SPUDASMATA

Studien zur Klassischen Philologie und ihren Grenzgebieten
Begründet von Hildebrecht Hommel und Ernst Zinn

Herausgeberinnen
Irmgard Männlein-Robert und Anja Wolkenhauer

Wissenschaftlicher Beirat
Robert Kirstein (Tübingen), Jürgen Leonhardt (Tübingen),
Marilena Maniaci (Rom/Cassino), Mischa Meier (Tübingen)
und Karla Pollmann (Bristol)

Band 184.1

AUGUSTAN PAPERS
NEW APPROACHES TO THE AGE OF AUGUSTUS ON THE
BIMILLENNIUM OF HIS DEATH

2020

GEORG OLMS VERLAG HILDESHEIM · ZÜRICH · NEW YORK

AUGUSTAN PAPERS
NEW APPROACHES TO THE AGE
OF AUGUSTUS ON THE
BIMILLENNIUM OF HIS DEATH

Volume 1

Edited by Maria Cristina Pimentel, Ana Maria Lóio,
Nuno Simões Rodrigues and Rodrigo Furtado

2020

GEORG OLMS VERLAG HILDESHEIM · ZÜRICH · NEW YORK

This work is financed with national funds through FCT (Foundation for Science and Technology), through the project UIDB/00019/2020.

FCT Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia

REPÚBLICA PORTUGUESA

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the
Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available
on the Internet at http://dnb.d-nb.de.

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation
in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten
sind im Internet über http://dnb.d-nb.de abrufbar.

Gedruckt auf säurefreiem und alterungsbeständigem Papier
Herstellung: KM Druck 2.0, Groß-Umstadt
Umschlagentwurf: Inga Günther, Hildesheim

www.olms.de
ISBN 978-3-487-15816-7
ISSN 0548-9705

Table of Contents

Volume I

Volume II

III. *Vt iure sit gloriatus marmoream se relinquere* (Suet. *Aug.* 28.3)

IV. *Imperium sine fine dedi* (Verg. *Aen.* 1.279)

Augustus and the Children: Family and Childhood in Augustus' Policies and in Augustan Literature

CRISTINA SANTOS PINHEIRO
Universidade da Madeira
Centro de Estudos Clássicos da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa

The aim of this volume is to celebrate the completion of the second millennium after Augustus' death, but according to Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.53), Julia, Augustus' only daughter, whom he exiled for adultery in 2 BC, died in that same year of AD 14. United in death, the stern father and the adulterous daughter represent two central and opposing facets of the *Saeculum Augustum*: the *Princeps*' striving for morality and Julia's supposedly dissolute way of life.

The Augustan era was characterized by this and many other contradictions. Combining an omnipresent evocation of the past with conspicuous innovations, the *Princeps* refashioned the ancestral virtues in order to make them the chief tenet of his political and social agenda. Augustus' unprecedented moral laws, implementing measures related to marriage, procreation and adultery, introduced in Roman society an obvious opposition between the ideals they attempt to restore and a reality that, by then, was far removed from the *exempla* of the past. Families had changed. Marriage patterns had changed. Marriage with *manus* was by then obsolete, so that married women remained legally a member of their birth families. Divorce and remarriage were increasingly recurrent practices as was the refusal to marry and to enter *iustae nuptiae*.[1]

The elegiac love poets created a literary genre supported by these new features and related to what has been classified as a 'new woman' or an 'emancipated woman', expressions that describe a woman in a

[1] On the date of the disappearance of *manus* marriage, cf. Treggiari (1991) 21, 30-31; Dixon (1992) 73-74; Grubbs (2002) 21.

high social position, 'who nevertheless claims for herself the indulgence in sexuality of a woman of pleasure,' as Fantham[2] states. But an ideal featuring a chaste and loving wife endures even in love elegy. These two different types of women create an ironic tension in elegiac poetry that is sometimes difficult to resolve. Tibullus may dream in his bucolic idylls with an humble Delia, as he does in 1.5.19-36, living in the country like the virtuous matrons of the past. But this is just a dream, for Delia is enslaved to a procuress and must look for a wealthier lover.

The elegiac mistress can be imagined in a harmonious relationship, but motives like the *seruitium* and the *militia amoris* are contrary to conventional social values. In elegy 2.7, about a law that was withdrawn and that would have coerced Propertius to marry another woman, he declares with disgust:

> Vnde mihi patriis natos praebere triumphis?
> nullus de nostro sanguine miles erit.
>
> vv. 13-14

In spite of the obscurity involving this elegy and the law mentioned, and leaving aside the complexity of its being classified as Augustan or anti-Augustan, it is clear that for the poetic persona war, marriage and parenthood were not his aims.[3] He concludes:

> Tu mihi sola places: placeam tibi, Cynthia, solus:
> hic erit et patrio nomine pluris amor.
>
> vv. 19-20

We do not know why Propertius could not have married Cynthia – was she a *femina probrosa*,[4] a woman not eligible for marriage? – but this kind of relationship is typically described as self-sufficient and

[2] Fantham (1994) 280.

[3] As Propertius Book 2 was probably published c. 26 or 25 BC, this poem has led scholars like Galinsky (1981) 127 and Bauman (1992) 107-108 to suggest that Augustus had tried to introduce some measures related to marriage in the early 20s. Cf. Badian (1985), defending that there was no law, but a tax, the *aes uxorium*, implemented by the triumvirs and abolished by Augustus. For an analysis of the poem, cf. Gale (1997). Hallett (1973) is still a good study about women in elegy.

[4] Astolfi (1986) 54 ff. According to Thomas (2007) 247, *femina probrosa* 'est une expression juridique mettant l'accent sur la dégradation morale et sociale, alors que *meretrix* réfère à l'immoralité sexuelle.'

hildren take no part in it.[5] The conflict between the demands of love and of society and the complex equation of giving oneself to *nequitia amoris* or to public obligations are certainly elegiac conventions, but nevertheless, and even if they are not to be taken at face value, they are important elements of Augustan poetry. Wallace-Hadrill[6] rightly asserts that:

> The benefit and the danger of the poets to Augustus was not that they could support or oppose any particular measure of his, but that they could (intentionally or not) articulate acceptance or rejection of the social order he was struggling to restore and of his own role in doing so.

In fact, a rise in individualism was perceived as a threat to family life, especially when associated with the feeling that Roman society was experiencing religious and moral degeneration. Decades of disruption caused by civil struggle and political insecurity were viewed as the consequence of moral and familial decay. The exploitation of pessimistic topics like a decline in piety, sexual immorality, indulgence in pleasure, excessive ambition or civic upheaval is omnipresent in Augustan literature. I will merely cite here Horace's characterizing his age as *impia... deuoti sanguinis aeta*s (*Ep.* 16.9) and *fecunda culpae saecula* (*Carm.* 3.6.17) or rebuking his contemporaries for having destroyed the virtuous austerity of the Romans' ancestors.[7]

Nevertheless, ideals related to family relationships, intermingled with these pessimistic traits, assume a new prominence. Dixon[8] claims that an affectionate ideal of family life was under development by the late Republic. Augustus shrewdly exploited it and the poets in his entourage, especially Horace, evoke the *Princeps*' responsibility for restoring the ancestors' virtuous way of life. Linking Augustus and an idea of a new golden age emerging as a result of his policies is a

[5] In Ovid *Amores* 2.13 and 2.14 – two poems about Corinna's abortion – the worries expressed are not related to the loss of the *foetus*, but to Corinna's possible death. About these poems, cf. Cahoon (1988), Gamel (1989), and Pinheiro (2010).

[6] Wallace-Hadrill (1985) 184.

[7] An important piece of evidence for this is, of course, Livy's preface, with its bleakness and misgiving. The decay of *disciplina* and *mores* led to a time with no hope of recovery: *donec ad haec tempora quibus nec uitia nostra nec remedia pati possumus peruentum est.* (*praef.* 9).

[8] Dixon (1996) 111.

commonplace to be found in texts such as Vergil's *Aeneid* or Horace's *Carmina*.[9] Advertising his and his family's links with the *summi uiri* of the Roman past, as he does in his Forum, Augustus constructs his own public image and legitimizes his newly acquired political position. He shrewdly assumes his identity as *Diui filius*, thus justifying his right to vindicate Caesar's death. Some decades later, though, he becomes the *Pater Patriae*. The point was that he was not a newcomer: he was a member of the *Julii*, but, more importantly, he was a descendant of Aeneas through a long line of the most important and praiseworthy heroes of the Roman past.[10]

The *leges Iuliae* on marriage were issued in 18 BC – the *lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* and the *lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis* – and were revised by *the lex Papia Poppaea* in AD 9. We do not know for sure which provisions belong to the former or to the latter because later jurists usually talk about them without making a clear distinction, referring to them generally as 'laws about marriage' or *leges Iulia et Papia*. They were designed to penalize those citizens who refused to marry (or remarry after divorce or the death of the spouse) and those who were childless, men between the ages of 25 and 60, and women between 20 and 50 years old. The penalties were mainly constraints in receiving and bequeathing inheritances. The laws also imposed some restrictions upon the choice of a spouse, especially among the upper classes: senators and their descendants were prohibited from marrying freedmen or freedwomen. Free citizens should not marry *infames*. By the *ius trium liberorum*, granted to free citizens with three or more children and to freedmen and freedwomen with four or more, women could attain freedom from guardianship and men had priority in receiving government appointments.[11]

The adultery law established heavy penalties for those who were involved in extramarital liaisons. A permanent court was established and hence the jurisdiction was removed from the familial sphere, where these failings had been treated in the past. By transforming adultery and *stuprum* into civil crimes, the laws curtailed the power of

[9] Cf. Galinsky (1996) 90 ff. and Verg. *Aen.* 1.291-296, 6.791-795; Hor. *Carm.* 4.5.21-24, 4.15.9-11.
[10] About Augustus' connection with the symbols of the Roman past, cf. e.g. Alberto (2004).
[11] About the laws, cf., for instance, Raditsa (1980), Astolfi (1986), Cohen (1991), and McGinn (1998).

the *paterfamilias* to cope with this kind of situation, as was expected previously. These regulations blurred the lines between public and private and family life came under state inspection. The policing of sexual behaviour was part of the aforementioned attempt to reinforce the *exempla* of the past. Family, sexuality and reproduction were now opened to public scrutiny.

Reaction to Augustus' legislation seems to have been fierce, and it was revised in AD 9. It is hard to believe that when he read Quintus Metellus' speech in the Senate, he voiced every Roman man's opinion about marriage, but the choice of this particular speech was not irrelevant. In this, a Metellus, probably the Metellus Macedonicus who had been censor in 131 BC or, according to Aulus Gellius, Metellus Numidicus, censor in 102 BC, urged Romans to marry and to have children, subjugating thereby their personal wishes to the public well-being. In Aulus Gellius' version, the speech, entitled *De ducendis uxoribus*, reads as follows:

> Si sine uxore possemus, Quirites, omnes ea molestia careremus; set quoniam ita natura tradidit, ut nec cum illis satis commode, nec sine illis ullo modo uiui possit, saluti perpetuae potius quam breui uoluptati consulendum est.

Livy asserts that the speech seemed to have been written with his and Augustus' own times in mind (*oratio... uelut in haec tempora scriptam*).[12]

Suetonius mentions an event, maybe the same described by Cassius Dio in AD 9. When the knights attending a public show persistently called for the repeal of the law about marriage, Augustus sent for the children of Germanicus and exhibited them, some in his own lap and some in their father's, suggesting by his gestures and his expression that the *equites* should not refuse to follow Germanicus' example (Suet. *Aug.* 34).

The claim that marriage and children are civic duties springs from a deep-rooted patriotic sense and re-emerges with special strength in the Augustan age. We can identify this same topic in two speeches Cassius

[12] *Q. Metellus censor censuit, ut cogerentur omnes ducere uxores liberorum creandorum causa, extat oratio eius, quam Augustus Caesar, <cum> de maritandis ordinibus ageret, uelut in haec tempora scriptam in senatu recitauit.* (Livy *Per.* 59).

Dio assigns to Augustus (56.1-5). In AD 9, the *equites* were seeking the repeal of the *lex Papia-Poppaea*, which revised some of the measures of the *leges Iuliae* of 18 BC. In one part of the Forum, Augustus assembled the married *equites*, in the other the single and childless. With grief he realised that the former, the married, were much fewer in number than the latter. First he addressed the married *equites*, whom he highly praised, because, as he supposedly said, they aggrandize the fatherland and, bringing children into the world, they achieve a kind of immortality. In fact, the generations succeeding like torch-bearers in a race ensure the existence of Rome, not only its physical existence, but also and more importantly, its cultural legacy, the deeds and virtues of the Roman past.[13] Then he added:

> πῶς μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἄριστον γυνὴ σώφρων οἰκουρὸς οἰκονόμος παιδοτρόφος ὑγιαίνοντά τε εὐφρᾶναι καὶ ἀσθενοῦντα θεραπεῦσαι, εὐτυχοῦντί τε συγγενέσθαι καὶ δυστυχοῦντα παραμυθήσασθαι, τοῦ τε νέου τὴν ἐμμανῆ φύσιν καθεῖρξαι καὶ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου τὴν ἔξωρον αὐστηρότητα κεράσαι; πῶς δ' οὐχ ἡδὺ ἀνελέσθαι τέκνον ἐξ ἀμφοῖν συμπεφυκὸς καὶ θρέψαι καὶ παιδεῦσαι, εἰκόνα μὲν τοῦ σώματος εἰκόνα δὲ καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς, ὥστε ἐν ἐκείνῳ αὐξηθέντι ἕτερον αὐτὸν γενέσθαι; (Cass. Dio 56.3.3-4)
>
> (...) is there anything better than a wife who is chaste, domestic, a good house- keeper, a rearer of children; one to gladden you in health, to tend you in sickness; to be your partner in good fortune, to console you in misfortune; to restrain the mad passion of youth and to temper the unseasonable harshness of old age? And is it not a delight to acknowledge a child who shows the endowments of both parents, to nurture and educate it, at once the physical and the spiritual image of yourself, so that in its growth another self lives again?
>
> transl. Cary (1924) 8-9

The description of the wife must be stressed. This wife is not the *molestia* referred to by Metellus. She gladdens, she tends, she consoles... She is the ideal woman. And the experience of raising and educating children is delightful and extremely rewarding. These married equestrians embraced parenthood as their duty and, as Dio's Augustus asserts, they alone are rightfully called 'Romans, citizens and fathers'. The speech he addresses to the unmarried exploits the same topic, but

[13] About life as a torch-bearers race, cf. Luc. 2.77-79: *augescunt aliae gentes, aliae minuuntur, inque breui spatio mutantur saecla animantum et quasi cursores uitai lampada tradunt.*

in the reverse mode. They are not to be called men, nor citizens, nor Romans, because they refuse to act like true citizens, ensuring Rome's safety through parenting.[14] Instead, they are destroying their families and betraying their country:

> καὶ γὰρ μιαιφονεῖτε, μηδὲ τεκνοῦντες ἀρχὴν τοὺς ἐξ ὑμῶν γεννηθῆναι ὀφείλοντας, καὶ ἀνοσιουργεῖτε, τά τε ὀνόματα καὶ τὰς τιμὰς τῶν προγόνων παύοντες, καὶ ἀσεβεῖτε, τά τε γένη ὑμῶν τὰ καταδειχθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν ἀφανίζοντες, καὶ τὸ μέγιστον τῶν ἀναθημάτων αὐτῶν, τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν, ἀπολλύντες, τά τε ἱερὰ διὰ τούτου καὶ τοὺς ναοὺς αὐτῶν ἀνατρέποντες. καὶ μέντοι καὶ τὴν πολιτείαν καταλύετε, μὴ πειθόμενοι τοῖς νόμοις, καὶ τὴν πατρίδα προδίδοτε, στερίφην τε αὐτὴν καὶ ἄγονον ἀπεργαζόμενοι. (Cass. Dio 56.5.1-3)
>
> For you are committing murder in not begetting in the first place those who ought to be your descendants; you are committing sacrilege in putting an end to the names and honours of your ancestors; and you are guilty of impiety in that you are abolishing your families, which were instituted by the gods, and destroying the greatest of offerings to them, – human life, – thus overthrowing their rites and their temples. Moreover, you are destroying the State by disobeying its laws, and you are betraying your country by rendering her barren.
>
> transl. Cary (1924) 13

The vocabulary of crime, sacrilege and subversion (μιαιφονεῖτε; ἀνοσιουργεῖτε; ἀσεβεῖτε; μὴ πειθόμενοι; προδίδοτε) is firmly stressed. What they are doing endangers the social order and the legacy of their ancestors, he says.

The speeches are obviously Dio's invention. Nevertheless, they show us how, even centuries later, Augustus' public image was still so strongly connected with the ideal of marriage and family as civic duties. The main topics explored by Dio are consistent both with Augustan propaganda and with Dio's perspective of Augustus' 'immense institutional achievement as founder of a stable monarchy,' as Kemezis[15] states, analysing the complex image of the first *princeps* conveyed in Dio's text. In fact, the composition of the speeches shows

[14] Cass. Dio 56.4.2: ἄνδρας; ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἀνδρῶν ἔργον παρέχεσθε. πολίτας; ἀλλ' ὅσον ἐφ' ὑμῖν, ἡ πόλις ἀπόλλυται. Ῥωμαίους; ἀλλ' ἐπιχειρεῖτε τὸ ὄνομα τοῦτο καταλῦσαι. 'Men? But you are not performing any of the offices of men. Citizens? But for all that you are doing, the city is perishing. Romans? But you are undertaking to blot out this name altogether,' transl. Cary (1924) 11.

[15] Kemezis (2007) 273.

how Augustus came to be identified with the moralizing purposes of the laws, even if these purposes stand in contrast with the actual behaviour of the *princeps* and of many of the members of the imperial *domus*, creating thus what Kemezis identifies as an 'ironic paradigm'.

This sentimental and affectionate ideal of the family as a network of relationships that makes life complete is not an invention of the Augustan age,[16] but Augustus and the Augustan poets – and even Livy – thoroughly exploited a set of ideas about family that included (among many others) female chastity, procreation as civic duty, compliance to the *exempla* of the Roman past, etc. We can identify this feeling in the early 40's BC. Regardless of how we decide to interpret Vergil's *Eclogue* 4, the so-called 'Messianic eclogue', the same picture is there. The unknown *puer* associated with fertility and peace and a symbol of the new golden age is a Vergilian innovation. But if we set aside the religious, political and metaphorical overtones, we still have a tender description of the birth of a child as a blessed event, with all expectation and hope for the future it involves. Whether this is a real boy or not – maybe the much hoped-for child of Antonius and Octavia after Brundisium – he is urged to smile at his mother, because if he refuses to do so, 'no god will invite him to table, no goddess to bed' (*Ecl.* 4.62-63).[17]

In Vergil's epic masterpiece, although some scholars point to the loss of Creusa and the abandonment of Dido as proof that Aeneas' succession proceeded through males only, I would suggest that, in spite of the dismissal of these two characters, there is a strong presence of the loving family ideal.[18] Lavinia stands for this, and there is a conspicuous feeling that in the future there will be peace for the Trojans. This peace will come from the marriage to Lavinia. Because, almost as the *puer* of *Eclogue* 4, Lavinia is the symbol of a new age for Aeneas and for the Trojan refugees. She represents Aeneas' duty to carry on, in a way that was not possible for Creusa or Dido. Destiny, family and duty are

[16] We can see it for example in Lucretius, *De rerum natura*. When describing the losses caused by death, he writes: *Iam iam non domus accipiet te laeta neque uxor/ optima, nec dulces occurrent oscula nati/ praeripere et tacita pectus dulcedine tangent.* (3.894-396).

[17] *qui non risere parenti,/ nec deus hunc mensa, dea nec dignata cubili est.*

[18] But it was Dido who in the first place voiced this ideal, when, revolted at Aeneas' decision to leave her, she regretted not having a *paruulus Aeneas*, a little Aeneas, playing in her palace.

so strongly connected in Aeneas' mind that Mercury can confidently remind the Trojan of Ascanius' future and expect the father immediately to leave Carthage, despite Dido's accusations.[19]

This brings me to Ascanius' importance in the epic. Although it has been variously interpreted, Ascanius is, in my opinion, not a peripheral but a chief character. This is not primarily because of his prominence as an agent, but especially for the reason that he symbolizes the future. In addition, he seems at times to have the capability of embodying every woman's child. Masquerading as *dulcis Ascanius*, Cupid can infect Dido with passion. Fascinating her with the presence of Aeneas' son, whom Dido embraces, Venus and Cupid are able to guarantee that the Trojans are safe in Carthage. The queen seems to be enchanted, in fact, with the tender image of the child, possibly because he is a symbol of the family she longs for.[20] For Andromache, in Book 3, Ascanius can also be a substitute for Astyanax (3.485); in Book 9, he assures Euryalus that Euryalus' mother will be like his own (9.297-298); in Book 5, to stop the Trojan women from burning the ships, he shouts at them: 'I'm your Ascanius,' throwing his helmet to the floor so that the women can recognize his face (5.672-673).[21] In the much debated farewell of father and son in Book 12, the fact that Aeneas does not remove the weapons, before issuing the words *disce, puer, uirtutem ex me uerumque laborem/ fortunam ex aliis*, contrary to what Hector had done in *Iliad* 6, proves that here Ascanius is not just the tender and much beloved son, but his father's heir, the inheritance being precisely *uirtus* and *labor*.

Ascanius is one of Aeneas' motives – maybe the stronger motive – to move towards the future. Aeneas is, in more than one sense, a torch bearer. He must pass it on to his descendants. The prominence of the Anchises-Aeneas-Ascanius group at this time demonstrates how

[19] Verg. *Aen.* 4.272-276: *Si te nulla mouet tantarum gloria rerum/ [nec super ipse tua moliris laude laborem,]/ Ascanium surgentem et spes heredis Iuli/ respice, cui regnum Italiae Romanaque tellus/ debetur.*

[20] Cf. *Aen.* 4.32, 4.84-85, 4.373-430.

[21] Merriam (2002) 853, analysing Ascanius' presence in the *Aeneid*, concludes that he '(...) does not mature into a replica of his father through the course of the epic, showing more and more concern for the welfare of others, but instead remains a heedless child, concerned only with its own interests, passions and enthusiasms?' I think that his lack of maturity is linked precisely with the importance of his characterization as a substitute child. Cf. Pinheiro (2012) 226 ff. and Golden (2013) 253 ff.

important familial values like *pietas* were. Aeneas must carry on, in order to save the Trojan legacy and pass it on to his Roman descendants. *Pietas*, the central moral value in the *Aeneid*, blends exactly the three central dimensions of the Augustan age: gods, fatherland, and family.

That is, I think, a key feature in Augustus' social policies: private aspects of life, like marriage, parenthood and sexuality are combined – not always easily – with public life, being in the process introduced into a political discourse that defines Roman civic identity. Being a Roman was, like never before, being a husband or a wife, a father or a mother. Not complying with this is a religious, a moral and a social fraud that endangers the existence of the *Res publica*.

According to Pliny the Elder, Augustus had a statue of Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi, previously displayed in the *Porticus Metelli*, moved to the *Porticus Octauiae*, built in his sister's name.[22] Talking about the number of children a woman can conceive, Aulus Gellius wrote that one of Augustus' slaves had given birth to quintuplets, but all, mother and children, were dead within a few days. By Augustus' order, a statue was built to her memory on the Via Laurentina (Gell. 10.2.2).[23] Statues of women displayed in public places were very rare under the Republic. According to Flory,[24] the references to women being honoured with public monuments usually concern mythical, legendary or divine women. Real women seem not to have been granted this kind of tribute until Augustan times. Cornelia, in particular, is a case in point. The statue, whose base reads *Cornelia mater Gracchorum*, was, according to Plutarch, voted by the people of Rome in the last decades of the Republic. The connection between Cornelia and the slave seems straightforward and extremely productive in terms of Augustan propaganda. They were both symbols of femininity and motherhood and they were important and active – or as active as they could have

[22] Plin. *HN* 34.31: *Exstant Catonis in censura uociferationes mulieribus statuas Romanis in prouinciis 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 Octauiae operibus.* About the dedication of the statue, cf. Plut. *Vit. C. Graech*, 4.4.

[23] *Sed et diuo Augusto imperante, qui temporum eius historiam scripserunt, ancillam Caesaris Augusti in agro Laurente peperisse quinque pueros dicunt eosque pauculos dies uixisse; matrem quoque eorum non multo, postquam peperit, mortuam, monumentumque ei factum iussu Augusti in uia Laurentina, inque eo scriptum esse numerum puerperii eius, de quo diximus.*

[24] Flory (1993).

been – in politics. Virtuous wives and fertile mothers, they strove for the *Res publica*, offering their services as *genetrices* to the state. The three marriages of Julia were certainly in line with her father's clear intention to make her assume a familial role. Augustus was at pains to show his daughter as a model Roman matrona.[25] *Romanitas* for women, even more than for men, meant being married and having children. So Treggiari asserts that: 'Being a mother was a particular service. The sudden appearance of portraits of women in public spaces in the city as role models as well as objects of veneration showed that all citizen women had a role to play.'[26]

For their fertility, these women had become a symbol of social well-being and safety and, as such, they seem to have deserved an honour that was awarded to men who had distinguished themselves in politics or war. In 35 BC, extraordinary honours were granted to Octavia and Livia: *sacrosanctitas*, the tribunician safeguard against physical violence, freedom from guardianship, and statues.[27] These seem to have been the first statues of real women in the imperial family to have been displayed in public spaces. Many more were yet to come. Notwithstanding the established practice of erecting monuments representing women and even entire families in the East, the western part of the empire seems to have been more reluctant to accept the commemoration of women and children, at least in official art. In this respect, Augustus seems to have led the way.

Some children appeared in republican public art, but their presence was not frequent and usually it was idealized. They were often represented as generic figures. If we consider, even briefly, the *Ara Pacis*, women and children – both real women and children, and idealized or mythological characters – are conspicuous. For my argument, it is not important *to play the 'Who was who?' game* imposed by the frieze. However, the representation of children in various ways, some as little Romans, with togas and *bullae*, others in barbarian costumes, with *torques*, poses some interesting questions. According to Uzzi, 'the Ara Pacis is the earliest imperial monument on which children appear.'[28]

[25] Cf. Severy (2003) 67.

[26] Treggiari (2005) 142.

[27] According to Cass. Dio 49.38.

[28] Uzzi (2005) 142.

Their presence among the adults, both members of the imperial family and magistrates, must therefore be of importance. The basis for the recognized dynastic nature of the frieze lies in the representation of the different generations composing the family of Augustus. Children stand for the future.

I shall agree with authors like Pollini,[29] Rose,[30] Uzzi[31] or Kleiner, Buxton[32] here and consider the little barbarians as foreign princes and not as Gaius Caesar and Lucius Caesar dressed as Trojans. With their non-Roman costumes and hairstyles, these two boys show how the empire had grown to encompass foreign countries, not only through conquest but also and, more importantly, through diplomacy. Suetonius reports that Augustus treated these children as his own, educating them and encouraging intermarriages, as was for instance the case of Juba, king of Mauretania, and Cleopatra Selene, Cleopatra's and Antonius' daughter, raised in Octavia's household.[33] This was a strategy to expand Augustus' power that demonstrates the external acknowledgment of Roman hegemony. In the *Ara Pacis* frieze, these children represent the global nature of the *pax augusta*. So, the altar is not just a commemoration of family and empire; it also shows how children – both Roman and foreign – are important to the establishment of peace.

According to McGinn,[34] the Augustan marriage laws reinforced a previous trend in Roman law towards the favoring of children. As time went by, children and women became frequent presences both in private and in public art, showing thus a new appreciation of the family unit. Ex-slave families advertised their newly acquired citizen status in family memorials where children were given a special place. Dressed in togas and wearing *bullae*, these children are tokens for citizenship. That was exactly what Augustus had wished.

[29] Pollini (1986).
[30] Rose (1990).
[31] Uzzi (2005) 147-148.
[32] Kleiner, Buxton (2008).
[33] Suet. *Aug.* 48: *Regnorum quibus belli iure potitus est, praeter pauca, aut iisdem quibus ademerat reddidit aut alienigenis contribuit. Reges socios etiam inter semet ipsos necessitudinibus mutuis iunxit, promptissimus affinitatis cuiusque atque amicitiae conciliator et fautor; nec aliter uniuersos quam membra partisque imperii curae habuit, rectorem quoque solitus apponere aetate paruis aut mente lapsis, donec adolescerent aut resipiscerent; ac plurimorum liberos et educauit simul cum suis et instituit.*
[34] McGinn (2013) 357.

Bibliography

Alberto, P.F. (2004), 'O simbólico na construção da imagem e do programa ideológico de Augusto: os mitos da fundação da Cidade', *Ágora* 6, 27-50.

Astolfi, R. (1986[2]), *La Lex Iulia e Papia*, Padua.

Badian, E. (1985), 'A phantom Roman marriage law', *Philologus* 129, 82-98.

Bauman, R. (1992), *Women and Politics in Ancient Rome*, London.

Cahoon, L. (1988), 'The bed as battlefield: erotic conquest and military metaphor in Ovid's *Amores*', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 118, 293-307.

Cary, E. (1924), *Dio Cassius. Roman History*, vol. 7, books 56-60, London/ Cambridge (MA).

Cohen, D. (1991), 'The Augustan law on adultery: the social and cultural context', in D.I. Kertzer, R.P. Saller (edd.), *The Family in Italy from Antiquity to the Present*, New Haven, 109-126.

Dixon, S. (1992), *The Roman Family*, Baltimore.

Dixon, S. (1996), 'The sentimental idea of the Roman family', in B. Rawson (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome*, Canberra/ Oxford/ New York, 99-113.

Fantham, E. (1994), 'Women, family, and sexuality in the Age of Augustus and the Julio-Claudians', in E. Fantham, H.P. Foley, N.B. Kampen, S.B. Pomeroy, A. Shapiro (edd.), *Women in the Classical World. Image and Text*, New York/ Oxford, 294-329.

Flory, M.B. (1993), 'Livia and the History of Public Honorific Statues for Women in Rome', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 123, 287-308.

Gale, M.R. (1997), 'Propertius 2.7: *Militia Amoris* and the ironies of elegy', *Journal of Roman Studies* 87, 77-91.

Galinsky, K. (1981), 'Augustus' legislation on morals and marriage', *Philologus* 125, 126-144.

Galinsky, K. (1996), *Augustan Culture. An Interpretive Introduction*, Princeton.

Gamel, M.-K. (1989), 'Non sine caede: abortion politics and poetics in Ovid's *Amores*', *Helios* 16, 183-206.

Golden, M. (2013), 'Children in Latin Epic', in J. Evans Grubbs, T. Parkin, R. Bell (edd.), *Childhood and Education in the Classical World*, Oxford, 249-263.

Grubbs, J.E. (2002), *Women and the Law in the Roman Empire*, London/ New York.

Hallett, J.P. (1973), 'The role of women in Roman elegy: counter-cultural feminism', *Arethusa* 6, 104-124.

Kemezis, A.M. (2007), 'Augustus and the ironic paradigm: Cassius Dio's portrayal of the *Lex Julia* and *Lex Papia Poppaea*', *Phoenix* 61, 270-284.

Kleiner, D.E.E., Buxton, B. (2008), 'Pledges of Empire: The *Ara Pacis* and the Donations of Rome', *American Journal of Archaeology* 112, 57-89.

Lee, G. (1994), *Propertius. The Poems*, Oxford.

McGinn, Th.A.J. (1998), *Prostitution, Sexuality, and the Law in Ancient Rome*, New York.

McGinn, Th.A.J. (2013), 'Roman children and the law', in J. Evans Grubbs, T. Parkin, R. Bell (edd.), *Childhood and Education in the Classical World*, Oxford, 341-362.

Merriam, C.U. (2002), 'Storm warning: Ascanius' appearances in the *Aeneid*', *Latomus* 61, 852-860.

Pinheiro, C.S. (2010), '*Suos utero quae necat* (*Am.* 2.14.38): aborto, sexualidade e medicina no tempo de Ovídio', in C. Pimentel, N.S. Rodrigues (coords.), *Sociedade, Poder e Cultura no Tempo de Ovídio*, Lisboa/ Coimbra, 173-186.

Pinheiro, C.S. (2012), *Orbae Matres: A dor da mãe pela perda de um filho na Literatura Latina*, Lisboa.

Pollini, J. (1986), 'Ahenobarbi, Appuleii and some others on the Ara Pacis', *American Journal of Archaeology* 90, 453-460.

Raditsa, L.F. (1980), 'Augustus' legislation concerning marriage, procreation, love affairs and adultery', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.13, 278-339.

Rose, C.B. (1990), 'Princes and barbarians on the *Ara Pacis*', *American Journal of Archaeology* 94, 453-467.

Severy, B. (2003), *Augustus and the Family at the Birth of the Roman Empire*, London/ New York.

Teixeira, C.A. (2009), 'Casamento, adultério e sexualidade no Direito Romano: o caso particular da *lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* e da *lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis*' in M. Ramos, M.C. Fialho, N.S. Rodrigues (coords.), *A Sexualidade no Mundo Antigo*, Porto/ Coimbra/ Lisboa, 361-366.

Thomas, J.-F. (2007), *Déshonneur et honte en Latin: étude sémantique*, Leuven.

Treggiari, S. (1991), *Roman Marriage. 'Iusti Coniuges' from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Treggiari, S. (2005), 'Women in the time of Augustus', in K. Galinsky (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, Cambridge, 130-147.

Uzzi, J.D. (2005), *Children in the Visual Arts of Imperial Rome*, Cambridge.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1985), 'Propaganda and dissent? Augustan moral legislation and the Love-Poets', *Klio* 67, 180-184.