Transactions of the American Philological Association 123 (1993) 287-308

Livia and the History of Public Honorific Statues for Women in Rome

Marleen B. Flory
Gustavus Adolphus College

Cassius Dio tells us that in 35 B.C., probably by *senatus consultum*, Octavian had public statues granted to his sister Octavia and his wife Livia.[1] Dio also records a senatorial decree of public statues to Livia in 9 B.C. to console her for the death of her younger son Drusus in that same year (55.2.5). Since these two grants occur at the very first stages of the new Imperial world, they are significant for the history of the practice of erecting public statues to important Roman women in the Imperial period. The grant of 35 B.C. marks a striking innovation in Rome, for we can trace only a single precedent: a public statue erected to Cornelia, the mother of the Gracchi, although the people, not the Senate, voted the honor. The purpose of this paper is to construct a history of the first examples of publicly voted statues for women in early Imperial Rome and to discuss the social context in which such statues first became possible.

I will first summarize the history of public, honorific statues for women in the city of Rome before 35 B.C. The evidence, although familiar, has not been collected with the specific purpose of illustrating ideas about public statues for women. This evidence demonstrates how striking the introduction of statues voted by the Senate for women would have been to Roman society at the time of the first such grant in 35 B.C. I will next discuss the two grants of 35 B.C. and 9 B.C. in their historical contexts and suggest possible reasons for the grants and erection of the statues, tracing how the grant of the statue

[1] Along with the statues, Octavia and Livia were granted freedom from *tutela* and sacrosanctity analogous to that of the tribunes. Dio's statement (our only source) makes clear that Octavian initiated the honors but does not explain how they were carried out: τῇ δ' Ὀκταουίᾳ τῇ τε Λιουίᾳ καὶ εἰκόνας καὶ τὸ τὰ σφέτερα ἄνευ κυρίου τινὸς διοκεῖν, τό τε ἀδεὲς καὶ τὸ ἀνύβριστον ἐκ τοῦ ὁμοίου τοῖς δημάρχοις ἔχειν ἔδωκεν (49.38.1). There is considerable controversy about the origin of tribunician sacrosanctity, but the issue of the statues can be separated from the other two honors, for the Senate traditionally voted public honorific statues. Thus I take the statues to have been granted by *senatus consultum*. There is no reason to believe that all three honors emanated from the same authority even if granted at the same time. On the Senate's votes of honorific statues and this passage, Lahusen 105 n. 48.

reflected a different political reality in the later period from the earlier, triumviral era.

The surviving evidence for honorific statues of women in Rome before 35 B.C. is three stories about legendary Roman women and the statue dedicated to Cornelia. Epigraphical documents from the Roman provinces of the Greek-speaking East beginning about 100 B.C. suggest the ultimate origins of the custom in the city of Rome.

The earliest attested statue dedicated to a woman belongs to a mythic figure in Roman history, a Vestal Virgin named Taracia Gaia, also known as Fufetia. According to Pliny the Elder (*HN* 34.25), whose source is "annals," perhaps those of Valerius Antias, the woman gave the Campus Martius to the Roman people. In gratitude a statue was decreed for her with the extraordinary compliment that she might choose wherever she wished in Rome to have the statue erected: "invenitur statua decreta et Taraciae Gaiae sive Fufetiae virgini Vestali, ut poneretur ubi vellet, quod adiectum non minus honoris habet quam feminae esse decretam. meritum eius ipsis ponam annalium verbis: 'quod campum Tiberinum gratificata esset ea populo.'"[2] Pliny, we ought to note, is speaking only of the written record of the *annales* he (or his intermediary source) had consulted, for he had not seen any actual statue. This apocryphal tale of the beneficent Vestal Virgin gives us the standard reason for the erection of a statue by senatorial decree and at public expense: gratitude and honor for an act of service to the *res publica*.[3]

The many statues of men erected in the city of Rome commemorated triumphs, courageous deeds, acts of civic munificence, or the sacrifice of lives for the country (Lahusen 67-96). Pliny the Younger (*Pan.* 55.6) wrote that in times prior to his own men received the honor of a public statue because of their illustrious service for the state: "ob egregia in rem publicam merita." Because there was no cultural tradition or public context for statues of women, when later Romans saw public statues of women or found records of them from far earlier periods, they created stories to explain the statues in terms of the situation for men. So intrinsic a connection had public statues with service

[2]Gell. (7.7.1-4) and Plut. *Publ.* 8.4 tell similar stories of a Vestal, whom Plutarch calls Tarquinia, although neither mentions a statue.

[3]For the story of Gaia Taracia and the related tale of Accia Larentia, *RE* 7a (1912) s.v. "Gaia Taracia," 480-83. Cf. Jex-Blake and Sellers 20-22; Gilbert 2. 112 n. 3 uses the anecdote, unconvincingly, to argue for the right of Vestals to public statues as one of their special privileges. The only surviving statues date from the Imperial period: Van Deman 324-42; Nock 251-74, esp. 270-74. On the prestige connected with specific locations of statues in Rome, Lahusen 129-31. On Valerius Antias as Pliny's source, Münzer 235.

to the state that the story of Taracia Gaia makes her an honorary man with a *meritum* analogous to that of a male citizen to explain the city's homage to her.

We do not know what (if any) statue sparked the story of Taracia Gaia, but with the statue of Cloelia we can trace or at least hypothesize how a statue of a female divinity, perhaps Venus, was claimed as an actual Roman and then endowed with a history that fitted the customary reasons for erecting honorific statues of men. According to accounts of Cloelia told by a number of sources but most dramatically and brilliantly by Livy (2.13.6-11), she rescued a group of young hostages from the Etruscan king Porsenna, and in gratitude the Romans erected an equestrian statue of her on the via Sacra. Livy introduces the story with the statement that the demonstration of masculine *virtus* also stirred up women to perform noble deeds for the state: "ergo ita honorata virtute, feminae quoque ad publica decora excitatae" (2.13.6). This masculine courage, new in a woman ("novam in femina virtutem," 2.13.11), leads to a new kind of honor. Seneca comments on Cloelia and her story: "We virtually enrolled [Cloelia] as a man because of her outstanding courage" (*Dial.* 6.16.2).[4]

In 204 B.C. Claudia Quinta, a Roman noblewoman, drew a boat carrying a sacred image of the Magna Mater to shore after the vessel had become stuck fast in the Tiber. In Ovid's account at *Fast.* 4.305-44, her miraculous achievement, a test of chastity analogous to trials of the Vestals, proved her purity. Ovid mentions no image of her, but Valerius Maximus (1.8.11) and Tacitus (*Ann.* 4.64.5) write of her statue, which was erected *in vestibulo* (Val. Max.) in the temple of the Magna Mater on the Palatine.[5] Tacitus also tells us that the Romans had dedicated the statue. Here we have the pattern, if we may call it that in the face of only a few examples, clearly established: The few early public statues of Roman women that were known at a later period were en-

---

[4]On Cloelia's story and the alternative of Valeria told in a number of ancient sources see *RE* 4 (1901) s.v. "Cloelia" no. 13, 110-11. Discussion in Ogilvie 267-68. On the history of the statue and its probable original representation of a divinity, Coarelli 1983: 82-83; Verzár 21-42. Pliny *HN* 34.29 says he could believe that the statues of Cloelia and Cocles were the first *publice* dedicated except for contradictory testimony by Piso. In an earlier passage (34.28) Pliny assumes a decree when he uses the verb *decernerentur*. Livy writes *Romani donavere* and, as Ogilvie comments (268), "heightens the importance of the reward by making it a gift of the Romans as a whole." D.H. 5.35.2 says that the statue was voted by the Senate.

[5]On the statue's miraculous escape from fire: Val. Max. 1.8.11; Tac. *Ann.* 4.64.4. On the sources of Claudia Quinta's story, see Gruen 5-33. Undoubtedly the "miraculous escape" of the statue, representing an eminent Claudian ancestor, received appropriate publicity in A.D. 3. Cf. Littlewood 381-95. Senators in Tiberius' rule knew how to interpret it: "sanctos acceptosque numinibus Claudios" (Tac. *Ann.* 4.64.5). Gérard argues that the story is a creation of the years between 50 and 16 B.C. to exalt the *gens Claudia.*

dowed with mythologies of noble deeds for the state in order to explain their existence.

With the statue of Cornelia set up at the end of the second century B.C. in the porticus Metelli in Rome, we are on more solid historical ground. Pliny the Elder (*HN* 34.31) writes that Cato the Elder spoke out during his censorship (184 B.C.) against the erection of statues for Roman women in the provinces but did not succeed in blocking the innovation either abroad or in Rome: "exstant Catonis in censura vociferationes mulieribus statuas Romanis in provinciis poni; nec tamen potuit inhibere quo minus Romae quoque ponerentur, sicuti Corneliae Gracchorum matri, quae fuit Africani prioris filia. Sedens huic posita soleisque sine ammento insignis in Metelli publica porticu, quae statua nunc est in Octaviae operibus." Pliny's introduction of the subject logically follows a discussion of the removal from the Forum of statues set up without any decree of the Senate or the people and the destruction of the statue of Spurius Cassius (34.30). Both illustrated *ambitio*. Livy's report (34.1-4) of Cato's speech on the Lex Oppia shows that the censor would perhaps have regarded the statues of women as an example of ostentatious display and a usurpation of masculine privilege.[6] There is a surviving base of a statue of Cornelia in the Capitoline Museum, whose inscription reads: "Cornelia Africani f. Gracchorum." Plutarch (*CG* 4) also mentions a statue of her when he discusses events of 123 B.C., remarking that at some later time (ὕστερον) than this year the people set up a bronze statue for Cornelia not only on account of her children but also her father: καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἠγάσθη καὶ συνεχώρησε, τιμῶν τὴν Κορνηλίαν οὐδὲν ἧττον ἀπὸ τῶν παίδων ἢ τοῦ πατρός, ἧς γε καὶ χαλκῆν εἰκόνα στήσας ὕστερον ἐπέγραψε Κορνηλίαν μητέρα Γράγχων. The last three words of Plutarch's statement—Κορνηλίαν μητέρα Γράγχων—could translate the Latin inscription as it was at the time of the statue's erection. Pliny (34.31) includes the same information that is on the Capitoline base although in reverse order: "Corneliae Gracchorum matri, quae fuit Africani prioris filia." The inscription on the surviving base, which Coarelli has suggested from his examination of the stone was recut in the Augustan period, may have been different from the earlier inscription, which would have read, simply, "the mother of the Gracchi."[7]

---

[6]Other opinions about statues voiced by Cato: Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 19.4; Plut. *Mor.* 198F, 820B; Amm. Marc. 14.6.8; Liv. 34.4.4; Van den Hout, page 226, 21; Malcovati 40-41.

[7]For a discussion of the statue, history of the inscription, and the contemporary context, Coarelli 1978: 13-28. On the omission of "mater" with Gracchorum, Kajava 119-31; Lewis 198-200. For the inscription: *CIL* 1 (2nd ed.) p. 201=*CIL* 6.10043. Description of the base in

The statue portrays a seated Cornelia. This statue type has been linked with a much later seated statue of Helena, the mother of the emperor Constantine. Both statues were probably modeled on a statue of Aphrodite by Phidias. The materials—bronze for the statue, with Pentelic marble for the base—derived, like the statue type, from Greek models.[8] Close to the date of this statue, which Coarelli has argued was around 100 B.C. and whose arguments I summarize below, we hear of the first well-documented public funeral oration given for a woman in Rome,[9] and we can also trace the appearance to an approximately contemporaneous period of statues of female relatives of Roman magistrates in the provinces of the Greek-speaking east. Here female relatives of rulers as well as female dynasts had long been honored with their husbands, fathers, brothers, or sons on coins and with statues. To curry favor with a Roman magistrate, the local βουλή or the δῆμος or both together might erect statues not only to him but to his female relations. Tuchelt, in his work on provincial magistrates in Asia Minor, lists as the earliest securely datable example of a public statue for a Roman woman, a dedication at Troy after 89 B.C. for the daughter of L. Julius Caesar (151). Payne has collected the evidence for Roman magistrates in Greece and has found an inscription for the wife or daughter of Q. Mucius Scaevola on Cos, datable to 98/7 B.C. or 94/3 B.C.[10]

Cornelia's statue, like these examples from the East, commemorates her relationship to her famous male relatives, but the original inscription apparently included only her sons (Plut. *CG* 4), although Plutarch says that the people honored her for her father as well as her sons. The reason for the erection of the statue seems to be political. Coarelli has suggested that between 107 and 100 B.C. the *populares* began to gain more political power, and the erection of this statue symbolized Cornelia's loyalty to the aims of her sons, champions of the *populares*. According to Coarelli the location of the statue in

---

Helbig 2, 470, no. 1679. Cf. the anecdote in Plut. *TG* 8.5 that Cornelia complained to her sons that the Romans called her the mother-in-law of Scipio but not yet mother of the Gracchi.

[8]Plutarch mentions the statue as bronze. Pliny adds the details that Cornelia was seated and had strapless sandals. The straps with decorations could have been made of gold or silver and thus removed or destroyed. I thank Caroline Houser for pointing this out to me. On the statue type, see Fittschen and Zanker 35 no. 38 with previous literature.

[9]For the mother of Q. Lutatius Catulus (cos. 102 B.C.). Cic. *de Orat.* 2.44: "a te est Popilia, mater vestra, laudata, cui primum mulieri hunc honorem in nostra civitate tributum puto." In the historiographical tradition the date is far earlier. Cf. Livy 5.50.7; Plut. *Cam.* 8; Ogilvie 741.

[10]Payne. On the wife or daughter of Q. Mucius Scaevola, see 374 (no. 81). The statues do not necessarily mean that the women were with their husbands (or male relatives) in a province.

the porticus Metelli added to its political meaning, constituting "un véritable trophée de victoire sur Metellus, et sur toute l'aristocratie romaine." The people, as Plutarch tells us, voted the statue, a special honor but also consistent with a partisan purpose for her image. In an earlier article, Carcopino made a similar link between the statue and "les partis populaires." Thus her statue, which in its style and materials, as Coarelli has written, reflects the Hellenizing tendencies of the *nobiles*, did not start a trend but specifically responded to political tensions and propaganda of the period. At a later period Cornelia was revered as the ideal mother, an Augustan revision, I suggest, to emphasize her as a moral exemplum for women. If Coarelli's suggestion is correct, the surviving base was the original one, and the inscription was erased in the Augustan period and replaced by a different inscription in order to include Cornelia's famous father and remove the political connotations of the original inscription. The statue was now in the porticus Octaviae, built to honor Augustus' sister in the 20s, where, as one scholar has suggested, her statue may have stood in a gallery or arrangement of statues of famous mothers.[11]

If there were other such public and honorific statues for women in Rome between the time of the erection of Cornelia's statue at the end of the second century B.C. and 35 B.C., no evidence for them survives. It is instructive to note that when Pliny (*HN* 34.31) seeks to illustrate how Cato's tirades against statues for women did not prevent their erection either in the provinces or in Rome, he cites no example contemporary with Cato's own lifetime but only the case of a statue set up—accepting Coarelli's date of ca. 100 B.C.—eighty years after Cato's censorship (184 B.C.). The very fame of Cornelia's statue may logically lead us to conclude it was unique. That and the customary occasions for public and honorific statues, which by their very nature excluded women from the public, male culture of Rome, argue for an innovation when in 35

[11]On the relation of the statue to politics in Rome: Coarelli (1978); Carcopino 107-109. Analysis of the evidence about Cornelia by Kreck 47-105, who concludes (105) that Cornelia "galt als das Muster einer Römerin" who "kann somit als Beispiel jener Frauen angesehen werden." Schrömbges sees the re-erection of the statue in the porticus Octaviae as a programmatic statement of the desired role of women in the Augustan period and in conscious recollection of and refutation of Cleopatra: "Welche Rolle Augustus den Frauen und vor allem seiner eigenen zuzuweisen gedachte, verdeutlicht schon die sicherlich politisch zu verstehende Aufstellung einer neuen Statue der Cornelia in der porticus Octaviae 27 v. Chr., jener Frau also, die als Idealbild einer römischen matrona angesehen wurde" (200). Lewis hypothesizes that "Cornelia's statue was one of several famous Roman mother-figures displayed *ensemble*" (200). Among the art work mentioned by Pliny is a marble statue of Aphrodite by Phidias (*HN* 36.15), probably the model for Cornelia's statue. We might reasonably expect a portrait of Octavia and other women in Augustus' family here, too.

B.C. statues were voted for Octavia and Livia along with freedom from *tutela*—financial wardship—and sacrosanctity. All three grants focused public attention on the women. Two of the honors—freedom from *tutela* and tribunician sacrosanctity—were exceptional, and we have no reason to exclude statues from that category. There were, however, contemporary analogies. Scholars have identified a female face on coins minted in the field as Fulvia, the wife of Antony. Coins struck during Antony's stay in the East carried the face of Octavia, and the features of Antony and Cleopatra also appeared on eastern issues. During this particular period in the east, approximately 40-31 B.C., statues were not only set up for Antony and Cleopatra but also for Octavia, even in divine guise. The power of those statues as propaganda can be seen in the publication of an accusatory pamphlet, "de Antonii statuis," by a partisan of Octavian, M. Valerius Messala Corvinus. These artistic images in the east of Antony's womenfolk, which accorded with Hellenistic traditions and Antony's personal propaganda, certainly could have stimulated Octavian to counter with propaganda in the west.[12]

The grants of freedom from tutela and sacrosanctity seem to have had mixed motives, both asserting a new elevated social status for Octavia and Livia while, as Scardigli has argued, exploiting that status as counter-propaganda against Cleopatra. The public focus on the women, unusual in itself, brought Cleopatra to the fore, with whose royal and—to the Romans—libertine position in society the morally respectable rank of Octavia and Livia could be contrasted (Scardigli). Indeed Plutarch's *Life of Antony* shows how adroitly Octavia was used as a political weapon against Antony. As Scardigli has pointed out, however, Dio's reference to the grant of statues and other privileges begins not with Livia's name but with Octavia's. In other words, Dio's source clearly recognized that these special privileges focused on the *imperator*'s sister and not his wife. While scholars tend to talk of these grants in terms of Livia, who survived Octavia by many decades and of course assumed a far greater historical importance, the order of words is very significant. These were the actions of a man beset by war, enemies, and a still tenuous political position. The prevalence of the sister, wife of Octavian's

[12]On coins minted for Fulvia, Kreck 198-209. See too Giard 35, 69. On statues and coins of Antony, Octavia and Cleopatra: D.C. 50.5.3; Plut. *Ant.* 86.9; Sen. *Suas.* 1.6; Crawford 1. no. 527; no. 533.3a, 3b; Sydenham no. 1255; Baldus 5-10; Buttrey 95-109; Raubitschek 146-50. A pamphlet by M. Valerius Messala Corvinus is attested by Charisius; see Keil 104,18. For Antony and Cleopatra satirized on a silver bowl as Heracles and Omphale, see Zanker 66-67. Sources on Antony in the East collected and discussed by Huzar 148-68; artistic evidence in Zanker 65-73.

titular ally but actual rival, shows that she was one of Octavian's weapons against Antony. The grant of sacrosanctity in particular suggested a need for protection from harm and insult, but only Octavia was being insulted by her errant husband. The extension of the grant to Livia was logical—to keep the honors for the wives of the triumvirs equal—but little more than a smoke screen. These honors were voted in 35 B.C. after Octavian's return to Rome from campaigning in Illyria. The chronology of events is not wholly clear in our sources, but perhaps Octavia went to Athens in late 36.[13] Plutarch tells us that Octavian hoped that she would be insulted, but nevertheless allowed her to leave: ἐν δὲ Ῥώμῃ βουλομένης Ὀκταουίας πλεῦσαι πρὸς Ἀντώνιον, ἐπέτρεψε Καῖσαρ, ὡς οἱ πλείους λέγουσιν οὐκ ἐκείνῃ χαριζόμενος, ἀλλ' ὅπως περιυβρισθεῖσα καὶ καταμεληθεῖσα πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον αἰτίαν εὐπρεπῆ παράσχοι (*Ant.* 53.1). Probably the grants were made on her return to Rome, capitalizing on the insults to Octavia's dignity. Her brother indeed complained loudly to the Senate and the people (Plut. *Ant.* 54-55.1). The grants may have been a further step to stretch the political advantage to Octavian generated by Roman resentment at Antony's treatment of a "wonder of a woman" (χρῆμα θαυμαστὸν γυναικὸς, Plut. *Ant.* 31.2).

Because of the lack of direct evidence, we cannot reconstruct the precise reasons for the statues erected for Livia and Octavia. There may have been multiple purposes. Initially the statues could have served to announce the new social status of the wives of the triumvirs which the grants of sacrosanctity and freedom from *tutela* had bestowed on them. Surviving inscriptions from statues of Livia that can be dated relatively close to this period come from outside of Rome and commemorate her as the wife of "Imperator Caesar."[14] No inscribed statue base survives from this period for Octavia. The public focus on his wife, even if secondary to Octavian's desire to exploit Octavia's marital problems to his advantage, could suggest Octavian's intention to give prominence to his family line. Married only two years earlier, Octavian had advertised his marriage by an omen that was reported as occurring right at the time of the betrothal or immediately after the marriage. An eagle supposedly dropped a pregnant hen with a laurel branch in her mouth into Livia's lap. The omen

[13]Schmitthenner 192 and Buchheim 84-86 suggest that Octavia was in Athens in the winter of 36/35. Cf. App. *B.C.* 5.138; D.C. 49.33.3; Plut. *Ant.* 53.2. Pelling 248 suggests Octavia could have stayed in Athens through the summer of 35 B.C. and that Octavian "sought to exploit his sister's treatment as early as winter 35-34 B.C."

[14]E.g., *IG* XII. 5. 628 (prior to 27 B.C.): ὁ δῆμος Λειβίαν Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος γυναῖκα; Vanderpool (between 31-27 B.C.): ὁ δ[ῆμ]ος Λιβίαν Δρουσίλλαν [αὐ]τοκράτορος Καίσαρος γυναῖκα.

predicted the birth of *triumphatores* in the symbolism of the laurel and of the brood of chicks, used in auspices, hatched by the hen (Suet. *Gal.* 1; Plin. *HN* 15.136-37; D.C. 48.52.3-4). Livia had already produced two sons for her first husband, and in a marriage only two years old, Octavian could still have been confident that he and his wife would have children together.

The statues could also have had some propagandistic functions related to the events of 35 B.C. and in particular to the emergence of Cleopatra as a major focus of Octavian's attempt to undercut Antony. Stereotypical characterizations of a "Roman" Octavian and an "Asiatic and Egyptian" Antony reflected, for example, in the two styles of banquets at Brundisium (D.C. 48.30.1) could have influenced the creation of these statues. While Cornelia's statue was Hellenistic in style and material, we can imagine that the statues of Livia and Octavia were "Roman," that is, the women appeared in Roman dress, and the style and material of the statues were consistent with Roman portraiture for women, primarily attested at this period in a funerary context. Moreover, the location of statues was one aspect of the prestige they conferred. On their physical relationship to other statues or city monuments, as Zanker has demonstrated, rested at least some of their power as propaganda.[15] We do not know where the statues were set up or how many of them there were, but an obvious place lay to hand for at least one display of such statues, the temple of Venus Genetrix built by Julius Caesar. The temple would have linked the two women to the founding mother of Octavian's family. At this temple there were annual ludi Veneris Genetricis, which Dio explicitly mentions as celebrated in 34 B.C. (49.42.1), so there would have been opportunities for the building to be open and in use.

An even more powerful motive for a display of statues in this temple could have been the presence of a gilded statue of Cleopatra set up by Julius Caesar (App. *BC* 2.102; D.C. 51.22.3). Appian speaks of a "beautiful statue" that was still there in the author's day: Κλεοπάτρας τε εἰκόνα καλὴν τῇ θεῷ παρεστήσατο, ἣ καὶ νῦν συνέστηκεν αὐτῇ (*BC* 2.102). Dio had seen the statue, so it was still in its original location as late as the third century: καὶ αὐτὴ ἐν τῷ 'Αφροδισίῳ χρυσῆ ὁρᾶται. That is an especially interesting fact when we learn in the same passage of Cassius Dio that in 29 B. C. by *senatus consultum* Octavian had many earlier dedications removed from various temples (51.22.3). Immediately after this statement, Dio notes that the gilded

[15]Banquet at Brundisium: Zanker 61. On prestigious locations for statues in Rome: Lahusen 7-36.

statue of Cleopatra was not removed, thus provoking a rhetorical set piece from the author about how the enemy, Cleopatra, although defeated and captured (καίπερ καὶ ἡττηθεῖσα καὶ ἁλοῦσα), had been glorified (ἐδοξάσθη) by being enshrined in a Roman temple. Caesar had placed the gilded statue by the side of the cult statue, τῇ θεῷ παρεστήσατο (App. *BC* 2.102), suggesting Cleopatra's own divinity. We might imagine that here was one possible location of the statues of Livia and Octavia in the traditional dress of the Roman *matrona*. Their marble portraits would have pointedly contrasted with the statue of the Egyptian queen, whose oriental *superbia*, evident in the gilt and location of her statue, compared unfavorably with the respect for decency and propriety of the two Roman women. Cleopatra had herself been in Rome in the 40s, thus the Romans knew her firsthand. We do not know why her statue was not removed after Actium, but, if statues of Octavia and Livia also stood there, Roman viewers might still find a moral lesson in the display. The message would have been different but equally apropos after Cleopatra's defeat. We do not know how many statues were set up of the two women. Copies of these two statues were disseminated outside Rome—as seems likely from surviving portraits—but we do not know the time or occasion for their erection. The statues marked the introduction of the portraits of female members of the ruling authorities as a new aspect of Roman politics and propaganda. As we shall see later, however, it would probably be mistaken to regard this innovative grant as the start of a trend.

In sum, the vote of statues to women in 35 B.C. is not part of any Roman tradition. Although we can cite the statue of Cornelia as a Roman precedent, it was Hellenistic in origin, borrowing the cultural values of the Hellenistic tradition of honoring female relatives of important men. A more direct model for the statues of 35 B.C. was the images of Fulvia, Octavia, and Cleopatra, which Antony encouraged in the east to support his dynastic schemes. Both Cornelia's statue and the statues granted to Octavia and Livia showed that women might step forward into public life to serve propagandistic needs. What is clear about both occasions—the conferral of public statues on Cornelia and later on Octavia and Livia—is that the statues were inherently at odds with Roman cultural assumptions and traditions about publicly voted statues for individuals in the city of Rome.[16]

[16]The Cartoceto bronzes—gilded statues of two horses, two men and two women—are still the object of great controversy, but a final consensus about the identification and purpose of this group may have bearing on my argument if that date is as early as has been argued by

In the senatorial vote of statues to Livia in 9 B.C. we can see that traditional ideas about publicly granted statues as based on *merita*—an idea that forms no part of the grant of 35 B.C.—are applied to a woman. Dynastic politics and the grant of the statues appear to have been closely connected. In the period between 15 B.C. and 9 B.C. Livia's sons had increasingly been the center of public focus as they emerged as a second pair of potential heirs to the throne. In 11 B.C., for example, Tiberius married Julia and, awarded significant military commands by Augustus, earned the right to an *ovatio* in that same year. His brother Drusus had been elected consul for 9 B. C. and also, like Tiberius, entrusted with important military commands in Germany (D.C. 55.1.1). Dio describes an *ovatio* that Tiberius celebrated, probably after Drusus' death (55.2.4).[17] The celebration drew Livia into public view in a new way, for she and her daughter-in-law Julia, herself the mother of the prime contenders Gaius and Lucius, gave a banquet for the women of Rome, while Tiberius gave a city-wide banquet (D.C. 55.2.4).[18] The plans for this celebration, even if it took place after Drusus' death, must have been readied considerably in advance, for an exactly similar celebration had already been planned for Drusus when he died in an accident in the second half of 9 B. C. (D.C. 55.2.5).[19] Presumably Livia and Drusus' wife Antonia would have entertained the women of Rome. Such events not only did homage to the emperor's stepsons but to their mother Livia, who was also honored by the dedication of the Ara Pacis Augustae on January 30, 9 B.C., for it was her birthday. Livia had had no recorded public honors since 35 B.C.

The death of the young and affable Drusus, a favorite of Augustus, occasioned an enormous outpouring of popular grief. Dio Cassius (55.2.5) writes that Drusus died "before his time" (προαπώλετο) and in the same sentence states that statues were voted to Livia as a consolation (ἐπὶ παραμυθίᾳ) and she was also granted the privilege of the *ius liberorum*. In his next sentence Dio writes that in times prior to his own the senate bestowed the privilege of the *ius liberorum* (διὰ τῆς βουλῆς), but in his own time the emperor conferred the honor (διὰ τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος). Whether the Senate was the spontaneous origin of these proposals or reacted to suggestions from

Bergemann. He believes that the group dates between 50 and 30 B.C. For an Imperial date, see Stucchi.

[17]On the date of the *ovatio* in relation to Drusus' death, Rich 200 with bibliography on the date, which is a matter of controversy.

[18]On this event and other innovations regarding the position of Livia in public life, Purcell 78-105.

[19]On the date of Drusus' death, Levick 783 n. 5.

friends or confidants of Augustus or Livia themselves, we do not know. Yet it is significant that these honors added to an already honor-filled year for Livia, who formed the connecting link between Claudii and Julii. That explains the attention she received in 9 B.C. after almost two decades during which we can find no certain record of any public honors or privileges bestowed on her. Between 35 and 9 B.C. her history is obscure because her position and the position of her two children in the plans of Augustus for the succession were minor since Marcellus and Agrippa were the putative heirs. Tiberius' marriage to Julia and the significant military appointments given to the two young men made clear their role as a second set of heirs to Augustus' power. Even the funeral of Drusus was made the occasion for a statement of the close links between the Claudii and the Julii, for the statues of both Julian and Claudian ancestors appeared in the funeral procession, although Drusus had never been adopted: "circumfusas lecto Claudiorum Iuliorumque imagines" (Tac. *Ann.* 3.5.2).

Dio's sentence makes clear an inherent connection between the *ius liberorum* and the statues in their simultaneous conferral. The major benefit of the *ius liberorum* was in freeing a woman from *tutela* so that she could administer her own property, but Livia had possessed this privilege since 35 B.C. Other benefits included the right to escape the financial penalties of *orbitas*. Since, however, the death of Drusus precipitated the decree, its purpose was only secondarily (or not at all) to confer some practical advantages previously denied her. Dio (55.2.6) says that the involuntarily childless could also receive the *ius liberorum*. Livia had been unable to conceive another child after her third pregnancy—her first by Augustus—ended in a stillbirth (Suet. *Aug.* 63.1; Plin. *HN* 7.13.57). By 9 B.C. the inability of Augustus and his wife to have children had been a long-established tragic fact of their happily married life together. Why did the Senate choose this particular moment to grant her this privilege or, to put it another way, why had she not received it earlier? Clearly the honor particularly suited a year in which Livia newly emerges into public life—as a mother. Implicit in the disregard of the granters for Livia's failure to satisfy the requirements of the law is that the stature, achievements, and importance of Livia's sons to Rome went far beyond those of ordinary citizens. The *Consolatio ad Liviam*, written at a later period, certainly could include ideas and sentiments current at the time of Drusus' death or which resurfaced at the time of the death of Germanicus or Drusus the Younger, to which the

Consolatio stands closer in date.[20] The author extravagantly praises Livia's fertility because of the achievements of her sons:

> nec genetrice tua fecundior ulla parentum
> tot bona per partus quae dedit una duos (81-82).

In a similar vein Pliny the Younger (*Ep.* 2.7.5) talks of how the possibility of the great deeds which sons may accomplish can be an incentive to bearing children. One significant line of the poem states that Livia was blessed and "increased" in status by the birth of her two sons, "es fetibus aucta duobus" (379), pointing to an underlying etymological connection between *aucta* and *Augusta*, the name already conferred on Livia at the time of the *Consolatio*.[21]

The statues—of Livia herself—were intended to console her. The usual practice, however, was for the erection of a statue of the deceased person, in whose familiar features, publicly remembered, the grieving survivor might take comfort.[22] The location of such statues in public areas might offer the additional solace of the community's recognition of the prestige of the deceased (Plin. *Ep.* 2.7.7). Livia, as we know from Seneca, commissioned images of her son for public and domestic areas—"non desiit denique Drusi sui celebrare nomen, ubique illum sibi privatim publiceque repraesentare" (*Dial.* 6.3.2)—in contrast to Octavia, whose grief for her son Marcellus was so excessive, according to Seneca's probably distorted point of view, that she could not bear the sight even of a marble image of her dead child: "nullam habere imaginem filii carissimi voluit" (*Dial.* 6.2.5). Thus the reason given for the statues by Dio is unusual since the act of consolation lay in erecting statues of the deceased rather than of the sorrowing survivor.

One way in which a statue or statues might have offered consolation to Livia was in honoring her as a mother whose child was of such value to the state that she deserved public recognition. Her grief transcended private sorrow to become the common grief of the state. We do not know what this statue

---

[20]On the date, Richmond 2773-80. He says (2780) the poem is "post A.D. 12" and "before A.D. 37." Schrijvers 381-84 dates it to A.D. 20. Statues were decreed for Drusus the Elder along with posthumous honors for his son in A.D. 19: Oliver and Palmer; González; González and Arce. Clutorius Priscus (Tac. *Ann.* 3.49) wrote a poem of consolation for the death of Germanicus after A.D. 19. One could imagine references in it to Germanicus' father.

[21]On "auctus/a" to mean "blessed with children," see, e.g. Plaut. *Truc.* 384, 516; Cic. *Att.* 1.2.1; Tac. *Agr.* 6.2; Gell. 12.1.1.

[22]Statues had already been voted for Drusus (D.C. 55.2.3). Cic. *Phil* 9.13: "[statua] quae quidem magnum civium dolorem et desiderium honore monumenti minuet et leniet." Cf. Plin. *Ep.* 2.7.3; 2.7.7. Discussion in Lahusen 135.

looked like, as no statue type has been conclusively associated with this year, nor do we know if the honor lay in the conjunction of the statue with that of Drusus and other family members in a dynastic grouping. No such group can be dated to this period. An inscription might also serve as a form of consolation, but we have no inscription either for this year or for any years close to it. All the specific historical circumstances related by Dio for 9 B.C. point to is that the statue was set up to Livia to console her for her son Drusus's death and thus honored her primarily as a mother. The grouping of Livia's statue(s) with images of Drusus or an inscription could have emphasized that aspect.

Many statues and inscriptions in the cemeteries of ancient Rome commemorated mothers. What difference is there here? The senatorial decree suggests that Livia's relationship to Drusus deserves statues set up by the state, a far greater honor than a family monument erected to demonstrate sentiment and *pietas*. Historically, only men who had performed benefits for Rome gained such public recognition. Livia's "merita in rem publicam," to turn back to Pliny's phrase, is her son. The author of the *Consolatio* uses different language to make the same point when he speaks of Livia's having given "tot bona" (82) by her two children Tiberius and Drusus. One possible implied indirect object, as Witlox suggested, is "patriae."[23] Propertius in his encomium to Cornelia, the wife of L. Aemilius Paullus Lepidus and the mother of three children, has Cornelia describe her maternity and child-rearing in terms of masculine achievement. Her children are her "deeds" and worthy of memory in the same way as masculine achievement in war:

> et tamen emerui generosos vestis honores,
> nec mea de sterili facta rapina domo. (4.11.61-62)

> haec est feminei merces extrema triumphi,
> laudat ubi emeritum libera fama rogum (71-72).

Cornelia, the daughter of Scribonia, Augustus' second wife, died in 16 B.C., just one year after new regulations about marriage and the *ius liberorum* had become operational. Cornelia's words may reflect the spirit in which the new

[23]Witlox 49. In debate after Augustus' death the Senate suggested calling Livia "parens patriae" or "mater patriae" (Tac. *Ann.* 1.14.1). Cf. D.C. 57.12.3 (both terms are discussed); Suet. *Tib.* 50.3: "parens patriae." At her death (D.C. 58.2.3) the Senate again alludes to her as μητέρα τῆς πατρίδος.

incentive to childbirth was presented to Roman women.[24] One significance of this grant lies in its tacit recognition that the mother of a state hero and stepson of the emperor deserved public honor because of the services of her son to the state. By the time of Augustus' death, when the Senate unsuccessfully attempted to vote Livia the official title of "mater patriae," which Tiberius summarily turned down for her, the idea implicit in 9 B.C. was already becoming a demonstrable fact of a political system based on family succession.

In conclusion I want to try to integrate these two grants into the history of surviving statues for Livia for the period between 35 and 9 B.C. Although the two senatorial grants marked innovations in the history of honorific public statues for women, we need at least to confront the question of whether our sources omit mention of other occasions. I think it likely that the two grants were exceptional and found their way into the historical record for that very reason, but we need to see if surviving statue types support that idea. To answer that question we need first to look at what scholars have proposed for the number of types created in the period between 35 and 9 B.C. Secondly, we will want to see if there is a correlation between the proposed types and important events in Livia's life, as there clearly is for 35 B.C. and 9 B.C. If there is not, then we may suggest that new types created did not necessarily reflect official "state" portraits but had private or family origins.

There is considerable difference of opinion about the number and date of types of statues of Livia in this period. In 1886 Bernoulli wrote: "Das Kapitel der Livia ist in der römischen Ikonographie eines der schwierigsten" (85), and Gross, in his 1962 monograph on the iconography of Livia, begins by quoting this statement. Gross identified two portrait types for the period in question: the first in the decade after Actium and the second in the last decade of the first century. Poulsen (65-71) suggested four types: the first datable to her marriage to Octavian (A), the second to the period of Actium and derived possibly from the prototype of 35 B.C. (B), the third created between 27-23 B.C. (C), and a fourth type (D) which Poulsen says originated later but without clear evidence

---

[24]The linking of service to the state and special privileges for women is found elsewhere in our sources; e.g., in Livy the right to a *laudatio* for women is linked to a contribution of gold to the city (5.50.7). Cf. D.S. 14.116.9; Plut. *Cam.* 8.3. The *toga praetexta* and *lorum* are given to freeborn sons of married freedwomen who had contributed money to the state in time of need: Macr. *Sat.* 1.6.13-14. A related story is of interest. Ovid (*Fast.* 1.619-626, cf. Plut. *QR* 56) tells how the honor of the *carpentum* was taken away from Roman women, and they aborted their children to compel the Senate to restore their privilege. Discussion of the language of Cornelia's speech by Curran; Richardson ad loc. On the language of epitaphs as gender-specific even when women are honored as patrons, see Forbis.

of when. He raises the possibility that type "D" could have been created in 9 B.C. Most recently Fittschen and Zanker (35 no. 9) have tried to refine the chronological sequence further and have suggested a first portrait type in 35 B.C. and a second in 30 B.C., which they associate with the east, where most of the surviving replicas have been found. A third type can be dated, according to their survey, in the 20s and a fourth to the period between 20-10 B.C. The analysis by Gross alone fits the surviving historical evidence exactly since he argues for only two types in this period, both of which were created at times close to 35 and 9 B.C. For the other two proposed series we must posit other occasions than those given in our historical sources for the creation of new types.[25]

What we would most like to know about the surviving statue types of Livia is the reason for their creation, since presumably these are prototypes created in Rome. If we follow the most detailed reconstruction of Fittschen and Zanker, on some occasion in the 20s and again in the period between 20-10 B.C. there was some demand for a new type. Between 35 and 9 B.C., however, there is no secure evidence of Livia's importance in Augustus' plans or any special focus on her in public life. In fact the two women of whom we do hear in this period are Octavia and Julia.[26] This is not surprising, since it was

[25]The chronology of Octavia's portrait is of interest here as well since she received statues in 35 B.C. A recent article has argued that a portrait of Octavia in the Getty Museum in Malibu is a mature or posthumous portrait of Augustus' sister. That, if true, would bring to two the total of portrait types of Octavia between 35 and 11 B.C., the year of her death. See Erhart 117-28; Chaisemartin 35-61 (with summary of earlier scholarship). The author postulates (48) a portrait at Octavia's marriage (40-35 B.C.) and one when Marcellus became heir apparent (29-23 B.C.) as the two types before posthumous creations.

[26]After Octavia's prominence in the 30s there is little evidence of a public role for her. Her honors are the porticus Octaviae, erected after 27 B.C. and a state funeral in 11 B.C. In 13-12 B.C. coins celebrate Julia, Gaius, and Lucius. See Fullerton. Datable public honors for Livia in Rome (apart from those of 35 and 9 B.C. discussed in the text) cluster around A.D. 14 and the period when Tiberius' son Drusus was granted tribunician power and marked out as the successor, in other words, dynastically significant years. Examples are A.D. 14: freedom from the restrictions of the lex Voconia, becomes "sacerdos divi Augusti," receives a lictor, takes by inheritance the cognomen Augusta, dedicates a statue of Augustus on the Palatine, and gives a feast to wives of senators and equestrians by decree of the Senate (Tac. *Ann.* 1.8.1; Vell. 2.75.3; Suet. *Aug.* 101.2; D.C. 56.32.1; 56.46.1-2; 57.12.5). A.D. 21: included for the first time in the *vota* of the fratres Arvales (*CIL* 6.32340); A.D. 22: a *supplicatio*, and *ludi* are voted by the Senate after her recovery from illness (Tac. *Ann.* 3.64.3); A.D. 22/23: coin minted for Iulia Augusta (Sutherland and Carson 96, nos. 11-12, pl. 12, no. 51). A.D. 23: a gift offered by the equites to Fortuna equestris "pro valetudine Augustae" (Tac. *Ann.* 3.71.1). A.D. 23: Livia begins to sit with the Vestals in the theatre (Tac. *Ann.* 4.16.5). A.D. 22/23: Coins minted to Salus Augusta, Iustitita, and Pietas may bear an idealized likeness of Livia. (*RIC* 96, nos. 8, 9.10, pl. 2; nos. 43, 46; *BMCRE* 1, 133 no. 98, pl. 24.7; 131, no. 81, pl. 24.2). Her death in

Octavia's son Marcellus and first Julia's husband Marcellus and then Agrippa and their children Gaius and Lucius who figured in Augustus' dynastic arrangements during these years. The surviving portrait types could, of course, reflect commissions of friends, relatives, Livia herself, the requests of the numerous *clientelae* in whose interests Livia was already busy apparently as early as 38 B.C., or requests from towns and cities which Augustus visited in company with Livia.[27] The portrait type identified by Fittschen and Zanker to around 30 B. C. would be logical for a period when Octavian was traveling widely in the East. Here there would have been a demand for a statue of the *imperator*'s wife, since honors voted to Roman magistrates often included their female relatives. If we accept Fittschen and Zanker's reconstruction of portrait types for Livia, we cannot satisfactorily connect the creation of every new type with significant occasions in Livia's life. Her public obscurity in this period argues against assuming that new types were state decrees rather than private initiatives from within the Imperial circle.

A distinction existed between the prestigious, public grant of a statue and other occasions for the creation of a new type. In A.D. 69 Otho, "recollecting his old passion" (Tac. *Hist.* 1.78.2), had statues of Poppaea re-erected in the city of Rome by senatorial vote (*per senatus consultum*). On an earlier occasion the Senate voted to remove the public statues of the disgraced Livilla (Tac. *Ann.* 6.2.1). We have no evidence of the authority for the erection of those statues, but the birth of twin sons, celebrated in coinage and boastfully announced by Tiberius to the Senate (2.84.1), could point to the Senate. A

A.D. 29 and deification in A.D. 42 brought, of course, further honors. A key event for Livia's history, as Schrömbges notes, is that in A.D. 25 Tiberius refused permission to Spain to build a temple to him and Livia (Tac. *Ann.* 4.37.1) although only two years before he had granted permission to Asia (Tac. *Ann.* 4.15.4). By then, however, the dynastic picture was utterly different since Drusus was now deceased. The pattern outside Rome is similar. I am indebted to Schrömbges' discussion of the dynastic pattern of Livia's honors (191-221).

[27]In the letter written to the Samians, which was engraved on the wall of the theatre at Aphrodisias, Octavian says he would like to do a favor for his wife, who was active on the Samians' behalf. On the letter, Reynolds 104-106, with a date of 38 B.C. The date is controversial. Cf. Bowersock with a date in the late 20s; Badian with a date of 31 B.C. As early as 31-27 B.C. there were statues of Livia on Samos, and those in conjunction with the text at Aphrodisias prove a strong link between the Samians and Livia. For the statues: Herrmann 104-105. Livia and Tiberius Claudius Nero, her first husband, took refuge with the Spartans, and Augustus granted them concessions on his trip there (D.C. 54.7.2) The freedom Tiberius grants to Livia to make her own decision about religious rites in her honor proposed by Gytheion could reflect deference to a long extant relationship between Livia and Sparta. The Gytheion decree: *SEG* 11.922-23. On Livia's travels with her husband: Tac. *Ann.* 3.34.6: "quoties divum Augustum in Occidentem atque Orientem meavisse comite Livia."

particular kind of prestige attached to the senatorial grant (even if Otho was attempting to defer to the Senate in contrast to Nero's high-handedness), which validated the importance of the Imperial family in public life. The vote of the Senate for Livia in 9 B.C. (as well as 35) was probably recorded in the *acta senatus* and published in the *acta diurna* (Baldwin). Its message emanated from the act of conferral as much or more than the statues created to fulfill it. The decision in 9 B.C. to console Livia with a statue shows this was still a special honor not yet hackneyed by repetition, especially as it was joined to the once-in-a-lifetime grant of the *ius liberorum*. I believe that the senatorial grant to Livia in 9 B.C. was only the second such made to her in accord with her new public role. We might view the grant of 35 B.C. as part of the strident and assertive politics of the period but imagine a more restrained attitude about such grants as the Augustan principate developed.

Roman society distinguished between masculine or public life and female or domestic life. In his own family Augustus demanded, apparently out of real conviction rather than solely for the sake of an improving example, modesty, simplicity, and old-fashioned domesticity in his womenfolk. Simultaneously, a family dynasty brought women to the public spotlight in a new way. Augustus' attitudes about the position of women, like those of Tiberius, can seem contradictory. In Suetonius, Cassius Dio, and Tacitus we read of the deep conservatism of the first two emperors about the role of women in public life but find the apparently conflicting evidence of statues, dedications, buildings and honors for Livia.[28] Dynastic necessity drove both to honor her even at the risk of compromise to their personal convictions. The kind of public honor she received, however, associated her with the Vestals and female life, for example, in her restoration of the temple of the Bona Dea or her dedication of a shrine to marital Concordia, as if in considered avoidance of male prerogatives or privileges.

---

[28]On her honors, see above, note 26. On Augustus' conservative views about women, see, e.g., Suet. *Aug.* 24.1, 34, 44, 45.4, 64.2; D.C. 54.16.3-7; Tac. *Ann.* 3.24.2; on Tiberius's similar attitudes: Suet. *Tib.* 50.3: "sed et frequenter admonuit, maioribus nec feminae convenientibus negotiis abstineret"; Tac. *Ann.* 1.14.3. Livia is rarely mentioned by writers contemporary with her lifetime. Horace refers to her once (although not by name) in an early poem (*Carm.* 3.14.5) but never again. Her name appears in Ovid's poetry but primarily poems written from exile, when Ovid hoped to use her infuence via his connections with Marcia, a close friend of Livia. Syme 44 comments: "The frequent obtrusion of Livia cannot have been to the liking of the Princeps (or of her son). Horace, the personal friend of the ruler, had shown the proper tact and reserve. He nowhere names Livia."

During the period between 35 B.C. and 9 B.C. the public and political role of women from Augustus' household did not follow a consistent trajectory, as sometimes seems to be assumed. The grants of 35 B.C. can be overinterpreted. Some have mistakenly written that the statutes voted in that year were a "Bildnisrecht" (Sandels 28-29). Mommsen saw the formation of the "Kaiserhaus" in the extension of tribunician sacrosanctity to Livia and Octavia, yet we may feel doubt that such a program was already in the mind of Octavian in the 30s (2.818). The issue of *tutela* became diluted since marital legislation of 18 B.C. extended it to any woman who had borne the requisite number of children and far beyond a few women and an elite circle. I believe that the female-focused politics of the 30s pushed Livia and especially Octavia into a prominent position. After her marriage Livia receded from the historical scene of the 30s; the focus was solely on Octavia. The women appeared or disappeared in the public gaze relative to current dynastic arrangements. In the two decades after Actium, first Octavia, then Julia, and only finally Livia received public honors. The porticus Octaviae, erected after 27 B.C., coincides with the rise of Marcellus; coins minted in 13-12 B.C. with Julia's image reflected the eminence of her two sons Gaius and Lucius; the honors of 9 B.C. complimented the mother of the emperor's son-in-law.

While Augustus and Tiberius gave public attention to women important to dynastic arrangements, both leave evidence of their desire to temper these honors. Suetonius (*Aug.* 61.2) writes that Augustus showed his mother and sister special respect (*praecipua officia*) while alive and "very significant honors" (*honores maximos*) when dead. But at Octavia's death Augustus curtailed the senatorial votes of honors to her: τὰ δὲ δὴ ψηφισθέντα αὐτῇ οὐ πάντα ὁ Αὔγουστος ἐδέξατο (D.C. 54.35.5). We do not know what was offered and declined; we do know that she had, like Augustus' mother, a state funeral. Possibly she also had statues voted to her. Tiberius, who followed Augustus rigidly and was even more conservative on the issue of women in public life, allowed a public funeral and arranged for statues of his mother (D.C. 58.2.1). The arch voted by the Senate he pretended to accept only to allow it to become void by neglect (D.C. 58.2.6).[29] While Dio represents his actions as indication of Tiberius' loathing for his mother, we can more realistically see his imitation of the precedent of Augustus. In fact, the funeral for Octavia may have been the model Tiberius had in mind. In sum, the grant

[29]Dio says Tiberius arranged for a public funeral, statues and "other things of no significance." We know (Tac. *Ann.* 6.5.1) that three years after her death the priests were celebrating her birthday.

of statues in 9 B.C. appears to have been a carefully thought-out public distinction, which, if it trespassed on the line between male and female worlds in order to bolster dynastic claims, seemed to build on rather than disturb Roman cultural traditions.

This history of the first appearance of public honorific statues for women in Augustus' family suggests a new honor—its origins in the not-so-distant Republican period—with public impact. The frequency of it in the later Imperial period requires a separate study, particularly in terms of the changed political scene from the first twenty-five years of Augustus' principate. The issue for Augustus was clearly how to represent women in his family in public without violating his scruples or societal conservatism. The grants of 35 B.C. and 9 B.C. are similar in their honoring the female relative of a powerful male figure; yet, the second points the way to the developing propagandistic focus for Livia and all successive Augustae on motherhood as securing the succession. Unfortunately, the lack of any statue or inscription to connect with the vote of 9 B.C. leaves us without the most important piece of evidence. The statue was a record of an historical moment, but Livia's image might have had other messages for the public to read, for artistic images during this period reinforced political and social programs. In an anecdote told by Aulus Gellius (10.2) Augustus ordered a *monumentum* with an appropriate inscription erected for one of his slave women in the area of Laurentum after she gave birth to quintuplets. Her monument, paid for by the *princeps*, exalted motherhood and Augustus' goal of large families. This story may also reveal the ideas of the *princeps* about the appropriate reason for a memorial and inscription for a woman in the Roman world. Just as the *ius liberorum* reinforced traditional female roles but may have attempted to glorify childbearing as noble service to the state, statues of Livia could have served not only to console her for her loss and the loss to Rome but also to set before the Romans an exemplum. Pliny wrote of how the statue voted by the Senate to console an eminent Roman whose son had died could be an encouragement to all leading citizens to undertake the responsibility of childbirth: "tanta praemia...acuent principes viros ad liberos suscipiendos" (Plin. *Ep*. 2.7.5).

Works Cited

Arcella, L. 1985. "Il mito di Cloelia e i Valerii." *SMSR* 9: 21-42.

Badian, E. 1984. "Notes on Some Documents from Aphrodisias Concerning Octavian." *GRBS* 25: 157-70.

Baldus, H. R. 1983. "Eine Münzprägung auf das Ehepaar Mark Anton-Kleopatra VII." *GNS* 33: 5-10.

Baldwin, B. 1977. "The *acta diurna*." *Chiron* 8.189-203.

Bergemann, J. 1988. "Die Pferde von San Marco; Zeitstellung und Funktion." *MDAI(R)* 95: 115-28.

Bernoulli, J. J. 1886. *Die Bildnisse der römischen Kaiser und ihrer Angehörigen I: Das Iulisch-Claudische Kaiserhaus*. Berlin.

Bowersock, G. 1984. rev. of Reynolds (1982). *Gnomon* 56: 48-53.

Buchheim, H. 1960. *Die Orientpolitik des Triumvirn M. Antonius*. Heidelberg.

Buttrey, Jr., T. V. 1954. "Thea Neotera on Coins of Antony and Cleopatra." *ANSMusN* 6: 95-109.

Carcopino, J. 1967. *Autour des Gracques*, 2nd. ed. Paris.

Coarelli, F. 1978. "La statue de Cornélie, mère des Gracques et la crise politique à Rome au temps de Saturninus." In *Le dernier siècle de la republique romaine et l'époque augustéenne*. Strasbourg. 13-28.

_____. 1983. *Il Foro Romano: Periodo Arcaico*. Rome.

Crawford, M. H. 1974. *Roman Republican Coinage*. Cambridge.

Curran, L. 1968. "Propertius 4.11: Greek Heroines and Death." *CP* 63: 134-39.

de Chaisemartin, N. 1983. "Note sur l'iconographie d'Octavie d'après un portrait provenant d'El Jem conservé au Musée de Sousse." *AntAfr* 19: 35-61.

Erhart, K. P. 1980. "A New Portrait Type of Octavia Minor (?)." *The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal* 8: 117-28.

Fittschen, K. and P. Zanker. 1983. *Katalog der römischen Porträts in den Capitolinischen Museen und den anderen kommunalen Sammlungen der Stadt Rom. Band 3: Kaiserinnen- und Prinzessinnenbildnisse Frauenporträts*. Mainz.

Forbis, E. P. 1990. "Women's Public Image in Italian Honorary Inscriptions." *AJP* 111: 493-512.

Fullerton, M. D. 1985. "The Domus Augusti in Imperial Iconography of 13-12 B.C." *AJA* 89: 473-83.

Gérard, J. 1980. "Légende et politique autour de la Mère des dieux." *REL* 58: 153-75.

Giard, B. 1983. *Le monnayage de l'atelier de Lyon, des origines au règne de Caligula*. Wetteren, Belgium.

Gilbert, O. 1885. *Geschichte und Topographie der Stadt Rom im Altertum*. Leipzig.

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

_____ and J. Arce. 1988. *Estudios sobre la Tabula Siarensis*. Madrid.

Gross, W. H. 1962. *Iulia Augusta: Untersuchungen zur Grundlegung einer Livia-Ikonographie*. Göttingen.

Gruen, E. 1990. "The Advent of the Magna Mater." In *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy*. Leiden. 5-33.

Helbig, W. 1966. *Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom*, 4th ed. Tübingen.

Herrmann, P. 1960. "Die Inschriften römischer Zeit aus dem Heraion von Samos." *MDAI(A)* 75: 68-183.
Huzar, E. 1978. *Mark Antony*. Minneapolis.
Jex-Blake, K. and E. Sellers. 1896. *The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art*. London.
Kajava, J. 1989. "Cornelia Africani f Gracchorum." *Arctos* 23: 119-31.
Keil, H., ed. 1961. *Grammatici Latini I*. Hildesheim.
Kreck, B. 1975. *Untersuchungen zur politischen und sozialen Rolle der Frau in der späten römischen Republik*. Diss. Marburg/Lahn.
Lahusen, G. 1983. *Untersuchungen zur Ehrenstatue in Rom*. Rome.
Levick, B.M. 1972. "Tiberius' Retirement to Rhodes in 6 B.C." *Latomus* 31: 779-813.
Lewis, R.G. 1988. "Some Mothers." *Athenaeum* 66: 198-200.
Littlewood, R. J. 1981. "Poetic Artistry and Dynastic Politics: Ovid at the *Ludi Megalenses* (*Fasti* 4. 179-372)." *CQ* 31: 381-95.
Malcovati, E., ed. 1955. *Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta.*, 3rd ed. Turin.
Mommsen, Th. 1932. *Römisches Staatsrecht*, 3rd ed. Graz.
Münzer, F. 1897 (1988). *Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius*. Berlin.
Nock, A. D. 1930. "A Diis Electa: A Chapter in the Religious History of the Third Century." *HTR* 23: 251-74.
Ogilvie, R. M. 1965. *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1-5*. Oxford.
Oliver, J. H. and R. E. A. Palmer. 1954. "The Text of the Tabula Hebena." *AJP* 75: 225-49.
Payne, M. 1984. 'Αρετάς ἕνεκεν. *Honors to Romans and Italians in Greece from 260-27 B.C.* Diss. Michigan State.
Pelling. C. B. R. 1988. *Plutarch: Life of Antony*. Cambridge.
Poulsen, V. 1962. *Les Portraits Romains I: République et dynastie Julienne*. Copenhagen.
Purcell, N. 1986. "Livia and the Womanhood of Rome." *PCPhS* 32: 78-105.
Raubitschek, A. E. 1946. "Octavia's Deification at Athens." *TAPA* 77: 146-50.
Reynolds, J. 1982. *Aphrodisias and Rome*. London.
Rich, J. W. 1990. *Cassius Dio: The Augustan Settlement*. Warminster, England.
Richardson, Jr., L. 1977. *Propertius: Elegies I-IV*. Norman, Oklahoma.
Richmond, J. 1981. "Doubtful Works Ascribed to Ovid." *ANRW* 31.4: 2773-80.
Sandels, F. 1912. *Die Stellung der kaiserlichen Frauen aus dem Iulisch-Claudischen Hause*. Darmstadt.
Scardigli, B. 1982. "La sacrosanctitas tribunicia di Ottavia e Livia." *AFLS* 3: 61-64.
Schmitthenner, W. 1958. "Octavians militärische Unternehmungen in den Jahren 35-33 v.Chr." *Historia* 7: 189-236.
Schrijvers, P. H. 1988. "A propos de la datation de la *Consolatio ad Liviam*." *Mnemosyne* 41: 381-84.
Schrömbges, P. 1986. *Tiberius und die res publica Romana*. Bonn.
Stucchi, S. 1988. *Il gruppo bronzeo tiberiano da Cartoceto*. Rome.
Sydenham, E. A. 1952. *The Coinage of the Roman Republic*. London.
Syme, R. 1978. *History in Ovid*. Oxford.
Tuchelt, K. 1979. *Frühe Denkmäler Roms in Kleinasien: Beiträge zur archäologischen Überlieferung aus der Zeit der Republik und des Augustus*. Tübingen.
Van Deman, E. B. 1908. "The Value of the Vestal Statues as Originals." *AJA* 12: 324-42.
Van den Hout, M. P. J., ed. 1988. *M. Cornelii Frontonis Epistulae*. Leipzig.
Vanderpool, E. 1968. "Three Inscriptions from Eleusis." *AD* 23a.9.
Verzár, M. 1980. "Pyrgi e l'Afrodite di Cipro. Considerazioni sul programma decorativo del tempio B." *MEFR* 92: 35-84.
Witlox, A. 1935. *Consolatio ad Liviam*. Groningen.
Zanker, P. 1987. *Augustus und die Macht der Bilder*. Munich.