

Dynastic Ideology, the *Domus Augusta*, and Imperial Women: A Lost Statuary Group in the Circus Flaminius

Marleen B. Flory
Gustavus Adolphus College

A statuary group of the *domus Augusta*, now lost, but originally erected in 15 C.E. in the Circus Flaminius, commemorated, as will be suggested below, Tiberius, Livia, Germanicus, and Drusus the Younger. This dynastic group illuminates Livia's role in the transmittal of power and foreshadows an increasing commemoration of Imperial women with public statues after 15 C.E., a striking contrast to practice before the death of Augustus. Imperial dynastic policy gradually admitted women to the prestige of public representation in the most frequented and politically symbolic areas of Rome. The dedication to a household, not an individual—remarkable in itself—also points to the pivotal importance of this dynastic monument in understanding the significance of the concept of the *domus Augusta* in the opening year of the rule of Tiberius. The dynastic statuary group confirms other evidence, to be discussed below, that the phrase *domus Augusta* was first publicly formulated during the final years of Augustus' rule. The monument, which the Senate voted and Tiberius must have approved, made an important propagandistic statement about the concept of political power at the crucial transition point between the first and second emperors.

The *Tabula Siarensis*, a copy of funerary honors decreed by the Senate for Germanicus in 19 C.E., is the only extant evidence for the *domus Augusta* statuary group. The senatorial decree preserved on this bronze tablet, found in Spain in 1982, describes a highly decorated marble arch for Germanicus, which is to be erected near these statues: *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 C(aio) Norbano Flacco*,¹ “and they decreed that a marble arch should be built with public funds

¹The *Tabula Siarensis*, found in 1982, provides almost all the missing portions of the *Tabula Hebana*, an inscription found at Heba in Etruria that also contained the senatorial

in the Circus Flaminius next to the place where statues had been erected by Gaius Norbanus Flaccus to the god Augustus and the Augustan house.” The statues were dedicated during Norbanus’ consulship and before the first of August, because Norbanus Flaccus, *consul ordinarius* of 15, stayed in office, according to an inscription from Rome, until the completion of the *ludi victoriae Caesaris*, which were celebrated between the 20th and 30th of July.² The statues were apparently voted by the Senate in 14 C.E. as part of the final honors for the recently deified Augustus. The names of the members of the *domus Augusta* whose statues were erected are not given in the *Tabula Siarensis*, but the senatorial decree of 14 C.E. undoubtedly listed their names.

Before turning to the identity of those commemorated, we need to look at the location, since the place where statues were erected in Rome validated their prestige. The Circus Flaminius was an area long associated with the victorious Roman *triumphatores*, whose parades passed through this area and who built many temples and commemorative buildings there.³ When Augustus came to power he began to claim a considerable part of this area as his own, rededicating a number of temples on the 23rd of September, his birthday.⁴ Among them was the temple of Apollo, where his mother Atia claimed that she had been impregnated by Apollo in the guise of a snake (Suet. *Aug.* 94.4; D.C. 45.1.2). In the area of the Circus Flaminius, Augustus also dedicated a portico in honor of his sister Octavia and built a theater in memory of his deceased nephew Marcellus, Octavia’s son and at one time Augustus’ presumed heir. A few years after Augustus’ death, on April 23 in 22 C.E., Livia dedicated a statue to the deified Augustus near the theater of Marcellus (Tac. *Ann.* 3.64.2) on the festal day of Venus Eryx.⁵ She was following in the tradition of her late husband by continuing to make an explicit public connection between the Circus Flaminius and the *gens Iulia*, whose founding mother was the goddess Venus. The area also had connections with the Claudii, who had entered by

decree of posthumous honors for Germanicus. For the text of the *Tabula Hebana*, see Oliver and Palmer. For the text of the *Tabula Siarensis*: González and Fernández 1981; González 1984; Lebek 1986 and 1987; Zecchini; González and Arce, eds., 1988.

²Tac. *Ann.* 1.55.1; *RE* 17 (1936) s.v. “Norbanus,” no. 10, 934–35; *PIR*, 2nd ed. s.v. “Norbanus,” no. 168. The inscription: *CIL* 6.37836; discussion by Gordon 1955 and 1958, no. 52. Drusus the Younger was fellow consul of Norbanus.

³Wiseman 1974, 1976; Humphrey 540–45; Richardson s.v. “Circus Flaminius”; Steinby, ed., s.v. “Circus Flaminius.”

⁴Degrassi 512.

⁵Degrassi 446–47.

marriage and adoption into Augustus' family, for on the declivity of the Capitoline was the burial place which had been granted as a special privilege to Atta Clausus at the time of the transfer of the *gens Claudia* to Rome at, according to one tradition, the time of Romulus or, according to a second, the time of the establishment of the Republic (Suet. *Tib.* 1.2).⁶ In 15 C.E. the Senate chose this area, filled with monuments to the great leaders of Rome and to Augustus and his family, to erect a major dynastic monument to the Imperial household.⁷

The only attempt to reconstruct the statuary group of the *domus Augusta* has been made by Richardson in a brief discussion of the group in his topographical dictionary of Rome.⁸ Richardson has argued that the close proximity of the arch of Germanicus and the statues to *divus Augustus* and the *domus Augusta* means that the designer intended them to complement each other. Starting from that premise, he suggests that the complementarity lay in the statuary programs and that the statues chosen for the arch of Germanicus were modeled on the statuary program in honor of the *domus Augusta*. The *Tabula Siarensis* gives the names and relationships of all those to be included on Germanicus' arch: his father, mother, sister, brother, wife, and children.⁹ Richardson suggests that the earlier group of 15 C.E. included approximately the same set of family members and reconstructs the group to include Julius Caesar, the adoptive father of Augustus; C. Octavius, Augustus' natural father; Atia, Augustus' mother; Livia, Augustus' wife; Octavia, his sister; and his children, all adopted, Gaius and Lucius Caesar and Tiberius. Richardson's one

⁶For further discussion of the Julian and Claudian presence in the Circus Flaminius, see La Rocca 347–72.

⁷The decree mentions that the arch was close to the statues, but there is no consensus about where the arch was located. One view has identified the arch with one depicted on fr. 31 of the *Forma Urbis*, a single bay arch at the southeastern corner of the Circus Flaminius near the theatre of Marcellus and the Porticus Octaviae. Recently, however, Kleiner has surveyed all the surviving evidence for arches and argued that there is no single bay arch that could have carried the twelve statues of Germanicus and his family plus the triumphal chariot and horses. See Steinby s.v. "arcus Germanici"; de Maria 111; Coarelli 299; Humphrey 540–45; Kleiner 1989: 200–201. Reservations also expressed by Castagnoli, who notes, however, the considerable size of the side piers, and by Gros 197–98. With comments on the limited knowledge of methods of schematic representation on the *Forma Urbis*, Carettoni, Colini, Cozza and Gatti 206.

⁸Richardson s.v. "arcus Germanici."

⁹The text reads: *circa latera eius statuae D[ru]si Germanici patris ei[us] naturalis fratris Ti[berii] Caesaris Aug[ust]i et Antoniae matris ei[us] et Agrippinae uxoris et Li[viae] sororis et Ti[berii] Germanici fratris eius et filiorum et fi[liarum] eius*.

reservation is that the total number of statues for the statuary group of 15 C.E. would have been smaller than the total of twelve statues on Germanicus' arch.¹⁰

For three reasons Richardson's proposal does not seem likely. First, some of his candidates seem inappropriate for commemoration in 15 C.E. Three of them in particular had virtually disappeared from public view many years in the past. Augustus' mother, Atia, for example, had died in 44 B.C.E. during the first consulship of her son, fifty-nine years before the erection of the monument. She was the object of vicious propaganda attacks in the late 40s as Antony denounced the ignobility of Octavian's maternal ancestors. Octavian fought back by asking—more likely compelling—the Senate to vote Atia a public funeral, the first woman in Rome to receive this honor, which had been reserved until then for men who had died in service to the state. Surviving epigrams by Domitius Marsus, an early partisan of Octavian, praise Atia and probably belong to the late 40s or 30s, apparently part of the response of Octavian to his mother's detractors. According to Nicolaus of Damascus' adulatory biography, Augustus revered his mother and attempted to rescue her memory and his own lineage from the slurs cast on her during the triumphal period. Atia did not play a significant role in the dynastic propaganda of the Augustan period, and her reappearance at the death of her son seems unconvincing. Even in the East, where dynastic monuments existed as early as Actium, Atia's presence among surviving statuary groups is virtually unknown, although Julia, Augustus' daughter, is widely commemorated.¹¹ Only one inscribed statue base has been found for Atia. Frel has suggested that a portrait statue of an elderly woman now in the J. Paul Getty Museum is Atia, but the identification is only tentative.¹²

¹⁰Richardson 26 counts seven statues for the *domus Augusta* (but actually there would have been, according to his reconstruction, eight: Julius Caesar, C. Octavius, Atia, Livia, Octavia, C. Caesar, L. Caesar, Tiberius). "This makes only seven, in addition to Augustus, but they were all adult, whereas four of the children of Germanicus were still under ten at the time of his death."

¹¹E.g., at Thespiae: Passart 447–51 = *AE* (1928) nos. 49–50; Ephesus: *ILS* 8897 = *IGSK Ephesus* VII.1 (1981) nos. 3006, 3007; Sestos: *IGR* 1.821 = Krauss no. 8.

¹²For Atia, Suet. *Aug.* 4.1, 61.2, 94.4; D.C. 45.1.2–3; Tac. *Dial.* 28; Nic.Dam. 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 22, 31, 33, 34, 38, 48, 52, 54, 126, 134; Vell. 2.60.1; App. *B.C.* 3.9. Attacks by Antony: Cic. *Phil.* 3.15–16. Virgil (*A.* 5.568) gives the *gens Atia* a distinguished genealogy. Also see *RE* s.v. "Attius," no. 34, although the article is long out of date and does not include all the ancient testimonia. Two epigrams by Domitius Marsus: Fogazza nos. 39, 40. A reconstruction of Atia's family line: Palmer 1983. Inscribed statue base: Reynolds no. 12 = *SEG* 30 (1980) 1247. Portrait bust: Frel 27, no. 13; cf. Pollini 1990: 22–23. The suggestion that she is one of the figures in the bronze statuary group at Cartoceto has been rejected. See Pollini 1993: 430–31. Her portrait may have appeared on glass paste gems of the 40s: Vollenweider 227 n. 31. It is an overstatement to claim on the basis of one inscribed statue

The same argument of unsuitability can be made for Augustus' father Octavius who, although he was honored with an arch in Rome, which was probably built in the year 27 B.C.E., played no further part in Augustan dynastic advertisement.¹³ Publicity for Atia and Octavius belonged to the triumviral period and early years of Augustus' rule, after which they faded from sight. Augustus was ashamed of his modest social origins, which he did not want to advertise and about which, as we can deduce from Suetonius and Nicolaus of Damascus, he had very little to say in his own autobiography.¹⁴ Another of the candidates suggested by Richardson, Augustus' sister Octavia, also seems an unlikely person to be commemorated twenty-six years after her death. She too has left no record of any continuing presence in dynastic propaganda.¹⁵ Commemoration of Lucius and Gaius Caesar did continue after Augustus' death, but there is little evidence to support their continuing importance in Tiberian dynastic propaganda.¹⁶

A second objection to Richardson's reconstruction is the importance given to two women—Atia and Octavia—who had no role to play in the political events of 14 C.E. and whose sudden appearance in an important Tiberian as well as Augustan monument seems implausible. We will see that one of the innovations of this group was the inclusion of a female member of Augustus' family, but contemporary political issues had to explain her presence.

Finally, this group of family members cannot be what the Senate or the Romans understood when they referred to the *domus Augusta* in 15 C.E. Richardson's proposed reconstruction is a retrospective group of mostly

base and a tentatively identified portrait that "there were portrait statues of Atia erected throughout the Roman world" (Frel 27).

¹³Plin. *Nat.* 36.36; Kleiner 1988; *RE* 17 (1937) s.v. "Octavius," no. 15, 1806–8.

¹⁴Nic.Dam. 2 promises to discuss Octavian's "high birth" but does not discuss Augustus' maternal family line; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 2.3.

¹⁵She was awarded a *funus publicum* at her death but Augustus refused to allow other honors voted to her (D.C. 54.35.5) because they apparently were excessive or too innovative. Only one statue type has been clearly identified for her: Boschung 43–45. Erhart provides arguments for a second, posthumous type, de Chaisemartin for a third type.

¹⁶An inscription to Lucius datable to 27/28 C.E. was found in the Basilica Aemilia at Rome but may have been inscribed earlier and reincorporated into the newly renovated building: see Panciera. An inscription of 14 C.E. commemorates Lucius as patron of Aesis: Sensi 1979: 235–38. Celebrations for Drusus the Elder, Lucius and Gaius continued in Hispellum in the Tiberian period: Sensi 1977. On portraits of Gaius and Lucius, Pollini 1987: 4–5: "the vast majority of their portraits would have been produced during the Principate of Augustus, with a few perhaps in Tiberian times."

deceased family members. Contemporary evidence, however, suggests that the phrase *domus Augusta*, a new term coined in the final years before Augustus' death, had a prospective point of view, looking to the future. A look first at the meaning of *domus* and then at the origins of the phrase *domus Augusta* in Rome supports that point.

The word *domus* originally meant the physical dwelling of the *dominus* and could also refer to the family and slaves who inhabited the house and were under the control of the *paterfamilias*, as well as the physical structure and its possessions.¹⁷ In time *domus* also came to indicate a family group, and the gentilic name was often attached to it—*domus Iunia* or *domus Claudia*—to indicate the founder of a family.¹⁸ The word *domus* had associations with Republican usage, but when Augustus' cognomen rather than his gentilic was attached to it, the phrase took on a dynastic element, suggesting that the *princeps* had founded a household to carry on his name Augustus. Since only Augustus' own family members could succeed to that name, which Augustus treated as a family possession even though it had initially been voted to him by the state,¹⁹ the phrase has autocratic overtones.²⁰ Ovid echoes that idea when he writes in the *Fasti* that “the care of our country will stay in the hands of the Augusti” (1.531). The creation of the phrase *domus Augusta* originated in the politics of conciliation—the desire to present a monolithic family group tied by birth and blood to Augustus and to blur the differences between the *gens Iulia* and the *gens Claudia*, which were potentially and sometimes in reality in competition with each other.²¹ The representation to the public of a harmonious family became a particularly significant issue as the moment of transition from

¹⁷On the historical development of *domus*, De Ruggiero s.v. “domus,” 2046–67; *TLL* s.v. “domus,” 1955–56, 1–21; 1972–73; 1978, 1–75.

¹⁸On *domus* in the sense of “family,” *TLL* 1981, 17–81; as a substitute for *gens*, *TLL* 1984, 22–37. Cf. De Ruggiero 2059–60 and Saller.

¹⁹Suet. *Aug.* 7.2. On Augustus' intention to make his name hereditary, Suet. *Tib.* 17.

²⁰References to the οἶκος of Augustus appeared in the Greek East as early as 4 B.C.E.: *IGR* 1.1109 (4 B.C.E.). A document of 27 B.C.E. (*IGR* 4.39.col. b 26) includes the thanks of Greek citizens to Octavian, his wife, his sister, his children, his relatives, and friends. From an early period statuary groups in the Greek East represented Augustus and/or family members. See, e.g., statues for Livia and Augustus between 31–27 B.C.E. in Eleusis (Vanderpool 8–9 = *AE* 1971 no. 439); statues for Augustus' daughter Julia, Livia, and Julia, the daughter of Agrippa, in Thasos, datable, according to the editor of *IGR*, between 19 and 12 B.C.E.; statues for Livia, Julia, Gaius and Lucius before 12 B.C.E. in Thespieae (*AE* 1928 no. 49–50 = Plassart no. 89). Cf. also the development of the phrase *gens Augusta*, e.g., a dedication at Corinth (see Kent, vol. 8.3.2, no. 71) and an altar at Carthage (see Cagnat).

²¹Discussion by Fantham esp. 260–62; Millar 1988 and 1993; Herbert-Brown 201–4.

the elderly and frail Augustus to his adopted heir drew obviously nearer. Augustus' personal desire to leave a memorial to himself as the founder of the ruling Roman family may have been a factor as well.²²

The phrase *domus Augusta* first appears in Rome in the poetry of Ovid. In addition, he uses the simple word *domus* and the related adjective *domesticus* to refer to the family of Augustus in a dynastic sense. The first allusions occur in the revised portion of the *Fasti*, after 8 C.E., and most often in the *Tristia*, written between 9 and 12, and the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, the first three books of which were written and published in 12 and 13 and the fourth and last book between 13 and 16 C.E. These references to the *domus*, as Bömer first pointed out in his commentary on the *Fasti*, show that the phrase *domus Augusta* began to be in use during, and was probably the creation of, the last six years of Augustus' rule.²³

Ovid's poetry can help reconstruct the dynastic group in the Circus Flaminius, for he is writing about the *domus* at a period within a few short years of the dedication of the group in 15 C.E. He also discusses the *domus Augusta* primarily from an ideological point of view by focusing on Augustus, Livia, Tiberius, Germanicus, and Drusus the Younger—the line of succession and the woman who links that line to Augustus. In eight poems he refers to this family, but, although he includes references to the wives of Germanicus and Drusus and/or their children in three poems, he does so only cursorily, and never by name.²⁴

A poem of considerable interest, the only one in which the specific phrase *domus Augusta* appears in Ovid's poetry, demonstrates the political connotations of the term. The second poem in Book 2 of the *Epistulae ex Ponto* was probably composed in early 13 C.E., since Ovid refers to the triumph

²²During the Claudian period propaganda may have focused on Livia as the founder of the house. Schoonhoven ad loc. construes a difficult verse—*quamque licet citra constituisse domum*, 50—to mean that Livia “established the Imperial house.” Since Schoonhoven argues that the poem is the work of pro-Claudian forces in the court of Nero, that interpretation suits a propagandistic use of Livia. Cf. an inscription from Tlos (*SEG* 28 [1978] no. 1227) of the Claudian period for Livia that says she “created the race of the Sebastoi.”

²³Bömer ad *Fast.* 1.701. The references to *domus* that clearly refer to Augustus and his family: *Fast.* 1.532, 701, 721; 6.810; *Tr.* 1.2.101; 3.1.41; 4.2.10; *Pont.* 2.1.18; 2.2.49; 2.2.74; 3.3.87; 4.6.20; 4.9.109. Elsewhere the word does not appear, but Ovid refers to family membership: *Met.* 1.835; *Tr.* 2.161; *Pont.* 2.8.1–4, 29–34; 3.1.163–64. The phrase *domus Augusti*, however, seems to refer specifically to Augustus' dwelling (*Pont.* 3.1.125).

²⁴*Tr.* 2.161–69; 4.2.7–12; *Pont.* 2.2.69–74; 2.8.1–4 with 29–34; 3.1.163–64; 3.3.87–88; 4.9.105–10; 4.13.25–32.

Tiberius celebrated on October 23 in 12 C.E., and a letter from Rome took about six months to arrive in Tomis (*Pont.* 3.4.59–60; 4.11.15–16). Ovid describes the tremendous joy in Rome at Tiberius' victory and the happiness of the citizens and Augustus because all of the members of the *domus Augusta* are healthy and safe. Verses 69–74 read:

incolumis coniunx sua pulvinaria servat,
 promovet Ausonium filius imperium.
 praeterit ipse suos animo Germanicus annos
 nec vigor est Drusi nobilitate minor.
 adde nurus neptesque pias natosque nepotum
 ceteraque Augustae membra valere domus.

His healthy wife safeguards her holy marriage bed; his son is extending the western border; the courage of Germanicus outstrips his years; the vigor of Drusus is no less than his nobility. In addition, his daughters-in-law and his good granddaughters and the children of his grandsons are prospering; so are all the other members of the family of Augustus.

In addition to Augustus, the family includes Livia, Augustus' wife, and Tiberius, his adopted son. Verses 71–72 refer to the two sons of Tiberius. The first is Germanicus, whom Tiberius had adopted in 4 C.E. and who was favored for the succession, and the second, Tiberius' own son, Drusus the Younger. These members of the family claim the greatest number of verses. Only the final two verses bring up the wives of Drusus and Germanicus and their children and "other members" of the family. Ovid tries to refer to the wives and children in a diplomatic way, which, however, compels the reader to do some genealogical puzzle solving. Verse 73 refers to *nurus*, daughters-in-law, who are also described as granddaughters. According to the *Digest* (23.2.14) a *nurus* was a son's wife, a *fili uxore*, but could also be used of the wife of a grandson or a great-grandson. The women referred to then are Agrippina, married to Germanicus, the grandson of Augustus, and Livilla, married to Drusus the Younger, also a grandson of Augustus. By their marriages to the grandsons, both women were also considered granddaughters. The adjective *pias*, unless it is simply rhetorical filler, may deliberately exclude Julia the Younger, who was a granddaughter of Augustus, but who had been exiled and was in disgrace. That fact may also explain the double way of referring to the two women as both "daughters-in-law" and "granddaughters." The only granddaughters Augustus now recognized were the wives of his two grandsons. A variant reading in the manuscripts—*nurum neptemque*—would distinguish between Livilla, wife of a grandson, and Agrippina, a granddaughter, but seems less

artful for calling attention to the more prestigious blood relationship of Agrippina.²⁵ The names of the women are not given here although the name of Livia is given elsewhere (e.g., *Tr.* 2.161; 4.2.11; *Pont.* 2.8.1). Livia, however, by her position in the poem and by her description, has greater significance than the daughters-in-law briefly mentioned with their children (*natos*).²⁶

In the last verse Ovid refers vaguely to "other members" of the *domus Augusta* without giving their identity. Perhaps they are Claudius and Antonia, both of whom are mentioned as members of the *domus Augusta* in the as yet unpublished *senatus consultum de Pisone*, one section of which extends condolences for Germanicus' death to specific family members. Since Antonia was Germanicus' mother, Claudius his brother, and Germanicus an heir apparent, they receive senatorial recognition, although Claudius comes last in the list, a reflection of his still dismal political prospects.²⁷ Although Ovid uses the phrase *domus Augusta* in *Pont.* 2.2 as if it were an inclusive family term, his actual references to the family exclude those not in the political succession or, in the case of Antonia, not a crucial link in it.

In all eight poems Ovid mentions the same roster of family members of the *domus Augusta*, that is, Augustus, Tiberius, Livia, Germanicus, and Drusus. Livia is always described in some detail, flattered, or mentioned by name. A few examples suffice. Livia is called *Livia mater* (*Pont.* 3.3.87), "Livia, the Vesta of chaste married women" (*Pont.* 4.13.31), and in two fulsome verses Ovid wishes that "Livia, a woman who was suited by rank to no other husband,

²⁵ Agrippina was the granddaughter of Augustus since her mother was Julia, Augustus' daughter. Livilla was the granddaughter of Livia. There are two different readings: *nurum neptemque* and *nurus neptesque*. The first is adopted by Richmond 33. The plural is accepted by André 46 and by Willige and Luck 364.

²⁶ Germanicus had three sons. Nero Caesar and Drusus Caesar were respectively seven and six years old in 13, and Gaius had been born late in August of 12 C.E. See Mommsen, who suggests that a Tiberius and a son of unknown name were born and died between 8 and 10 C.E. A son named Gaius, referred to by Suetonius (*Cal.* 7), was probably born in 11; his elder brother adopted his praenomen, showing he was deceased at the time of Caligula's birth. See *CIL* 6.888, 889, 890. Drusus had a daughter named Julia, *PIR* 2 s.v. "Julia," no. 674. Cassius Dio (57.14.6) mentions a grandson of Tiberius, the son of Drusus the Younger, who died during the first year of Tiberius' rule. Livilla had at least four children, widely spaced in time; the date of her birth and marriage to Drusus are unknown. See Raepsaet-Charlier no. 443. The fertility of Agrippina relative to that of Livilla is remarked on as a political issue by Tacitus: *Ann.* 1.41.2; 2.43.6; 4.12.3.

²⁷ The *Senatus Consultum de Pisone* of 20 C.E. has only been published in summary, but Eck notes that in thanks offered to the members of the *domus Augusta* Claudius' name comes last. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 3.18.

may complete her harmonious years with you (i.e., Augustus)” (*Tr.* 2.2.161–62). Ovid’s references to Livia mark a departure from the reticence he had shown in the past about referring to female family members of the *princeps*. Livia had been mentioned five times in earlier poetry, once in the *Metamorphoses*, but not by name, and twice in the portions of the *Fasti* written before Ovid’s exile.²⁸

Can we reconstruct the statuary group from Ovid’s description of the membership of the *domus Augusta*? The test of a plausible reconstruction will be supporting artistic or epigraphical evidence. It is very unlikely that the statuary group represented the extended family group that Ovid describes in three of his poems—Augustus, his wife, son, grandsons, and great-grandchildren. Among the surviving dynastic statuary groups, most of which come from the Greek East, there is no contemporary evidence of a group sculpture analogous to the extended family Ovid describes. There is no evidence, moreover, to show commemoration of Agrippina and Livilla in 15 C.E.. Agrippina is commemorated during her trip to the East with her husband Germanicus in 18 C.E.²⁹ Livilla only receives attention after Germanicus’ death when her husband’s succession to the throne was assured or from those provincial communities that favored Drusus.³⁰ It is the smaller group, which Ovid also refers to as the *domus*, and which includes Augustus, Tiberius, Germanicus, Drusus the Younger, and Livia, that makes sense as a political grouping. This is the most plausible reconstruction of the statuary program of the *domus Augusta*, which must have been an advertisement for the line of male succession from Augustus, with Livia’s presence explained by her pivotal role as

²⁸*Met.* 15.836; *Fast.* 5.157–58; 6.637–38 (before exile); *Fast.* 1.536, 649–50 (after exile). Domenicucci argues that if Romulus is meant in the *Metamorphoses* to suggest Augustus, then Hersilia may refer to Livia. After one appearance as the unnamed *mulier* of Augustus (*Hor. Carm.* 3.14.5), Livia is not mentioned again in Augustan literature. Syme 44 comments: “Horace, the personal friend of the ruler, had shown the proper tact and reserve. He nowhere names Livia.” The *Consolatio ad Liviam*, whose date is very controversial, is usually placed between the Tiberian and Neronian periods; see Schoonhoven.

²⁹Inscriptions survive from Lesbos, where she had her last child in 18 C.E.: *IGR* 4.74, 100. She is commemorated there on coins as θεᾶς Αἰολίδος καρποφόρας. See too *IGR* 3.716 (Andriacae, Asia), 4.22, 23 (Thermae, Asia), 980 (Samos), 1300 (between Cyme and Myrina in Asia).

³⁰She is commemorated at Gytheion as the “Aphrodite of Drusus.” The inscription dates between 14 and 19 C.E., before Germanicus’ death, but reveals that the local people were partial to Drusus. The area had long ties with the Claudii; Livia had helped the Spartans in thanks for their having sheltered her during the triumphal period (D.C. 54.7.2). See Seyrig and Rostovtzeff. In an inscription from Troy, Livilla is called the “goddess Aphrodite” and “a descendant of Anchises”: Frisch no.88 = *IGR* 4.206.

wife, daughter, priestess of the deified Augustus, and Augusta. She was the linchpin that held the family together. Because of her unique structural place in the dynasty, of which Ovid is very aware, it was impossible for her not to be represented.

Another poem of Ovid may give us the arrangement of the group as well. In *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.8.1–6 Ovid thanks a friend for a gift of three silver statuettes of Livia, Augustus, and Tiberius which Ovid had installed in a *sacrarium* in his house in Tomis. To these he then added, after the death of Augustus, two more statuettes, one of Drusus and the other of Germanicus, so that “no member of the family should be missing” (*neu desit pars ulla domus*, 4.9.105–10). The statuette of Drusus was placed next to Tiberius, that of Germanicus next to Livia. Augustus, of course, would have been the central figure. Ovid’s additions to the shrine reflect a new blitz of publicity for the successors, Germanicus and Drusus, and suggest, a point to which I will return, that Drusus and Germanicus, Tiberius, Livia and Augustus form not only a *domus Augusta* but a *domus divina*. There are surviving dynastic groups that corroborate this family grouping, an exactly similar dynastic group in Baeterrae in France³¹ and another in Apollonia Sozopolis in Turkey.³² A different kind of supporting evidence comes from a document that survives from Gytheion in Greece and details celebrations of the Imperial cults between 14 and 19 C.E.. Five days are set aside for the celebrations; the first was dedicated to Augustus, the second to Tiberius, the third to Livia, the fourth to Germanicus, and the fifth to Drusus.³³

An important tie joined these five people together. All were members of the *gens Iulia*, and the monument, although dedicated to the house of Augustus, reinforced the idea that the line of succession passed directly from Julius Caesar through his heirs. Livia had been adopted into the *gens Iulia* in her husband’s will.³⁴ Here, in this statuary group, there appears a clear reason for that adoption. The dynastic group and the groups that imitated it could not have a member of the *gens Livia* (who also had Claudian blood) as a pivotal member, particularly since Livia linked Tiberius and Augustus. The obliteration of her old family name made the family portrait homogeneous.

Livia’s presence in this dynastic group in the Circus Flaminius is confirmed by her appearance in other contemporary dynastic monuments of the

³¹Discussion of this group by Rose forthcoming.

³²*MAMA* IV 49–56, no. 143. Discussion by Rose forthcoming.

³³Above, n. 30.

³⁴*Tac. Ann.* 1.8.1; *D.C.* 56.46.1.

Tiberian period and also by Ovid's insistent emphasis on her importance in his poetry, where she regularly is named after Augustus and Tiberius and before Germanicus and Drusus. Livia's status represents a significant moment for the history of women in dynastic portraiture and marks the end of the ambiguity of the Augustan period concerning the dynastic role of female family members in public life.³⁵ Although women appear in public roles during Augustus' lifetime, they are not openly commemorated as the mothers of successors. Livia became Augusta at her husband's death and in his will.³⁶ During the Julio-Claudian period the significance of that title is maternal. No woman who had not borne an heir received the name of Augusta until Nero granted it to Poppaea Sabina and her baby daughter (Tac. *Ann.* 15.23; Suet. *Nero* 35.3). The title, according to the pattern of conferral during the earliest period of Julio-Claudian rule, was granted to either the mother of the emperor or a mother-surrogate after the emperor had taken the throne. Antonia was elevated to the position by her grandson Caligula (Suet. *Cal.* 15.2; D.C. 59.3.3) and then, after Claudius had abolished the *acta* of his predecessor and undone the senatorial grant of the title Augusta, had the title reconferred by her son (Suet. *Cl.* 11.2). Wives were excluded from possessing this title until Claudius conferred it on Agrippina (Tac. *Ann.* 12.26.1),³⁷ whose son Nero was the intended successor. In 69 C.E. Vitellius awarded the title to his mother, not his wife (Tac. *Hist.* 2.89). His case makes clear that the title of Augusta was intended only for the mother of the successor after he had reached the throne. While Livia had acquired no constitutional position in the Roman state by virtue of her new name, it gave her unmatched personal prestige and created an honorific position for a mother in

³⁵The women in Augustus' family entered into public life as sponsors of buildings and temples (portico of Octavia, portico of Livia, temple to Bona Dea, temple to Concordia) and received special honors in 35 B.C.E. of public statues, freedom from *tutela* and sacrosanctity. The Ara Pacis Augustae was dedicated on Livia's birthday. A coin of Julia with her sons from 12 B.C.E. is an apparent dynastic advertisement, but Julia is not named and appears with the features of Diana: discussion in Fullerton. On the absence of references to female members of Augustus' family in Augustan literature, n. 28 above. Herbert-Brown 130 notes that extant copies of inscribed calendars do not mention Livia until after the death of Augustus.

³⁶For the history of the title, see Temporini 27–35; Ritter; Kienast 53–57; and Kuhoff, whose article is weakened by his insistence that only coins and inscriptions are valid evidence for the conferral of the title.

³⁷None of the three wives Caligula had while on the throne were elevated to the rank of Augusta. The Senate offered the title to Messalina, but Claudius refused it (D.C. 60.12.5). Nero's wives Octavia and Statilia Messalina did not receive the title.

public life that was, as the statuary group of the *domus Augusta* demonstrates, recognized by the Senate.³⁸

Livia had, on earlier occasions, received statues by vote of the Senate. The first time was in 35 B.C.E. when both she and Octavia received public statues, freedom from *tutela*, and sacrosanctity analogous to that of the tribunes after Octavian's return from Illyricum and deferral of a triumph.³⁹ Instead, he sought special honors for his wife and sister. Dio Cassius (49.38.1) is the source for this information, and he puts Octavia's name first when he describes the two recipients of the honors. The order of names indicates that the grants and the statues were part of Octavian's propaganda campaign to elevate his sister's position in society in order that Octavian might be able to discredit her husband, the philandering Antony, and even to have a pretext for war, should Antony insult Octavia. The statues voted at this time honor both women as relatives of Octavian and also exalt his family line. The second occasion when Livia was honored by the Senate with statues was on the death of her son Drusus in 9 B.C.E. The Senate voted these statues to her, as Dio Cassius writes, "by way of consolation" (55.2.5). Both these grants honored Livia as an individual in relation to husband or son on a particular historical occasion.⁴⁰ The grant of 15 C.E. establishes the principle of a ruling house, which endows the mother of the successor with a public position. Beyond the Ara Pacis Augustae there is no evidence to show that Livia had ever been publicly depicted as part of a dynastic group in Rome.⁴¹ The presence of her statue with her husband, son and grandsons in the Circus Flaminius marks a new stage in the public depiction of Imperial women in Rome.

Between 14 and 29 C.E. Livia is the woman who receives the most honors and public attention,⁴² but there is evidence to show the rapid acceptance in

³⁸The recognition of this position is further demonstrated by the debate in the Senate shortly after Augustus' death about calling Livia *mater patriae* or *parens patriae*. Tac. *Ann.* 1.14.1; D.C. 57.12.4; Suet. *Tib.* 50.3.

³⁹See the discussion by Scardigli.

⁴⁰Argued in Flory 1993.

⁴¹An allegedly important piece of evidence outside Rome, a triumphal arch in Pavia supposedly erected in 7/8 C.E. and crowned by ten statues of the Julio-Claudians, including one of Livia, has now been shown not to have existed. The inscriptions in fact belong in Rome on the Porta Appia: Rose 1990.

⁴²For honors for Livia in her lifetime, n. 40 above. After 14 C.E. her honors escalate: she receives the priesthood of Augustus, the right to a lictor, dedicates a statue to Augustus on the Palatine, presides over a banquet for the wives of senators and equestrians, initiates *ludi* for Augustus that continue to be celebrated annually, is freed from the provisions of the *lex*

Rome of the idea that the female relatives of the emperor or future emperor—as potential mothers of heirs—are public figures who merit state recognition. In dynastic art women begin to appear in extraordinary ways. On Germanicus' arch, erected in 19 C.E., stood statues of his mother, sister, wife, and three daughters. This innovative monument represents female family members on a triumphal arch in a central area of Rome and combines triumphal and familial imagery together. In 23 C.E. Drusus the Younger died and, according to Tacitus (*Ann.* 4.9.2), received the same honors as Germanicus. A portion of a senatorial decree for Drusus survives, which Lebek has reconstructed to a considerable extent.⁴³ Drusus too must have received an arch similar to that of Germanicus that depicted him in a triumphal chariot and displayed statues of his female relatives, probably his grandmother Livia, his wife Livilla, his mother Vipsania, and his daughter Julia. A surviving statuary group from Lepcis Magna, which Trillmich has argued is a copy of the statuary group set up for Drusus in Rome,⁴⁴ included his grandmother, his mother, and his wife.⁴⁵

When Livia died in C.E. 29 the Senate voted to set up an arch for her, an honor for a woman for which there were no precedents (D.C. 58.2.3).⁴⁶ Senatorial discussions about the arch, which Cassius Dio reports, focused on the many services that Livia had rendered to the state, including paying for the dowries of daughters of indigent senators and giving money to families to support their children. The *senatus consultum de Pisone*, which details the actions taken by

Voconia, pledges with Tiberius to build a temple for Augustus in Rome (Tac. *Ann.* 1.8.1; Vell. 2.57.3; Suet. *Aug.* 101.2; D.C. 56.32.1; 56.46.1–5; 57.12.5). In 21 C.E. she is included for the first time in the *vota* of the *fratres Arvales* (CIL 6.32340), who also erected a statue for her sometime before her death. In 22 C.E. she and Tiberius dedicate a statue to *divus Augustus pater* near the theater of Marcellus. In 23 a *supplicatio* and *ludi* are voted to her after her recovery from illness (Tac. *Ann.* 3.64.3). In 22/23 C.E. coins are minted for Iulia Augusta (Sutherland and Carson 96, nos. 11–12, pl. 12, no. 51). In 23 C.E. the equestrians offer a gift to *fortuna equestris* on her behalf (Tac. *Ann.* 3.71.1), and in the same year she begins to sit with the Vestals in the theater (Tac. *Ann.* 4.16.4). Coins minted in 22/23 C.E. to *Salus Augusta*, *Iustitia* and *Pietas* may bear an idealized likeness of her (Sutherland and Carson 96, nos. 8–11, pl. 11, nos. 43, 46; BMCRE 1.133 no. 98, pl. 24.7; 131, no. 81, pl. 24.2). Her birthday was celebrated by the *fratres Arvales* in 27 C.E. Three years after her death the priests were celebrating her birthday (Tac. *Ann.* 6.5.1). These are honors from the city of Rome. For honors outside Rome, L. Olendorf, “Livia,” *RE* (1926) 916; Grether 233. My own study of inscribed statue bases for Livia from all over the Roman world shows twenty-four dedications after her husband's death in comparison with fourteen before it.

⁴³Lebek 1993.

⁴⁴See Trillmich.

⁴⁵Discussed by Rose forthcoming.

⁴⁶Kleiner 1990.

Piso in 20 C.E., also speaks of the “beneficia” of Livia to the state. What is most interesting is the gigantic step that had been taken between 15 C.E., when Livia’s statue appeared as a member of a family group, and 29 C.E., when the Senate wanted to vote a commemorative arch for a woman in Rome. Tiberius promised the Senate to build it at his own, rather than at state, expense but did not carry out the plan, for he, a man who was conservative about the kinds of honors appropriate to a woman, apparently considered the idea too innovative.⁴⁷ One final example does not demonstrate innovation but confirms the frequency of the appearance of women in dynastic art in the Tiberian era. This example is Tacitus’ statement about senatorial decrees against the statues of Livilla, Drusus’ wife, after her complicity in the death of her husband had been discovered.⁴⁸ No portrait type of Livilla has been identified,⁴⁹ but Tacitus’ statement shows that public statues had been voted to her in Rome once her husband became the certain heir to Tiberius. In contrast there is scanty evidence for official statues for women in the capital city during the whole of the Augustan period.

The statuary group in the Circus Flaminius honored the successors and the family line of Augustus but also reflected other ideology about the *domus Augusta* expressed by Ovid. Ovid emphasizes a number of ideas about the dynastic house: the descendants of Augustus have a divine right to rule (*Fast.* 1.532); the family and household of Augustus are sacred and sacrosanct (*Fast.* 6.810); only Augustus’ family has the right to celebrate triumphs (*Tr.* 3.1.41); and finally the *domus Augusta* will rule in perpetuity (*Tr.* 4.2.10; *Fast.* 1.721). All these ideas are inherent in the statuary group in the Circus Flaminius. The juxtaposition of the statues of the four living family members—Tiberius, Livia, Germanicus, and Drusus—with that of the deified Augustus suggests their descent from a god and further implies that the successors themselves could earn deification at some future time. Ovid, in a revised passage of the *Fasti* (1.536), was already predicting Livia’s deification, which was discussed at the time of her death but prohibited by Tiberius (Suet. *Tib.* 51.2; D.C. 58.2.1). Caligula urged the Senate to deify Tiberius but failed to convince them of his predecessor’s virtues (D.C. 59.3.7). The group, with a clear line of succession marked out for two generations beyond Augustus, emphasizes the security of the descent. The

⁴⁷D.C. 58.2.6; Tac. *Ann.* 1.14.2; Suet. *Tib.* 50.3.

⁴⁸Tac. *Ann.* 6.2.1: *atroces sententiae dicebantur in effigies quoque ac memoriam eius.*

⁴⁹Some cameo portraits have been tentatively identified as Livilla. See Megow 293–301. She underwent a *damnatio memoriae* that has wiped out any record of her in art.

location of the monument in the Circus Flaminius, famous for monuments set up by *triumphatores*, the place where triumphal booty was displayed, and through which triumphal processions made their way, subtly suggested the military dominance of this family. Livia's presence confirms that the triumph belongs to a family and heralds the future inclusion of Imperial women on triumphal monuments.

And finally, what of the relationship between the arch erected to Germanicus and the statuary group of the *domus Augusta*? Richardson believes that connection was in the statuary display, an idea rejected here. The arch to Germanicus is one of a series of commemorative arches dedicated to deceased members of the Imperial family, beginning with the arch erected to Drusus the Elder, Livia's son, in 9 B.C.E., although the statuary program for Germanicus' arch is highly innovative. In some ways the arch represents a *domus Germanici*—whereas earlier examples had commemorated individuals—and constitutes an *exemplum* of the ideal Roman man. The proximity of the arch to the statuary group and particularly to the statue of *divus Augustus* was an honor for Germanicus, linking him to the *domus* of which he was a member, and to its divine founder. The erection of a separate monument to his own family further elevated his social stature. Yet, although the arch was an honor and its location must have also been part of the prestige, it is possible to read it in quite another way. There are some striking absences in the statuary display. Tiberius is not there, although earlier Imperial propaganda consistently emphasized his role as father of Germanicus. Tiberius is referred to only obliquely when Germanicus' father is described as the *naturalis frater* of Tiberius. Livia, Germanicus' grandmother, is missing, and so is his brother by adoption, Drusus the Younger, with whom Germanicus is often paired in inscriptions, dedications, and dynastic statuary groups. The arch is a monument to the *gens Claudia*; all references to the *gens Iulia* have been expunged. Since Drusus the Younger was now the heir apparent, the arch ignores Germanicus' place in the succession and with it that of his sons.⁵⁰ The arch, whose construction and statuary composition Tiberius must have approved,⁵¹ is thus a highly political monument.

The unearthing of the *Tabula Siarensis* has led to the discovery of a significant dynastic monument in the city of Rome to the *domus Augusta*. The as yet unpublished *senatus consultum de Pisone* of 20 C.E. also talks about

⁵⁰ Lebek 1991.

⁵¹For Tiberius' control over honors for the Imperial family, Tac. *Ann.* 1.14; D.C. 56.47.1; 57.12.5; *Tab. Siar.*, fr. 1, line 4.

the *domus Augusta*,⁵² and Lebek, reconstructing the decree for Drusus at his death in 23 C.E., believes there were also references there. Literature, epigraphy, and art combine to demonstrate how an ideological concept took form and was spread by court poets, artists, and the government. The new epigraphical evidence, corroborated by Ovid, shows that the ideological concept of the *domus Augusta* was far more important in the early Tiberian period than previously thought. In addition, the first epigraphical reference to the *domus divina* occurs in 33 C.E., during Tiberius' rule, and Phaedrus, perhaps writing about the same time or somewhat later, is our first literary reference.⁵³ The juxtaposition of the statue of *divus Augustus* and the *domus Augusta*, however, shows that the idea of the family of Augustus as an object of worship implicitly belonged to the concept of the *domus Augusta* from the earliest part of Tiberius' rule.

This statutory group, if the hypothetical reconstruction here is valid, asserted the familial nature of political power in the critical transition period. Tiberius must have approved this senatorial motion although he rejected as excessive other senatorial attempts to honor Livia. Those potential honors marked her out as an individual with latent power in the state, but this dynastic group placed her in a family and as mother of successors. Her key role—a virtual political necessity—was to link together Augustus and his adopted heirs and advertise their legitimacy to the public. Out of the immediate political concerns of the transition from first to second emperor, however, sprang a model for a far more extensive public commemoration of future Imperial women.⁵⁴

⁵²See above, n. 27. For references to “*maiestas domus Aug(ustae)*” see Eck 195; to the members of the *domus Augusta*, Eck 200.

⁵³33 C.E.: Cogitore 828–29. Another inscription (*CIL* 13.4635) may date to the time of the fall of Sejanus. Phaed. *Fab.* 5.7.38. Epigraphical evidence: De Ruggiero s.v. “*domus divina*,” 2062–67. For a discussion of the origins of the phrase to mean “the family of the *divus*,” see Mowat with the further comments of Fishwick 423–35.

⁵⁴I would like to thank the editor of TAPA, in particular, and the anonymous readers for many helpful suggestions. I owe special thanks to C. B. Rose for generously sharing with me a pre-publication copy of his forthcoming book *Dynastic Art and Ideology in the Julio-Claudian Period* and for help with this manuscript. The Classics Department of the University of North Carolina cordially invited me during my sabbatical to give a talk on this topic and their discussion greatly helped me. I owe a particular debt to J. Linderski and G. Koepfel. Debbie Whitney meticulously checked this manuscript.

Works Cited

- André, J. 1977. *Ovide, Pontiques*. Paris.
- Bömer, F. 1957–58. *P. Ovidius Naso: Die Fasten*. 2 vols. Heidelberg.
- Boschung, D. 1993. "Die Bildnistypen der iulisch-claudischen Kaiserfamilie: ein kritischer Forschungsbericht." *JRA* 6: 39–79.
- Cagnat, M. 1913. "Un temple de la Gens Augusta à Carthage." *CRAI* : 680–86.
- Carettoni, G., A. M. Colini, L. Cozza, and G. Gatti. 1960. *La pianta marmorea di Roma antica*. Rome.
- Castagnoli, F. 1984. "L'arco di Germanico in circo Flaminio." *ArchClass* 36: 329–32.
- Coarelli, F. 1980. *Roma*. Vol. 2. Rome.
- Cogitore, I. 1992. "Séries de dédicaces italiennes à la dynastie Julio-Claudienne." *MEFRA* 104.2: 817–29.
- 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.
- Degrassi, A. 1963. *Inscriptiones Italiae* 13.2. Rome.
- de Maria, S. 1988. *Gli archi onorari di Roma e dell'Italia romana*. Rome.
- De Ruggiero, E. 1961–. *Dizionario Epigrafico di Antichità Romane*. Rome.
- Domenicucci, P. 1991. "La caratterizzazione astrale delle apoteosi di Romolo ed Ersilia nelle Metamorfosi di Ovidio." In *Cultura, poesia, ideologia nell'opera di Ovidio*. Naples. 221–28.
- Eck, W. 1993. "Das s.c.de Cn. Pisone patre und seine Publikation in der Baetica." *Cahiers du Centre Glotz* 4: 189–208.
- Erhart, K. P. 1980. "A New Portrait Type of Octavia Minor (?)." *The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal* 8: 117–28.
- Fantham, R. E. 1986. "Ovid, Germanicus and the Composition of the Fasti." *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 5: 243–73.
- Fishwick, D. 1991. *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West*. Leiden.
- Flory, M. B. 1993. "Livia and the History of Public Honorific Statues for Women in Rome." *TAPA* 123: 287–308.
- Fogazza, D. 1981. *Domiti Marsi Testimonia et Fragmenta*. Rome.
- Frel, J. 1981. *Roman Portraits in the Getty Museum*. Tulsa.
- Frisch, P. 1975. *Die Inschriften von Ilion*. Bonn.
- Fullerton, M. D. 1985. "The *Domus Augusti* in Imperial Iconography of 13–12 B.C." *AJA* 89: 473–83.
- González, J. 1984. "Tabula Siarensis, Fortunales Siarenses et Municipia Civium Romanorum." *ZPE* 55: 55–100.
- González, J., and F. Fernández. 1981. "Tabula Siarensis." *Iura* 32:1–36.
- 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.
- . 1958. *Album of Dated Latin Inscriptions*. Berkeley.
- Grether, G. 1946. "Livia and the Roman Imperial Cult." *AJP* 67: 222–52.
- Gros, P. 1986. "Une hypothèse sur l'arc d'Orange." *Gallia* 44: 191–201.
- Herbert-Brown, G. 1994. *Ovid and the Fasti: An Historical Study*. Oxford.
- Humphrey, J. H. 1986. *Roman Circuses: Arenas for Chariot Racing*. Berkeley.
- Kienast, D. 1990. *Römische Kaisertabelle: Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*. Darmstadt.
- Kent, J. H. 1966. *Corinth: The Inscriptions, 1926–1950*. Princeton.
- Kleiner, F. S. 1988. "The Arch in Honor of C. Octavius and the Fathers of Augustus." *Historia* 37: 347–57.

- . 1989. "The Study of Roman Triumphal and Honorary Arches 50 Years after Kähler." *JRA* 2: 195–206.
- . 1990. "An Extraordinary Posthumous Honor for Livia." *Athenaeum* n.s. 78: 508–14.
- Krauss, J. 1980. *Die Inschriften von Sestos und der Thrakischen Chersones*. Bonn.
- Kuhoff, W. 1993. "Zur Titulatur der römischen Kaiserinnen während der Prinzipatszeit." *Klio* 75: 244–56.
- La Rocca, E. 1987. "L'adesione senatoriale al 'consensus': i modi della propaganda augustea e tiberiana nei monumenti 'in circo Flaminio'." In *L'Urbs, espace urbain et histoire (I^{er} siècle avant J.C.—III^e siècle après J.C.)*. Collection de l'École Française de Rome 98. Rome and Paris. 347–72.
- Lebek, W. D. 1986. "Schwierige Stellen der Tabula Siarensis." *ZPE* 66: 31–48.
- . 1987. "Die drei Ehrenbögen für Germanicus: Tab.Siar. frg. I 9–34; *CIL* VI 31199a 2–17." *ZPE* 67: 129–48.
- . 1991. "Ehrenbogen und Prinzentod: 9 v. Chr.–23 n. Chr." *ZPE* 86: 47–78.
- . 1993. "Roms Ritter und Roms Pleps in den Senatsbeschlüssen für Germanicus Caesar und Drusus Caesar." *ZPE* 95: 81–120.
- Megow, W.-R. 1987. *Kameen von Augustus bis Alexander Severus*. Berlin.
- Millar, F. 1988. "Imperial Ideology in the *Tabula Siarensis*." In J. González and J. Arce, eds., *Estudios sobre la Tabula Siarensis*. Madrid. 11–19.
- . 1993. "Ovid and the *Domus Augusta*: Rome Seen from Tomoi." *JRS* 83: 1–17.
- Mommsen, Th. 1878. "Die Familie des Germanicus." *Hermes* 13: 245–65.
- Mowat, R. 1885. "La *Domus divina* et les *Divi*." *Bull. epig. de Gaule* 5: 226–40.
- Oliver, J. H., and R. E. A. Palmer. 1954. "Text of the Tabula Hebana." *AJP* 75: 225–49.
- Palmer, R. E. A. 1983. "On the Track of the Ignoble." *Athenaeum* n.s. 61: 343–61.
- Panciera, S. 1969. "Miscellanea Epigrafica IV." *Epigraphica* 31: 104–20.
- Plassart, A. 1926. "Inscriptions de Thespies." *BCH*: 383–462.
- Pollini, J. 1987. *The Portraiture of Gaius and Lucius Caesar*. New York.
- . 1990. *Roman Portraiture: Images of Character and Virtue*. Los Angeles.
- . 1993. "The Cartoceto Bronzes." *AJA* 97:422–35.
- Raepsaet-Charlier, M.-T. 1987. *Prosopographie des femmes de l'ordre sénatorial (I^{er}–II^e siècles)*. Louvain.
- Reynolds J. M. 1980. "The Origins and Beginning of Imperial Cult at Aphrodisias." *PCPS* 206: 70–84.
- Richardson, L., Jr. 1992. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Baltimore.
- Richmond, J. A. 1990. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Ex Ponto Libri Quattuor*. Leipzig.
- Ritter, H.-W. 1972. "Livia's Erhebung zur Augusta." *Chiron* 2: 313–38.
- Rose, C. B. 1990. "The Supposed Augustan Arch at Pavia (Ticinum) and the Einsiedeln 326 Manuscript." *JRA* 3: 163–68.
- . *Dynastic Art and Ideology in the Julio-Claudian Period*. In publication. Cambridge.
- Rostovtzeff, M. 1930. "L'empereur Tibère et le culte impérial." *RH* 163: 1–26.
- Saller, R. P. 1984. "*Familia, Domus* and the Roman Conception of the Family." *Phoenix* 38: 336–55.
- Scardigli, B. 1982. "La sacrosanctitas tribunicia di Ottavia e Livia." *AFLS* 3: 61–64.
- Schoonhoven, H., ed. 1992. *The Pseudo-Ovidian ad Liviam de morte Drusi*. Groningen.
- Sensi, L. 1977. "Un frammento di feriale della casa Giulio-Claudia da Spello." *Athenaeum* n.s. 55: 329–44.
- . 1979. "Il ciclo di ritratti imperiali giulio-claudio de Iesi." In *Studi in Onore di Filippo Magi*. Perugia. 227–39.
- Seyrig, H. 1929. "Inscriptions de Gythion." *RA* 29: 84–106.

- Steinby, E., ed. 1993. *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*. Vol. 1. Rome.
- Sutherland, C. H. V., and R. A. G. Carson. 1984—. *The Roman Imperial Coinage*. Revised ed. London.
- Syme, R. 1978. *History in Ovid*. Oxford.
- Temporini, H. 1978. *Die Frauen am Hofe Trajans: Ein Beitrag zur Stellung der Augustae im Principat*. Berlin.
- Trillmich, W. 1988. "Der Germanicus-Bogen in Rom und das Monument für Germanicus und Drusus in Leptis Magna. Archäologisches zur *tabula Siarensis* (I, 9–21)." In J. González and J. Arce, eds., *Estudios sobre la Tabula Siarensis*. Madrid. 51–60.
- Vanderpool, E. 1968. "Three Inscriptions from Eleusis." *AD* 23: 1–9.
- Vollenweider, M.-L. 1972. *Die Porträtgemmen der römischen Republik*. Mainz.
- Willige, W., and G. Luck. 1963. *Briefe aus der Verbannung*. Zurich.
- Wiseman, T. P. 1974. "The Circus Flaminius." *PBSR* 42: 3–26.
- . 1976. "Two Questions on the Circus Flaminius." *PBSR* 44: 44–47.
- Zecchini, G. 1986. "La tabula Siarensis e la 'dissimulatio' di Tiberio." *ZPE* 66: 23–29.