen in perpetuum* within the cult of Livia.[612] Here, *in perpetuum* can hardly be interpreted in a temporal sense, since the priests and priestesses were elected only for the duration of a year. The addition *perpetuus* to *flamen* might have indicated that the officiate was allowed to keep his privileges when his year of imperial service was ended, for example, to keep a seat in the theatre and amphitheatre or to wear a priestly costume on special days and festivals.[613] The earlier assumption that a *flaminica* was always married to a *flamen* and thereby held her priesthood has generally been discarded, and an inscription from the island of Gaulos in the Maltese archipelago testifies that here a married couple both served the cult of the deified Livia, the husband as *flamen* and his wife as *sacerdos*.[614] Though they both recorded their priesthoods on their joint gravestone, it does not necessarily mean that they held the office as a couple: for all we know, they could have exercised their duty to the imperial cult in different years and in different cities. Altogether, consideration of the evidence for priests and priestesses devoted to the cult of Livia suggests that it is time for us to modify the view still prevalent in the late twentieth century that the religious roles of women in Greco-Roman antiquity were completely under male control, and that female gods were primarily concerned with female spheres of interest and male gods with male spheres.[615]

In most cases, the only thing we know about the priests and priestesses devoted to the cult of Livia comes from scantily worded inscriptions. However, the case of the Bosporan queens discussed in Chapter 3 may help to elucidate how the worship of Livia became a medium of political and

611 Hemelrijk 2015 p. 75.

612 *CIL* II.194.

613 Hemelrijk 2005 p. 157.

614 *CIL* X.7501. This is a rare instance when both a statue of Livia and the statue base have survived. For the statue see Bartman Cat. 20.

615 Holland 2012 pp. 204-214 provides a useful summary on the prevailing views on women and Roman religion.

social self-representation. Queen Pythodoris and her husband Polemo had a daughter, Antonia Tryphaena. Tryphaena married the king of Thrace, Cotys. Cotys had however an uncle, Rhescuporis, who aspired to the throne and had Cotys murdered shortly before 19 CE. Antonia Tryphaena then fled to Rome, together with her three sons, and stayed at the court where she lived in company with Antonia, widow of Drusus.[616] Rhescuporis was duped into coming to Rome, where he was charged with the murder of Cotys, expelled to Alexandria and later killed.[617] The kingdom of Thrace was temporarily ruled by Roman officials until the sons of Antonia Tryphaena had come of age. Tryphaena herself settled down in Cyzicus and started to act as the city's benefactress.[618] As an elected priestess within the cult of Livia, she was the one who dedicated the statue to Livia as *Nikephoros,* the bringer of victory, in the temple of Athena Polias in Cyzicus.[619] Athena had been granted the same epithet during the third Mithridatic war when she was said to have helped the city to raise a siege, and this dedication to Livia demonstrates how a divine assimilation could be made in response to a particular action or event.[620] The inscription further relates how Tryphaena received her priesthood from the city at the Panathenaic Festival, 'for she satisfied everything relating to piety towards the gods in a distinguished manner according to her custom, offering many sacrifices.'[621] Tryphaena, who in return for her religious benefactions received thanks from the city, clearly demonstrates that to hold an imperial priesthood, and to do so lavishly, could be medium for self-promotion and enhancement of one's standing.

In the course of imperial history, priests and priestesses are attested as serving the cult of the living emperor or empress individually, whereas deceased members of the imperial family were given worship collectively.[622] The allocation of individual priesthoods to individual members of the

616 Val. Max. 4.3.3.
617 Barrett 2002 p. 196.
618 *PIR* A 900.
619 *IGRom* 4.144 = *SEG* IV.707. Bartman EpigCat. 43.
620 Price 1984b p. 86.
621 Trans. Price 1984a p. 63.
622 See Hemelrijk 2005 pp. 154-156. *Contra* Gradel 2002 pp. 87-91.

imperial family was downplayed in the reign of Claudius. Worship was now often directed towards the Augustan gods and the term *domus divina* appears in inscriptions.[623] However, Livia retained individual priests and priestesses for an exceptionally long period of time. Her cult is attested up until the late first century CE, when a certain Cantria Longina in Aeclanum in Italy was called *flaminica divae Iuliae Augustae*.[624] Livia's birthday was still celebrated with a three-day festival in Pergamum in the early second century.[625]

Temples

Where did the priestly officiants carried out their rites? A temple in Smyrna was dedicated to Tiberius, Livia, and the Senate in 26 CE.[626] Permission for setting up imperial temples had to be sought in Rome. The decision in which city the temple should be erected, and hence host a recurrent imperial festival, was of great importance in the status-competition between cities.[627] When Smyrna was given the right to erect the imperial temple, the province of Asia had previously asked for, and received, the needed permission from Rome. However, they could not agree on where to erect it and three years later, Tacitus asserts, the Senate had to adjudicate between eleven cities.[628] Smyrna won the competition, and spread the word by issuing coins with the busts of Livia and the Senate on the obverse and the new temple on the reverse.[629]

A good way to detect temples devoted to Livia is by looking for dedicatory inscriptions on architectural elements, especially the architrave blocks.[630] Livia is named on such blocks at Eresus, Terracina, Collegno, Vienna, Corinth, and Rhamnous. The inscriptions are fragmentary and

623 Fishwick 1991 423-435; Osgood 2011 pp. 137-145.
624 *CIL* IX.1153.
625 *I. Ephesos* 1a 18d 11-19.
626 Tac. *Ann*. 4.55. Burrell 2004 pp. 38-54.
627 Price 1984a pp. 63-64. During the reign of Hadrian the term *neokoros*, originally meaning 'temple warden', came to denote a city possessing an imperial temple and a recurrent festival.
628 Tac. *Ann*. 4.55-56.
629 *RPC* 1.2469. See also p. 78.
630 Bartman 1999 p. 128.

the blocks have been removed from their original buildings and re-used, but it is still possible to make some observations about them. At Eresus, on Lesbos, a sanctuary and a temple were dedicated to Livia, Augustus and sons of Augustus.[631] An inscription from Tarracina speaks of a temple to Livia and Tiberius and furthermore of how a certain Pompeia Trebulla, as a testamentary benefaction, paid a hundred thousand sesterces for its restoration, while at Collegno Livia's cult was combined with that of Drusilla.[632] The inscription from Corinth speaks of Diva Augusta as the grandmother of Claudius, which suggests that it dates from his reign.[633] At Vienna, two inscriptions made up of metal letters seem to have been set upon the façade of the temple.[634] Recent re-analysis of the holes left behind by the missing metal letters suggests that the temple was dedicated to Roma and Augustus in 27-25 BCE, and that the inscription was updated when Livia had been deified.[635] The inscription, as now restored, would have read: *[Apollini? san]cto et divo Augusto / et divae Augustae*.

The inscription from Rhamnous is a rededication of the fifth-century BCE temple of Nemesis to Livia.[636] It has recently been the object of two articles by Mika Kajava (2000) and Emma Stafford (2013). The inscription refers to *thea* Livia, which would suggest an Augustan dating.[637] However, substantial repairs to the temple took place during the early years of Claudius' reign, including the replacement of the whole of the east *epistyle*, work that Claudius himself seems to have been involved in as benefactor.[638] This, together with a reading of the inscription that accepts that the archon in the text is the known Antipatros, whose archonship is datable to 45/46

631 *IG* XII Supp. 124.

632 Terracina: *CIL* XI. 6309; Collegno: *AE* 1988 no. 607.

633 *Corinth* 8.3 (1966) 33 no. 55 pl. 8.

634 Rémy et al 2004 104-106 no. 34 updates *CIL* XII.1845 and AE 1925 no. 75. See also Cooley 2012 p. 154.

635 Rémy et al 2004.

636 *IG* 2/3^3 3242.

637 Rose 1997 (p. 222 n. 12), Bartman 1999 (p.128) suggest an Augustan dating on the basis of Livia's nomenclature.

638 Stafford 2013 pp. 215-216 with references.

CE, makes a Claudian date less problematic than an Augustan.[639] Either way, the rededication has provoked questions, as Rhamnous is located in the remote northeast corner of Attica, while we have seen how the imperial cult was normally an urban phenomenon. Moreover, cult appears to have been more or less abandoned there at the time, and the site depopulated.[640] If the temple was to be restored and re-dedicated, why was Livia chosen to be its new dedicatee? Both Kajava and Stafford emphasise the Roman interest in Nemesis as avenger, linked to the representation of Augustus as *ultor*. To link his wife to the *ultrix* of Attica makes sense, especially given characterisation of the Rhamnousian Nemesis as an avenger specifically against the Parthians, who were threatening war again in the early 40s.[641] As a token of Livia's assimilation with Nemesis, a version of the goddess-statue with Livia's head was made which recalls a series of statues available in Rome and elsewhere.[642]

To the inscriptions discussed above a dedication on the architrave of the theatre of Lepcis Magna should perhaps be added. It refers to the *dis Augustis*, the Augustan gods, which probably included Livia.[643] A statue of her as Ceres has been found at the theatre, together with the dedication, mentioned earlier, made by C. Rubellius Blandus to Ceres Augusta. [644] At the imperial temple in the same city statues of Livia and Tiberius were probably placed against the back-wall of the divided cella around 31-23 BCE, together with cult statues of Roma and *divus* Augustus, whereas statues of other family members stood elsewhere in the temple: along the side-walls or in the *pronaos*.[645] Additional statues of Livia, Augustus and Tiberius were set up in the temple during the reign of Claudius,

639 For the reading of the inscription see Stafford 2015 pp. 206-209 with references. It is of course possible that other dedications were made around the Rhamnousian temple before the reign of Claudius, though they are not preserved.

640 Kajava 2000 p. 41.

641 Kajava 2000 p. 51; Stafford 2013 p. 232. Ovid (*Met*. 3.403-406; *Trist*. 5.8.7-12) refers to the goddess as the *Rhamnousian*, while Catullus (64.395; 66.71) uses the apellation *Rhamnusia virgo*, usages which allude particularly to the Attic sanctuary.

642 Ridgway 1984 p. 74; Winkes 1995 p. 53; Kajava 2000 pp. 53-54.

643 *AE* 30 1951 no. 85.

644 Bartman Cat. 74.

645 Rose Cat. 125; Bartman Cat. 72. Fishwick 1991 pp. 521-522.

accompanying statues of the emperor and his family.[646]

Though the construction of a temple was always a prestigious event, the imperial cult did not depend on the presence of such a building: an altar alone was sufficient. However, altars with imperial dedications are rarely attested in the archaeological remains. A marble altar found at Tegea with the dedication to Livia as *thea* is an exception to the general rule, as is an inscription from Aezani in Asia which testifies that Livia and Augustus shared an altar.[647] Bartman suggests that inscribed altars would have been superfluous in sanctuaries whose dedication to Livia was clearly marked on architectural elements.[648] Statues of Livia also served as focal point for imperial worship. As we shall see, they featured sometimes in sanctuaries, and also in contexts such as theatres, basilicas and *fora.*

Rituals and sacrifices

So far I have been discussing where and by whom Livia was given worship. But what kind of worship did she actually receive? After all, in the words of Manfred Clauss: 'Die antike Religion ist Handlung nicht Haltung'.[649] It was by ritual that Livia was created a goddess. Though divinity can be regarded as a relative status, this does not mean that the distinction between humans and gods was blurred in actual ritual. The distinction was clearly drawn, as was usual in Greco-Roman rituals. Unfortunately, rites and sacrifices are given very little attention in extant literature and their content has not been verbalized in ancient texts.[650] However, some inscriptions can offer interesting glimpses of honorific practice.

The first known festivals in which Livia received worship took place in the years shortly after Augustus' death. They are described in two lengthy inscriptions similar in date, one from Gytheum in Laconia and one from Forum Clodii, a town situated about 23 miles northwest of Rome. I will begin by discussing the *Kaisareia* in Gytheum. An envoy of the city

646 Rose Cat. 126; Bartman Cat. 73.
647 Tegea: *IG* V.2.301; Hahn 323 no. 13. Aezani: *IGR* IV.584.
648 Bartman 1999 p. 128.
649 Clauss 1999 p. 23.
650 Gradel 2002 p. 3.

presented a proposal to Livia and Tiberius, regarding an imperial festival. Both his letter and the one Tiberius sent in response were laid out as sacred legislation (*hieros nomos*) inscribed on a stone column in the town.[651] It may be worth noting that there was only a short distance between Gytheum and Sparta, where Livia and Tiberius had been *patroni* for a long period of time. The inscription dates after the deification of Augustus in 14 CE, but before the death of Germanicus in 19 CE, since his victory is included in the festivities. It should perhaps be dated close to his triumph in 17 CE.[652]

We learn from the text that the celebrations took place over a period of eight days. The first day was consecrated to Augustus as Saviour and Liberator, the second to Tiberius as *pater patriae* and the third to Livia, who was invoked as the Tyche of the city and of its inhabitants. The fourth and fifth day were consecrated to the Nike of Germanicus and the Aphrodite of Drusus the Younger. The last three days were to be celebrated in the honour of T. Quinctius Flamininus (consul in 198 BCE and liberator of Greece from Macedonian domination) and two local benefactors of the city, Gaius Iulius Eurycles and his son Julius Laco. The association between Drusus the Younger and Aphrodite is perhaps the most unusual feature of the rituals, providing interesting evidence that a member of the imperial family did not necessarily have to be paired with a pre-existing deity of the same sex.

Before the performances began in the theatre, painted images (*eikones*) of Augustus, Tiberius, and Livia were erected on the stage. In front of them, a table was placed on which the councillors and the other magistrates burnt incense to the health of the imperial family. Each day, a procession made its way from the sanctuary of Asclepius and Hygieia to the theatre. The procession was made up by the ephebes (young men) and the other citizens, dressed in white and garlanded with crowns of laurel, together with women (probably priestesses) in ritual clothing. When the procession reached the imperial temple on its way from the sanctuary of Asclepius and Hygieia to the theatre a bull was sacrificed for the perpetuation of the

651 *SEG* 11.922-3 = *EJ* 102. Rose Cat. 74; Bartman EpigCat. 52. The imperial festival at Gytheum is further attested by *IG* V.1.1167.

652 As is suggested by Rose, it was shortly after his triumph that Germanicus began his new command over the eastern provinces which took him close to Sparta. Rose Cat. 74 n. 3.

principate. Specifically, the sacrifice was made for the sake of 'the safety of the rulers and gods and the eternal duration of their rule', and the temple of Asclepius and Hygieia was clearly chosen to emphasise the fact that this was its intention. The ephors are recorded to have supplied equipment for the *symphonia*, mimes, and choir indicating that performances by players of musical instruments, mime-actors and choral singers were to be included in the festival.

Luckily the reply of Tiberius to this request is preserved, in which he acknowledges the arrival of the envoy sent to himself and Livia. He commends the city of Gytheum for giving Augustus honours fit for gods and commensurate with the size of his divine father's benefaction to the world. Concerning his own honours Tiberius was more modest, regarding honours of a human sort as more fitting, which is, presumably, why he was celebrated as *pater patriae* and not paired with a deity. He ended the letter with the information that Livia will reply in person, which suggests that Livia had received a separate letter and was expected to make a separate response.[653] The fact that Livia is honoured as Livia Tyche might indicate that she differed from Tiberius in her attitude to divine honours.

The inscription from Forum Clodii is easily dated to 18 CE, thanks to its recording of consulships and duumvirates.[654] It seems to be made up of excerpts from different decrees, gathered together in a way that is grammatically somewhat confusing. Even though Livia is called Augusta, the text takes no account of the divine status of Augustus, so at least part of the text must date back before 14 CE. The inscription records a dedication of an *aedicula*, an altar to the Augustan *numen*, and statues of Livia, Augustus and Tiberius.[655] The altar appears to have been dedicated separately from the *aedicula* and the statues, but all seem nevertheless to be placed in close proximity to each other, forming a unit, as the inscription

653 For Livia's correspondence see Cass. Dio 57.12.2. It included correspondence with the court of Judaea: Jos. *Bell.* 1.26.6; *AJ* 17.1.1. Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.42) mentions a letter to Archelaus of Cappadocia from Livia.

654 *CIL* XI.3303 = *EJ* 101; *ILS* 154 = *AE* 2002 no. 138 = *AE* 2005 no. 128 = *AE* 2005 no. 135 = *AE* 2005 no. 487.

655 For an interpretation of the references to the Augustan *numen* see Gradel 2002, pp. 240-250.

mentions only one cult.[656] The exact location of the altar is unknown, but it was presumably in the forum.

The cultic actions at Forum Clodii were carried out on the birthdays of Augustus, Tiberius and Livia, Livia's being celebrated on 30th January. Augustus and Tiberius were honoured by sacrifices and incense-burning at the temple-complex: Livia's birthday, however, was celebrated elsewhere. Through the inscription the town council tells us: *natali Augustae mulsum et crustlum mulieribus vicanis ad Bonam Deam pecunia nostra dedimus.* The line is not easily translated. Hendrik H.J. Brouwer has chosen to interpret it as: 'on the birthday of the Empress we have treated the women of the Bona Dea quarter to mead and cakes, at our own expense'[657] The word *vicanis,* an adjective, derived from *vicus,* could indicate a town quarter as well as a village and is mainly attested in inscriptions where it is used together with a genitival adjunct. To be able to translate the line as Brouwer does one must accept that a prepositional adjunct is used together with an adjective to specify location. As that kind of grammatical construction is not otherwise attested in Roman inscriptions, *ad Bonam Deam* should more properly be interpreted as indicating the place of the dedication, which could be a statue to the goddess or a sanctuary, and that the *mulsum* and *crustlum* were given to the *mulieribus vicanis*, to the women living in Forum Clodii, which at that time was no bigger than a village. The inscription will thus mean: 'on the birthday of Augusta, we have, at our own expense, given *mulsum* and *crustlum* to the women of the village at (the statue/sanctuary of) Bona Dea.' This indicates that the women living in Forum Clodii celebrated a separate feast on the birthday of Livia, and that Livia was associated with Bona Dea in the village. The local council most likely sanctioned the event, as they provided the *mulsum* and *crustlum*.

Public banquets, *cenae publicae*, were a common feature of Roman life, offered to a large group of people by a benefactor or local council. In imperial times, the emperor and his family monopolised the giving of large public banquets within the city of Rome, and occasions when Livia threw banquets have been discussed in the previous chapters. Municipal

656 Gradel pp. 242-243.

657 Brouwer 1989 no. 101, pp. 104-105. Rose (Cat. 11) is following Brouwer.

magistrates did the same within their towns, as in the case of Forum Clodii. *Mulsum et crustlum* was one of the less expensive forms of public hospitality, being was more like a hand-out than a *triclinium* style dinner-party.[658] The inscription points to another important aspect, namely the choice of day. The organisation of time was one of the most refined political creations of the Augustan age. The birthdays, deaths, wedding anniversaries and other essentially private concerns of the imperial family were made into public events. We also know of celebrations of Livia's birthday in another Italian city, and at Pergamum.[659]

Livia was worshipped as Augusta Demeter Karpophoros at Ephesus, where her priestess, Servilia Secunda, was responsible for preparing paintings of her to be erected in a 'convenient public space.'[660] Paintings of Artemis and the twin sons of Drusus the Younger, Tiberius Gemellus and Germanicus Caesar, referred to as the New Dioscuri, were likewise to be erected by Bassos, priest of Artemis, and Proclus, priest of the two boys. In view of the reference to the twins, the decree has to be be dated after their birth in 19 CE, and most likely to before the death of Germanicus Caesar in 23 CE.

The city of Chalcis held a festival in Livia's honour, the so-called Leibidea.[661] At Ancyra, the priest Albiorix threw a public feast to her and Tiberius in 19-20 CE during which statues of them were erected.[662] The inscription in which this is recorded was situated on the left anta of the Temple to Roma and Augustus, perhaps indicating that the statues were set up near those of Augustus and Roma in the cella of this temple. At Cumae in Campania, sacrificial offerings of animals, *hostiae maiores,* were performed in front of statues of Tiberius and Livia, a rare instance of blood

658 Dunbabin 1991 pp. 452-455.

659 Which Italian city is unfortunately unknown. The inscription (*CIL* VI. 29681) is preserved in Rome, but its original context is unclear. It contains three occurrences of the name Trebulanus, which could indicate that it comes from a municipality called Trebula, of which we know of four in Italy. For Pergamum see Fraenkel 1890-1895, II, nos, 374 B12, C9, D.) See also Grether 1946 p. 230; Purcell 1986 p. 91.

660 *Ephesos* 7.2 (1981) no. 4337, II. 14-24; Rose Cat. 116; Bartman EpigCat. 45.

661 *BCH* III. 443.

662 *IGRom* 3.157. Rose Cat. 99; Bartman EpigCat. 30. The inscription is possible to date on the basis of local lists of priests.

offerings given to Livia.[663] The reference to the sacrifice forms part of a larger decree recording honours given to a certain Gaius Cupienius. The sacrifice was paid for by public funds while the statues seem to have been dedicated by Gaius himself.[664]

In Rome, the Arvals sacrificed a cow to Livia and an ox to Augustus at their temple on the anniversary of Livia's deification, 17th January.[665] She received sacrifices on other occasions as well, such as Augustus' birthday. When Claudius was deified, the Arval record tells how he and *divus* Augustus received oxen, while a cow was sacrificed to *diva* Augusta, either on the Capitol or at the Palatine temple.[666] Livia's birthday was still celebrated in the city in 108 CE by gladiatorial games and a public banquet given by the *Augustales* and the decurions.[667]

Conclusions

After having examined a bulk of epigraphic, numismatic and sculptural evidence, I find that there was not one cult of Livia, but many. She is represented in a variety of stations on a continuum between woman and goddess, assimilated with divinity in different ways. This development began during the reign of Augustus, but this chapter has shown that the overwhelming majority of assimilations between Livia and divinity originated from the reign of Tiberius, including: the development of coin-images featuring Livia provided with divine accessories; dedications to her either paired with existing goddesses or as a goddess herself; the formation in her honour of a priesthood, rituals, sacrifices, and dedications of temples and altars. The question that needs to be asked is why Livia was seen in such a sharp divine focus during the reign of Tiberius?

One answer is to see the divine worship given to Livia as an honorific practice that both formulated her position, and, correspondingly, that of the worshippers themselves. This approach means that Livia was not

663 *AE* (1927) no. 158 II. 3-6. Bartman EpigCat. 40; Rose Cat. 8.
664 Rose Cat. 8.
665 *AFA* LV.16; 19.
666 *AFA* LXIII; LXIX-LXXII. Fishwick 1991 pp. 506-507.
667 *CIL* VI.29681

worshipped because she was a goddess *per se*, she was rather worshipped because of her position as Augusta, *divi filia* and *sacerdos* of the cult of *divus* Augustus. When Livia received a statue-dedication, either paired with a pre-existing deity or as a goddess in her own right, it was a greater honour than if she had been given a statue as 'just' herself. However, it was still the same kind of honour: the difference in status between her and the dedicator was merely being defined as bigger than between two ordinary mortals. In this respect, divine honours fulfilled the purpose of expressing a social hierarchy involving Livia and the worshippers.

It is noteworthy that Livia is more frequently referred to as divine than Tiberius both in legends on coins and in inscriptions, and more often paired with different deities. A reason for this might be that his standing as emperor already implied divinity to a greater extent than did Livia's position. Furthermore, she had fewer formal functions in which to be honoured than an emperor, and her divine attributes and epithets served as a substitute for titles. The fact that the worship of Livia was so widespread during the reign of Tiberius clearly suggests that whether or not her apotheosis was officially acknowledged mattered little for her cult outside the city of Rome. Tiberius' refusal of granting Livia divine honours in Rome may have been important in the interplay between him and the Senate but it has been demonstrated in this chapter that it bore little relation to what was taking place at municipal and local levels. In fact, Tiberius seems to have allowed Livia to make her own decision when it came to the divine honours offered by the Gytheans, and he approved of the temple dedicated to himself, Livia and the Senate, at Smyrna.

It has been demonstrated that the majority of the divine honours Livia received originated from the provinces rather than the city of Rome, and that the dynamics of the imperial cult were complex. The language of coins and inscriptions implied syncretic identification of Livia with a city's founding goddess or other important local deities, and meanwhile temples, altars, statues, and rituals brought her into the physical space of a city. A whole community could be involved in processions and sacrifices or as recipients of donations from members of the local élite, who often served as imperial priests and priestesses. To incorporate Livia into civic life appears to have been a way for cities to acknowledge Roman authority

while at the same time representing themselves as autonomous and independent. Likewise, a ritual that included aspects of both the local cult and that of the imperial family could, just like a coin with different images on each side, provide the participants and spectators with a double sense of identity: affiliation both to the local community and to the imperial structures. The choice of pairing Livia with a pre-existing and locally important goddess appears to have been made in consideration of specific characteristic or function of that goddess which was perceived to be akin to Livia's persona as empress. This made a dedication more specific and nuanced than if it would have been made 'only' in the name of Livia as *thea* or *diva*. By way of example, when Livia was paired with Nemesis she was brought into relationship with a traditional goddess in Attica, while the quality of divine retribution that brought victory and peace to the empire was added to Livia's portfolio of virtues. The fact that a statue of Nemesis of Rhamnous in Attica, with Livia's head, was copied in sculptures found in Rome even suggests acceptance of Livia's provincial honours in the city.

To hold a priesthood was a part of the two-way traffic of religious ideas between the provinces and Rome. It was a sign of loyalty towards Rome and the imperial family, and the officiants could in that respect be seen as clients to Livia. In turn it was an important function for both men and women in terms of political and social self-representation, and the priests and priestesses became patrons within their local context, often engaged in beneficent activities. Though the royal houses of the Roman East had lost their kingdoms, the continuation of the same families' lofty position was ensured by direct association with the imperial family.

There is no evidence that Livia's divine titles or iconography were ordered at an imperial level. The coin-images that developed during the reign of Tiberius were probably local initiatives; their viewers were primarily inhabitants of the localities where they were minted, plus visitors from neighbouring cities and villages. However, the visual program for Livia's representation on coins that developed in the eastern provinces was to provide a model for the coins from the western provinces and Rome that began to feature Livia in the twenties CE, though we cannot know whether the die-cutters of Rome intended to convey exactly the same

message as their provincial colleagues. Renderings of Livia as a seated female figure, common on coins, can also be found in sculpture and cameos. The conventions of how Livia was represented in visual media fell within clear guidelines that allowed for a limited number of compositional modes, and also a limited number of elements within each mode, and this probably facilitated the readability of the images amongst viewers. Some of the elements were exclusive to Livia, such as her facial features and *nodus* hairstyle, while elements such as the sceptre or ears of corn or flowers assimilated her into divinity.

Livia's deification in 42 CE can in itself be seen as a reception of her cult in the city of Rome. Claudius' proposal to the Senate, that she should be declared divine was, as has been suggested, a way of strengthening his standing in a peculiar position when the imperial system was threatened. However, the fact that Livia had been worshipped as a goddess long before the deification might have influenced Claudius' decision. By formalising Livia's *de facto* divine status, created by the subjects, Claudius was able to reinforce his own position. As a state goddess Livia reached the summit of her rise in status. Her poses were now comparable with those of her male contemporaries and in the epigraphic material she was no longer defined by her relationship to her relatives. Outside her cult, Livia was *filia*, *uxor*, or *mater*, with the name of her father, husband or sons in the genitive, but as *diva* she obtained an independent status.

V. CONCLUSIONS:
THE POSITION OF THE PRINCEPS FEMINA

In the beginning of his *Annales*, Tacitus rhetorically asks if there was anyone left at the time of Augustus' death who had seen the republic.[668] There were, most likely, few left who had done so, but Livia was still alive. She, to the same extent as Augustus, embodied the transformation from republic to empire. When Livia was born into the Claudian family in 58 BCE nobody would have predicted that, a hundred years later, she would be declared divine by the Senate, and her portrait carried around the circus in a chariot drawn by elephants. In this concluding chapter it is time to discuss the development of the position that allowed Livia to cross the border not only between domestic and public, female and male but between human and divine. This will be done by considering her roles as *mater/uxor*, *patrona* and *diva* side by side and taking a comprehensive view of the chronological progression of their content and enactment.

668 Tac. *Ann*. 1.3.

At the time of her marriage to Octavian in 38 BCE Livia, even though a refugee of the Civil Wars, nevertheless retained the position as a woman of the political nobility, to which the traditional roles of wife, mother, and patroness were attached. During the triumviral years up until the battle of Actium in 31 BCE, Livia's *patrona*-role followed the established pattern for prominent women and during the years of civil discord she supported Octavian as a loyal *uxor*. The earliest recorded instances where Livia was honoured by association with a divinity – a couple of statue-dedications to Hera made at her behalf at the Heraion at Samos – likewise follow established custom: in the Greek East such dedications traditionally served as a means of honouring women. As has been demonstrated in Chapter 2, the first discernible shift in Livia's position, when from being a woman of the élite she became the wife of one of the triumvirs, was manifested in the privileges bestowed on her and Octavia in 35 BCE, namely the sacrosanctity of the tribunes of the people and freedom of financial actions.

During the years following the battle of Actium until c. 9 BCE Livia's role as *mater* and *uxor* was not publicly manifest as a constituent part of the triumvirate or the principate, and we have seen how Augustus' claim to have restored the old republican values was inconsistent with a prominent public position for his wife. However, in some quarters, Livia's position as wife of the *Princeps* raised particular expectations of her as an exalted personage, more notably in the Hellenistic East than in the city of Rome. Livia's *patrona*-role was being publicly emphasised in Greece and Asia Minor parallel in time with Augustus' legislative programme enacted in the years following in 19 BCE, which aimed at encouraging proper family behaviour by regulation of everything from marriage and childrearing to the private display of wealth. Livia's friendship with Herod the Great and his sister Salome was publicized in rituals like the *profectio* and by the sumptuous gifts that Livia donated to the temple in Jerusalem. The sources further speak of how she helped Samos to obtain freedom from taxation, and supported Sparta in political matters, both Samos and Sparta being under the patronage of the Claudian family. A compilation of all the sculptural dedications to Livia confirms that during this period it was mainly her clients, either as individuals or in groups, who enjoyed her patronage. Most of the statue-dedications from this period do not

associate Livia with divinity. The few which do make this association do not represent Livia as exemplifying motherhood. This finding supports the view that Livia's *mater*-role was not yet integrated as a part of Augustus' political program.

In 9 BCE Livia, both literally and figuratively, walked on to the political stage in the city of Rome. Three years earlier, Augustus had been elected *pontifex maximus*, an office which was associated with the duties of a father in his capacity as the religious head of his family. The new emphasis on the paternal aspect of Augustus' leadership favoured Livia's impact as *mater*, rather than *uxor*. In 9 BCE the public dimension of her role became clearly evident through the pictorial program of the Ara Pacis, and furthermore the altar was inaugurated on her fiftieth birthday on 30 January. One other important occasion in the same year deserves mention: Drusus, Livia's youngest son, died on 14 September. Livia was a leading character in his funeral cortège during its progress from northern Italy to Rome, and personally performed her *mater*-role in the public eye. We have noted how she now received a new set of privileges, and how her *merita* as the mother of a military hero were explicitly recognised. The recognition that she gained through this part of her *mater*-role may still be seen as a public extension of the honouring of republican women as mothers in a domestic context. However, the elevation of Livia's position and *merita* as mother to the stepsons of the *Princeps* added new dimensions to the role and she was entering into the male sphere of military victory when she became involved in triumphal arrangements and gave banquets in honour of Tiberius' equestrian and Germanic triumphs.

Livia's civic patronage in Rome corresponded chronologically with the emergence of her *mater*-role in the last decade BCE. She provided individuals outside the imperial family with dowries for marriage and financial support for childrearing. Livia's patronage to members of the lower social strata reflects how Roman society came to be seen as an enlargement of the *domus* of Livia and Augustus. By acting as a patroness of the whole community, Livia extended familial privileges outside her own household, thus reinforcing Augustan family values. When Livia acted as *patrona* in relation to a major body of clients, lack of social proximity was compensated for by publicly demonstrated largesse. I have

argued that her enhanced position allowed her to expand her patronage into public building-works, including the restoration of temples devoted to female cults, the erection, in collaboration with Tiberius, of a portico and a shrine to honour her marriage to Augustus. To draw a distinction between her role as *patrona* and her *mater*-role is admittedly somewhat artificial, as these roles went hand-in-hand for an élite woman, but it is striking how the part of Livia's *patrona*-role that did not follow the established paths for female republican patronage is explicable in terms of her role as *mater* and position within the *domus Augusta*. Livia's ability to take on the roles of *mater* and *patrona* without compromising her perceived exemplification of traditional virtues was aided by the transformation of the concept of the *domus*, through the rhetoric and realities of Roman politics in the last decade BCE, as the imperial family became the centre of Roman civic life. In the Latin-speaking part of the empire, the notion of the state as an extension of the *domus Augusta,* combined with respect for Livia's position as the female head of this *domus*, was confirmed by dedications to her *iuno*, analogous to the honour that was paid to Augustus' *genius*, in a form of worship that imitated the cult of the *genius* of a *paterfamilias* that was traditionally performed by slaves, freedmen and clients within a household.

Augustus' death in 14 CE was immediately followed by the formalizing of Livia's position in the state. She was posthumously adopted as his daughter, received the name Augusta, inherited one third of his assets, and was elected priestess of *divus* Augustus. These provisions openly recognised the long-term development of Livia's *mater*-role as an essential part in the construction in which *Augustus* was presented as *paterfamilias* and Tiberius as his son and heir. The roles of Livia, Augustus, and Tiberius were interdependent, and each of them necessarily defined the others. Tiberius had neither a wife, nor a sister or daughter, and, since he could not be the new father of the state without a family, Livia kept on being the indisputable female head of the *domus Augusta*. Furthermore, while Livia's position was derived from her relationship to Augustus and Tiberius, it was not subordinate to that defining relationship, as they could derive advantage from her position as well. A political structure that emphasised the family as the medium through which imperial power was transmitted would not

have been possible for Augustus to establish without a consort: hence Livia's unprecedented position.

The content and enactment of Livia's roles changed during the period from 14 CE until her death in 29 CE. As we have seen, her *patrona*-role included such elements as the hosting of a banquet for senators following the death of Augustus and the sponsorship of the building of an aqueduct in Etruria. Livia held formal audiences, and at times official correspondence was addressed to and from both her and Tiberius. It could be argued that this development was due to the fact that Livia, as a widow, was no longer part of a ruling couple. She was seen, rather, along with Tiberius, as one of the most important representatives of the imperial power, and as such Livia could, and was perhaps even expected to, act more freely after Tiberius came to power than she had done under Augustus, and petitions and honours were addressed directly to her to a greater extent. Livia's role as *patrona* was formally acknowledged in a senatorial decree of 19 CE. In her capacity as Augustus' adopted daughter, Livia inherited the loyalty of his freedmen and slaves, and thereby part of the civil service; she also gained direct ties with his large and important *clientela*.

Livia's position as Tiberius' colleague in the maintenance of an imperial and dynastic régime did not make her co-ruler but nevertheless enabled her *mater*-role to develop in such a way that she came to be seen as almost a talisman of Rome. The perception that Livia's wifely and motherly virtues resembled those traditionally praised in good consorts of ancient times was approved and spot-lighted because of its value to the dynasty, and to the Roman state. This development is further reflected in her *diva*-role. Even when dedications and sacrifices were not made directly to Livia, but on her behalf, the dedicators had the well-being of the imperial house in mind. The sacrifices carried out at festival of Gytheum were made on behalf of 'the safety of the rulers and gods and the eternal duration of their rule.' Sacrificial rites with a similar intention came to the fore when Livia fell ill in 22 CE and the Senate decreed *supplicia* to be carried out to the gods on her behalf. The Arval Brothers would later make vows and sacrifices for her safety. I have argued, consequently, that the reason why Claudius was able to strengthen his own position by deifying Livia was that she had

become so closely linked with the well-being of the state, both because of the development of her *mater*-role, and because of the way in which subjects around the empire had formulated their worship in relation to her.

The increasing amount of honour given to Livia between 14–29 CE, evidenced by a large number of sculptural dedications made to her, can be seen as a response to her enhanced position. In the case of Roman emperors, the relation of statuary-types to roles is well known; the togate type shows him as a citizen, the *velatio capitis* as a priest, the cuirass type as *imperator* and so on. Livia's role-set was similarly reflected in her statuary-types: she might be portrayed as a *matrona* wearing a *stola*, as a *sacerdos*, or in the guise of goddesses such as Ceres or Demeter with allusion to her *mater*-role. These visual formulae were freely available to anyone who wanted to honour Livia. By such acts as setting up inscriptions, erecting statues or issuing coins, Livia's clients acknowledged and publicized her position in the state. Furthermore, imperial patronage established a system in which the clients of Livia could maintain, and possibly even elevate, their status as *patroni* by distributing her *beneficia* to members of their local society. Public games and feasts – such events as Livia herself held in Rome – are examples of *beneficia* that Livia's clients gave in her name all around the empire, and to praise Livia became a medium for political self-advertisement.

I have demonstrated how the actual bestowal of divine honours on Livia at no stage in her lifetime constituted the only way in which respect might be shown to her. More traditional modes of giving her honour continued to be available. But worship of her as an imperial divinity became the predominant expression of loyalty towards her adopted by her clients the last decades of her life. Their worship was carried out in all sorts of contexts, from the smallest households to the biggest cities, with the whole apparatus of Greco-Roman religious practice employed: including temples, altars, priests and priestesses, rituals and sacrifices. Neither novelty nor originality seems to have been valued in Roman religion. No new architectural language was developed for the imperial temples, and the traditional titles of priests and priestesses were re-used in connection with the cult within them. It might also be claimed that the divine worship given to Livia did not conflict with republican tradition at a fundamental level. The real

novelty lay in the aspects of Livia's position within the principate that prompted worship of her.

If we consider Livia's roles as *uxor/mater*, *patrona* and *diva* all together, the year 14 CE stands out as a watershed for her position in the state. The adoption resolved many of the difficulties that stood in the way of the bestowal of honours upon women in Rome, by providing Livia with a title and a position that allowed her to be honoured to the fullest possible extent, both as a mortal woman and as a divine being. It has often been argued that when women held civic titles, they were strictly honorary, any real power being delegated to the woman's husband or a male relative, or some other male offical. Similarly, it has been stressed that the title 'Augusta' was simply bestowed upon Livia because of her relationship to Augustus, and is, therefore, not really significant. However, it seems simplest to assume that when Livia came to bear the title 'Augusta' she held the position implied by the name and exercised its authority. This is the cumulative message that emerges from the statue dedications, literary references, coins, gems, and assimilations to divinity. Under Augustus, praise of the *domus Augusta* had become systematized as an important medium of political and social self-representation, and now the system was fully established whereby the praise and honour owed by clients to patrons was lavished, to a superlative degree, on the women as well as the men of the imperial family.

From 14 CE onwards, Livia no longer appeared as on the same level as other élite women: instead she was separated from them in various ways. She travelled in a *carpentum,* was escorted by a *lictor,* and was seated together with the Vestal Virgins at the theatre. Rather than being presented as the archetypal Roman woman, we have seen how Livia began to be represented in visual media as seated, provided with regal and divine attributes such as the *sceptrum*. Coins even feature Livia without a male counterpart, revealing how far perceptions of the *res publica* had changed in the direction of incorporating female leadership.

It appears to me that, from the time of Tiberius onwards, Livia's *diva*-role was crucial for the acceptance of her position: it was easier for conservative senators and members of the local élites to honour Livia with

divine or quasi-divine worship, such as men always had bestowed upon gods and goddesses, than to revere her as a mere mortal woman. The higher Livia was placed on the social ladder, the higher the possible status of her worshippers. Her elevated position is confirmed by epigraphic evidence. Outside her cult, Livia's status was defined by her relationship to her male relatives: she was *filia*, *uxor* or *mater,* with the name of her father, husband or sons in the genitive, but as *diva* she obtained an independent status.

If we compare the fundamentals of Livia's and Augustus' positions respectively, it is clear that Augustus's establishment of himself as *princeps* was to a larger extent than Livia's position as *femina princeps*, built on constitutional elements taken over from a republic governed exclusively by men: the concept of *imperium*, the consulship, the special powers granted to tribunes. However, thanks to a precedent offered by the Vestal Virgins' privileges, he was able to ensure that Livia acquired, at least, the *tribunicia potestas*.

This study has shown that three of the most important foundations of Livia's position in the state were, apart from the *tribunicia potestas*, the title 'Augusta', and her divinization. It is an important finding, then, that these were foundations that Livia shared with Augustus. However, if we examine the chronology of how the positions of Livia and Augustus developed, it appears that Augustus acquired the foundations of his eventual status ahead of Livia: he received the *tribunicia potestas* some years earlier than her in the thirties BCE; he acquired the title 'Augustus' forty-one years prior to Livia's adopton as 'Julia Augusta', and his divinization followed directly after his death, whereas Livia was not deified until fourteen years after her demise. One of the reasons for this delay might have been reluctance on Augustus' part to appear like one half of a Hellenistic ruling couple. However, while the rhetoric and visual art of the first decades of Augustus' rule focused on the restoration of the republic and the re-creation of a male political sphere, the successive stages in the formation of Livia's position reveal that, in the transition from republic to empire, the structure of power at Rome was in actual fact pushed closer to that of the Hellenistic kingdoms.

It has earlier been suggested that Livia, as Augusta, became so closely linked with the well-being of the state that she eventually seemed almost a talisman of Rome. This symbolic dimension of her position paved the

way for empresses to come. While Livia's position was a product of a process of negotiation, redefinition, and new synthesis of how women might be implicated and engaged in the Roman imperiality, successive empresses were loaded with honours as a matter of course, and, once established by Livia, the practice of according these honours appear to have needed little explanation.[669] Subsequent empresses were honoured for qualities, inherent in their status as élite married women, which equipped them to be represented as guarantors of the well-being of Rome, even if their achievements in this regard did not necessarily match Livia's.

In my introductory chapter, I used the phrase *femina princeps* to sum up Livia's paradoxical position in the Roman state: one that somehow combined the status of a formally powerless *femina* with the powerful male supremacy conveyed by the term *princeps*. Now that this study has come to its conclusion and we have seen how in her wide-ranging enactment of roles Livia came to occupy a variety of stations in the hazily defined territory between domestic and public, female and male, human and divine, I believe that Ovid's recommendation of her as both *femina* and *princeps* may be read as a attempt to reconcile the many dimensions of her complex position in the Roman state.

669 For the public image of successive empresses see Angelova 2015.

SVENSK SAMMANFATTNING

Från sin exil vid Svarta havet, till vilken han sänts av kejsar Augustus, skrev den romerske poeten Ovidius ett brev till sin hustru i Rom. I brevet uppmanades hon att inte rikta sina böner till de traditionella gudarna utan till Livia, kejsarens hustru och *femina princeps*. I det antika Rom hade kvinnor en mycket begränsad tillgång till formell makt, och ändå binder Ovidius samman just ordet för kvinna, *femina*, med *princeps*, ett ord med starka konnotationer till den politiska, manliga, sfären. Den till synes paradoxala frasen fungerar som utgångspunkt för föreliggande avhandling vars syfte är att diskutera fundamenten till Livias position i den romerska staten – varför och på vilket sätt den etablerades och i hur hög utsträckning den framväxande kejsarmakten kom att inrymma ett kvinnligt ledarskap.

Avhandlingen tar sin början under de romerska inbördeskrigens sista år som kulminerade vid slaget vid Actium 31 f.v.t. efter vilket Octavianus stod som ensam härskare. Vid den tidpunkten, då Rom påbörjade en långsam övergång från republik till kejsardöme, fanns inga färdiga positioner för varken Augustus eller Livia. Givet att Augustus' maktställning skapades genom en skicklig och av honom själv initierad hantering av både formella och informella medel, hur skapades då Livias?

För att besvara frågan väljer föreliggande studie att ta steget bortom Livias person och eventuella förmåga att utöva politiskt inflytande, vilket varit det primära fokuset i tidigare forskning, och närmar sig frågan om hennes ställning i termer av position och roller. Begreppet position förstås i en sociologisk tradition såsom betecknande en persons status i ett samhälle och som ett begrepp som kan användas både för att beskriva en formell och informell ställning. Till en position hör en eller flera roller, ofta orienterade gentemot olika grupper eller kollektiv med en viss uppsättning förväntningar på personen. En individ kan uppbära mer än en position och en roll samtidigt och i avhandlingen studeras Livias positioner som hustru till en triumvir, hustru till Roms förste *princeps* och mor till dess andre och slutligen som anmoder till kejsarfamiljen. Till dessa positioner hör rollerna som *mater* och *uxor* (som är så nära sammankopplade att de behandlas såsom en), *patrona* och *diva*. I fokus står dessa rollers utveckling vad beträffar innehåll och utförande, med särskild tonvikt på de förändringar som kejsarmaktens etablerande innebar. Avhandlingen har därmed en kronologisk struktur som sträcker sig från Livias födelse år 58 f.v.t. till hennes formella deifikation hundra år senare, år 42 v.t. Eftersom kronologin är det centrala har ingen geografisk begränsning gjorts utan material från hela det romerska området behandlas. Källmaterialet är brett och inkluderar litterära texter, inskrifter, skulptur, mynt samt kaméer, och genom att olika materialkategorier läggs bredvid varandra belyses de olika skeendena i etableringen av Livias position. De tre rollerna *mater/uxor*, *patrona* och *diva* fungerar både som ett teoretiskt och metodologisk ramverk. De har givit avhandlingen sin disposition då varje roll diskuteras i ett kapitel vardera, för att sedan i det avslutande kapitlet läggas samman. Ett viktigt antagande är att en persons position inte är statisk utan kräver konstant validering för att vidmakthållas och förstärkas. Denna validering diskuteras i form av de ärebetygelser som gavs åt Livia och de kanaler som etablerades för att uttrycka lojalitet till kejsarmakten.

Bilden som framtonar av övergången från republik till kejsardöme, betraktad utifrån Livias position, visar hur det i samband med Augustus' död blir tydligt vilken roll familjen spelade för maktöverföringen mellan en kejsare till en annan, en politisk struktur som inte hade varit möjlig för Augustus

att skapa på egen hand, utan en hustru. I samband med Augustus' död adopterades också Livia såsom hans dotter och gavs namnet Augusta. Vidare ärvde hon en tredjedel av Augustus' tillgångar och utsågs till *sacerdos* inom kulten av sin gudaförklarade make. Adoptionen tycks överbrygga många av de hinder som stod i vägen för att ge Livia alla de ärebetygelser som manliga medlemmar av kejsarfamiljen tidigare hade mottagit. Såsom Augusta däremot äras Livia fullt ut, både som mänsklig och gudomlig, och antalet statyer, inskrifter, mynt, kaméer och litterära referenser till henne ökar dramatiskt. Från år 14 v.t. och framåt var Livia inte längre den främsta bland likar utan istället urskilde hon sig på flera sätt från andra kvinnor ur den romerska nobilteten. Hon färdades i en *carpentum*, den typ av vagn som dittills hade varit förbehållen vestalerna, höll banketter för senatorer och åtföljdes av en *lictor* då hon rörde sig i Roms stadsrum. Livia avbildas nu sittande på tronliknande stolar, hållandes kungliga och gudomliga attribut såsom en spira, och mynt slås med Livia på obversen som ensam representant för Rom och kejsarmakten.

Avhandlingen har visat hur tre av de viktigaste fundamenten till Livias position var hennes innehav av *tribunicia potestas*, titeln Augusta samt hennes deifiering år 42 v.t. En viktig iakttagelse är att detta är tre fundament som hon delade med Augustus, med den skillnaden att de i Livias fall gavs henne med en fördröjning: Augustus förses med *tribunicia potestas* några år före Livia, titeln Augustus fyrtioen år före henne och medan Augustus deifieras direkt efter sin bortgång infaller Livias deifikation fjorton år efter hennes död. En av anledningarna till fördröjningen kan ha varit önskan att undvika att framstå som ett hellenistiskt härskarpar, Augustus och Augusta. Emellertid, även om retoriken under Augustus' första decennier vid makten syftade till att framställa den romerska republiken som återupprättad, visar etableringen av Livias position hur maktstrukturerna i själva verket allt mer kom att efterlikna de hellenistiska och monarkiska.

Ytterligare en paradox som kännetecknar Livias position är det faktum att hennes roll som *mater* lyftes fram som central trots att hon och Augustus aldrig fick några gemensamma barn. Det visar i sin tur att blodsband aldrig var det avgörande inom kejsarfamiljen. Trots det har de mest bestämmande händelserna gällande Livias position, såsom adoptionen och senare Claudius' deifikation av henne, samstämmigt förklarats i termer av att

biologiska kopplingar mellan olika familjemedlemmar behövde stärkas. Ett sådant resonemang lägger dock inte tillräcklig vikt vid det faktum att adoption var det primära tillvägagångssättet för en kejsare att utse sin efterträdare. Därmed drar föreliggande studie slutsatsen att Augustus' adoption av Livia inte i första hand syftade till att skapa en genealogisk koppling mellan honom och Tiberius, inte heller att Livia deifierades som en konsekvens av att Claudius' blodsband till makten gick via henne och inte Augustus. Istället anförs argumentet att Livia deifierades eftersom hon så starkt kom att symbolisera endräkt och välgång, inte bara för kejsarfamiljen, utan för det romerska samhället i stort. Genom att deifiera Livia kunde Claudius, i ett läge då hans position som kejsare var hotad, stärka sin egen ställning. Att deifikationen av Livia var av stor vikt för Claudius' etablering av en kejserlig dynasti bekräftas av det faktum att han själv mottog titeln *pater patriae* bara fem dagar tidigare. Den abstrakta dimensionen av Livias position såsom symbol för kejsarmakten och Rom kom att få avgörande betydelse för efterföljande kejsarinnor. Medan etableringen av Livias ställning i Rom pågick under närmre sjuttio år och kantades av förhandling, formulering och omformulering gavs kommande kejsarinnor namnet Augusta och tillskrevs kvaliteter som framställde dem såsom garanter för Roms välstånd och fortlevnad, även om deras faktiska handlingar inte alltid motsvarade Livias.

Om studien utgick från frasen *femina princeps* och betraktade den som ett paradoxalt, närmast omöjligt, sätt att binda samman två ord för att beskriva Livias position, avslutas den med ståndpunkten att den inte bara var möjlig, utan också avgörande. Etableringen av den romerska kejsarmakten förutsatte inte bara en *princeps* utan också en *princeps femina*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The abbreviations used are those recommended by the *American Journal of Archaeology.*

Alexandridis 2004	Alexandridis, A., *Die Frauen des römischen Kaiserhauses. Eine Untersuchung ihrer bildlichen Darstellung von Livia bis Iulia Domna*, Mainz 2004.
Alföldy 1959	Alföldy, A.,'*Hasta - summa imperii*: The spear as embodiment of sovereignty in Rome', *AJA* 63 pp. 1-27.
Alföldy 1973	Alföldy, G., *Flamines Provinciae Hispaniae Citerioris*, Madrid 1973.
Allan & Adams 1998	Allan G. & Adams R., *Placing friendship in context*, Cambridge 1998.
Anderson 1984	Anderson, M. L., 'A proposal for a new reconstruction of the altar of the *vicomagistri*', *Monumenti Musei e Gallerie Pontificie: Bollettino* 5 pp. 33-54.
Ando 2000	Ando, C., *Imperial ideology and provincial loyalty in the Roman empire*, Berkeley 2000.
Angelova 2015	Angelova, D. N., *Sacred founders. Women, men, and gods in the discourse of imperial founding. Rome through early Byzantium*, Oakland 2015.
Aschbach, von 1864	Aschbach, J von, *Livia, Gemahlin des Kaisers Augustus. Eine historisch-archäologische Abbhandlung*, Wien 1864.
Barnes 1998	Barnes, T. D., 'Tacitus and the "Senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre"', *Phoenix* 52 pp. 125-148.

Barrett 1999	Barrett, A. A, 'The year of Livia's birth', *CQ* 49, pp. 630-632.
Barrett 2002	Barrett, A. A., *Livia, first lady of imperial Rome,* New Haven 2002.
Bartman 1999	Bartman, E., *Portraits of Livia: Imaging the imperial woman in Augustan Rome*, Cambridge 1999.
Bartman 2012	Bartman, E., 'Early imperial female portraiture' in *A Companion to women in the Ancient world,* eds. S.L. James & S. Dillon, Malden 2012, pp. 414-423.
Bauman 1992	Bauman, R.A., *Women and politics in ancient Rome*, New York 1992.
Beard 1985	Beard, M., 'Writing and ritual: a study of diversity and expansion in the Arval Acta', *PBSR* 53 pp. 114-162.
Beard, North & Price 1998	Beard, M., North, J., & Price, S., *Religions of Rome. A history*, Cambridge 1998.
Bell 2008	Bell, S., 'Role models in the Roman world' in *Role models in the Roman world: identity and assimilation*, eds. S. Bell & I.-L. Hansen, Ann Arbor 2008 pp. 1-39.
Bell & Coleman 1999	Bell, S., & Coleman S., *The anthropology of friendship*, Oxford 1999.
Beltrán Lloris 2015	Beltrán Lloris, F.,'The epigraphic habit in the Roman world', *The Oxford handbook of Roman epigraphy*, eds. C. Bruun & J. Edmondson, Oxford 2015 pp. 131-148.
Bernhard 1956	Bernhard, M.-L.,'Topographie d'Alexandrie: Le tombeau d'Alexandre et le mausolée d'Auguste', *RA* pp. 129-156.
Bernoulli 1886	Bernoulli, J. J., *Römische Ikonographie: Die Bildnisse der römischen Kaiser: Das julisch-claudische Kaiserhaus* (Band 2.1), Berlin 1886.
Bianchini 1727	Bianchini, F., *Camera ed inscrizioni sepulcrali de' liberti, servi, ed ufficiali della casa di Augusto scoperte nella via Appia, ed illustrate con le annotazioni di monsignor Francesco Bianchini veronese*, Rome 1727.

Bielman 2002	Bielman, A., *Femmes en public dans le monde hellénistique: IVe-Ier s. av. J.-C*, Paris 2002.
Bielman 2012	Bielman, A., 'Female patronage in the Greek Hellenistic and Roman republican periods' in *A Companion to women in the Ancient world*, eds. S. L. James & S. Dillon, Malden 2012 pp. 238-249.
Birley 1981	Birley, A. R., *The Fasti of Roman Britain*, Oxford 1981.
Borriello et al. 2008	Borriello, M. R., *Ercolano. Tre secoli di scoperte - Napoli, Museo Archeologico Nazionale*, Naples 2008.
Boyce 1937	Boyce, G. K., 'Corpus of the *lararia* of Pompeii', *MAAR* 14.
Boyd 2002	Boyd 2002 (ed.), *Brill's companion to Ovid*, Leiden 2002.
Bradley 1991	Bradley K. R., *Discovering the Roman family*, New York 1991.
Brennan 2012	Brennan, T. C., 'Perceptions of women's power in the late republic: Terentia, Fulvia, and the generation of 63 BCE', in *A Companion to women in the ancient world*, eds. S. L. James & S. Dillon, Oxford 2012 pp. 354-366.
Brouwer 1989	Brouwer, H. H. J., *Bona Dea: the sources and a description of the cult*, Leiden 1989.
Bruun & Edmondson 2015	Bruun C. & Edmondson, J. (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of Roman epigraphy*, Oxford 2015.
Brännstedt 2015a	Brännstedt, L., 'Livia on the move', in *The Moving City. Processions, passages and promenades in ancient Rome*, eds. J. Bjørnebye, S. Malmberg & I. Östenberg, London 2015 pp. 37-46.
Brännstedt 2015b	Brännstedt, L., 'Fikon och fiktion. Livia, I Claudius och bilden av den intrigerande kvinnan' in *Svärd, sandaler och skandaler. Antiken på film och i tv*, eds. I. Hammar & U. Zander, Lund 2015 pp. 55-67.

Buraselis 2000 — Buraselis, K., *Kos between Hellenism and Rome. Studies on the political, institutional and social history of Kos from ca. the middle second century B.C. until late antiquity*, Philadelphia 2000.

Burrnell 2004 — Burrell, B., *Neokoroi: Greek cities and Roman emperors*, Leiden 2004.

Buxton 2014 — Buxton, B.A., 'A new reading of the Belvedere altar', *AJA* 118 pp. 91–111.

Bömer 1966 — Bömer, F., *Ahnenkult und Ahnenglaube im alten Rom,* (*Beihefte zum Archiv für Religionswissenschaft)*, Berlin & Leipzig 1966.

Caballos et al. 1996 — Caballos, R. A., *El Senadoconsulto de Gneo Pisón Padre*, Seville 1996.

Canina 1854 — Canina, L., 'Il tempio di Fortuna Muliebre al quarto miglio della via Latina', *AnnInst* 26 pp. 69-61.

Castagnoli 1958 — Castagnoli, F., *Le ricerche sui resti della Centuriazione*, Rome 1958.

Castagnoli 1984 — Castagnoli, F., 'L'arco di Germanico in Circo Flaminio', *ArchCl* 36 pp. 329- 332.

Cesarano 2012 — Cesarano, M., 'La sacerdos divi Augusti tra l'ascesa di Tiberio e la consecratio del divus Claudius', *Inter Classica* 21 pp. 93-107.

Champlin 1999 — Champlin, E. J., 'The first (1996) edition of the "Senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre": A review', *AJP* 120, pp. 117-122.

Champlin 2011 — Champlin, E. J., 'Tiberius and the heavenly twins', *JRS*, pp. 73-99.

Christian 1987 — Christian, L. G., *Theatrum mundi: the history of an idea*, Garland 1987.

Claridge 2015 — Claridge, A., *Rome. An Oxford archaeological guide* (2nd, enlarged and revised ed.), Oxford 2015.

Clauss 1999 — Clauss, M., *Kaiser und Gott. Herrscherkult im Römischen Reich*, Stuttgart 1999.

Coarelli 1974 — Coarelli, F., *Guida archeologica di Roma*, Rome 1974.

Coarelli 1978	Coarelli, F., 'La Statue de Cornélie, mère des Gracques, et la crise politique a Rome au temps de Saturninus', in eds. H. Zehnacker et al. *Le Dernier siècle de la République romaine et l'époque augustéenne*, Strasbourg 1978, pp. 13-28.
Coarelli & Thébert 1988	Coarelli, F., & Thebert, Y., 'Architecture funéraire et pouvoir: réflexions sur l'hellénisme numide' *MÉFRA* 100 pp. 761-818.
Connell 2009	Connell, R., *Gender: in world perspective*, Cambridge 2009.
Cooley 1998	Cooley, A. E., 'The moralizing message of the *senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre*', *GaR* 45 pp. 199-210.
Cooley 2009	Cooley, A. E., Res gestae divi Augusti*: text, translation and commentary*, Cambridge 2009.
Corbier 1991	Corbier M., 'Constructing kinship in Rome: marriage and divorce, filiation and adoption' in *The family in Italy from antiquity to present*, eds. D. I. Kertzer & P. Saller, New Haven 1991 pp. 127-144.
Corbier 1995	Corbier, M., 'Male power and legitimacy through women: the *domus Augusta* under the Julio-Claudians', in *Women in antiquity: new perspectives,* eds. R. Hawley B. Levick, London 1995 pp. 178-193.
Crawford 1983	Crawford, M. H., 'Roman imperial coin types and the formation of public opinion' in *Studies in numismatic method presented to Philip Grierson*, eds. C. H. V Brook et al., Cambridge 1983 pp. 47-64.
Crawford 1996	Crawford, M. H., *Roman statutes*, London 1996.
Crook 1996	Crook, J. A., s.v. 'Augustus', *CAH* 10 1996.
Damon 1999	Damon, C., 'The trial of Cn. Piso in Tacitus' Annals and the "senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre": New light on narrative technique', *AJP* 120 pp. 143-162.

Davies 1935	Davies, O., *Roman mines in Europe*, Oxford 1935.
Davies 2004	Davies, P. J. E., *Death and the emperor: Roman imperial funerary monuments from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius*, Austin 2004.
Davies 2005	Davies, G., 'On being seated: Gender and body language in Hellenistic and Roman art' in *Body language in the Greek and Roman worlds*, ed. D. Cairns, Swansea 2005 pp. 215-238.
de Grummond	de Grummond, N., '*Pax Augusta* and the *horae* on the *Ara Pacis Augustae*', *AJA* pp. 663–677.
de Vos 1980	de Vos, M., *L'Egittomania in pitture e mosaici romano-campani della prima età imperiale*, Leiden 1980.
Deininger 1965	Deininger J., *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit von Augustus bis zum Ende des dritten Jahrhunderts n. Chr.*, Munich 1965.
Delgado Delgado 1998	Delgado Delgado J. A., *Élites y organización de la religión en las provincias romanas de la Bética y las Mauritanias: sacerdotes y sacerdocios*, Oxford 1998.
Dillon 2007	Dillon, S., 'Portraits of women in the early Hellenistic period', in *Early Hellenistic portraiture: image, style, context*, eds. P. Schultz & R. von der Hoff, R., Cambridge 2007 pp. 63-83.
Dixon 1983	Dixon, S., 'A family business: Women's role in patronage and politics at Rome 80-44 BC.' *ClMed* 34 pp. 91-112.
Dixon 1988	Dixon, S., *The Roman mother*, London 1988.
Dixon 1992	Dixon, S., *The Roman family*, Baltimore 1992.
Dixon 2001	Dixon, S., *Reading Roman women*, London 2001.
Dixon 2007	Dixon, S., *Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi*, London 2007.

Domenicucci 1991	Domenicucci, P. 'La caretterizzazione astrale delle apoteosi di Romulo ed Ersilia nelle Metamorfosi di Ovidio', in *Cultura poesia ideologia nell'opera di Ovidio*, eds. I. Gallo & L. Nicastri, Naples 1991 pp. 221-228.
Dumézil 1974	Dumézil G., *Archaic Roman religion vol. 1* (trans. Philip Krapp), Baltimore 1974.
Dunbabin 1991	Dunbabin, K. M. D., '*Triclinium* and *stibadium*' in *Dining in a classical context* ed. W. J. Slater, Ann Arbor 1991.
Duncan-Jones 2005	Duncan-Jones, R. P., 'Implications of Roman coinage: debates and difference', *Klio* 87 pp. 459-487.
Eck et al. 1996	Eck, W., *Das Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone patre,* Munich 1996.
Eck 2000	Eck, W., 'Die Täuschung der Öffentligchkeit oder Die "Unparteilichkeit" des Historikers Tacitus', *A&A* 46 pp. 190-206.
Eck 2002	Eck, W., 'Cheating the public, or Tacitus vindicated', *Scripta Classica Israelica* 21 pp. 149-164.
Eck 2007	Eck, W., *The age of Augustus*, Malden 2007.
Edwards 1993	Edwards, C., *The Politics of immorality in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge 1993.
Eisenstadt & Roniger 1984	Eisenstadt, S. N & Roniger, L., *Patrons, clients and friends: interpersonal relations and the structure of trust in society,* Cambridge 1984.
Elsner 1991	Elsner, J., 'Cult and sculpture: Sacrifice in the *Ara Pacis Augustae*', *JRS* 81 pp. 50-61.
Etienne 1958	Etienne, R., *Le culte impérial dans la péninsule ibérique d'Auguste á Dioclétien*, Athens and Rome 1958.
Evans 1991	Evans, J. K., *War, women and children in ancient Rome*, London 1991.
Feeney 2009	Feeney, D., *Caesar's calendar. Ancient time and the beginnings of history*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 2009.

Fejfer 2008	Fejfer, J., *Roman portraits in context*, Berlin 2008.
Fejfer 2014	Fejfer, J., 'Statues of Roman women and cultural transmission: understanding the so-called Ceres statue as a Roman portrait carrier' in *Tradition: Transmission of culture in the ancient world*, eds. J. Fejfer M. Moltesen & A. Rathje, Chicago pp. 85-116.
Feldherr 2009	Feldherr, A. (ed.), *Cambridge companion to Roman historiography*, Cambridge 2009.
Fischler 1994	Fischler, S., 'Social stereotypes and historical analysis: the case of the imperial women at Rome' in *Women in ancient societies*, ed. L. J. Archer, S. Fischler & M. Wyke, New York 1994 pp. 115-133.
Fishwick 1969	Fishwick, D., '*Genius* and *numen*', *HTR* 62 pp. 356-367.
Fishwick 1978	Fishwick, D., 'The development of provincial ruler worship in the western Roman empire', *ANRW* 2 pp. 1201-1253.
Fishwick 1989	Fishwick, D., '*Di Caesarum*', *AntAfr* 25 pp. 111-114.
Fishwick 1992	Fishwick, D., 'Le *numen* impérial en Afrique romaine', *Afrique du Nord antique et médiévale, spectacles, vie portuaire, religion*, Paris 1992 pp. 83-94.
Fishwick 1994	Fishwick, D., '*Numinibus Aug(ustorum)*', *Britannia* 24 pp. 127-141.
Fishwick 1987-2005	Fishwick, D., *The imperial cult in the Latin West: studies in the ruler cult of the western provinces of the Roman empire*, Leiden 1987-2005.
Flory 1984	Flory, M. B, '*Sic exempla parantur*: Livia's shrine to Concordia and the *Porticus Liviae*,' *Historia* 33 pp. 309-330.
Flory 1988	Flory, M. B., '*Abducta Neroni uxor*: The historiographical tradition on the marriage of Octavian and Livia, *TAPA* 118 pp. 343-359.

Flory 1993 — Flory, M. B., 'Livia and the history of public honorific statues for women in Rome', *TAPA* 123 pp. 287-308.

Flory 1995 — Flory, M. B., 'The deification of Roman women', *Ancient History Bulletin* 9 pp. 127–134.

Flory 1996 — Flory, M. B., 'Dynastic ideology, the *domus Augusta*, and imperial women: A lost statuary group in the Circus Flaminius', *TAPA* 126 pp. 287-308.

Flory 1998 — Flory, M. B, 'Octavian and the omen of the *gallina alba*' , *CJ* 84:4 pp. 343–356.

Flower 1996 — Flower, H., *Ancestor masks and aristocratic power in Roman culture*, Oxford 1996.

Flower 1998 — Flower, H., 'Rethinking "damnatio memoriae": The case of Cn. Piso pater in AD 20', *ClAnt* 17, pp. 155-187.

Fraschetti 1996 — Fraschetti A., 'Indice analitico della *Consolatio ad Liviam Augustam de morte Drusi Neronis filii eius qui in Germania de morbo periit*', *Antiquité Année* pp. 191-239.

Fraschetti 1988 — Fraschetti A., 'Osservazioni sulla *Tabula Siarensis* ("frg I", l. 6-8)', *Epigraphica* 50 pp. 47-60.

Frei Stolba 1998 — Frei Stolba, R., 'Recherches sur la position juridique et sociale de Livie, l'épouse d'Auguste' in *Femmes et vie publique dans l'Antiquité gréco-romaine* eds. A. Bielman & R. Frei-Stolba, Lausanne, 1998 pp. 65–89.

Fröhlich 1991 — Fröhlich, T., *Lararien- und Fassadenbilder in den Vesuvstädten. Untersuchungen zur 'volkstümlichen' pompeianischen Malerei*, Mainz 1991.

Galinsky 1992 — Galinsky, K., 'Venus, Polysemy, and the *Ara Pacis Augustae*', *AJA* 96 pp. 457-475.

Galinsky 1996 — Galinsky, K., *Augustan culture: an interpretive introduction*, Princeton 1996.

Galinsky 2012 — Galinsky, K., *Augustus: introduction to the life of an emperor*, Cambridge 2012.

Gardner 1998 — Gardner, J. F., *Family and familia in Roman law and life*, Oxford 1998.

Gatti 1888 — Gatti, G., 'Dove erano situati il Teatro di Balbo e il Circo Flaminio', *Capitiolium* 35.7 (1960) pp. 3-12.

Geertz 1980 — Geertz C., *Negara*, Princeton 1980.

Gigli 1981 — Gigli, S. Q., 'Annotazioni topograpiche sul tempio della Fortuna Muliebris', *MÉFRA* 93 pp. 547-563.

Gonzáles 1984 — Gonzáles, J., '*Tabula Siarensis, Fortunales Siarenses et Municipia Civium Romanorum*,' *ZPE* 55 pp. 55-100.

Gonzáles 1988 — Gonzáles, J. (ed.), *Estudios sobre Urso colonia Iulia Genetiva*, Andalusia 1988.

Gorio 1727 — Gorio, A. F., *Monumentum sive coumbarium libertorum Liviae Augustae et Caesarum*, Florence 1727.

Gorrie 2004 — Gorrie, C., 'Julia Domna's building patronage, imperial family roles, and the Severan revival of moral legislation', *Historia* 53 pp. 61–72.

Gowing 2009 — Gowing, A. M., 'The Roman *exempla* tradition in imperial Greek historiography: the case of Camillus' in *Cambridge companion to Roman historiography*, ed. A. Feldherr, Cambridge 2009 pp. 332-347.

Gradel 2002 — Gradel, I., *Emperor worship and Roman religion*, Oxford 2002.

Graves 1934 — Graves, R., I, *Claudius: from the autobiography of Tiberius Claudius born B. C. 10, murdered and deified A. D. 54*, London 1934.

Graves 1935 — Graves, R., *Claudius the god and his wife Messalina*, London 1935.

Green 2004 — Green, S., *Ovid*, *Fasti 1. A commentary*, (Mnemosyne, suppl. 251), Leiden 2004.

Grether 1946 — Grether, G., 'Livia and the Roman imperial cult', *AJP* 67 pp. 222-252.

Griffin 1997 — Griffin, M., Review: 'The Senate's story: *Das Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre*', *JRS* 87 pp. 249-263.

Gross 1962 — Gross, W. H, *Iulia Augusta: Undersuchungen zur Grundlegung einer Livia-Ikonographie*, Göttingen 1962.

Gruen 2005 — Gruen, E. S., 'Augustus and the making of the principate', in *The Cambridge companion to the age of Augustus*, ed. K. Galinsky, 2005 pp. 33-52.

Habinek 2002 — Habinek, T., 'Ovid and empire' in *The Cambridge companion to Ovid* ed. P. Hardie, Cambridge 2002 pp. 46-61.

Hahn 1994 — Hahn, U., *Die Frauen des römischen Kaiserhauses und ihre Ehrungen im griechischen Osten anhand epigraphischer und numismatischer Zeugnisse von Livia bis Sabina*, Saarbrücken 1994.

Hammar 2013 — Hammar, I., *Making enemies. The logic of immorality in Ciceronian oratory*, Lund 2013.

Hardie 2002 — Hardie, P. (ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Ovid*, Cambridge 2002.

Harvey 2011 — Harvey, T., *The visual representation of Livia on the coins of the Roman empire*, Edmonton 2011.

Hasegawa 2005 — Hasegawa, K., *The familia urbana during the early empire: A study of columbaria inscriptions*, Oxford 2005.

Hedlund 2008 — Hedlund, R., *"... achieved nothing worthy of memory." Coinage and authority in the Roman empire c. AD 260-295*, Uppsala 2008.

Hekster 2003 — Hekster, O., 'Coins and messages. Audience targeting on coins of different denominations' in *The representation and perception of Roman imperial power* eds. L. de Blois et al., Amsterdam 2003 pp. 20-35.

Hemelrijk 1999 — Hemelrijk, E.A., *Matrona docta. Educated women in the Roman élite from Cornelia to Julia Domna*, London & New York, 1999.

Hemelrijk 2005a — Hemelrijk, E.A., 'Octavian and the introduction of public statues for women in Rome', *Athenaeum* 93.1 pp. 309-317.

Hemelrijk 2005b — Hemelrijk, E. A., 'Priestesses of the imperial cult in the Latin west,' *AntCl* 75 pp. 137-161.

Hemelrijk 2015 — Hemelrijk, E.A., *Hidden lives, public personae. Women and civic life in the Roman west*, Oxford 2015.

Herbert-Brown 1994 — Herbert-Brown, G., *Ovid and the 'Fasti': an historical study*, Oxford 1994.

Herbert-Brown 2002 — Herbert-Brown, G. (ed.), *Ovid's Fasti: Historical readings at its bimillennium*, Oxford 2002.

Herrmann 1960 — Herrmann, P., *Die Inschriften römischer Zeit aus dem Heraion von Samos*, Berlin 1960.

von Hesberg 1994 — von Hesberg, H., *Formen privater Repräsentation in der Paukunst des 2. und 1. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Köln 1994.

Hillard 1992 — Hillard, T. W., 'On the stage, behind the curtain' in *Stereotypes of women in power*, eds. B. Garlick, S. Dixon, S. P. Allen, New York 1992 pp. 37-64.

Hohl 1937 — Hohl, E., 'Zu den Testamenten des Augustus', *Klio* 14 pp. 61-75.

Holland 2012 — Holland, L. L., 'Women and Roman religion' in *A Companion to women in the Ancient world,* eds. S. L. James & S. Dillon, Malden 2012 pp. 204-215.

Horster 2013 — Horster, M., 'Coinage and images of the imperial family: local identity and Roman rule', *JRA* 26 pp. 243-262.

Howgego 1995 — Howgego. C., *Ancient History from coins*, London 1995.

Huntsman 1997 — Huntsman, E. D., *The family and property of Livia Drusilla*, Ann Arbor 1997.

Hölkeskamp 2010 — Hölkeskamp, J. *Reconstructing the Roman republic: an ancient political culture and modern research* (trans. H. Heitmann-Gordon), Princeton 2010.

Hölscher 2008 — Hölscher, T., 'The concept of roles and the malaise of 'identity': Ancient Rome and the modern world' in *Role models in the Roman world: identity and assimilation* eds. S. Bell & I.-L. Hansen, Ann Arbor 2008 pp. 41-56.

Illouz 2012	Illouz, E., *Why love hurts*, Cambridge 2012.
Jenkins 2009	Jenkins, E. J., 'Livia the *princeps*: Gender and ideology in the *Consolatio ad Liviam*,' *Helios* 36 pp. 1-25.
Joshel 2001	Joshel, S. R., 'I, Claudius: Projection and imperial soap opera' in *Imperial projections: ancient Rome in modern popular culture*, eds. S.R. Joshel, M. Malamud and D. T. McGuire Jr., Baltimore 2001 pp. 119-161.
Judge 2008	Judge, E. A., 'Caesar's son and heir' in *The first christians in the Roman world: Augustan and New Testament essays*, eds. E.A. Judge & J.R. Harrison, Tübingen 2008, pp. 90-110.
Kajava 2000	Kajava, M., 'Livia and Nemesis', *Arctos* 34 pp. 39–61.
Kampen 1991	Kampen, N. B, *Between public and private: women as historical subjects in Roman art*, Chapel Hill 1991.
Kampen 2009	Kampen, N. B., *Family fictions in Roman art*, New York 2009.
Kearsley 2005	Kearsley, R. A., 'Women and public life in imperial Asia Minor: Hellenistic tradition and Augustan ideology', *Ancient West and East* 4 pp. 98-121.
Kendall 1957	Kendall, P. L., 'Theory and research: the case studies in medical education' in *The idea of social structure*, ed. C.A. Coser New York 1975 pp. 301-21.
Kertzer & Saller 1991	Kertzer D. I. & Saller, R. (eds.), *The family in Italy from antiquity to present*, New Haven 1991.
Kleiner 1978	Kleiner, D. E. E., 'The great friezes of the *Ara Pacis Augustae*: Greek sources, Roman derivatives, and Augustan social policy', *MEFR* pp. 753-785.
Kleiner 1992	Kleiner, D. E. E., *Roman sculpture*, New Haven 1992.

Kleiner & Matheson 1996 Kleiner, D. E. E. & Matheson, S. B. (eds.) *I, Claudia: women in ancient Rome*, New Haven 1996.

Kleiner & Buxton 2008 Kleiner, D. E. E. & Buxton, B., 'Pledges of empire: the *Ara Pacis* and the donations of Rome', *AJA* 112 pp. 57-89.

Kleiner 2009 Kleiner, D. E. E., *Cleopatra and Rome*, Harvard 2009.

Klynne 2002 Klynne, A., *Terra sigillata from the Villa of Livia, Rome: consumption and discard in the early principate: the Prima Porta Garden Archaeological Project*, Uppsala 2002.

Knox 2009 Knox, P. E. (ed.), *A Companion to Ovid,* Malden 2009.

Kraft 1967 Kraft, K., 'Der Sinn des Mausoleums des Augustus', *Historia* 16 pp. 189-206.

Kunst 2008 Kunst, C., *Livia. Macht und Intrigen am Hof des Augustus*, Stuttgart 2008.

La Rocca 1983 La Rocca, E., *Ara Pacis Augustae,* Rome 1983.

Lancini 1893-1901 Lancini, R., *Forma urbis Romae*, Milan, 1893-1901.

Langlands 2014 Langlands R., 'Exemplary influences and Augustus' pernicious moral legacy' in *Suetonius the biographer: studies in Roman lives* eds. T. Power & R. K. Gibson, Oxford 2014 pp. 111-129.

Lebek 1999 Lebek, W., '*Das Senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone* patre und Tacitus', *ZPE* 128 pp. 183-211.

Lendon 1997 Lendon, J.E., *Empire of honour. The Art of government in the Roman world*, Oxford 1997.

Levick 1976 Levick, B., *Tiberius the politician*, London 1976.

Levick 2010 Levick, B., *Augustus: image and substance*, Harlow 2010.

Linderski 1974 Linderski, J., 'The mother of Livia Augusta and the Aufidii Lurcones of the republic.' *Historia* 23 pp. 463-480.

Lindsay 2009	Lindsay, H., *Adoption in the Roman world*, Cambridge 2009.
Lobur 2008	Lobur, J. A., *Consensus, concordia, and the formation of Roman imperial ideology*, New York 2008.
Lott 2012	Lott., B. J., *Death and dynasty in early imperial Rome: Key sources, with text, translation, and commentary.* Cambridge 2012.
Maiuri 1931	Maiuri, , A., *La villa dei misteri*, Rome 1931.
Makay 2003	Makay, C., '*Questiones Pisonianae*: Procedural and chronological notes on the "S.C. de Cn. Pisone patre"', *HSCP* 101 pp. 311-370.
Malaise 1972	Malaise, M., *Les conditions de pénétration et de diffusion des cultes égyptiens en Italie*, Leiden 1972.
Manders 2012	Manders, E., *Coining images of power. Patterns in the representation of Roman emperors on imperial coinage, A.D. 193-284*, Leiden 2012.
Martin 1981	Martin, R., *Tacitus,* London and Berkley, 1981.
Mattingly 1960	Mattingly, H., *Roman coins from the earliest times to the fall of the western empire*, 2nd ed London 1960.
Megow 1987	Megow, W. R., *Kameen von Augustus bis Alexander Severus*, Berlin 1987.
Mendel 1957	Mendel, C. W., *Tacitus: the man and his work*, New Haven 1957.
Merton, Reader & Kendall 1957	Merton, R. K., Reader G. G. & Kendal P. L., *The student-physician: introductory studies in the sociology of medical education*, Cambridge 1957.
Merton 1968	Merton, R. K., *Social theory and social structure*, New York 1968.
Metcalf 1993	Metcalf, W. E., 'Whose *liberalitas*? Propaganda and audience in the early Roman empire', RIN 95 pp. 337-346.
Meyer 1998	Meyer, E., Review: '*Das senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre*', *CJ* 93 pp. 315-324.

Mikocki 1995 — Mikocki, T. *Sub specie deae: les impératrices et princesses romaines assimilées* à *des déesses: étude iconologique*, Rome 1995.

Millar 1964 — Millar, F. G. B, *A Study of Cassius Dio*, Oxford 1964.

Millar 1977 — Millar, F. G. B, *The emperor in the Roman world 31 BC - AD 337*, London 1977.

Milledge-Nelson 1999 — Milledge-Nelson, S., 'Rethinking gender and power' in *Manifesting power: gender and the interpretation of power in archaeology* ed. T.L. Sweeley, London 1999 pp. 184-189.

Milnor 2005 — Milnor, K., *Gender, domesticity, and the age of Augustus: Inventing private life*, Oxford 2005.

Milnor 2009a — Milnor, K., 'Women and domesticity' in *A companion to Tacitus* ed. E.V. Pagán, Oxford 2009 pp. 458-476.

Milnor 2009b — Milnor, K., Women in Roman historiography in *The Cambridge companion to Roman historiography*, ed. A. Feldherr, Cambridge 2009 pp. 276-287.

Munk Højte 2005 — Munk Højte, J., *Roman imperial statue bases from Augustus to Commodus*, Aarhus 2005.

Nicolet 1995 — Nicolet, C., 'La *tabula Siarensis*, la plebe et les statues de Germanicus' in *Leaders and masses in the Roman world*, eds. I. Malink & Z.W. Rubinsohn, Leiden 1995 pp. 115-127.

Noreña 2001 — Noreña, C. F., 'The communication of the emperor's virtues', JRS 91 pp. 146-168.

Oliver 1965 — Oliver, J. H., 'Livia as Artemis Boulaia at Athens', *CP* 60 p. 179.

Ollendorf 1926 — Ollendorf, L., 'Livius (Livia)' no. 37 *RE* 13 cols. 900-927.

Orr 1978 — Orr, D. G., 'Roman domestic religion: The evidence of the household shrines', *ANRW* pp. 1557-1591.

Osgood 2006 — Osgood, J., *Caesar's legacy: civil war and the emergence of the Roman empire*, New York 2006.

Osgood 2011	Osgood, J., *A Suetonius reader: selections from the lives of the Caesars and the life of Horace*, Mundelein 2011.
Osgood 2012	Osgood, J., Review: *Augustan Rome 44 BC to AD 14: the restoration of the republic and the establishment of the empire* by J.S. Richardson, *BMCR* 2012.
Osgood 2014	Osgood, J., Turia. *A Roman woman's civil war*, Oxford 2014.
Pagán 2012	Pagán, E.V. (ed), *A companion to Tacitus,* Oxford 2012.
Palmer 1974	Palmer, R. E. A., 'Roman shrines of female chastity from the caste struggle to the papacy of Innocent I', *RivStorAnt* 4 pp. 122-159.
Panella 1984	Panella, C., 'L'organizzazione degli spazi sulle pendici settentrionali del colle Oppio tra Augusta e i Severi', *CEFR* 98 pp. 611-651.
Pelling 1993	Pelling, C., 'Tacitus and Germanicus' in *Tacitus and the Tacitean tradition* eds. T.J. Luce & A.J. Woodman, Princeton 1993 pp. 59-85.
Perkounig 1995	Perkounig, C.-M., *Livia Drusilla – Iulia Augusta*, Vienna 1995.
Platner & Ashby 1929	Platner S. B. & Ashby T. *A topographical dictonary of Ancient Rome*, Rome 1929.
Pollini 2012	Pollini, J., *From republic to empire: Rhetoric, religion, and power in the visual culture of ancient Rome,* Oklahoma 2012.
Potter 1998	Potter, D., '*Senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone', JRA* 11, pp. 437-457.
Power & Gibson 2014	Power, T. & Gibson R. K. (eds.), *Suetonius the biographer: Studies in Roman lives*, Oxford 2014.
Premerstein von 1964	Premerstein von A., *Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats*, München 1964.
Price 1984a	Price, S. R. F., *Rituals and power. The Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor*, Cambridge 1984.
Price 1984b	Price, S. R. F., 'Gods and emperors: The Greek language of the Roman imperial cult', *JHS* 104 pp. 79-95.

Purcell 1986 — Purcell, N., 'Livia and the womenhood of Rome', *PCPS* 212 pp. 78-105.

Pye & Verba 1965 — Pye, L. & Verba, S. (eds.), *Political culture and political development*, Princeton 1965.

Rapsch 2004 — Rapsch, A., *Soziologie der Freundschaft*, Stuttgart 2004.

Rathmayr 2006 — Rathmayr, E., 'Götter- und Kaiserkult im häuslichen Bereich anhand von Skulpturen aus dem Hanghaus 2 in Ephesos.' *Römisch-Historische Mitteilungen* 48 pp. 119–149.

Rawson 1987 — Rawson, B., *The family in ancient Rome. New perspectives*, Ithaca 1987.

Rawson 1991 — Rawson, B. (ed.), *Marriage, divorce and children in ancient Rome*, Oxford 1991.

Rawson & Weaver 1997 — Rawson, B. & Weaver, P. (eds.), *The Roman family in Italy: status, sentiment, space*, Oxford 1997.

Reeder 2001 — Reeder, J.C., *The villa of Livia ad gallinas albas. A study in the Augustan villa and garden*, Providence 2001.

Rehak 2006 — Rehak, P., *Imperium and cosmos. Augustus and the northern Campus Martius*, Wisconsin 2006.

Reynolds 1982 — Reynolds, J. M., *Aphrodisias and Rome: documents from the excavation of the theatre at Aphrodisias conducted by Kenan T. Erim; together with some related texts*, London 1982.

Ridgway 1984 — Ridgway, B. S., *Roman copies of Greek sculpture: the problem of the originals*, Ann Arbor 1984.

Richard 1970 — Richard, J. C., "'Mausoleum" d'Halicarnasse à Rome, puis d'Alexandrie', *Latomus* 29 pp. 370-388.

Richardson 1997 — Richardson, J. S., 'The senate, the courts, and the SC de Cn. Pisone patre', *CQ* 47, pp. 510-518.

Richardson 2012 — Richardson, J. S., *Augustan Rome 44 BC to AD 14: the restoration of the republic and the establishment of the empire*, Edinburgh 2012.

Richmond 1981 — Richmond, J. A., 'Doubtful work ascribed to Ovid,' *ANRW* II pp. 2773-2782.

Rietbergen 2006 — Rietbergen P. J. A. N., *Power and religion in baroque Rome: Barberini cultural policies*, Leiden 2006.

Ritter 1972 — Ritter, H.-W., 'Livias Erhebung zur Augusta', *Chiron* 2 pp. 313-338.

Rives 1992 — Rives J., 'The *iuno feminae* in the Roman society', *EchCl* 11 pp. 33-49.

Rodgers 2003 — Rodgers, R., 'Female representations in Roman art: feminizing the provincial "other"', *Roman imperialism and provincial art* eds. S. Scott & J. Webster, Cambridge 2003.

Rogers 1947 — Rogers, R. S., ''The emperors as heirs and legatees,' *TAPA* 78 pp. 140-158.

Rose 1990 — Rose, C.B., '"Princes" and barbarians on the Ara Pacis', *AJA* 94 pp. 453-67.

Rose 1997 — Rose, C.B., *Dynastic commemoration and imperial portraiture in Julio-Claudian Rome*, New York 1997.

Roullet 1972 — Roullet, A., *The Egyptian and Egyptianizing monuments of imperial Rome*, Leiden 1972.

Rowe 2002 — Rowe, G., *Princes and political cultures: The new Tiberian senatorial decrees*, Ann Arbor 2002.

Russell 2016 — Russell, A., *The politics of public space in republican Rome*, Cambridge 2016.

Rutland 1978 — Rutland, L. W., 'Women as makers of kings in Tacitus' Annals,' *CW* 72 pp. 15-29.

Ryberg 1955 — Ryberg, I. S., 'Rites of the state religion in Roman art', *MAAR* vol. 22 pp. 1-227.

Saller 1982 — Saller, R.P, *Personal patronage under the early empire*, Cambridge 1982.

Saller 1994 — Saller, P., P*atriarchy, property and death in the Roman family*, Cambridge 1994.

Saller 1998 — Saller, P., 'Symbols of gender and status hierarchies on the Roman household' in *Women and slaves in the Greco-Roman culture. Different equations* eds. S. R: Joshel & S. Murnaghan, London 1998 pp. 85-91.

Sánchez-Ostiz 1999	Sánchez-Ostiz, G. A., *Tabula Siarensis: edición, traducción y comentario*, Pamplona 1999.
Scardigli 1982	Scardigli, B., 'La *sacrosanctitas tribunicia* di Ottavia e Livia', *Atti della Facoltá di Lettere e Filologia dell'Università di Siena* 3 pp. 61–64.
Scheer 2006	Scheer, T. S., 'Bilder der Macht? Repräsentationen römischer Kaiserinnen' in *Images and gender: contributions to the hermeneutics of reading ancient art*, ed. S. Schroer, Götingen 2006 pp. 295-321.
Sheid 1990	Sheid, J., *Romulus et ses frères: le collège des Frères Arvales, moèle du culte public dans la Rome des empereurs*, Rome 1990.
Schilling 1978	Schilling, R., 'Genius', *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 10 pp. 52-83.
Schinkel 2003	Schinkel, A., *Freundschaft von der gemeinsamen Selbstverwirklichungzum Beziehungsmanagement*, Freiburg 2003.
Schmaltz 2009	Schmaltz, G. C. R., *Augustan and Julio-Claudian Athens. A new epigraphy and prosopography*, Leiden 2009.
Schoonhoven 1992	Schoonhoven, H., *The Pseudo-Ovidian Ad Liviam de morte Drusi*, Gronigen 1992.
Schrijvers 1988	Schrijvers P. H., 'A propos de la datation de la *Consolatio ad Liviam*', *Mnemosyne* 41 pp. 381-384.
Scott 1986	Scott, J., *Gender and the politics of history*, New York 1986.
Seagar 2013	Seagar, R., 'Perceptions of the *domus Augusta*, AD 4-24', in *The Julio-Claudian succession* ed. A. G. G. Gibson, Leiden 2013.
Serviez de 1758	Serviez de, J.R., *Les impératrices romaines*, Paris 1758.
Severy 2003	Severy, B., *Augustus and the family at the birth of the Roman empire*, New York 2003.
Shipley 1931	Shipley, F. W., 'Chronology of the building operations in Rome from the death of Caesar to the death of Augustus', *MAAR* 9 pp. 7-60.

Simpson 2008	Simpson, C., 'The Julian succession and its Claudian coda: a different perspective on the so-called Julio-Claudian dynasty', *Latomus* 67 pp. 353-365.
Spaeth 1996	Spaeth, B. S., *The Roman goddess Ceres,* Austin 1996.
Späth 2012	Späth T., 'Masculinity and gender performance in Tacitus' in *A companion to Tacitus* ed. E.V. Pagán, Oxford 2012 pp. 431-457.
Spencer-Wood 1999	Spencer-Wood S. M., 'Gendering power' in *Manifesting power: gender and the interpretation of power in archaeology* ed. T.L. Sweeley, London 1999 pp. 175-183.
Stafford 2013	Stafford, E., 'The people to the goddess Livia. Attic Nemesis and the Roman imperial cult', *Kernos* 26 pp. 205-238.
Strack 1937	Strack, P. L., U*ntersuchungen zur römischen Reichsprägung des zweiten Jahrhunderts*, *Teil I, Trajan. Teil II, Hadrian*, Stuttgart 1937.
Stuart 1936	Stuart, M., 'The date of the inscription of Claudius on the Arch of Ticinum', *AJA* 40 pp. 314–322.
Strunk 2014	Strunk, T., 'Rape and revolution: Livia and Augustus in Tacitus' Annales', *Latomus* 73 pp. 126-148.
Suerbaum 1980	Suerbaum W., 'Merkwürdige Geburtstage: Der nicht-existierende Geburtstag des M. Antonius, der doppelte Geburtstag des Augustus, der neue Geburtstag der Livia und der vorzeitige Geburtstag des älteren Drusus,' *Chiron* 10 pp. 327-355.
Sutherland 1951	Sutherland, C. H. V., *Coinage in Roman imperial policy*, *31 BC – AD 68*, London 1951.
Swan 2004	Swan, P. M., *The Augustan succession. An historical commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman history books 55-56 (9 B.C-A.D 14*), Oxford 2004.

Syme 1939	Syme, R., *The Roman revolution*, Oxford 1939.
Syme 1958	Syme, R., *Tacitus*, Oxford 1958.
Syme 1970	Syme, R., *Ten studies in Tacitus*, Oxford 1970.
Syme 1981	Syme, R., 'Princesses and others in Tacitus', *GaR* 28 pp. 40-52.
Tenbruck 1964	Tenbruck, F., 'Freundschaft. Ein Beitrag zu einer Soziologie der persönlichen Beziehungen', *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 16 pp. 434 - 436.
Treggiari 1975	Treggiari, S., 'Jobs in the household of Livia', *PBSR* 43, pp. 48-77.
Treggiari 1993	Treggiari, S., *Roman marriage: iusti coniuges from the time of Cicero to the time of Ulpian*, Oxford 1993.
Treggiari 1994	Treggiari, S., '*Leges sine moribus*', *Ancient History Bulletin* 8 pp. 86–98.
Treggiari 2007	Treggiari, S., *Terentia, Tullia and Publilia. The women of Cicero's family*, London 2007.
Vidén 1993	Vidén, G., *Women in Roman literature: attitudes of authors under the early empire*, Gothenburg 1993.
Wallace-Hadrill 1983	Wallace-Hadrill, A., *Suetonius: The scholar and his Caesars*, London 1983.
Wallace-Hadrill 1989	Wallace-Hadrill, A., *Patronage in ancient society*, Cambridge 1989.
Wallensten, forthcoming	Wallensten, J., 'New gods for a new world. Observations on a mythological interplay between Greeks and Romans', forthcoming.
Weaver 1972	Weaver, P. R. C, *Familia Caesaris: a social study of the emperor's freedmen and slaves,* Cambridge 1972.
Weiss 2000	Weiss, P., 'Euergesie oder römische Prägegenehmigung: Λιτησαμένου-Formular auf Städtemünzen der Provinz Asia, Roman Provincial Coinage (RPC) II und persönliche Aufwendungen im Münzwesen', *Chiron* 30 pp. 235-254.

Weiss 2003	Weiss, P., 'Zwischen Routine und Euergesie, Traditionen und Trends. Das kaiserzeitliche Städtegeld des Ostens' in *Stadt und Stadtentwicklung in Kleinasien* eds. E. Schwertheim & E. Winter, Bonn 2003.
Welch 2011	Welch, K., 'Velleius and Livia: making a portrait' in *Velleius Paterculus: Making history* ed. C. Cowan, Swansea 2011 pp. 309-334.
Williams 2002	Williams, G., 'Ovid's exile poetry' in *The Cambridge companion to Ovid* ed. P. Hardie, Cambridge 2002 pp. 233-246.
Wilson 2004	Wilson, A. I., 'Villas, horticulture and irrigation infrastructure in the Tiber Valley' in *Mercator placidissimus: The Tiber Valley in Antiquity. New research in the upper and middle river valley* eds. F. Coarelli & H. Patterson, Rome 2004 pp. 731-768.
Willrich 1911	Willrich, H., *Livia*, Berlin & Leipzig, 1911.
Winkes 1995	Winkes, R., *Leben und Ehrungen der Livia : ein Beitrag zur Entwicklung des römischen Herrscherkultes von der Zeit des Triumvirats bis Claudius,* Wroclaw 1995.
Winterling 2009	Winterling, A. A., *Politics and society in imperial Rome*, Oxford 2009.
Wiseman 1965	Wiseman, T. P, 'The mother of Livia Augusta', *Historia* 14 pp. 333-334.
Wiseman & Wiseman 2011	Wiseman A. & Wiseman P., *Ovid: times and reasons : a new translation of Fasti*, Oxford 2011.
Wissowa 1912	Wissowa, G., *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, Munich 1912 (repr. 1971).
Wolf 1966	Wolf, E. R., *Peasants*, New Jersey 1966.
Wood 1999	Wood, S. E., *Imperial women: A study in public images, 40 BC – AD 68*, Lediden 1999.
Woodhull 1999	Woodhull, M., *Building power: women as architectural patrons during the Roman empire, 30 BCE-54 CE*, Austin 1999.
Woodman 2009	Woodman, A. J. (ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Tacitus*, Cambridge 2009.

Yakobson 1998 — Yakobson, A., 'The princess of inscriptions', *Scripta Classica Israelica* 17 pp. 206-224.

Zachos 2003 — Zachos, K., 'The *tropaeum* of the sea-battle of Actium at Nikopolis: interim report', *AJA* 2003 pp. 64-92.

Zanker 1979 — Zanker, P., 'Prinzipat und Herrscherbild', *Gymnasium* 86 pp. 353-368.

Zanker 1990 — Zanker, P., *The power of images in the age of Augustus* (trans. A. Shapiro), Ann Arbor 1990.

Zanker 2010 — Zanker, P., *Roman Art* (trans. H. Heitmann-Gordon), Los Angeles, 2010.

Östenberg 2009 — Östenberg, I., *Staging the world: Spoils, captives, and representations in the Roman triumphal procession*, Oxford 2009.