FAMILY AND STATE IN THE EARLY IMPERIAL MONARCHY: THE *SENATUS CONSULTUM DE PISONE PATRE,* TABULA SIARENSIS, AND TABULA HEBANA

BETH SEVERY

THE DISCOVERY AND PUBLICATION of the *senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre* (hereafter, *SC de Pisone*), which details the results of the conspiracy trial of Cn. Piso held in 20 C.E., has created a great deal of scholarly excitement. Werner Eck, Antonio Caballos, and Ferrando Fernández (1996) have produced widely acclaimed initial publications of the decree in Spanish and German, and a first round of scholarly reaction has focused on the details of their epigraphical, prosopographical, and historical commentary.[1] Roman historians have particularly seized the tantalizing opportunity to compare the *senatus consultum* with Tacitus' account of the early Tiberian period; the newly discovered decree, in combination with the 19 C.E. senatorial decrees and consular law inscribed on the Tabula Siarensis and Tabula Hebana, provides an invaluable glimpse into Tacitus' source material and historiographical techniques in reporting on the early Julio-Claudians.[2]

But what can these documents reveal to us about the period in which they were written? The founder of the new order, Augustus, had died in 14 C.E. His successor, Tiberius, was the first man to inherit the role of *princeps,* and thus the years immediately following contain critical moments in Rome's successful transformation from the oligarchy of the republic into the monarchy of the empire. Fergus Millar, in his recent analysis of Ovid's work from the late Augustan and early Tiberian period, has called attention to our need to study these years more closely (1993, 7):

> If we are to understand the revolution of consciousness brought about by the emergence of a monarch from within the traditional *res publica,* it is here, and not with the great writers of a generation, or half-generation, earlier, that we should begin.

The *SC de Pisone,* Tabula Siarensis, and Tabula Hebana indeed provide a healthy collection of official, senatorial prose from this crucial period. Produced no more than a year apart, these documents provide unique and rich

1. Including Flower 1997; Griffin 1994; Meyer 1998; Potter 1998; Yakobson 1998; and Champlin 1999. English translations are provided by Griffin, Meyer, Potter 1998, and Potter and Damon 1999.

2. See especially Potter 1998; Barnes 1998; González 1999; Talbert 1999; Damon 1999; and Woodman and Martin 1996.

Classical Philology 95 (2000): 318–37
 0009-837X/00/9503-0005$02.00

evidence of contemporary senatorial rhetoric and official ideology. David Potter (1999) has begun an investigation of this ideology by analyzing references to imperial "virtues" in the *SC de Pisone,* that is, the qualities of Tiberius that rhetorically justify his position in the community, and the history of this rhetoric of virtue in the late republican and Augustan periods. This is not the only source of Tiberius' authority recognized in the decree, however: the author(s) carefully emphasize Tiberius' relationship to his family and his family's relationship to Rome. The presentation of the imperial family in the senatorial documents of 19–20 C.E. deserves closer attention.

Millar argues that Ovid's poetry from the reign of Tiberius evinces the rise of a language to identify and discuss the imperial family as an institution. I suggest that the Tiberian documents can be read as similar attempts to describe people and politics within a *res publica* controlled by a Roman family. As we shall see, the inscriptions on the Tabulae Siarensis and Hebana honor the dead son of the emperor by integrating his memorial into Roman public institutions, including electoral bodies, the plebeian, equestrian, and senatorial orders, the rituals performed by state priests, and the imperial family. In turn, the *SC de Pisone* presents the surviving imperial family, including the female members of the household, as a civic institution, while punishing Piso in part for failing to fulfill his family obligations. The authors of these official documents are thus shown to be actively reshaping the notions of public and private, family and state, as they adapt to and help create a new power structure early in the reign of the second Roman emperor.

BACKGROUND TO THE INSCRIPTIONS

Tacitus provides in the *Annales* the specific historical background to the production of the documents under investigation. Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso, appointed governor of Syria by Tiberius in 17 C.E., quarreled with Tiberius' adopted son Germanicus, who had been given supervisory command of Roman forces in the east (*Ann.* 2.43, 2.55, 2.57, 2.69). When Piso was replaced as governor, he briefly left his province, only to return in armed conflict against his gubernatorial successor (2.74.2, 2.80–81). At about the same time, in 19 C.E., Germanicus died, and rumors accused Piso of poisoning him (2.69–71, 2.73.5–6). The death of an imperial heir, the procession of his widow and children to Rome (2.75), an outbreak of armed civil conflict, and ongoing rumors created quite a public stir (2.82; cf. Suet. *Calig.* 5).

Germanicus' remains were returned to Rome for burial, during which time senatorial decrees and a law were passed enumerating honors for the deceased son of the emperor (2.83).[3] Parts of the law, the *lex Valeria Aurelia,* are preserved on the Tabula Hebana, found in 1947 near Grossetto, Italy,[4] while the fragmentary Tabula Siarensis, discovered in Spain in 1982, contains

3. The number of decrees and their relationship to the law are still unclear; see most recently González 1999.

4. First fully published by Oliver and Palmer 1954; for English translation and commentary, see Johnson, Coleman-Norton, and Bourne 1961, 131–35.

parts of a related decree or decrees.[5] In turn, on Piso's return to the capital, hearings were held in the senate for several days, in the midst of which the defendant committed suicide (3.1–19). The *SC de Pisone,* discovered in several fragmentary copies in Spain, summarizes the findings of the senate against the dead Piso and a few coconspirators.[6]

THE MIXING OF FAMILY AND STATE IN THE HONORS OF GERMANICUS

After Augustus won the last of the triumviral civil wars, in 30 B.C.E., he began to experiment with a variety of images and terms to express his evolving relationship with Rome. His statue in the center of the Forum Augustum and his epigraphic autobiography suggest that ultimately he found the analogy of a father to a family most useful. The statue inscription (Vell. 2.39) and the *Res Gestae* (35) emphasize his title *Pater Patriae,* "Father of the Fatherland," which he formally accepted in 2 B.C.E.[7] When Augustus' adoptive son Tiberius "inherited" his position within the community upon his death in 14 C.E., the family metaphor became that much more poignant and predominant.[8]

To create relationships within this developing, and familial, governmental structure, Tiberius himself, members of his family, and other aristocrats dynamically reused pre-existing forms and traditions. For example, the senatorial author(s) combine formerly distinct public and private domains in the process whereby the first senatorial decree recorded on the Tabula Siarensis was created (1.3–8):

> [. . . atque ideo placuit uti age|retur de] ea re consilio Ti(beri) Caesaris Aug(usti) prin[cipis nostri atque uti libellus cum]| copia sentiarum ipsi fieret atque is, adsu[e]ta sibi [indulgentia, ex omnibus iis]| honoribus, quos habendos esse censebat senatus, legerit [eos, quos Ti(berius) Caesar Aug(ustus) et]| Augusta mater eius et Drusus Caesar materque Germanici Ca[esaris et Agrippina uxore eius]| adhibita ab eis et deliberationi, satis apte posse haberi existum[averint. D(e) e(a) r(e) i(ta) c(ensuere):]
>
> And therefore it was pleasing that action be taken about this affair through the counsel of Tiberius Caesar Augustus, our *princeps,* and that a booklet with the multitude of senatorial opinions be made for him, and he, with customary indulgence, chose, from all those honors that the senate moved should be taken up, those that Tiberius Caesar Augustus, and his mother, Augusta, and Drusus Caesar, and the mother of Germanicus Caesar, and Agrippina, his wife, invited by them also for consultation, judged sufficient to be taken up. About this affair they thus decreed: . . .[9]

5. First edition: González 1984; see in particular González and Arce 1988.

6. Controversy surrounds the reconstruction of the precise chronology of Piso's trial and its aftermath. Tacitus concludes his account of the trial in his narrative of May (*Ann.* 3.1–19), but the *SC de Pisone* was passed in December (*SC de Pisone* 1), of 20 C.E. Various scholars have addressed the problem, including Eck, Caballos, and Fernández 1996, 109–21; Woodman and Martin 1996, 71–79; Griffin 1997; Potter 1998, 352–54; Talbert 1999; and Flower 1999, 109–15.

7. For more on Augustus as a father of state, and the related development of an imperial family, see Severy 1998.

8. See especially Millar 1993; Flory 1996; Severy 1998, 307–65; and Rose 1997, 22–31, on family imagery in the early Tiberian period.

9. All translations are my own.

Thus, not only did the senators accept recommendations from Germanicus' family on how to proceed, they publicly commemorated these consultants in their decree, including women such as Livia (Augusta), Antonia, and Agrippina. The funeral was traditionally the domain of the private family, and mourning the role of the women in particular, but such formal recognition of women's giving advice to the deliberative body of the senate is unprecedented and reflects dramatic changes in the boundaries between public and private.

In this section, we will review several examples of this creative process of mixing forms of family and state found in the law and decree(s) on the Tabula Hebana and Tabula Siarensis. Although they all address the same topic, the honors voted by the senate to the dead Germanicus, these documents are fragmentary, and the relationships among the different enactments they record are unclear. Moreover, many of the specific honors are based on those voted to Augustus' grandsons Gaius and Lucius, who died in 4 and 2 C.E., respectively. Nevertheless, analysis of certain thematic elements of these documents illuminates patterns of change in the traditional lines between public and private. Such a sketch of the development of the family of state up to 19 C.E. provides a useful background to the more fully preserved and rhetorically forceful *SC de Pisone,* composed about a year later.

The senatorial documents of 19 C.E. reflect a mixing of family and state most dramatically in the case of religion. During the republic, cults and ceremonies were divided into public and private forms (cf. Festus *Gloss. Lat.* 284L). As one family took control over the state, however, new relationships were expressed and defined by mixing familial and civic religious forms. For example, both the Tabula Siarensis (2.a.3–5) and Tabula Hebana (59–62) record that the *sodales Augustales* should annually sacrifice to the dead in honor of Germanicus in the same way they did for Gaius and Lucius. These *Augustales* were relatively new priests in Roman society, devoted to the cult of Augustus, which was based on that of the Roman *familia* to the *genius* of its *paterfamilias*. In Italian towns, these *Augustales,* consisting largely of freedmen, developed into a recognized social class between the town counselors and the common *plebs* (cf. Ostrow 1990; Duthoy 1986). In these inscriptions, the senate advises or orders such priests to include in their sacred calendar a sacrifice to another deceased imperial heir; a quasi-public cult of a private family is hereby shaped and expanded by the senate.

The inverse occurs in lines 4–5 of the Tabula Hebana, in which the law adds the name of Germanicus to the song sung annually by the Salii. These were among the oldest priestly colleges and state ceremonies of Rome (Wissowa 1912, 555–65). The complexities of these public/private relationships are underscored in lines 50–52. Here the law establishes that during the Augustan games—a new addition to the state calendar honoring the deified Augustus—Germanicus' consular chair be displayed among the benches of the officiating priests to commemorate Germanicus' own priesthood in this cult of his adoptive grandfather. In the case of the imperial family, public

and private religious roles and ceremonies became intertwined to articulate the public nature of their family.

The ceremony created for the interment of Germanicus' remains into the mausoleum of Augustus reveals similar patterns.[10] The law on the Tabula Hebana (54–55) institutes that "on that day . . . the temples of the gods shall be closed." Moreover, it specifies that members of the "two orders," senatorial and equestrian, should join the procession to the tomb normally restricted to members of the family (55–57). The presence of these representatives of official political groups helps mark the ceremony and event as a public as well as a private tragedy. Although the fragmentary nature of the passage leaves the context unclear, part of the inscription on the Tabula Siarensis (2.b.6–13) also mentions statues of Germanicus to be erected by the urban *plebs*. Particularly if we consider the *Augustales* to have been largely freedmen, all critical census and political classifications of Roman society were thus brought into this commemoration of a fallen potential leader of the imperial house.

On the anniversary of Germanicus' death, moreover, the senatorial enactments explicitly brought all citizens into the ceremony. Not only were the temples reclosed, with the *sodales Augustales* performing a sacrifice, as described above, but citizens were forbidden from transacting public business in all municipalities and colonies, Roman and Latin (Tabula Siarensis 2.a.7–8). Interestingly, the events proscribed include weddings (*nuptiae*) and engagement parties (*sponsalia*); thus, this death within the imperial house was publicly commemorated by disrupting the ceremonies of private families.

We can also see this intermixing of traditionally public and private forms in the treatment of the spaces occupied by state officials and by families. The fragment of the *lex Valeria Aurelia* preserved on the Tabula Hebana begins (1–4):

> Utique in Palatio in porticu quae est ad Apollinis, in eo templo in quo senatus haberi solet, [inter ima]|gines virorum in⟨l⟩us⟨t⟩ris ingeni Germanici Caesaris et Drusi Germanici, patris eius natural[is, fratrisq(ue)]| Ti. Caesaris Aug(usti), qui ipse quoq(ue) fecundi ingeni fuit, imagines ponantur.
>
> And that on the Palatine, in the colonnade that is near the Temple of Apollo, in which the senate customarily meets, there shall be placed among the images (*imagines*) of men of renowned talent, images (*imagines*) of Germanicus Caesar and of Drusus Germanicus, his natural father and the brother of Tiberius Caesar Augustus, who himself was also a man of abundant talent.

First, note that this is the Temple of Apollo Actius, which Augustus dedicated in 28 B.C.E. and built into the physical structure of his private house on the Palatine hill (Dio 53.1.3; Wiseman 1987). Because this part of the home was properly sanctified, the senate was able to hold official meetings here (Suet. *Aug.* 29.3). The inscriptions draw great attention to the resulting public status of this private house: not only are the new *imagines* added to the colonnade, but the decree on fragment 2 of the Tabula Siarensis was

10. Germanicus had died and undergone funerary cremation in Syria (Tac. *Ann.* 2.69–74).

supposed to be inscribed and erected here (b. 21–23), and the *SC de Pisone* was passed by the senate meeting in this temple (1).

The intermediary nature of this space between public and private is further underscored by the very presence of *imagines*. Likenesses of politically successful family members were traditionally displayed in the atria of aristocratic houses (Poly. 6.53; Cic. *Verr.* 2.5.36, *Fam.* 9.21; Plin. *HN* 35.6; Flower 1996, 159–222). In this colonnade attached to the Temple of Apollo and to the house of the imperial family, however, we seem to have a collection of portraits of brilliant men from different families. This parallels the statues of great Romans that lined the colonnades of the Forum Augustum (Suet. *Aug.* 31.5; SHA *Alex. Sev.* 28), a new civic space constructed by Augustus on private ground (*RG* 21) for public use and consecrated to Mars, Venus, and the Divine Caesar. These displays of *imagines,* which featured Romans from many families, created a new history of Rome by adopting everyone into Augustus' family and were a means of declaring that the head of this family was the head of Rome. If any of this symbolism had been unclear earlier, it was forcefully reiterated at Augustus' funeral, in which not just the *imagines* of his own family were carried, as was traditional, but also "those of other Romans who had been prominent in any way, beginning with Romulus" (Dio 56.34.2). We might compare the addition of equestrian and senatorial representatives to Germanicus' interment procession (Tabula Hebana 55–57), noted above. The addition of Germanicus and his father Drusus to the portrait gallery in the Temple of Apollo continues this institutionalization of the imperial family through the mixing of public and private images, spaces, and traditions.

Something similar occurred in the *lex Valeria Aurelia*'s creation and naming of new voting centuries in honor of Germanicus (Tabula Hebana 5–50). The five new electoral blocks of senators and equestrians were created expressly on the model of the ten blocks developed in honor of the deceased Gaius and Lucius (6–7). Brunt (1961, 78) summarizes the effect of this change in the procedure for electing consuls and praetors as a new electoral privilege of the upper class tied to the glory of the deceased imperial successors. These honors voted to Gaius, Lucius, and Germanicus wove the imperial family into the most political and public act of the Roman community and its citizens—voting.

The last of the honors voted to Germanicus that call for analysis in these terms is the monumental arch (Tabula Siarensis 1.9–21):

> Placere uti Ianus marmoreus extrueretur in circo Flaminio pe[cunia publica, posi]|tus ad eum locum in quo statuae Divo Augusto domuique Augus[tae iam dedicatae es]|sent ab G(aio) Norbano Flacco, cum signis devictarum gentium ina[uratis tituloque]| in fronte eius Iani senatum populumque Romanum id monum[entum marmoreum dedi]|casse memoriae Germanici Caesaris, cum {i}is Germanicis bello superatis [et deinceps]| a Gallia summotis receptisque signis militaribus et vindicata frau[dulenta clade]| exercitus p(opuli) R(omani), ordinato statu Galliarum, proco(n)s(ul) missus in transmarinas pro[vincias Asiae]| in conformandis iis regnisque eiusdem tractus ex mandatis Ti(berii) C(a)esaris Au[g(usti), imposito re]|g(e) Armeniae, non parcens labori suo priusquam decreto senatus [ei ovatio conce]|deretur, ob rem p(ublicam) mortem obisset, supraque eum Ianum statua Ger[manici Caesaris po]|neretur in curru triumphali et circa latera eius statuae

D[rusi Germanici patris ei]|us, naturalis fratris Ti(berii) Caesaris Aug(usti) et Antoniae matris ei[us et Agrippinae uxoris et Li]|viae sororis et Ti(berii) Germanici fratris eius et filiorum et fi[liarum eius.]

[The senate decrees] that it pleases that a marble arch be constructed in the Circus Flaminius with public funds, placed near where the statues of the Divine Augustus and the Augustan House have already been dedicated by Gaius Norbanus Flaccus; [the arch will be decorated] with the gilded standards of conquered peoples and a plaque in front [stating that] the senate and Roman people dedicated this marble monument to the memory of Germanicus Caesar, since, after he had overcome the Germans in war and driven them out of Gaul, and recovered the military standards and vindicated the treacherous slaughter of the army of the Roman people, and gave order to the state of the Gauls, having been sent as proconsul to the transmarine provinces of Asia to organize them and the kingdoms of this same region according to the mandates of Tiberius Caesar Augustus, after he had put a king of Armenia in place, not sparing his own labor before he was granted an ovation by decree of the senate, he died for the sake of the *res publica;* and atop that arch should be placed a statue of Germanicus Caesar in a triumphal chariot, and around the sides of it statues of Drusus Germanicus, his father, the natural brother of Tiberius Caesar Augustus, and of Antonia, his mother, and of Agrippina, his wife, and of Livia, his sister, and of Tiberius Germanicus, his brother, and of his sons and daughters.

As with many of the honors I have discussed, the funerary arch for a fallen prince of the imperial house had precedent: Drusus the Elder (Germanicus' father) received one on the Via Appia in 9 B.C.E., as did Gaius and Lucius in 4 C.E.[11] The monument erected for Germanicus, however, broke new iconographical and ideological ground. The earlier imperial arches were decorated with spoils taken from conquered enemies and statues of the honorees in triumphal costumes and other military poses (Suet. *Claud.* 1.3; *CIL* 11.1421.34–37). Those arches thus emphasized the type of public service that earned men triumphs during the republic: military victory. The new inscription and arch likewise stressed Germanicus' successes as a general. In addition, however, to images representing the regions conquered by the imperial heir, and his own statue in a triumphal chariot, his arch was to be decorated with statues of members of his family. Certain republican arches had indeed commemorated the family of the triumphator, but through statues of the men of his family who themselves had enjoyed military and other public success (Asc. *Pis.* 44; *CIL* 6.1303, 1304, 31593; *ILS* 43). The presentation in particular of Germanicus' mother, wife, sister, and young children, in addition to that of his decorated father, formed a sharp contrast to the age and gender conventions of triumphal monuments and to the definition of the "public" service that they were designed to commemorate.

Indeed, women and children were extremely rare in republican public imagery and appeared in Augustan art relatively infrequently.[12] Germanicus'

11. Arch of Drusus: Suet. *Claud.* 1.3. Evidence for an arch of Gaius and Lucius in Rome is indirect. A decree from the town of Pisa describes an arch erected there (*CIL* 11.1421.34–7; cf. Rose 1997, no. 28), and the inference that the Pisan arch reflects a monument in the capital is strong enough to lead Rose tentatively to identify foundation remains in the forum Romanum as those of an arch for Gaius and Lucius (p. 19).

12. The *Ara Pacis Augustae* of 13 B.C.E. forms a notable exception; for more on this phenomenon, see especially Kampen 1991.

arch, however, reflected a developing Tiberian tradition of honoring members of the imperial house by depicting them in the midst of their relatives (cf. Severy 1998, 307–65; Rose 1997, 22–31; Flory 1996). The otherwise unknown group monument to Divus Augustus and the Domus Augusta (Augustan House) mentioned in this section of the decree was erected by a consul of 15 C.E.[13] We do not know who was depicted in this representation of the Domus Augusta,[14] but to honor the recently deceased Augustus, the monument recognized the line he had created, which also served to support the status of his heir, Tiberius, who was presumably one of those represented. In turn, during Germanicus' triumph of 17 C.E., all of his children, including his daughters, rode with him in his chariot (Tac. *Ann.* 2.41). It was highly unusual for daughters to participate in this military parade; the only other known case involved an adult Vestal priestess.[15] Germanicus' triumph thus changed the shape of this republican ceremony by including the "private" members of the family, in the same way in which his later arch combined the new funerary memorial for fallen princes with a growing tendency to honor such individuals within a visual representation of the family. The decrees and the arch communicated that Germanicus was a public figure both because of his military service and because of his position within his family.

Finally, we should also note the significance of the location of this arch in the city of Rome. The Circus Flaminius had a long history of association with the Roman triumph and with monuments of the imperial family, including not only the statue group of the Domus Augusta, but also the Theater of Marcellus and the Porticus of Octavia, some of the first monuments to celebrate individual members of Augustus' family (cf. Wiseman 1974). The arch of Germanicus formed a culmination of both traditions, combining images of military triumph with those of a family, and communicating visually and spatially that the Domus Augusta was now responsible for Rome's military success. We shall find this ideology expressed even more directly in the language of the *SC de Pisone,* passed about a year later.

One last statement made near the conclusion of the *senatus consultum* inscribed on column 2.b of the Tabula Siarensis calls for comment, because it foreshadows more explicit constructions of the civic community as a kind of family in the *senatus consultum* of 20 C.E. The reasons the senate specifies for the publication of this decree are (2.b.22–24): ". . . quo facilius pietas omnium ordinum erga domum Augustam et consen|su⟨s⟩ universorum civium memoria honoranda Germanici Caesaris appareret" ("so that the more easily the *pietas* of all orders toward the *domus Augusta* and the

13. Flory 1996, 288; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.55.1; *RE* 17 (1936): 934–35; *CIL* 6.37836; Gordon 1955.

14. Flory 1996 suggests Augustus, Tiberius, Livia, Germanicus, and Drusus, much like Ovid's household shrine of the imperial family (*Pont.* 2.8.1–10, 4.9.105–12); Rose 1997, 22, adds Gaius and Lucius, who were legally brothers of Tiberius and whose inclusion thus reinforced the image of a united family. See also Richardson 1992, 26.

15. Appius Claudius, a consul of 143 B.C.E., was denied a triumph by the senate, but held one anyway. When a tribune tried to stop him, his daughter Claudia climbed into his chariot to protect him with her sacrosanctity as a Vestal Virgin, and he completed his parade (Val. Max. 5.4.6; Cic. *Cael.* 34; Oros. 5.4.7; Suet. *Tib.* 2).

consensus of all citizens to honor the memory of Germanicus Caesar might be apparent").

That the political orders (senate, *equites,* and perhaps *plebs*) should owe *pietas* to the imperial house is striking. In republican discourse, this was a familial and religious term; one felt pious obligation to relatives (Plaut. *Pseud.* 291; Cic. *Part. or.* 78; *Red. sen.* 37) and gods (Plaut. *Cas.* 418; Cic. *Verr.* 4.12; Sall. *Cat.* 12.4). Saller (1994, 105–14) emphasizes the familial nature of the term, arguing that the Romans intended *pietas* to convey a sense of affection and emotion, not just dutiful obedience, between parents and children, and between other relatives. Cicero began using the term in reference to the state, but often when comparing family duty to patriotism.[16] "Piety" was the defining characteristic of Virgil's national hero, Aeneas, but the image of him leading his son and carrying his father and his household and state gods from the burning city of Troy underscores Virgil's traditional use of the term. *Pietas,* in turn, was one of the virtues inscribed on the Golden Shield (*Clipeus Aureus*) awarded to Augustus by the senate in 27 B.C.E. Bengtson (1981, 290–91) and Ramage (1987, 74) argue that this refers to Augustus' religious devotion and restoration of ceremonies and temples; however, the piety that Augustus demonstrated in avenging the assassination of his divinized father Caesar should not be overlooked (cf. Potter 1999, 83–84). The other preserved use of the term *pietas* on the Tabula Siarensis itself is familial (2.b.18–19):

> Item quo testatior esset Drusi Caesaris pietas, placere uti libellus, quem is proxu|mo senatu recitasset, in aere incideretur cum eo s(enatus) c(onsulto) quod factum est.
>
> Likewise, so that the *pietas* of Drusus Caesar [toward his brother Germanicus] may be better attested, it is pleasing that the pamphlet, which he recited in the recent meeting of the senate, be inscribed in bronze with the senatorial decree that was passed.

In such a context, *pietas* only becomes patriotism when Rome is conceived of as a family—exactly what is being expressed when the key political groups of Roman society are described as feeling *pietas* to the Augustan house.

In the honors the senate chose to record for the deceased Germanicus and in the manner in which the senators recorded them, we can perceive an intermixing of the imperial family and institutions of the Roman state in terms of religious ceremonies, state priesthoods, voting procedures, and public monuments. Moreover, major political groups, including the senate, *equites,* and *plebs*, were called on as groups to commemorate this fallen potential leader of the imperial house, and their loyalty to Rome was expressed as a devotion to this family. Many of the enactments had precedent in Augustus' lifetime, particularly among the honors passed for his sons Gaius and Lucius, but those voted for Germanicus early in Tiberius' reign stretched into new iconographical and ideological territory. The documents thus reveal that the creative interweaving of Augustus' family and civic

16. Cic. *Brut.* 126, *Rep.* 6.16, etc.; for a more complex analysis of Cicero's use of *pietas,* see especially Wagenvoort 1980.

government was well underway in official language, action, and ideology in 19 C.E.

THE FAMILY OF STATE IN THE *SENATUS CONSULTUM DE PISONE PATRE*

We now turn to the *SC de Pisone,* passed in December of 20 C.E. Its modern editors have put together a single and complete text from the surviving fragmentary copies, all found in the Roman province of Baetica (Eck, Caballos, and Fernández 1996). The decree records the results of the conspiracy trial of provincial governor Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso. The summarizing tone of the decree and the directions for where it was to be set up, namely, in Rome, in the most important city of each province, and in the winter quarters of every legion (165–73), show that the aim of the decree is to communicate to provincial governors and their soldiers what has happened to a governor who has rebelled, and to assert in general that now all is right with Rome. As such, this decree of 20 C.E. gives us an idealized picture of the Roman state.

Significantly, in proclaiming that after this conflict Rome is once again peaceful and perfect, the author(s) of the decree present the *res publica* as a family headed by Tiberius. Continuing the trends seen in the earlier documents, the *SC de Pisone* uses terms of family obligation to describe loyalty to Rome, substitutes *domus Augusta* where previously we might have expected *res publica,* and defines the relationships between various political groups using traditions and terms of the Roman family. The decree of 20 C.E., however, also provides evidence for consequences of this new idea of the state for all members of the aristocracy. The authors' efforts to explain and forge relationships within the new power structure show evidence of tension, particularly in the articulation of the role of the women of the imperial house. The rhetoric of a family of state indeed affects how all key characters in the Piso affair are presented, including Tiberius, Piso, and the senate itself, in addition to other members of the imperial house. This document thus gives us great insight into the ideology and the difficult reality of the early imperial monarchy at the highest levels of power.

The *SC de Pisone* expresses a more fully articulated conception of the role of Augustus' family in Rome than that found on the Tabula Hebana or Tabula Siarensis, but along similar lines. A long list of institutions betrayed by the revolutionary Piso, including public law, begins with "the neglected *maiestas* of the house of Augustus" (32–33). We might compare a phrase from the *lex de Insula Delo* of 58 B.C.E. quoted by Potter (1999, 69 translating Crawford 1966, no. 22): "[this is done] in accord with the *maiestas* and dignity of the Roman people." The lines of the *SC de Pisone* praising the Roman soldiery are even more explicit (159–62):

> Item senatum probare eorum militum fidem, quorum animi frustra sollicita|ti essent scelere Cn. Pisonis patris, omnesq(ue), qui sub auspicis et imperio principis| nostri milites essent, quam fidem pietatemq(ue) domui Aug(ustae) p[raesta]rent, eam sperare| perpetuo praestaturos, cum scirent salutem imperi nostri in eius dom[u]⟨s⟩ custo|dia posita⟨m⟩ esse{t}, senatum arbitrari eorum curae atq(ue) offici esse, ut aput eos ii,| qui quandoq(ue)

e[i]⟨s⟩ praessent, plurumum auctoritatis ⟨haberent⟩, qui fidelissuma pietate| salutare huic urbi imperioq(ue) p(opuli) R(omani) nomen Caesarum coluissent.

Likewise, the senate praises the loyalty (*fides*) of those soldiers whose souls were solicited in vain by the crime of Cn. Piso the father, and the senate hopes that all soldiers who were under the auspices and the *imperium* of our *princeps,* who showed such *fides* and *pietas* to the house of Augustus, will show this perpetually when they know that the safety of our empire is placed in the guardianship of his house; the senate decides that it be of concern and duty to them that among [the soldiers] those have most authority who, with the most faithful *pietas,* hail the name of the Caesars for the sake of the city and the empire of the Roman people.

Military loyalty is thus defined as loyalty to the imperial family; patriotism is religious and familial devotion to the house of Augustus.

In turn, note that it is not just the soldiers and their commanders, an important and intended audience of the decree, whose relationship to the state is cast in these familial terms. Another paragraph praises the *equester ordo* for its *pietas* and devotion to Tiberius and his son (151–54):

Item equestris ordinis curam et industriam unic[e] senatui probari,| quod fideliter intellexsisset, quanta res et quam ad omnium salutem pietatemq(ue)| pertinens ageretur, et quod frequentibus adclamationibus adfectum animi sui| et dolorem de principis nostri filiq(ue) eius iniuris ac pro r(ei) p(ublicae) utilitate testatus sit.

Likewise the care and industry of the equestrian order is singularly commended by the senate, because it knew faithfully (*fideliter*) how great an affair it was and how much was done relevant to the safety and *pietas* of all, and because with frequent acclamations it testified to the affection of its own spirit and its grief over the injuries of our *princeps* and his son for the sake of benefit to the *res publica.*

In the section immediately following, the authors praise the *plebs* for following the equestrians' model (155–58):

Plebem quo(que) laudare senatum, quod cum equestr[i] ordine consenserit pietatemq(ue)| suam erga principem nostrum memoriamq(ue) fili eius significaverit, et cum| effusissumis studis ad repraesentandam poenam Cn. Pisonis patris ab semet ipsa| accensa esset, regi tamen exemplo equestris ordinis a principe nostro se passa sit.

And the senate lauds the *plebs* because it agreed with the equestrian order and signified both its own *pietas* towards our *princeps* and its remembrance of his son, and because when it was inflamed with eager zeal to hasten on its own the punishment of Cn. Piso the father, it allowed itself to be ruled by our *princeps* on the example of the equestrian order.

All of these significant sociopolitical groups—*equites, plebs*, and soldiers—are thus praised for their loyalty to Rome through praise of their familial devotion to the emperor and his house.

In case we miss the new structure of the state herein described, however, this last third of the decree can be read as a diagram. At the close of the *SC de Pisone,* the senators thank a number of people for their role in putting down the conspiracy. The praises of the soldiery, *plebs*, and equestrians just quoted conclude this series of laudations of well-defined groups. This is where the authors present a picture of an ordered and peaceful state to the

audience of provincial governors and soldiers, and thus these praises provide for us an idealized version of the hierarchic structure of Roman society. The list ends with the praise of the Roman military, preceded by praise of the Roman *plebs* (155–58), a paragraph praising the *equites* (151–54), and, quite significantly, the list begins with lines praising members of the imperial house individually (123–51). Moreover, the decree does not focus only on the members we would expect to be participants in state affairs, such as Tiberius and his heir, Drusus: the women of the family are thanked as well, including Livia, Agrippina, Antonia, and Livilla, by name. The entire Roman nuclear family has been institutionalized as the most important organ of the state.

Moreover, this hierarchy is not just expressed in the order of presentation. Groups or individuals of higher rank are identified as sources of moral authority for those below; Tiberius serves as an example for Livia and Drusus (133–34), and the *equites* as models for the *plebs* (155–58). The paternal quality of this authority is revealed elsewhere in the decree. At the moment when the senators begin to announce their findings to the questions put to them by Tiberius (4–11), they describe the senate as "mindful of its clemency, justice, and greatness of spirit, virtues that it received from its ancestors (*maiores*) and then learned especially from the god Augustus and Tiberius Caesar Augustus, its *principes*" (90–92).[17] The senators use the line of moral authority within a Roman family to articulate their relationship to the emperors; Augustus and Tiberius are as ancestors to the individual senators. In general, the rhetoric of the decree thus constructs the state as a hierarchy based on familial devotion (*pietas*) and the demonstration of virtues learned from (paternal) superiors.[18] The authors of the *SC de Pisone* hereby provide a much more complex articulation of the family of state than anything we have seen previously.

The nature of the praise of the female members of the house at the top of the hierarchy, moreover, reveals tensions resulting from this new power pyramid. In the new conception of civic society, women of the imperial family might outrank even aristocratic men—a situation not in keeping with

17. ". . . senatum, memorem clementiae suae ius|titiaeq(ue) ⟨atq(ue)⟩ animi magnitudinis, quas virtutes {quas} a maioribus suis acce|pisset, tum praecipue ab divo Aug(usto) et Ti(berio) Caesare Aug(usto) principibus suis didicisset." Compare Tabula Siarensis 2.b.13–17, in which all Rome's children are adopted under the moral authority of the emperor: "Idque eo iustius futurum arbitrari senatum, quod| [libellus Ti(beri)] Caesaris Aug(usti) intumus et Germanici Caesaris f(ili) eius non magis laudatio|nem quam vitae totius ordinem et virtut(is⟩ eius uerum testimonium contineret,| aeternae tradi memoriae et ipse se uelle non dissimulare eodem libello testatus| esset et esse utile iuuentuti liberorum posterorumque nostrorum iudicaret" ("And likewise the senate judges that, because the very deep and intimate document of Tiberius Caesar Augustus contained not so much praise of his son Germanicus Caesar as an account of his whole life and a true testimonial to his virtue, it will be more just to bequeath it to eternal memory, and [Tiberius] himself testified in this document that he wished not to conceal it and judged it to be useful for the youth of our children and posterity").

18. Potter 1999 places these "virtues" in an important early imperial context. Augustan ideology stressed that Augustus and his heirs were responsible for ending and preventing the return of the civil wars. He argues that in the *SC de Pisone* "the specific virtues that are adduced . . . offer a reading of the history of the late Republic that is intended to show how the *domus* stands between the Roman state and the chaos of Cicero's generation" (70–71), which explains why the state is described as being "in the guardianship of his house" (162–63) and why the "tranquility of the present state of the *res publica*" is emphasized (13–14). What I would underscore is that the language of the decree does not dwell only on Augustus' virtues, nor those of Tiberius, but lodges ability and responsibility for the state in their family.

traditional aristocratic sensibilities. The authors of the decree try to understand this and make it seem appropriate by praising the women for their traditionally and stereotypically female characteristics, that is, for their domestic virtues: Agrippina, for her many children (137–39); Antonia for having had only one husband, and for her refined manners (140–42); and Livilla for the good opinion held of her by Livia and Tiberius (142–45). These are not new roles or new reasons for women to be praised. Official concern for them is new, however, and reflects their family's new status in the Roman state.[19] More than that, we can see here the development of an official language mixing public and private to allow contemporaries to talk about people politely in a political structure that did not obey Roman notions about gender roles.

The same tensions drive the presentation of Livia. In the section concerning Plancina, Piso's wife, the senators openly recognize Livia's role in obtaining her pardon (109–20):

> Quod ad Plancinae causam pertineret, qu⟨o⟩i pluruma et gravissuma crimina| obiecta essent, quoniam confiteretur, se omnem spem in misericordia{m}| principis nostri et senatus habere, et saepe princeps noster accurateq(ue) ab| eo ordine petierit, ut contentus senatus Cn. Pisonis patris poena uxori [e]ius| sic uti M. filio parceret, et pro Plancina rogatu matris suae depreca⟨tus⟩ s⟨it⟩ et,| quam ob rem [id] mater sua inpetrari vellet, iustissumas ab ea causas sibi ex|positas acceperit, senatum arbitrari et Iuliae Aug(ustae), optume de r(e) p(ublica) meritae non| partu tantum modo principis nostri, sed etiam multis magnisq(ue) erga cui|usq(ue) ordinis homines beneficis, quae cum iure meritoq(ue) plurumum posse⟨t⟩ in eo,| quod a senatu petere deberet, parcissume uteretur eo, et principis nostri summa⟨e⟩| erga matrem suam pietati suffragandum indulgendumq(ue) esse remittiq(ue)| poenam Plancinae placere.
>
> As pertains to the case of Plancina, who was accused of the most grave crimes, since she confessed that she held all her hope in the mercy of our *princeps* and the senate, and often our *princeps* specifically sought from this order that the senate be content with the punishments of Cn. Piso the father and spare his wife, just as his son Marcus, and since he interceded on behalf of Plancina at the request of his own mother, and accepted most just reasons laid out by her to him as to why his mother wanted this to be accomplished, the senate decides that, both for Julia Augusta, most deserving of the *res publica* not only for the birth of our *princeps,* but also for her many and great favors to men of each order, who, when she is justly and deservedly most able to seek out from the senate that which she ought, scarcely makes use of it, and for the supreme *pietas* of our *princeps* toward his mother, [the senate decides that] it must be supported and conceded, and it seems best to remit the punishment of Plancina.

Livia's level of influence, which horrified Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.3, 1.13–14, 2.34, 3.15, etc.), is rhetorically justified in the document in two ways: (1) because she has performed many *beneficia* for men of all orders and (2) because she is the mother of the *princeps,* and it is appropriate for a man to observe *pietas* toward his mother.

Again, these are not new roles for Roman women. Suzanne Dixon's analysis of the Roman mother has shown her to be a formidable and respected figure within the Roman family. Moreover, a woman's wielding of influence

19. Augustus' so-called "marriage legislation," however, had politicized the issues of marriage, child rearing, and marital fidelity; see Severy 1998, 85–110, 152–66.

on behalf of or through male relatives was nothing new. Plutarch praised Octavia for continuing to do so for Antony even while he was carousing with Cleopatra (*Ant.* 54), and in his letters Cicero called on women not infrequently to act as intercessors with their male relatives (e.g., *Fam.* 5.2.6, 5.8.2, 15.7, *Ad. Brut.* 17.7; cf. *Fam.* 14.2.2). But the context of these activities is critical: even though such roles sometimes brought republican matrons into what we might think of as the public sphere, they were playing behind-the-scenes, familial, and private roles as the Romans defined them.

Livia's situation was complicated by the status of her family. In asking her son to protect her friend, she was operating within the family sphere, but because her son was the *princeps* and the imperial family a public institution, she was operating within the political sphere as well. The same paradox occurred in her relationship with the senators. Women who did favors incurred debts of gratitude from the men and women for whom they acted; it is not surprising that even senators were indebted to Livia for her *beneficia*. What is surprising is the formal recognition of these debts to a woman in a senatorial decree (*SC de Pisone* 117). The senators tried to resolve this tension by emphasizing Livia's family position and by clarifying that although many of them were indebted to Livia, she did not approach the senate directly: Tiberius asked for the pardon "at his mother's request." But tension remained, perhaps reflected in the fact that this is one of the most convoluted and difficult sections in the decree. In being celebrated in a public document, Livia's family roles were raised to a new, public status in Roman society. She herself, by virtue of being a mother in the imperial family, had become in effect an officer of the state. The official language of the decree was, in turn, in the process of adapting to this changing political situation by emphasizing the appropriateness and domesticity of these roles for a woman, even while recognizing her political importance in a way that was without precedent.

The combination of the imperial family with civic institutions, and the related evaluation of public figures through their families and family values affect the presentation of other individuals in the document as well. For example, Tiberius is consistently portrayed as a father and identified by his familial relationships. The first time he is named in the decree, he is called "Tiberius Caesar Augustus, son of the deified Augustus" (4). In the description of why Germanicus was present in the East, the "problems across the seas" are defined as "requiring the presence of either Tiberius Caesar Augustus himself or of one of his sons" (31–32). Similarly, the senators praise Tiberius' even temper throughout the affair and pray that he and the gods will protect his surviving son, Drusus, because "all hope for the state will be placed in someone of his father's position" (129–30). In fact, the first item for which the senators praise Tiberius is "that Tiberius Caesar Augustus, our *princeps,* had exceeded the *pietas* of all parents" (123–24).[20] Tiberius is honored in part by being presented as the model father, and in the decree the senate encourages him to direct his paternal attention to his sole

20. "Of all parents," *par⟨en⟩tium,* is based on an emendation of *partium* suggested by Jones and Reeve, as reported in Potter and Damon 1999, 32.

remaining heir for the good of the *res publica:* "[The senate] eagerly asks and seeks that all the care that [Tiberius] once divided between his sons he direct to the one whom he [still] has" (126–27).

In contrast, the same decree in part expresses the failure of Piso to respect civic order by presenting him as failing as a father. Note that he is not the only one whose trial is recorded here: charges against his wife, Plancina, their two sons, and two companions are also addressed. Almost Piso's entire family is in fact put on trial. Moreover, because one of these sons was named after his father, the primary defendant is identified throughout the document as Piso *pater,* Piso "the father." Now that family duties and obligations had become an accepted and even necessary part of evaluations of public figures, and relationships of power were expressed as familial, part of the rhetoric of this decree is to argue that among Piso's public crimes is his failure to take care of his family.

For example, Piso's punishment consisted largely of his removal from his family: his female relatives were not allowed to mourn him, and his *imago,* or death mask, was not to be carried in any funeral processions or set up by any Calpurnii (70–90, cf. Bodel 1999). Some creativity was necessary: as Piso had already taken his own life, so the senate did not have the option of executing him. But consider the interesting way his property was treated: the senate confiscated his estate, then redistributed it as inheritance and dowry to his sons and granddaughter "in the name of the *princeps* and the senate" (90–98). The emperor and the senate thus replaced Piso as head of his family. The senators requested that the son named Gnaeus after his father change his praenomen to emphasize this break (98–100).

In the decree, not only has Piso been punished by being cut out of family commemoration and lines of inheritance, but the state has taken over some of these familial roles for the good of Rome. A short passage describing a woodland in Illyria exempted from the redistribution of Piso's property clarifies the point. Tiberius has personally assumed control of the land (84–90):

> . . . quod ⟨civitates⟩, quarum fines hos saltus contin|gerent, frequenter de iniuris Cn. Pisonis patris libertorumq(ue) et servorum| eius questae essent, atq(ue) ob id providendum putaret, ne postea iure meritoq(ue)| soci p(opuli) R(omani) queri possent.
>
> . . . because the peoples whose borders touched these woodlands frequently complained of injury from Gn. Piso the father and his freedmen and slaves, and on account of this [Tiberius] thought provision should be made so that thereafter the allies of the Roman people might not have just and deserving grounds for complaint.

That is, the *princeps* must take over as the *pater* of this land for the empire to be protected. The trial of Piso's whole family works in the same way. Piso has been unable to control them and serve as their father properly. Therefore he is removed, and the emperor and the senate look after his dependents for the good of the *res publica.* The emperor's status as the ultimate *pater* of the family of state is then emphasized by the passage of this decree in the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine (1), the temple physically built into the private house of Augustus, as described above.

The decree also provides evidence for the delicate position of the senate within the ideology of the family of state. One manner in which the senators define their position is through comparison with Piso, whom the senate charges with having "forgotten" (Flower 1999, 101) the very duties and political and personal relationships (29–35, 59–62) that the senate itself remembers, as is evinced by this decree. In particular (57–70):

> . . . qui post mortem Germanici Caesaris, quoius in|teritum non p(opulus) R(omanus) modo, se exterae quoq(ue) gentes luxserunt, patri optumo et| indulgentissumo libellum, quo eum accusaret, mittere ausus sit oblitus non| tantum venerationis caritatisq(ue), quae principis filio debebantur, ceterum| humanitatis quoq(ue), quae ultra mortem odia non patitur procedere, et cuius| mortem gavisum esse eum his argumentis senatui apparuerit: quod nefaria| sacrificia ab eo facta, quod naves, quibus vehebatur, ornatae sint, quod reclu|serit deorum immortalium templa, quae totius imperi R(omani) constantissuma| pietas clauserat, eiusdemque habitus animi argumentum fuerit, quod dedisset congi|arium ei, qui nuntiaverit sibi de morte Germanici Caesaris, probatum⟨q(ue)⟩ sit frequen|ter{q(ue)} convivia habuisse eum his ipsis diebus, quibus de morte Germanici Caesaris ei| nuntiatum erat.
>
> . . . after the death of Germanicus Caesar—whose loss not only the Roman people but also foreign nations mourned—[Piso] dared to send the best and most indulgent father a document in which he accused [Germanicus], [Piso] having forgotten not only the veneration and affection which is owed the son of the *princeps,* but moreover that human courtesy which does not allow for hatreds to continue after death.
>
> And that he rejoiced in his death was clear to the senate through these proofs: because nefarious sacrifices were made by him; because the ships by which he was carried were decorated; because he opened up the temples of the immortal gods which the most constant *pietas* of the whole Roman empire had closed; his dress was proof of the same spirit; because he gave a reward to the one who announced to him the death of Germanicus. It was proven also that he held frequent parties in those days in which it was announced to him about the death of Germanicus.

The senators, in contrast, express *pietas* toward Tiberius and his sons, and they commemorated Germanicus' death properly through the honors recorded on the Tabula Hebana and Tabula Siarensis. The *SC de Pisone* may even serve to re-emphasize the propriety of the senatorial response, as it was published near the first anniversary of the announcement in Rome of the death of Germanicus.[21] The author(s) of the decree even suggest that Piso committed suicide due to his fear of the *pietas* and severity of his senatorial judges (71–73), making the contrast between them most explicit.

The senators also define their positions as leaders, however, by showing themselves to be fathers. Recall that the decree calls for Piso's wealth to be confiscated and redistributed to his heirs in the name of the emperor *and the senate* (90–98). In addition, the senate's request of the Calpurnii that they not display Piso's portrait among those of other famous ancestors (76–82) intrudes "into an area traditionally under the power of the family" (Flower 1999, 104). Interestingly, however, the senators also rhetorically place Augustus and Tiberius among their own ancestors (90–92), putting

21. The decree was passed on December 10, 20 C.E. Germanicus died on October 10, 19 C.E., but official mourning was not declared in Rome until December 8.

themselves lower than the *principes* in the hierarchy of the family of state. The situation is tense. Because the senators are presented as the authors of the decree, they do not appear in the roll call of sociopolitical groups thanked by the senate, which constructs such a beautiful diagram of power relationships in the new Rome. What is the senate's relationship to the imperial house? Was this relationship ever satisfactorily resolved under the Julio-Claudians?

We might also identify tension in Tiberius' response to the decree. In his subscript ordering the *senatus consultum* to be enrolled in the public record, Tiberius rejects the family metaphor and identifies himself by his possession of tribunician power (174–76). Compare this to Tiberius' explicit refusal of the title *Pater Patriae* ("Father of the Fatherland") voted him by the senate in 14 C.E. (Suet. *Tib.* 26). Why does he do so, when the senators seem to find the rhetoric of a family of state so useful? The authors of the *SC de Pisone* actually point to the answer for us; they remit the punishment of Plancina out of respect for "the supreme *pietas* of our *princeps* toward his mother" (119). The combination of the imperial family with public institutions created a conflict of roles for these two individuals. Within his household, Tiberius owed a respect and obedience to Livia far exceeding modern western expectations of the adult man's relationship with his mother (Dixon 1988, 176–77), and the emphasis on familial relationships we have seen in contemporary public discourse must have exacerbated the situation. In this light, Tiberius' repeated refusals to allow certain public honors of his mother, from the time of his accession until her death fifteen years later (Tac. *Ann.* 1.14.2; Dio 58.2.3), served to assert his own power and authority over Rome. Tiberius' emphasis on tribunician power in the subscript thus clarifies that, although he owed *pietas* toward his mother, now a political as well as familial term, Tiberius was the head of Roman society. We might note that this particular conflict of roles created by the familial nature of the imperial system culminated in matricide during the reign of the last Julio-Claudian emperor, Nero.

CONCLUSIONS

The decrees and law recorded on the fragmentary Tabula Hebana and Tabula Siarensis provide great insight into the status of the imperial family as a public institution in 19 C.E. The documents show the senators openly recognizing their consultation with even the women of the imperial house in the process of designing the honors for the deceased Germanicus. The tragedy of his death was incorporated into the state religious calendar, and the families of all Roman citizens were encouraged to mark its anniversary by not holding engagement parties or weddings. Germanicus' interment into the mausoleum of Augustus was attended by representatives of the senatorial and equestrian orders, and a new electoral privilege for members of this class was tied to the name of the fallen prince. In some form or fashion, the honors voted for Germanicus created a relationship between almost every sociopolitical group of Roman society and this member of the imperial family.

The monuments created by the enactments of 19 C.E. reveal a similar recombination of public and private traditions in the case of the imperial house. Portraits of Germanicus and his father Drusus were incorporated into a gallery of great Romans in the portico of the Temple of Apollo, a meeting place of the senate prominent in all the documents of 19–20 C.E. and built into the structures of Augustus' house on the Palatine hill. Such a showcase of *imagines,* like the statues in the forum Augustum, played on the tradition of displaying busts of famous ancestors in aristocratic houses to create a family of Rome. Similarly, the arch designed for the fallen Germanicus was decorated with insignia from his military victories *and* with statues of his relatives, including his mother, wife, and daughters. The monument thus broke the gender and age traditions of these military monuments, while its location in an area long associated with the triumph reinforced the implied relationships between Roman victory, Germanicus the individual, and the imperial family. All of these interpenetrations of formerly distinct public and private, civic and family traditions signified and shaped a new political order headed by an imperial house.

In its presentation of the emperor, the imperial family, Piso the Father, and his family, the *SC de Pisone Patre* of 20 C.E. provides invaluable evidence for the further development and for some of the consequences of these changes in the relationship between families and Roman civic institutions. In their attempts to assert that after Piso's conspiracy, Rome was once again calm and ordered, the authors of the decree present an idealized image of the state. Significantly, the hierarchy they display is headed by the individual members of the imperial house, including not just Tiberius, but Livia, Drusus, Antonia, Agrippina, and others. The authors also use *pietas,* a term of familial and religious devotion, to describe ties of traditional political institutions, such as the equestrian order and the *plebs*, to the imperial house.

More importantly, the *SC de Pisone* reveals how the idea of a family of state affected the status and public presentation of individuals within the new system. For example, the senatorial authors handle the difficult task of discussing the women of the imperial family in such a political setting by emphasizing their domestic virtues, such as childbearing. But the men are evaluated as public figures through reference to their family relationships, as well. Tiberius is presented as a dutiful son of Augustus and as father of Germanicus and Drusus; moreover, the *SC de Pisone* explicitly declares that Tiberius' position in Rome will pass on to his surviving son. The conspirator Piso, in turn, is rhetorically condemned for his failure as a *pater,* his epithet throughout the decree. Tension can be seen between newly conflicting roles within a familial system of government, such as between Livia and Tiberius, and between the women of the imperial house and the senators. Obligations to family and community for all members of the aristocracy were blurred in the process of combining the imperial house with the governmental structure of Rome.

Such a change, however, is really at the heart of the transition from an oligarchy to a monarchy. In the new system, one family stood atop the political structure and transmitted political authority to the next generation,

creating newly public roles for women out of traditional family duties, among other things. To cope with this changing political landscape, praise and emphatic concern for family obligations came into public discourse. Looking back on the Tiberian period from a different dynasty almost a century later, Tacitus condemned this intrusion of women and the family into public space as illicit and unseemly. In the surviving senatorial documents of 19–20 C.E., however, we can see the degree to which contemporaries were openly and actively engaging in a familial model of government during the second generation of the Roman empire.

Macalester College

LITERATURE CITED

Barnes, T. D. 1998. Tacitus and the *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre. Phoenix* 52:125–48.

Bengtson, H. 1981. *Kaiser Augustus: Sein Leben und sein Zeit.* Munich.

Bodel, J. 1999. Punishing Piso. *AJPh* 120:43–63.

Brunt, P. A. 1961. The Lex Valeria Cornelia. *JRS* 51:71–83.

Caballos, A., W. Eck, and F. Fernández, eds. 1996. *El Senadoconsulto de Gneo Pisone Padre.* Seville.

Champlin, E. 1999. The First (1996) Edition of the *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre:* A Review. *AJPh* 120:117–22.

Crawford, M. H., ed. 1996. *Roman Statutes.* Vol. 1. London.

Damon, C. 1999. The Trial of Cn. Piso in Tacitus' *Annals* and the *Senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre. AJPh* 120:143–62.

Dixon, S. 1988. *The Roman Mother.* Norman, OK.

Duthoy, R. 1986. Les Augustales. *ANRW* 2.16.2:1254–309.

Eck, W., A. Caballos, and F. Fernández, eds. 1996. *Das senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre.* Vestigia 48. Munich.

Flory, M. B. 1996. Dynastic Ideology, the *Domus Augusta,* and Imperial Women: A Lost Statuary Group in the Circus Flaminius. *TAPhA* 126:287–306.

Flower, H. I. 1996. *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power.* Oxford.

_____. 1997. Review of *Das senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre,* ed. W. Eck et al. *BMCRev* 7:22.

_____. 1999. Piso in Chicago: A Commentary on the APA/AIA Joint Seminar on the *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre. AJPh* 120:99–115.

González, J. 1984. Tabula Siarensis, Fortunales Siarenses et Municipia Civium Romanorum. *ZPE* 55:55–100.

_____. 1999. Tacitus, Germanicus, Piso, and the Tabula Siarensis. *AJPh* 120:123–42.

González, J. and J. Arce, eds. 1988. *Estudios sobre la Tabula Siarensis.* Madrid.

Gordon, A. E. 1955. On the Date of the Consul Suffect, A.D. 15. *CP* 50:194.

Griffin, M. 1997. The Senate's Story. *JRS* 87:71–91.

Johnson, A. C., P. R. Coleman-Norton, and F. C. Bourne. 1961. *Ancient Roman Statutes.* Austin.

Kampen, N. B. 1991. Between Public and Private: Women as Historical Subjects in Roman Art. In *Women's History and Ancient History,* ed. S. B. Pomeroy, 218–48. Chapel Hill.

Meyer, E. 1998. Review of *Das senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre,* ed. W. Eck et al. *CJ* 93:315–24.

Millar, F. 1993. Ovid and the *Domus Augusta:* Rome Seen from Tomoi. *JRS* 83:1–17.

Oliver, J. H. and R. E. A. Palmer. 1954. Text of the Tabula Hebana. *AJPh* 75:225–49.

Ostrow, S. E. 1990. The *Augustales* in the Augustan Scheme. In *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate,* ed. K. A. Raaflaub and M. Toher, 364–79. Berkeley.

Potter, D. 1998. *Senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone. JRA* 11:437–57.
_____. 1999. Political Theory in the *Senatus Consultum Pisonianum. AJPh* 120:65–88.
Potter, D. and C. Damon. 1999. The *Senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre. AJPh* 120:13–41.
Ramage, E. S. 1987. *The Nature and Purpose of Augustus' "Res Gestae."* Historia Einzelschriften, 54. Stuttgart.
Richardson, L., Jr. 1992. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome.* Baltimore.
Rose, C. B. 1997. *Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio-Claudian Period.* Cambridge.
Saller, R. P. 1994. *Patriarchy, Property, and Death in the Roman Family.* Cambridge.
Severy, B. 1998. Reconceiving the *Res Publica:* Family and State at the Birth of the Roman Empire. Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley.
Talbert, R. J. A. 1999. Tacitus and the *Senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre. AJPh* 120:89–97.
Wagenvoort, H. 1980. Pietas. In *Pietas: Selected Studies in Roman Religion,* ed. H. S. Versnel, 1–19. Leiden.
Wiseman, T. P. 1974. The Circus Flaminius. *PBSR* 42:3–26.
_____. 1987. *Conspicui Postes Tectaque Digna Deo:* The Public Image of Aristocratic and Imperial Houses in the Late Republic and Early Empire. *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Antiquité* 98:393–413.
Wissowa, G. 1912. *Religion und Kultus der Römer.* Handbücher der Altertumswissenschaft 4.5. Munich.
Woodman, A. J. and R. H. Martin. 1996. *The "Annals" of Tacitus: Book 3.* Cambridge.
Yakobson, A. 1998. The Princess of Inscriptions. *SCI* 17:206–24.