

# Gendering the Roman *imago*\*

---

LEWIS WEBB  
*University of Gothenburg*  
[lewis.webb@gu.se](mailto:lewis.webb@gu.se)

*Eius te suscitāt*

*Imago, cuius effigīa, quo gnātū's patre.*

It is his ancestor mask and image that stirs you, that of the father  
by whom you were born.  
Afr. frs. 363-364 Ribbeck.

## *Introduction*

The relationships between the Roman *imago*, the male ancestor mask, and elite male lives have been well established, notably by Harriet Flower<sup>1</sup>. Yet very little has been said about their roles in the lives of elite

---

\* — Many thanks to Lovisa Brännstedt, Jacqueline Clarke, Kyle Conrau-Lewis, Jacqueline Fabre-Serris, Judith Hallett, Alison Keith, Chris de L'isle, Tuomo Nuorluoto, Ida Östenberg, Robin Rönnlund, C. Brian Rose, Irene Selsvold, Kimberley Webb, Hélène Whittaker, and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and feedback on initial drafts of this article. Any remaining errors are my own. *RE* and *PIR*<sup>2</sup> numbers provided for persons discussed, where available. All magistracies and associated abbreviations: Broughton 1951; 1952; *RE*; *PIR*<sup>2</sup>. Female nomenclature: Raepsaet-Charlier 1987; Kajava 1994. Latin from the *PHI Latin Corpus* and Greek from the *TLG*, unless otherwise indicated. All translations are my own.

1 — Recent significant studies: Drerup 1980; Flower 1996; Walter 2004, esp. 109-111; Rüpke 2006; Pollini 2007; Kaplow 2008; Rose 2008; Hölkeskamp 2010, esp. 112-115.

women<sup>2</sup>. In this article, I provide a gender perspective on the *imagines* by arguing that they were deeply entangled in elite women's lives in the Republic and Empire<sup>3</sup>. I begin with background on the *imagines*, demonstrating their fundamental connection with elite identities and their function as an inheritance, and then provide my own definition for elite women. Thereafter, I trace their presence and didactic role in the *atrium* (entrance hall) of the natal home of a *filia* (daughter), and their reproduction and transfer from the natal to marital *atrium* for a *nupta* (bride) and *uxor* (wife). I then examine the accumulation and didactic use of *imagines* in the marital home of a *matrona* (married woman) and *mater* (mother), speculate on their (re)configurations on the occasions of remarriage or divorce, identify their presence in the *funera* (funerals) of some elite women, and underline the associations between a female *maior* (ancestor), *imagines*, and elite identities. I will argue that these *imagines* and accompanying *tituli* (descriptive inscriptions) could function as an inheritance and *dos* (dowry) for an elite woman, and as a deposit of symbolic capital, embodying her social position (rank) and status (prestige, symbolic capital)<sup>4</sup>. I conclude that *imagines* were an important mecha-

2 — Apart from a brief discussion on their transmission from natal to marital homes in the *RE* and by Flower: *RE* s.v. *imagines maiorum*; Flower 1996, 59, 103, 201-202.

3 — My focus will be on these *imagines*, not on the broader subject of elite women and their numerous roles in Roman funerary practices. On this topic, see recent discussions: Šterbenk Erker 2009; 2010; Valentini 2012, 119-199. See also a forthcoming article by Ida Östenberg, which she kindly provided me in advance: Östenberg (forthcoming).

4 — By inheritance, I mean inherited property. On Roman women and inheritance: Dixon 1985; Crook 1986; Evans 1991, 71-83; Gardner 1995, 163-204. By *dos*, I mean the dotal property transmitted from a bride's natal family to her marital one in marriage, which, in some instances, could operate as (part or the entirety of) an elite woman's inheritance. Dotal property encompassed money, land, farms, buildings, livestock, slaves, gold, clothing, jewelry, household goods, and more. On dotal property: Evans 1991, 53-71; Treggiari 2002, 323-364, esp. 348-350. If a woman entered *manus* through marriage, this dotal property became the property of her marital *paterfamilias*. If she did not enter *manus*, her marital *paterfamilias* could use this property (with certain limits), but it remained the property of her natal *paterfamilias* (or her own if she was *sui iuris* – subject to *tutela* where relevant). *Manus* marriages seem to have been uncommon from the time of Cicero onwards. Marriages without *manus* – marriages *sine manu* – gradually overtook *manus* marriages as the default form from roughly the late second century BCE onwards. On these developments: Saller 1984, 196; 1994, 76; Dixon 1985, 163; Treggiari 2002, 30-34; Hin 2013, 289. If a woman's marriage ended in divorce or widowhood, she or her natal family could recover (all or some of) the dotal property – subject to pre-existing dotal contracts and certain rules regarding marital conduct and maintenance of children. See: Saller 1984; Dixon 1985, 163; Crook 1986, 68-69; Treggiari 2002, 324-331, 350-353. On the possible (re)configurations of *imagines* on the occasions of divorce or remarriage, see discussion below. On *dos* functioning as an inheritance: *Dig.* 6.1.65.1; 28.5.62. See: Saller 1984 (with reservations); Dixon 1985, esp. 167-168; Gardner 1985; Champlin 1991, 117-118; Evans 1991, 68, 79-83. In this article, 'social position' is equated with *locus*, *gradus*, or *dignitas*, interconnected with but distinct from 'status', *gloria*. Cf. *OLD* s.v. *locus* (17, 18); *gradus* (8); *dignitas* (3); *gloria* (1a). I conceptualise status as the symbolic capital of individuals, their 'prestige, reputation, [and] renown' (Bourdieu 1985, 724). The symbolic capital of an individual contributes to their social position, that is, it helps to define social hierarchies. Symbolic capital emerges from legitimated or recognised forms of capital, viz. economic (wealth and assets), cultural (knowledge and values), and

nism for transferring elite female social position and status between families, and an elite woman's own *commendatio maiorum* (commendation of the ancestors).

## *Background*

### **Imagines maiorum**

The *imagines maiorum*, male ancestor masks made of wax, were fundamental to elite identities in the Roman Republic and Empire<sup>5</sup>. If an elite man attained the public magisterial office of aedile (plebeian or curule) or the higher curule magistracies (praetorship or consulship if he skipped the aedileship), he attained the customary (not legal) right to bequeath his *imago* to his male and female descendants, the *ius imaginis ad memoriam posteritatemque prodendae* (Cic. *Verr.* 2.5.36)<sup>6</sup>. As an elite woman could not attain public magisterial office, she did not have the same right, and thus could not bequeath her own *imago*<sup>7</sup>. Nevertheless, *imagines* were an indelible part of elite women's lives, as I will argue below<sup>8</sup>.

This *imago* was a life-like wax mask, created by *factores* (image-makers), typically during the life of an elite man, and presumably subsequent to his election to the aedileship (or praetorship or consulship if he skipped the aedileship). It was thence typically a life-mask not a death-

---

social (relationships and networks). On symbolic capital and the Roman elite: Beck 2005, 114-154; Hölkeskamp 2010, 107-124.

5 — As attested paradigmatically by Polybius, Diodorus, Seneca (the Younger), Pliny (the Elder), and the *Codex Iustinianus*: Polyb. 6.53.4-54.3; Diod. Sic. 31.25.2; Sen. *Ben.* 3.28.2; Plin. *HN* 35.6; *Cod. Iust.* 5.37.22.3. See: Flower 1996, 37-43 (Polybius and Pliny), 104-105 (Diodorus), 110-111 (Polybius), 259 (Seneca), 264-269 (*Codex Iustinianus*); Rose 2008, 113, esp. n. 89. For all textual testimonia: Flower 1996, 281-332. In what follows, I translate both *imagines* and *imagines maiorum* as ancestor masks, and *imago* as ancestor mask. Cf. *OLD* s.v. *imago* (2a); Flower 1996. Notably, much of our surviving literary evidence for the *imagines* derives from outsiders and new members of the office-holding elite (e.g., the evidence of Cicero, Pliny (the Elder), and Seneca (the Younger)), not long-term members, and is thus coloured by their outsider and newcomer status and goals. See: Flower 1996, 61-65.

6 — Cf. Cic. *Rab. Post.* 16-17. See: Flower 1996, 53-59. Plebeian and curule aedileship by Cicero's time: Taylor 1939; Flower 1996, 54, esp. n. 111. On skipping the aedileship: Livy 32.7.8-12; Plut. *Vit. Flam.* 2.1-2; App. *Pun.* 112. See: Beck 2005, 368-393; Lushkov 2015, 151-159. Male and female descendants: Cic. *Vat.* 28; *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre (SCPP)* 76-82; Plin. *Ep.* 8.10.3. See: Flower 1996, 59, 103, 201-202 and discussion below.

7 — Flower 1996, 7; Pollini 2007, 237. Elite women could attain public sacerdotal office, but this did not entitle them to *imagines*. On their sacerdotal offices: Boëls-Janssen 1993; Schultz 2006; Hemelrijk 2015; DiLuzio 2016.

8 — Elite women also had other honours and privileges, including public sacerdotal office, prestigious non-sacerdotal religious roles, honorific statues and inscriptions, titles, representations on coins, privileged movement, elaborate transport and clothing, and public funerals. See: Chastagnol 1979; Purcell 1986; Hemelrijk 1987; 1999; 2005; 2012; 2015; Flory 1993; 1998; Hillard 2001; Berg 2002; Flower 2002; Schultz 2006; DiLuzio 2016; Hudson 2016; Webb (forthcoming).

mask, although it was only displayed after his death<sup>9</sup>. Such *imagines* were held and displayed in *armaria* (cupboards) within the *atrium* of an elite home<sup>10</sup>. They were accompanied by *tituli*, perhaps affixed to the *armaria*, which provided an abbreviated summary of the highest public offices and honours obtained by elite men, including consulships, censorships, triumphs and possibly other magisterial and sacerdotal offices<sup>11</sup>. In this way, the *imagines* and accompanying *tituli* materialised and memorialised the achievements of the male ancestors of a household, both patrilineal and matrilineal<sup>12</sup>. Moreover, *imagines* were located near *imagines pictae* (painted family portraits) linked by lines to form a *stemma* (family tree)<sup>13</sup>. The family and its achievements were thus on conspicuous display in the *atria* of elite homes, one of the first sights for any visitor.

Beyond their domestic presence, *imagines* played a central role in elite funerary practice. Some elite funerals included a *pompa funebris* (funeral procession), wherein the deceased was ceremonially transported from the *atrium* of an elite home to the *rostra* in the Forum, where a *laudatio funebris* (funerary oration) was delivered by one of the deceased's relatives<sup>14</sup>. This *pompa funebris* was a vibrant spectacle, including (in approximate order) musicians, dancers, professional mourners, actors emulating the family's ancestors in chronological order of death (earliest first) accompanied by retinues, the bier with the deceased, and family and friends dressed in mourning clothes behind the bier<sup>15</sup>. Notably, the actors-as-ancestors wore the *imagines* and magisterial or honorific garb of said ancestors (e.g., praetorian, consular, censorial, or triumphal), rode in carriages, were accompanied by appropriate retinues (lictors etc.), and

9 — Life-like: Polyb. 6.53.5. Wax: Plin. *HN* 35.6. *Fictores*: Serv. auct. ad. Verg. *Aen.* 8.634. Created during lifetime: *SCPP* 76-82; Tac. *Ann.* 2.32. See: Flower 1996, 2, 36-38, 53-59, 206; Rose 2008, 113-115. For possible creation after untimely death: Pollini 2007, 238, esp. n. 5. On the creation process for an *imago*: Rose 2008, 113-114; Rose & Lovink 2014.

10 — Polyb. 6.53.4; Asc. *Mil.* 43C; Sen. *Ben.* 3.28.2; *Ep.* 44.5; 76.12; Plin. *HN* 35.6. See: Flower 1996, 40-46, 185-202.

11 — *Tituli*: Livy 10.7.11. Cf. Livy 8.40.4; 22.31.11; Hor. *Sat.* 1.6.17; *Panegyricus Messallae* 28-36; Val. Max. 5.8.3; Tac. *Dial.* 8.4; Sil. *Pun.* 4.493-497. See: Flower 1996, 180-184, 206-207. For potential paradigms for *tituli*: *CIL* VI.1286; 1304; 1319; 31617; 37077; X.6087; Asc. *Pis.* 12C.

12 — Flower 1996, 59.

13 — On *stemma* and *imagines pictae*: Sen. *Ben.* 3.28.2; Plin. *HN* 35.6; Stat. *Silv.* 4.4.75; Mart. 4.40.1; 5.35.4; Suet. *Galb.* 2; *Vesp.* 12; Plut. *Vit. Num.* 21; SHA *Alex. Sev.* 44.3; Isid. *Etym.* 9.6.28. See: Flower 1996, 40-46; Corbier 2007; Pollini 2007, 239.

14 — Polyb. 6.53.6-6.54.1; Diod. Sic. 31.25.2; Plin. *HN* 35.6. See: Crawford 1941; Flower 2006, 91-127; Favro and Johanson 2010. *Laudationes funebres*: Polyb. 6.54.1; Sempronius Asellio fr. 13 *FrRH*; *CIL* VI.1527 (*laudatio Turiae*); VI.10230 (*laudatio Murdiae*); Plin. *HN* 7.139-140; Tac. *Ann.* 3.76; Plut. *Vit. Caes.* 5.2-5; Suet. *Iul.* 6.1. See: Flower 1996, 128-158.

15 — Composition of *pompa funebris* adduced from Polyb. 6.53.6-9; Cic. *De Or.* 2.225; Diod. Sic. 31.25.2; Dion. Hal. *Rom.* 7.72.12; Hor. *Epod.* 8.11-12; Tac. *Ann.* 3.76; Suet. *Vesp.* 19.2; and the late Republican Amiternum relief apud Flower 1996, plate 6. See: Flower 1996, 98-106.

simulated the behaviours of the ancestors<sup>16</sup>. These actors-as-ancestors were adorned with all the symbols and trappings of the ancestors' public magisterial offices and honours. They were thus embodied exempla of male ancestors and a living manifestation of the family's achievements. Tacitus termed the procession of actors-as-ancestors the *pompa imaginum* (ancestor masks procession) (Tac. *Ann.* 4.9). Once the procession reached the *rostra*, the actors-as-ancestors sat down there on ivory chairs (cf. *curule*) in chronological order (of death): an arresting and public display of an elite family's *imagines maiorum*<sup>17</sup>. Moreover, according to Polybius, the bier was positioned on the *rostra* and the deceased propped upright (Polyb. 6.5.1). The deceased was thus represented as joining the ranks of the *maiores* (ancestors) themselves<sup>18</sup>. The spectacle of the *pompa imaginum* and subsequent *laudatio funebris* inscribed the deceased into memory, locating them in a long line of *maiores*, and celebrated the continuity, social position, and status of the family<sup>19</sup>.

The *imagines* were in use from before the early third century BCE to (perhaps) the sixth century CE – attested textually from Plautus to Boethius (Plaut. *Amph.* 458-459; Boethius, *Con.* 1.*pros.*1.3) – but the exact *terminus* of their usage is uncertain<sup>20</sup>. Their presence in funerals for non-imperial elite families was restricted by the early third century CE, but they remained in (some) non-imperial elite homes until perhaps the sixth century CE<sup>21</sup>. In the Republic, the *imago* was a vital symbol of social position, status, and identity for the aristocracy of office (or office-holding caste), sc. patricio-plebeian senatorial families with ancestors who were office-holders. An *imago* symbolised an elite man's

16 — *Imagines* in the *pompa funebris*: Plaut. *Amph.* 458-459; Polyb. 6.53.6-9; Cic. *De Or.* 2.225-226; *Mil.* 33, 86; Diod. *Sic.* 31.25.2; Hor. *Epod.* 8.11-12; Livy *Per.* 48; Val. *Max.* 2.9.3; 5.8.3; 8.15.1-2; Plin. *HN* 35.6; Tac. *Ann.* 2.32; 2.73; 3.5; 3.76; 4.9; Plut. *Vit. Caes.* 5; App. *Hisp.* 89; Dio. 56.34. See: Flower 1996, 91-127. Actors with *imagines*, carriages, magisterial and honorific garb, retinues, and simulated behaviours: Polyb. 6.53.7-9; Diod. *Sic.* 31.25.2; Suet. *Vesp.* 19.2. See: Flower 1996, 102-106; Hölkeskamp 2011, 113. For the view that the actors-as-ancestors with their *imagines* represented statues: Rüpke 2006, 272-278.

17 — Polyb. 6.5.8-9; Tac. *Ann.* 3.5. See: Walbank 1957, 739; Flower 1996, 129-130; Woodman & Martin 2004, 100. Ivory *curule* chair: Polyb. 6.53.9; Dion. *Hal.* 3.62.1; Livy 5.41.2; Hor. *Epist.* 1.6.53-54; Ov. *Fast.* 5.51; *Pont.* 4.9.27-28.

18 — See: Walbank 1957, 737; Flower 1996, 130.

19 — Flower 1996, 127.

20 — See: Flower 1996, 46-47, 223, 263-264, 268; Pollini 2007, 245-252. Earliest literary references: Plaut. *Amph.* 458-459; Polyb. 6.53.4-54.3; Afr. *frs.* 363-364 Ribbeck. For their use in the third and second centuries BCE: Polyb. 6.53.4-54.4; Sall. *Iug.* 4.5-6; Livy 22.31.8-11; Val. *Max.* 8.15.1-2; App. *Hisp.* 89. Flower and Pollini posit the late fourth century BCE as potential origin: Flower 1996, 46; Pollini 2007, 245-252. For the early sixth century CE as final secure attestation: *Cod. Iust.* 5.37.22.3; Boethius, *Con.* 1.*pros.*1.3. See: Flower 1996, 268.

21 — Restriction adduced from: Dio 47.19.2; Pompon. *Porph.* ad Hor. *Epod.* 8.11-12. See: Flower 1996, 223, 263-264. Additionally, the fire of 64 CE probably destroyed many *imagines*: Suet. *Ner.* 38.2. See: Flower 1996, 259.

attainment of magisterial public office, while its accompanying *titulus* lauded the extent of a man's public career and honours<sup>22</sup>. In this way, the *imago* and *titulus* functioned as a kind of 'deposit of symbolic capital' (Hölkeskamp 2010, 113), representing the establishment, accretion and renewal of social position (office-holding) and status for an elite family<sup>23</sup>. *Imagines* provided the office-holding caste with the advantage of the *commendatio maiorum*, crucial for electoral success and thus for gaining future deposits of symbolic capital, although this advantage diminished in the Empire, especially after the emperor Tiberius transferred magisterial elections to the Senate in 14 CE<sup>24</sup>. The *imago* was also a physical vessel of memory, a didactic reminder of a male ancestor, his achievements, roles and values, acting as an inspiring exemplum for his descendants to emulate, a burden to live up to and, if a descendant did not measure up, a potential source of shame<sup>25</sup>. Essentially, the *imagines* were a form of *inheritance*, a material connection between (and manifestation of) the status and social position of an office-holder and his descendants<sup>26</sup>.

22 — *Imagines* and public office: Cic. *Planc.* 18; *Rab. Post.* 16-17; *Verr.* 2.5.36; Sall. *Iug.* 85.10, 25, 29-30, 38. See: Flower 1996, 10, 63-64, 220-222. On the patricio-plebeian senatorial elite as an aristocracy of office: Hölkeskamp 1993; 2010; 2011; Cornell 1995; Ryan 1998; Jehne 2011. Here I use the more inclusive terms patricio-plebeian senatorial elite or aristocracy of office as opposed to the more exclusive terms *nobilitas* or *nobiles*. On problems with these latter terms: Hölkeskamp 1993, 14; 2010, 78.

23 — Hölkeskamp 2010, 112-115.

24 — On *imagines* and the *commendatio maiorum*: Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 2.100; *Pis.* 1; *Planc.* 18, 51; Sall. *Iug.* 85.21-25, 29-30, 38; Hor. *Sat.* 1.6.7-17. See: Flower 1996, 60-90, 206; Morstein-Marx 1998, esp. 273-274, 279; Kaplow 2008, 410; Hölkeskamp 2010, 122. On Tiberius' transfer of magisterial elections to the Senate in 14 CE: Tac. *Ann.* 1.14-15. See: Lacey 1963; Levick 1967; 1999, 69-88.

25 — Didactic and exemplary nature of *imagines*: Polyb. 6.53-54; Afr. frs. 363-364 Ribbeck; Cic. *Cacl.* 33-34; *De or.* 2.225-226; *Mur.* 88; *Phil.* 2.26; *Pis.* 1; *Planc.* 51; Sall. *Iug.* 4.5-6, 85.21-23, 38; Sen. *Controv.* 1.6.3; *Panegyricus Messallae* 28-36; Vell. Pat. 2.116.4; Val. Max. 3.3(ext).7; 3.5; 5.8.3; *Laus Pisonis* 1-24, 32-34; Iuv. 8.1-23; Plin. *Ep.* 3.3.6; Tac. *Ann.* 2.27; Plut. *Vit. Mar.* 9.2. See: Flower 1996, 220-221; Hölkeskamp 2006, 483. Cf. cultural memory in the Roman Republic and Empire: Gowing 2005; Hölkeskamp 2006; Flower 2014; Galinsky (ed.) 2014; Galinsky & Lapatin (eds.) 2015.

26 — That the *imagines* (and accompanying spectacles) were an inheritance for the descendants of an office-holder is evinced by various authors of the Republic and Empire: Polyb. 6.54.2; Cic. *Rab. Post.* 16; *Verr.* 2.5.36; Sall. *Iug.* 85.30, 38; Sen. *Controv.* 1.6.3; Livy 3.58.2; Plin. *HN* 35.8; Plin. *Ep.* 8.10.3; *Cod. Iust.* 5.37.22.3. Cf. Flower 1996, 10, 22-23, 264-265. It is uncertain whether the inheritance of *imagines* was effected or affected by testamentary dispositions or intestate succession. Pliny (the Elder) records one instance where testamentary adoption led to the inheritance of *imagines*: Plin. *HN* 35.8. In this passage, Pliny indicates: a) that a Cornelius Scipio Salvitto (*RE* 357, cf. Plin. *HN* 7.54; Plut. *Vit. Caes.* 52.5) adopted a Cornelius Scipio Pomponianus (*RE* 357) into the *gens Cornelia* via *adoptio testamentaria* (testamentary adoption); b) that Salvitto was heir to the *imagines* of the Africanus, sc. Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus (*RE* 336, cos. 205, 194 BCE) and Publius Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus Africanus (*RE* 335, cos. 147, 134 BCE); c) that by virtue of his testamentary adoption Pomponianus inherited and displayed these same *imagines* in his *atrium*; d) that Marcus Valerius Messalla Rufus (*RE* 268, cos. 53 BCE) was so incensed to see these *imagines* in Pomponianus' *atrium* that he wrote his *De familiis* on genealogies in response. This passage reveals that some members of the elite were critical of the inheritance of *imagines* by testamentary adoption, but does not clarify

Notably, Sallust (in his version of a consular speech of Caius Marius (*RE* 14, cos. 107, 104-100, 86 BCE) of 107 BCE) and a Constantinian edict of 326 CE (republished in the *Codex Iustinianus* in 534 CE) indicate that the *imagines* were a part of a *hereditas* or *patrimonium* (inheritance) for the descendants of an office-holder (Sall. *Iug.* 85.30; *Cod. Iust.* 5.37.22.3)<sup>27</sup>. The creation, inheritance, and display of these *imagines* were the province of custom, family arbitration, and law – a complex entanglement reflecting their importance and antiquity<sup>28</sup>. These *imagines* did not lose (all of) their significance in the Empire, despite the imperial monopoly of power and restrictions on their presence in funerals for non-imperial elite families. Instead, they remained an important symbol of social position, status, and identity for the imperial and non-imperial elite for centuries, as witnessed by the aforementioned Constantinian edict and by Boethius' allusion to *fumosae imagines* (smoky ancestor masks) in the early sixth century CE (Boethius, *Con.* 1.*pros.*1.3, ca. 523-525 CE)<sup>29</sup>. The *imago*, then, constituted and reconstituted elite identities.

whether *imagines* were (always or ever) bequeathed by testamentary dispositions, what might happen during intestate succession, or whether Rufus' *De familiis* had any impact on the inheritance and display of *imagines*. On the *imagines* and the testamentary adoption of Pomponianus: Billows 1982, 53-62; Lindsay 2009, 162-163; Cornell (ed.) 2013, 386-388. Adoption *inter vivos* (and perhaps testamentary adoption) does not seem to have altered the ability of a person to inherit the *imagines* of biological ancestors. Cf. inclusion of the *imagines* of biological and adoptive ancestors in *pompae imaginum*: Tac. *Ann.* 3.76 (see discussion below); 4.9 (presence of *imagines* of *gentes Iulia* and *Claudia* at Drusus Iulius Caesar's (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 219, cos. 15, 21 CE) *pompa imaginum* in 23 CE). See: Flower 1996, 85, 243. It seems that the creation, inheritance, and display of *imagines* occupied the realms of custom, family arbitration, and law: Cic. *Fam.* 9.21 (advice on the selection of *imagines* for an *atrium*); *SCPP* 76-82 (legal ban, custom, and the display of *imagines*); Plin. *HN* 35.8 (publicly expressed disapproval at the creation, inheritance, and display of certain *imagines*). The aforementioned passage of Pliny provides further evidence of this (Plin. *HN* 35.8). Beyond the reference to Rufus, Pliny indicates that Marcus Valerius Messalla Corvinus (*RE* 261, cos. 31 BCE) delivered a speech in which he (presumably as *paterfamilias*) forbade (*prohibere*) the introduction of an *aliena imago* (unbelonging or unfamiliar ancestor mask) of the Valerii Laevini into his family. In this instance, Corvinus made the ultimate decision regarding the inheritance of this *imago*. See: Billows 1982, 54; Cornell (ed.) 2013, 387. The display – but not creation – of *imagines* in *atria* and *pompae imaginum* could of course be restricted by legal bans: *SCPP* 76-82; Tac. *Ann.* 2.32. See: Flower 1996, 23-31. The *SCPP* of 20 CE does not treat the *imagines* of the *gens Calpurnia* alongside matters of confiscated property and inheritance, but instead treats them as a separate matter of custom and family (*SCPP* 76-82). See: Flower 1996, 56-59. The Constantinian edict of 326 CE, however, does treat them as a matter of inheritance for minors (*Cod. Iust.* 5.37.22.3). See: Flower 1996, 264-265. What can we make of this? Prior to the Constantinian edict (and perhaps thereafter), I suggest *imagines* were functionally an inheritance, but that their creation, inheritance, and display were subject to custom and family arbitration, not just testamentary dispositions or intestate succession. In these respects, decisions regarding *imagines* may have been made by the *paterfamilias* of an elite household (like Corvinus) – in consultation with a family *consilium* – and these decisions would be subject to scrutiny and potential criticism from other members of the elite (like Rufus). See: Flower 1996, 56-59.

27 — Sall. *Iug.* 85.30: *hereditas* for the office-holding elite. *Cod. Iust.* 5.37.22.3: *patrimonium* for minors. See: Flower 1996, 22-23, 264-265.

28 — Cf. n. 26. See: Flower 1996, 53-59, esp. 59.

29 — Flower 1996, 223-269, esp. 265-266. Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius (cos. 510 CE) was himself a member of the office-holding elite and well aware of the *imagines*: Matthews 1981;

### *Elite women*

Elite women are here defined as senatorial women, female relatives of senators<sup>30</sup>. Our earliest epigraphic sources provide insight into their social position and status: elite female names included a patronymic and gamonymic, signifying their association with their natal and marital families, and their freeborn status, e.g. ‘Paula Cornelia, daughter of Cnaeus, wife of Hispallus’ ([*P*]aulla Cornelia Cn(aei) filia Hispalli [uxor], *CIL* VI.1294, *RE* 445)<sup>31</sup>. As daughters, their social position and status were interconnected with their natal male relatives, particularly their fathers and brothers, and as wives, with their marital male relatives, their husbands and sons<sup>32</sup>. Their sexual status (filial, marital, maternal, divorced, widowed), public behaviour, religious activity, and sacerdotal public offices also enhanced (or diminished) their social position and status<sup>33</sup>. In the Republic, these elite women were members of the patricio-plebeian senatorial elite, the aristocracy of office, but did not have legally defined social positions<sup>34</sup>. Instead, they derived informal ones from their natal and marital families, thence some women were praetorian or consular etc., reflecting the highest attained magisterial public office of their male relatives<sup>35</sup>. From the early Empire, senatorial daughters were legally born

---

Flower 1996, 265-266. For the smoky colour of the *imagines*, presumably from smoke stains and dirt in *atria*: Cic. *Pis.* 1; Sen. *Ep.* 44.5; Iuv. 8.8. See: Flower 1996, 186, 265.

30 — This definition excludes wealthy sub-elite women, e.g. equestrian women, and encompasses both imperial and non-imperial elite women in the Empire. These are the women related to past, present, and future senators, thence those with (potential) access to male *imagines*. For elite women as senatorial women: Raepsaet-Charlier 1987, 1-14; Hemelrijk 1999, 10-13, 202; Webb (forthcoming). Overviews: Chastagnol 1979; Hallett 1984a; Purcell 1986; Raepsaet-Charlier 1987; Evans 1991; Boëls-Janssen 1993; 2008; Bauman 1994; Hemelrijk 1999; 2015; Flower 2002; Hänninen 2011; Valentini 2012.

31 — Cf. *CIL* VI.1274; 10043. See: Kajava 1994, 19-31. Outside of the epigraphic context, elite women were probably referred to with their *nomina* in formal contexts and a range of personal names in informal contexts, including *nomina*, *praenomina* (particularly for multiple homonymous women e.g. female agnates), relational expressions (*filia*, *uxor* etc.), diminutives, nicknames, and pet names. See: e.g., Cic. *Div.* 1.103 (*mea Tertia*); 2.83 (*Aemilia*); *Fam.* 2.15.2 (*Tullia mea*); 4.5.1 (*Tullia filia tua*); 14.1.5 (*mea Terentia*); 14.4.3 (*Tulliola mea*); 14.19.1 (*Tullia nostra*); *QFr.* 2.6.1 (*Tullia nostra*). See: Kajava 1994, esp. 19-31, 118-124.

32 — Fathers: Cic. *Cael.* 33; *Phil.* 3.16; *Rosc. Am.* 147. Brothers: Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 147; Livy *Per.* 19; Val. Max. 8.1.damn.4; Gell. *NA* 10.6.2; Suet. *Tib.* 2. Husbands: C. Gracch. fr. 48 *ORF*; Cic. *Cael.* 34. Sons: Polyb. 10.4.4-5.7; Nep. fr. 59 Marshall; Livy 40.37.6; Val. Max. 4.4.praef. See: Dixon 1988; Hemelrijk 1999, 10.

33 — Hemelrijk 1999; 2015; Treggiari 2002; Langlands 2006; Schultz 2006; DiLuzio 2016. An elite woman's social position, influence, and authority improved when she became a mother, and grew (along with her independence) if she was widowed. See: Hemelrijk 1999, 9-10.

34 — Cf. Raepsaet-Charlier 1987, 1-14; Hemelrijk 1999, 10-13, 202; Webb (forthcoming).

35 — In the Republic, a male senator had a formal social position based on his highest attained magisterial public office. We can thus speak in ascending order of non-curule (tribunician, quaestorian, aedilician) to curule (aedilician, praetorian, consular) senators, with consular senators and the *princeps senatus* at the summit. The formal *cursum honorum* with its sequence of offices was probably established in the middle of the third century BCE and certainly by the time of the *lex Villia annalis*

into the *ordo senatorius* (senatorial order), as codified by the *lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* (18 BCE) and the *lex Papia Poppaea* (9 CE)<sup>36</sup>. By ca. 169 CE, a senatorial wife formally held the title (social position, rank) of *clarissima femina*, and by ca. 176 CE an unmarried senatorial daughter held the title of *clarissima puella*<sup>37</sup>. Moreover, by 184 CE, a consular wife formally held the title of *consularis femina*<sup>38</sup>. Evidently, the social position of elite women was associated with the public magisterial offices of their male relatives. In what follows, I will argue that the lives of elite women were intimately entangled with the *imago*, itself an important symbol of social position and the aristocracy of office.

## Filia

*Imagines* and their accompanying *tituli* were a constant presence in the *atrium* of the natal home of an elite *filia*. Whenever she stepped into the *atrium*, they loomed there before her<sup>39</sup>. She would have known the *atrium* and *imagines* well, for *telae* (looms) stood there, on which she and her female relatives (sisters, mother, grandmother etc.) could work wool (if they did so)<sup>40</sup>. The *imagines* could thus watch over her wool-working. It must be said that many elite women may have used these *telae* infrequently (if at all), as there was a disjunction between the normative ideology of elite women working wool and actual practice, as other scholars have discussed elsewhere<sup>41</sup>. Nevertheless, elite women would have

of 180 BCE. Cf. *CIL* I<sup>2</sup>, p. 192 (*elogium* for Appius Claudius Caecus (*RE* 91, cos. 307, 296 BCE)); I<sup>2</sup>, p. 193 (*elogium* for Quintus Fabius Maximus Verrucosus (*RE* 116, cos. 233, 228, 215, 214, 209 BCE)); IX.416 (*lex Latina Tabulae Bantinae*); Plin. *HN* 7.140 (*laudatio* for Lucius Caecilius Metellus (*RE* 72, cos. 251, 247 BCE)). See: Ryan 1998; Beck 2005, esp. 395-407; Beck et al. 2011, 6; Hölkeskamp 2011, 26; Jehne 2011. Cicero explicitly links some elite women with the praetorian and consular social position of their male relatives: Cic. *Att.* 2.1.5 (*illa consularis*); *Cael.* 33-34 (consular *stemma*); *Phil.* 3.16 (praetorian and consular *stemma*); *Planc.* 18 (consular maternal *stemma*); *Rosc. Am.* 147 (consular *stemma*). Cf. consular wives: Papiria C.f. (*RE* 78) in Polyb. 31.26.6; an *ignota* in C. Gracch. fr. 48 *ORF*.

36 — On these laws: Dio 54.16.2; 56.7.2; *Dig.* 23.2.44, 47. See: Raepsaet-Charlier 1987, 1-4; Hemelrijk 1999, 216-217, n. 18; McGinn 2003, 70-104.

37 — Senatorial wives and daughters: *CIL* XIII.1801 (*c.f.*, ca. 169 CE); *ILAlg-02-03* 7909 (*c.p.*, ca. 176 CE); *Dig.* 1.9.8, 10, 12 (Ulpian). See: Raepsaet-Charlier 1987, 7-8; Hemelrijk 1999, 216, n. 17.

38 — Consular wives: *CIG* 4380b2 = *IGR* IV.911 (ὑπατική, 184 CE); *ILAfr* 414 (*consulari feminae*); SHA *Heliogab.* 4.3; *Dig.* 1.9.1.1 (Ulpian). See: Raepsaet-Charlier 1987, 12; Nicols 1989, 124-125.

39 — For the presence of *imagines* in the home and spatial concerns: Flower 1996, 185-222.

40 — On elite mothers, daughters, and granddaughters working wool on *telae* in *atria*: Asc. *Mil.* 43C; Livy 1.57.9; Suet. *Aug.* 64.2; 73.1. Cf. female wool-working in *laudationes* and an *elogium*: *CIL* VI.1527 (*laudatio Turiae*); VI.10230 (*laudatio Murdiae*); VI.15346. See: Flower 1996, 195. For loom weights in Roman elite *atria* as evidence for the presence of women: Allison 2004, 146-148; 2007, 348-349; Strong 2016, 20.

41 — See: Larsson Lovén 1998, 88-89; Hersch 2010, 124-126.

frequently walked through their own and others' *atria* and observed the *imagines* throughout their daily lives<sup>42</sup>. The *armaria* holding the *imagines* were not always open, but the *tituli* were (presumably) visible every day (if affixed to or nearby the *armaria*)<sup>43</sup>. During *feriae* (public festivals) and family celebrations, elite families opened the *armaria* and publicly displayed the *imagines* (*imagines aperire*)<sup>44</sup>. On certain special occasions (e.g. male electoral success) they decorated the *imagines* with laurel, while in times of mourning they closed the *armaria*<sup>45</sup>. The constant presence of these *imagines* in natal homes is well articulated by Cicero and Valerius Maximus, when Cicero cites their daily didactic (and revolutionary) presence in the houses of the tyrannicides Marcus Iunius Brutus (*RE* 53, pr. 44 BCE) and Decimus Iunius Brutus Albinus (*RE* 55a), and when Valerius Maximus links the fraternal bond with the shared inheritance of status from the *imagines*:

*Etenim si auctores ad liberandam patriam desiderarentur illis actoribus, Brutus ego impellerem, quorum uterque L. Bruti imaginem cotidie videret, alter etiam Ahalae* (Cic. *Phil.* 2.26)?

If indeed advocates for liberating our fatherland were needed by those actors, would I have been able to incite the Bruti, each of whom saw the ancestor mask of Lucius [Iunius] Brutus daily, and one also that of [Caius Servilius] Ahala<sup>46</sup>?

*In eodem domicilio antequam nascerer habitavi, in isdem incunabulis infantiae tempora peregi, eosdem appellavi parentes, eadem pro me vota excubuerunt, parem ex maiorum imaginibus gloriam traxi* (Val. Max. 5.5.praef.)!

I lived in the same home [as my brother] before I was born, I spent the time of my infancy in the same cradle, I called the same people my parents, they guarded me with the same vows, I drew equal status [prestige, glory] from the ancestor masks<sup>47</sup>!

42 — On the public lives of elite women, see: Hallett 1984a; Purcell 1986; Dixon 1988; Evans 1991; Boëls-Janssen 1993; 2008; Bauman 1994; Hemelrijk 1999; 2015; Schultz 2006; Valentini 2012; DiLuzio 2016.

43 — Cic. *Phil.* 2.26; Iuv. 8.1-23; See: Flower 1996, 207.

44 — Polyb. 6.53.6; Cic. *Sull.* 88; Sen. *Contr.* 7.6.10 (festivals); SHA *Tac.* 19.6. See: Flower 1996, 207-208. That the family members did this themselves and not slaves is suggested by SHA *Tac.* 19.6.

45 — Decoration: Polyb. 6.53.6; Cic. *Mur.* 88 (electoral success, laurel). Closure: Val. Max. 3.5; Sen. *Contr.* 7.6.10. See: Flower 1996, 207-208.

46 — Commentary: Ramsey 2003, 200-201; Richardson 2011, 156, esp. n. 11. The legendary matrilineal *imago* of Caius Servilius Ahala (*RE* 32, magister equitum 439 BCE) would have entered the natal atrium of Marcus Iunius Brutus (*RE* 53, pr. 44 BCE) via his mother Servilia Q.f. (*RE* 101) or his adoptive father and maternal uncle Quintus Servilius Caepio (*RE* 40). Cf. Cic. *Att.* 2.24.3; 13.40.1; Plut. *Vit. Brut.* 1.5. On matrilineal *imagines*, see arguments below.

47 — Cf. Flower 1996, 323.

While these invocations of the *imagines* do not refer to elite daughters, they indicate the powerful visual and didactic effects these *imagines* had on elite children and their associations with the natal home. Moreover, Valerius Maximus supports the notion that *imagines* provided a deposit of symbolic capital (*gloria*) for future generations. The *imagines* were a part of daily life for an elite family.

The connections between *imagines* and an elite daughter are made explicit by Cicero in his *Pro Caelio*, a speech he delivered in 56 BCE<sup>48</sup>. In an elaborate *prosopopoeia*, Cicero summons the illustrious Appius Claudius Caecus (*RE* 91, cos. 307, 296 BCE) to condemn his descendant Clodia Ap.f. (*RE* 66) for her connection to Marcus Caelius Rufus (*RE* 35, pr. 48 BCE). In this condemnation, Cicero's Caecus recalls Clodia's consular ancestors, deceased husband, and their *imagines* as an admonitory rhetorical device:

*Non patrem tuum videras, non patruum, non avum, non proavum, non abavum, non atavum audieras consules fuisse? Non denique modo te Q. Metelli matrimonium tenuisse sciebas, clarissimi ac fortissimi viri patriaeque amantissimi, qui simul ac pedem limine extulerat, omnis prope civis virtute, gloria, dignitate superabat? Cum ex amplissimo genere in familiam clarissimam nupsisses, cur tibi Caelius tam coniunctus fuit? Cognatus, adfinis, viri tui familiaris? Nihil eorum. Quid igitur fuit nisi quaedam temeritas ac libido? Nonne te, si nostrae imagines viriles non commovebant, ne progenies quidem mea, Q. illa Claudia, aemulam domesticae laudis in gloria muliebri esse admonebat (Cic. Cael. 33-34)?*

Didn't you see your father and uncle, didn't you hear that your grandfather, your great-grandfather, your great-great-grandfather, and your great-great-great grandfather had all been consuls? Weren't you aware that you have been the spouse of Quintus [Caecilius] Metellus [Celer], a man of greatest illustriousness and strength, of greatest patriotism, who only had to step outside to surpass almost every other citizen in virtue, status, and rank? Since you had married from the most aristocratic [abundant] stock into a most illustrious family, why was [Marcus] Caelius [Rufus] so joined with you? Was he a kinsman [cognate], a relation by marriage [affinal], a friend of your husband? None of these. What was there, then, except for rashness and lust? If our male ancestor masks haven't moved you, didn't my descendant, that famous Quinta Claudia, admonish you to compete with her in familial renown for female status<sup>49</sup>?

Here, Clodia's great-great-great-great grandfather Caecus invokes her deceased patrilineal male ancestors in chronologically ascending order:

48 — In defense of Marcus Caelius Rufus (*RE* 35, pr. 48 BCE). Date: Cic. *Cael.* 1, 78. See: Austin 1977, 151.

49 — Commentary: Austin 1977, 93; Flower 2002, 162-165.

her father Appius Claudius Pulcher (*RE* 296, cos. 79 BCE), uncle Caius Claudius Pulcher (*RE* 302, cos. 92 BCE), grandfather Appius Claudius Pulcher (*RE* 295, cos. 143 BCE), great-grandfather Caius Claudius Pulcher (*RE* 300, cos. 177 BCE), great-great grandfather Appius Claudius Pulcher (*RE* 293, cos. 212 BCE), and great-great-great grandfather Publius Claudius Pulcher (*RE* 304, cos. 249 BCE). All of these elite men were dead by 56 BCE: these *were* the patrilineal *imagines* in Clodia's natal home and their *tituli* would evince their many consulships<sup>50</sup>. Moreover, Cicero's Caecus mentions Clodia's deceased husband, Quintus Caecilius Metellus Celer (*RE* 86, cos. 60 BCE), whose own *imago* and ancestral *imagines* and *tituli* would have graced the *atrium* of her marital home, an *atrium* that could boast a long line of patrilineal consular *imagines* back to the illustrious Lucius Caecilius Metellus (*RE* 72, cos. 251, 247 BCE)<sup>51</sup>. Moreover, her husband's *imagines* would have been joined by copies of *imagines* and *tituli* from Clodia's natal home, as I will discuss subsequently. In this passage, then, Cicero conjures up both a *stemma* and a rhetorical *pompa imaginum* in reverse: a family tree and procession of office-holding ancestors admonishing Clodia. Cicero knew that she, like the aforementioned Bruti, would have seen the *stemma* and *imagines* (or at least the *tituli*) daily and known them well. The didactic role of the *imagines* for elite sons is well known, but here the target is clearly an elite daughter, implying they had didactic roles for daughters too, at the very least admonitory and possibly exhortatory as well<sup>52</sup>. Cicero's use of Clodia's ancestral *imagines* suggests that, like elite sons, elite daughters were both blessed and burdened by them. In this case, Clodia is accused of being unmoved by her illustrious *imagines maiorum* (Cic. *Cael.* 34): '*si nostrae imagines viriles non commovebant*'. The *imagines* of her own ancestors thus impugned her<sup>53</sup>.

Valerius Maximus further evinces these bifurcated effects of the *imagines*, indicating that their deposit of symbolic capital (here described as *lux*, light) could be lost (here described as a reversal into *dedecus*, disgrace, and the changing of *lux* into *tenebrae*, darkness):

50 — The patrilineal *imagines* of the *gens Claudia* may have stretched past Caecus beyond even Attus Clausus sc. Appius Claudius Sabinus Inregillensis (*RE* 321, cos. 495 BCE) to their Sabine ancestors: Tac. *Ann.* 4.9. See: Flower 1996, 243.

51 — Father (biological): Quintus Caecilius Metellus Nepos (*RE* 95, cos. 98 BCE). Uncle and father (adoptive): Quintus Caecilius Metellus Celer (*RE* 85); Grandfather (biological): Quintus Caecilius Metellus Balaricus (*RE* 82, cos. 123 BCE). Great-uncle and grandfather (adoptive): Lucius Caecilius Metellus Diadematus (*RE* 98, cos. 117 BCE). Great-grandfather: Quintus Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus (*RE* 94, cos. 143 BCE). Great-great-grandfather: Quintus Caecilius Metellus (*RE* 81, cos. 206 BCE). Great-great-great-grandfather: Lucius Caecilius Metellus (*RE* 72, cos. 251, 247 BCE). On adoption and *imagines*, cf. n. 26 and discussion on Tac. *Ann.* 3.76 below.

52 — See: n. 25.

53 — Cf. Flower 1996, 221.

*Quo evenit ut et humili loco nati ad summam dignitatem consurgant et generosissimarum imaginum fetus in aliquod revoluti dedecus acceptam a maioribus lucem in tenebras convertant* (Val. Max. 3.3(ext).7).

So it happens that both those born of humble birth rise to the highest rank and the progeny of the most aristocratic [generous] ancestor masks reverse into some disgrace, converting the light they received from their ancestors into darkness<sup>54</sup>.

Many elite daughters, not just Clodia, would have been blessed and burdened with the *lux* of their *imagines*, for they were part of *family* life not just elite male lives.

### Nupta and uxor

The most striking – yet underexamined – connection between elite women and the *imagines* occurred at the marriage of an elite *nupta*. For, after a bride entered her husband's home and became his *uxor*, not only would *telae* and a *lectus genialis* (ceremonial marriage bed) grace their marital *atrium*, but so too would copies of the bride's *imagines maiorum*, joining those of her husband<sup>55</sup>. Her bridal *imagines* would enter his *atrium* – a symbol of both her natal family and her own presence in his home. While the process and timing of their reproduction is unclear, *factores* feasibly reproduced the *imagines* from plaster moulds stored in the natal home, and then they were transferred and set up in *armaria* in the marital home, along with reproduced *tituli*<sup>56</sup>. The transfer of these masks can be adduced from the testimony of Cicero, Livy, the *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre*, and Pliny (the Younger), all of which I will now examine.

In Cicero's excoriation of Publius Vatinius (*RE* 2, cos. 47 BCE) in the *In Vatinium* of 56 BCE, he indicates that the *imagines* of the *gens Antonia* were transferred with Antonia M.f. (*RE* 111) into her husband Publius Vatinius' home<sup>57</sup>:

54 — For the *lux* of the *imagines* cf. Cic. *Ag.* 2.1; Sall. *Iug.* 85.23. For the *lux* as the glare of publicity: Flower 1996, 63, esp. n. 15. Cf. Morstein-Marx 1998, 273-274, 279.

55 — *Telae*: n. 40. *Lectus genialis*: Cic. *Cluent.* 14; Hor. *Epist.* 1.1.87; Iuv. 10.334; Gell. 16.9.4; Festus, 83L. Bridal *imagines*: Cic. *Vat.* 28; Livy 1.34.6; *SCPP* 76-82; Plin. *Ep.* 8.10.3. See: *RE* s.v. *imagines maiorum*; Flower 1996, 59, 103, 201-202.

56 — Reproduction and setting up of copies of *imagines*: Cic. *Fam.* 9.21.2-3. See: Flower 1996, 206; Rose 2008, 113-114 (plaster); Rose & Lovink 2014 (plaster). *Factores*: Serv. auct. ad. Verg. *Aen.* 8.634. Reproduced *tituli* are presumed and supported by Sen. *Ben.* 3.28.2.

57 — On this marriage: Schol. Bob. *In Vatin.* 27 (149 St.). Iulia L.f. was daughter of Lucius Iulius Caesar (*RE* 142, cos. 90 BCE).

*Ac nunc quidem C. Antonius hac una re miseriam suam consolatur, quod imagines patris et fratris sui fratrisque filiam non in familia sed in carcere conlocatam audire maluit quam videre* (Cic. *Vat.* 28).

And now, Caius Antonius [Hybrida] is consoled by this one thing in his misfortune [exile], that he has chosen to hear, rather than to see, how the ancestor masks of his father [Marcus Antonius] and brother [Marcus Antonius Creticus], and [along with] his brother's daughter [Antonia] were given in marriage [cf. set up]<sup>58</sup>, not into a family, but into a prison<sup>59</sup>.

Antonia was patrilineal granddaughter of Marcus Antonius (*RE* 28, cos. 99 BCE), daughter of the Marcus Antonius Creticus (*RE* 29, pr. 74 BCE) and Iulia L.f. (*RE* 543), and patrilineal niece of the exiled Caius Antonius Hybrida (*RE* 19, cos. 63 BCE). Cicero is referring here to her patrilineal *imagines*, sc. the consular *imago* of her patrilineal grandfather and praetorian *imago* of her father, both of whom had died by 56 BCE<sup>60</sup>. The *imagines* of the *gens Antonia* would have thus been transferred to the *atrium* of Vatinius, which formerly had none. This evidence alone suggests that, at least by Cicero's time and probably much earlier, copies of *imagines* were given along with a bride in marriage (*collocare*): thence patrilineal and matrilineal *imagines* were present in *atria*. Cicero's aforementioned invocation of Clodia's *imagines maiorum* can thus be read in this light: copies of the *imagines* of the *gens Claudia* stretching back to Caecus (and beyond) were present in Clodia and Celer's home, representing the unification of two illustrious consular families. Cicero's evidence reveals that – like elite men – elite women inherited *imagines* and, as brides, transferred copies of them to their marital home.

Livy's testimony is legendary or pseudo-historical, but it signals the presence of matrilineal *imagines* in a marital home. In his account of the migration of Lucumo sc. Lucius Tarquinius Priscus (*RE* 6) and Tanaquil (*RE* 2) to Rome, Livy discusses Tanaquil's preference for Rome, due to the newness of its aristocracy (nobility), evincing as evidence that even Ancus Marcius (*RE* 9) had only one *imago*, that of Numa Pompilius (*RE* Numa Pompilius), acquired from his mother, Pompilia (*RE* Numa Pompilius), Numa's daughter:

*Roma est ad id potissima visa: in novo populo, ubi omnis repentina atque ex virtute nobilitas sit, futurum locum forti ac strenuo viro; regnasse Tatium Sabinum, arcessitum in regnum Numam a Curibus, et Ancum Sabina matre ortum nobilemque una imagine Numae esse* (Livy 1.34.6).

58 — Cf. *OLD* s.v. *colloco* (2, 3, 9).

59 — Commentary: Pocock 1926, 114-115; Flower 1996, 103, 201-202.

60 — By implication of my arguments below, he may also be referring to her matrilineal *imagines*, e.g. those of her matrilineal grandfather Lucius Iulius Caesar (*RE* 142, cos. 90 BCE) and great-great grandfather Sextus Iulius Caesar (*RE* 148, 149, cos. 157 BCE).

Rome appeared [to Tanaquil] the most preferable [location to migrate to]: among a new people, where all aristocracy [nobility] was sudden and out of virtue, there would be a place [social position] for a strong and vigorous man; ruled by Tatius the Sabine, it [Rome] had summoned Numa [Pompilius] to the kingship from Cures, and Ancus [Marcius] arose from a Sabine mother, and was aristocratic [noble] by only one ancestor mask of Numa<sup>61</sup>.

While Livy's account must be treated with extreme caution, given its ahistorical nature, it does yield information about matrilineal *imagines*. Livy draws here a close connection between elite identities, elite women, and *imagines*: Ancus Marcius was aristocratic matrilineally, by virtue of his inheritance of a single matrilineal *imago*. This account indicates that (at the very least) Livy retrojected matrilineal *imagines* – and thus the practice of giving copies of *imagines* in marriage – into the distant, legendary past<sup>62</sup>. The existence of such legendary *imagines* is adduced by their inclusion in the *pompa imaginum* for Drusus Iulius Caesar (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 219, cos. 15, 21 CE) in 23 CE<sup>63</sup>. Moreover, it is further supported by Cicero's aforementioned invocation of the legendary patrilineal *imago* of Lucius Iunius Brutus (*RE* 46a, cos. 509 BCE) and legendary matrilineal *imago* of Caius Servilius Ahala (*RE* 32, magister equitum 439 BCE) in the natal *atrium* of the tyrannicide Marcus Iunius Brutus (*RE* 53, pr. 44 BCE) (*Cic. Phil.* 2.26). Clearly matrilineal *imagines*, both legendary and historical, existed by Livy's time.

Cicero and Livy's evidence is bolstered and confirmed by clauses within the *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre* (henceforth *SCPP*) of 20 CE. This senatorial decree posthumously condemned Cnaeus Calpurnius Piso (*RE* 70, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 287, cos. 7 CE) for *maiestas* (treason), was a case of official (senatorial) *damnatio memoriae* (condemnation of memory) and contained numerous penalties<sup>64</sup>. It is a penalty on *imagines* that provides further evidence for the practice of giving copies of *imagines* in marriage (*SCPP* 76-82)<sup>65</sup>. In these clauses, the Senate strongly adjures the relatives by birth or marriage of the *familia* (*gens*) *Calpurnia* not to display publi-

61 — Commentary: Ogilvie 1965, 143.

62 — Cf. Flower 1996, 62, 156, 347.

63 — Legendary *imagines*: Tac. *Ann.* 4.9; Suet. *Iul.* 6. See: Flower 1996, 243.

64 — On the *SCPP*: Eck, Caballos & Fernández 1996; Flower 1996, 23-31; 1998; Potter & Damon 1999. The penalties imposed included: (1) a ban on the mourning of Piso by women (*SCPP* 73-75); (2) the destruction of Piso's public and private portraits (*SCPP* 75-76); (3) a ban on the display of his *imago* in *pompa imaginum* and *atria* of his relatives by birth or marriage (*SCPP* 76-82); (4) the removal of his name from a public inscription on the Campus Martius (*SCPP* 82-84); (5) the confiscation of his property (*SCPP* 84-105); (6) and the destruction of certain additions made by Piso to private houses (*SCPP* 105-108). See: Flower 1996, 27; 1998, 158-170.

65 — Flower 1996, 102.

cly the consular *imago* of Piso in their *pompae imaginum* or in their *atria* alongside their other *imagines*:

[...] *recte et ordine facturos, qui qu- | andoq(ue) familiae Calpurniae essent, quive eam familiam cognatione | adfinitateve contingerent, si dedissent operam, si quis eius gentis aut quis eo- | rum, qui cognatus adfinisve Calpurniae familiae fuisset, mortuos esset, lugen- | dus esset, ne inter reliquas imagines, <quibus> exequias eorum funerum celebrare solent, | imago Cn. Pisonis patris duceretur neve imaginibus familiae Calpurniae i- | mago eius interponeretur (SCPP 76-82)*<sup>66</sup>.

That those who at any time were of the Calpurnian family or who were connected [related] by blood [cognate] or marriage [affinal], would act rightly and with due process, if they took care, if anyone of their clan or anyone of those related by blood or marriage to the Calpurnian family died and was to be mourned, that the ancestor mask of Cnaeus [Calpurnius] Piso the father not be carried among the remaining [other] ancestor masks with which they are accustomed to celebrate the rites of those funerals, and that his ancestor masks not be placed among the ancestor masks of the Calpurnian family<sup>67</sup>.

These clauses indicate that by 20 CE, it was customary (*solere*) for any agnatic (sc. of the *familia* or *gens Calpurnia*), cognatic (*cognati*), and marital/affinal (*adfines* = *affines*) relatives of a deceased elite man to display his *imago* in their *pompae imaginum* and their *atria*<sup>68</sup>. As Flower has argued, the *SCPP* thus indicates that *imagines* ‘were part of a bride’s equipment to be taken with her to her husband’s house’ and that sons and daughters could ‘expect to have their own copies of ancestral *imagines* if they moved from their father’s house’ (Flower 1996, 103). The *SCPP* directly evinces the phenomenon of the bridal transfer of *imagines* and thus the inheritance of patrilineal and matrilineal *imagines* by elite women (and men). What were the implications of the *SCPP* for the use of Piso’s *imago* by his female descendants? The *SCPP* refers to one such descendant, Calpurnia L.(formerly Cn.)f. (*SCPP* 104-105, *CIL* VI.1371), identified as the (probable) granddaughter of Piso and Munatia Plancina L.f. (*RE* 44, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> M 737), and daughter of their son Lucius (formerly Cnaeus) Calpurnius Piso (*RE* 76, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 293, cos. 27 CE)<sup>69</sup>. In clauses regarding the confiscation of Piso’s property and provisions for his descendants, the *SCPP* indicates the Senate provided Calpurnia with a *dos* of 1 million sestertii and a *peculium* (personal allowance) of 4 million sestertii from

66 — Latin *apud* Potter & Damon 1999, 26.

67 — Commentary: Flower 1996, 24-25.

68 — Interpretation: Flower 1996, 103.

69 — Identification of Calpurnia as granddaughter: Eck, Caballos & Fernández 1996, 83-87 with *stemma* at 87; Flower 1998, 174 with *stemma* at 187; Raepsaet-Charlier 1999, 550.

the confiscated property (*SCPP* 104-105)<sup>70</sup>. This same Calpurnia (presumably) would not have transferred a copy of the *imago* of her patrilineal grandfather Piso to her marital home on the occasion of her marriage or, if she did, she would not have displayed it in *pompae imaginum* or the marital *atrium*<sup>71</sup>. She would, however, have transferred and displayed copies of the many *imagines* of the *gens Calpurnia*<sup>72</sup>. The absence of Piso's *imago* may have been particularly painful for her – but of this we cannot be certain. Notably, no mention of the *imagines* of the *gens Munatia* (those inherited by Plancina) is made in the *SCPP*. As *adfines*, members of the *gens Munatia* were adjured not to display the *imago* of Piso, but there were no such limitations on the display of their *imagines* by, say, members of the *gens Calpurnia*<sup>73</sup>. Plancina (presumably) transferred copies of the *imagines* of the *gens Munatia* to Piso's *atrium*, namely the consular *imago* of her patrilineal grandfather Lucius Munatius Plancus (*RE* 30, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> M 728, cos. 42 BCE) and the praetorian *imago* of her patrilineal great-uncle Lucius Plotius Plancus (*RE* Munatius 26, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> P 514, pr. 43 BCE). Perhaps, then, Calpurnia inherited these *imagines* and transferred copies of them on the occasion of her marriage – a comfort in the absence of Piso's *imago*. Calpurnia has been (insecurely) identified as the wife (or perhaps mother) of Lucius Nonius Asprenas (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> N 119, cos. suff. 29 CE) and thus the mother (or perhaps grandmother) of Nonius Calpurnius Asprenas (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> N 132, cos. suff. ca. 71-72 CE), Asprenas Calpurnius Serranus (*CIL* VI.1371), and Asprenas Calpurnius Torquatus (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> N 127)<sup>74</sup>. Did her children (whoever they were) inherit the *imago* of their matrilineal great-grandfather Piso? We cannot be certain, but, if they did, they presumably were unable to display it. Either way, they would have inherited the many *imagines* of the *gens Calpurnia* and those of the *gens Munatia* from their mother. The *SCPP* provides incontrovertible evidence for the widespread reproduction and inheritance of *imagines* by agnatic, cognatic, and marital relatives in the early Empire, as well as the practice of giving *imagines* in marriage.

70 — Flower 1998, 164.

71 — Cf. Flower 1996, 58. Piso's *imago* may simply have not been displayed.

72 — On the many *imagines* of the Calpurnii Pisones, see e.g.: Cic. *Pis.* 1; *Laus Pisonis* esp. 8, 33. Three of the most notable individuals with *imagines* from the Calpurnii Pisones follow, viz. those who were both consuls and triumphal generals or recipients of *ornamenta triumphalia*: Caius Calpurnius Piso (*RE* 62, cos. 180, triumph 184 BCE), Marcus Pupius Piso Frugi Calpurnianus (*RE* 10, cos. 61, triumph 69 BCE) and Lucius Calpurnius Piso Frugi (*RE* 99, cos. 15, *ornamenta triumphalia* 11 BCE). Triumphs (all forms) after Rich 2014; Goldbeck & Wienand (eds.) 2017.

73 — Plancina was of course remitted in the *SCPP*, but later committed suicide when charges were renewed against her: *SCPP* 109-120; Tac. *Ann.* 6.26.

74 — *CIL* VI.1371. See: Eck, Caballos & Fernández 1996, 83-87; Flower 1998, 174, 187; Raepsaet-Charlier 1999, 550 (with reservations).

The final testimony is a letter from Pliny (the Younger) to Lucius Calpurnius Fabatus (*RE* 34, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 263), grandfather of Pliny's last wife, Calpurnia (*RE* 130, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 326), on the unhappy occasion of Calpurnia's miscarriage in ca. 107 CE<sup>75</sup>. In this exchange, Pliny links the patrilineal and matrilineal *imagines* in his marital *atrium*, i.e. those from both his and Fabatus' side (*latus*), with public offices and well-heard names for his hoped-for future children:

*Neque enim ardentius tu pronepotes quam ego liberos cupio, quibus videor a meo tuoque latere primum ad honores iter et audita latius nomina et non subitae imagines relicturus. Nascantur modo et hunc nostrum dolorem gaudio mutant. Vale* (Plin. *Ep.* 8.10.3).

For you are no more ardent for great-grandchildren than I long for children, to whom I envision I would bequeath from my side and yours an easy path to public offices, names [e.g. *nomen* and *tituli*] heard more widely, and no novel ancestor masks. Just let them be born and let them change our sorrow into joy. Farewell<sup>76</sup>.

Here then, Pliny indicates that the inheritance of patrilineal and matrilineal *imagines* and practice of giving *imagines* in marriage were widely understood in the early second century CE. In this case, on Pliny's side, sc. Caius Plinius Caecilius Secundus (*RE* 6, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> P 490, cos. suff. 100 CE), there was the name (but not *imago*) of his deceased matrilineal uncle and posthumously adoptive father Caius Plinius Secundus (*RE* 5, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> P 493), as well as his own consular *imago*. Pliny may have been overcompensating with his claim of *non subitae imagines*, as the office-holding status of the *gens Plinia* was new<sup>77</sup>. However, he might have inherited the numerous *imagines* and *tituli* (thence names) of the *gens Caecilia* from his birth father, perhaps a Lucius Caecilius Cilo (*RE* 40, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 30) or Lucius Caecilius Secundus (*RE* 115), even the *imagines* of the aforementioned Caecilii Metelli, although the identity of his birth father is insecure<sup>78</sup>. The *imagines* of the *gens Caecilia* would certainly have been *non subitae*.

75 — Date: Sherwin-White 1998, 459.

76 — Commentary: Sherwin-White 1998, 459.

77 — Sherwin-White 1998, 459.

78 — On adoption and the retention of the *imagines* of biological ancestors, cf. n. 26 and discussion on Tac. *Ann.* 3.76 below. As with Pomponianus, this was another testamentary adoption: Plin. *Ep.* 5.8.5. See: Sherwin-White 1998, 334. On Pliny's (the Younger) biological father: *RE* Caecilius 40; Caecilius 115; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 30; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 80; Sherwin-White 1998, 69-70. Pliny may also have acquired patrilineal and matrilineal *imagines* from an earlier (perhaps second) wife, possibly a Venuleia L.f., conjectural daughter of Lucius Venuleius Montanus Apronianus (*RE* 9, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> V 376, cos. suff. 92 CE) and Pompeia L.f. Celerina (*RE* 126, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> P 670), herself a daughter of Lucius Pompeius Vopiscus C. Arruntius Catellius Celer (*RE* 122, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> P 662, cos. suff. 77 CE), although he may not have kept her *imagines* after the death of Venuleia and his remarriage to Calpurnia, especially as the marriage was childless — a matter I discuss below. On Venuleia and Pompeia Celerina: Carlon 2009, 103-109; Shelton 2013, 96-97, 259.

On Fabatus' side, there may have been *imagines* and *tituli* (thence names) from the *gens Calpurnia*, although their exact identities are irrecoverable due to Fabatus' uncertain parentage. What is apparent from Pliny's letter is that he *expected* his future children to inherit patrilineal and matrilineal *imagines* (whosoever they were).

From the testimony of Cicero, Livy, the *SCPP*, and Pliny, we can adduce that, from at least the time of Cicero until Pliny (and probably well before and thereafter), copies of patrilineal and matrilineal *imagines* were conveyed from a bride's natal *atrium* to her marital one and thence both patrilineal and matrilineal *imagines* were inherited by sons and daughters. Both Antonia and her bridal *imagines* were given in marriage to Vatinius, as were Calpurnia and her *imagines* to (perhaps) Asprenas (although the *imago* of her grandfather Piso was probably absent or at least un-displayed), and Calpurnia and her *imagines* to Pliny. The implication is that an *imago* could function as an inheritance and *dos* for an elite woman. Essentially, a bride's patrilineal and matrilineal *imagines*, inherited from her parents, were part of the dotal property, reproduced and transmitted from her natal home to her marital one. As marriages without *manus* were the dominant form by the end of the Republic, and our earliest extant source for the bridal transmission of *imagines* is from Cicero, we cannot be certain whether this process differed for marriages with and without *manus*, but, if the bridal *imagines* were treated as a kind of *dos*, then they would have been transmitted either way<sup>79</sup>. Whether or not a husband kept the bridal *imagines* after divorce or remarriage is another matter, which I will discuss below. What is fundamentally significant here is that when an elite woman married she transferred her patrilineal and matrilineal *imagines* into her husband's home – a physical reminder of her natal family and a potential source of comfort, inspiration, pride, and perhaps even shame, as we saw with Clodia. Beyond a physical transfer, this was a mechanism for transferring elite female status and social position between families, for the aforementioned *tituli* would have accompanied these *imagines*, clearly indicating the social position and status of the elite men they signified. The *imago* and accompanying *titulus* were a deposit of symbolic capital, embodying an elite woman's social position and status vis-à-vis her ancestors.

### **Matrona and mater**

An elite *matrona* and *mater* could expect her marital *atrium* to accumulate more *imagines* if her male relatives (brothers, husband, sons etc.) attained the aedileship (or the higher curule magistracies). She may

<sup>79</sup> — Cf. n. 4.

indeed have desired and exhorted her sons to campaign for election to the aedileship (or higher), as suggested by a passage in Polybius, where he represents Pomponia M'.f. (*RE* 28) expressing such a desire for both her sons, Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus (*RE* 336, cos. 205, 194 BCE) and Lucius Cornelius Scipio Asiagenus (*RE* 337, cos. 190 BCE):

θεωρῶν γὰρ τὴν μητέρα περιπορευομένην τοὺς νεῶς καὶ θύουσαν τοῖς θεοῖς ὑπὲρ τὰδελφοῦ καὶ καθόλου μεγάλην προσδοκίαν ἔχουσαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ μέλλοντος, ἧς μόνης ἔμελεν αὐτῷ – τὸν μὲν γὰρ πατέρα τότε πλεῖν συνέβαινε εἰς Ἰβηρίαν στρατηγὸν καθεσταμένον ἐπὶ τὰς προειρημένας πράξεις – οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' ἔφη πρὸς αὐτὴν ὄνειρον τεθεωρηκέναι δις ἡδὴ τὸν αὐτόν. δοκεῖν γὰρ ἅμα τὰδελφῷ καθεσταμένος ἀγορανόμος ἀναβαίνειν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ὡς ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν, ἐκείνην δὲ συναντᾶν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὰς θύρας καὶ περιπτύξασαν ἀσπάσασθαι. τῆς δὲ παθούσης τὸ γυναικεῖον πάθος καὶ τι προσεπιφθεγξαμένης Ἐἰ γὰρ ἐμοὶ ταύτην ἰδεῖν γένοιτο τὴν ἡμέραν' Βούλει' φησὶ ἡμῶν, πείραν λάβωμεν' (Polyb. 10.4.4-8).

Seeing that his mother [Pomponia] was visiting the different temples and sacrificing to the gods on behalf of his brother [Lucius Cornelius Scipio Asiagenus, for his election] and generally exhibiting great apprehension about the result, he [Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus] was concerned only about her – his father [Publius Cornelius Scipio] having left for Spain, where he had been appointed to the command in the aforementioned campaign – he, as a fact, told her that he had twice had the same dream. For he said that he dreamt that along with his brother, he had been elected aedile [ἀγορανόμος] and was going up from the forum to their house, and that she met them at the door and embraced them and welcomed them. She was affected by female passion [πάθος] and exclaimed, “If only I could see the day!” “Mother, would you like us to make an attempt?” he said<sup>80</sup>.

This passage and its preceding context contain some problems, namely errors regarding the implied dates of Africanus' and Asiagenus' aedileships and the brothers' respective ages<sup>81</sup>. Despite these, Polybius provides clear evidence that by the early second century BCE, (he thought) it was not unusual for an elite mother to be invested in and encourage her sons' elections to the aedileship (or higher), as well as to publicly sacrifice on their behalf for their electoral success<sup>82</sup>. Given that the aedileship (or the higher curule magistracies) was so closely linked with an *imago*, Pomponia's desire here may have been that her sons attain both electoral success *and* the attendant *imagines*. Certainly, Polybius elsewhere stresses

80 — Commentary: Walbank 1967, 199-200.

81 — Walbank 1967, 199.

82 — Walbank 1967, 199-200.

the importance of *imagines* for elite families (Polyb. 6.53.4-54.3)<sup>83</sup>. Pomponia was not alone in her investment and engagement in her sons' political careers: numerous other instances exist<sup>84</sup>. We can imagine, then, that elite mothers directly engaged with the *imagines*, perhaps as they walked through their *atria* or when (if) they worked wool on their *telae* there, and exhorted their sons to attain more of them for their *atria*, as we will see in the passage below.

Such maternal engagement with the *imagines* is evinced by a letter from Pliny (the Younger) to his elite female friend Corellia Q.f. Hispulla (*RE* 6, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 1296) in the early second century CE<sup>85</sup>. In this exchange, Pliny indicates that his friend the rhetorician Iulius Genitor (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 341), Pliny himself, and Corellia would use her (patrilineal and matrilineal) *imagines* as didactic tools for her son, (Lucius Neratius) Corellius Pansa (*RE* 2, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 1293, cos. ord. 122 CE)<sup>86</sup>:

*Nilil ex hoc viro filius tuus audiet nisi profuturum, nihil discet quod necesse rectius fuerit, nec minus saepe ab illo quam a te meque admonebitur, quibus imaginibus oneretur, quae nomina et quanta sustineat* (Plin. *Ep.* 3.3.6).

Your son will hear nothing from this man [Iulius Genitor] except what will benefit him, he will learn nothing that would have been better for him not to know, and he will be admonished [reminded] no less often by him than by you and me, by what ancestor masks he is burdened, and what great names [e.g. *nomen* and *tituli*] he bears<sup>87</sup>.

Pliny is clear. Corellia, along with Iulius Genitor and Pliny, frequently reminded her son of the burden of his *imagines*. These were no abstract or *subitae imagines*. By the time of this correspondence, Corellia was daughter of the deceased Quintus Corellius Rufus (*RE* 3, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 1294, cos. suff. 78 CE) and Hispulla (*RE* 1, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> H 185) and wife of either Lucius Neratius Priscus (*RE* 15, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> N 60, cos. suff. 97 CE) or his brother Lucius Neratius Marcellus (*RE* 9, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> N 55, cos. suff. 95, 129 CE)<sup>88</sup>. Her husband and brother-in-law were sons of Lucius Neratius Priscus (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> N 59, cos. suff. 87 CE). Corellia's marital *atrium* would have thus contained these patrilineal and matrilineal *imagines*, resplendent with consular *tituli*. It was with these *imagines* and *tituli* that she reminded her son where he came from and with which she would have encouraged

83 — Walbank 1957, 738-740.

84 — Notably that of Quarta Hostilia (*RE* 27): Livy 40.37.6. See: Briscoe 2008, 502-504. Cf. also the letter attributed to Cornelia P.f. 'mater Gracchorum' (*RE* 407): Nep. fr. 59 Marshall. See: Hallett 2002; Dixon 2007, 26-29. For other examples and commentary: Dixon 1988, 168-203.

85 — Sherwin-White 1998, 211-213.

86 — Date: Sherwin-White 1998, 211.

87 — Commentary: Sherwin-White 1998, 213.

88 — Context of letter: Sherwin-White 1998, 211-213. For identity problems for her husband and a *stemma*: Carlon 2009, 73-74, 222.

him to pursue a political career, perhaps when she walked through this same *atrium* or while (if) she worked wool there. We can imagine that Corellia (and Pliny and Iulius Genitor) frequently used these *imagines* to remind her son that both his (patrilineal and matrilineal) grandfathers were (suffect) consuls and to urge him to imitate their examples. It would appear that such encouragement was successful, for her son became consul *ordinarius* in 122 CE, no small feat, adding his own *imago* and consular *titulus* to the family *atrium* for future generations<sup>89</sup>. Not only were elite daughters like Clodia aware of the burden of the *imagines*, but mothers like Corellia imparted this knowledge to their own children, using the *imagines* as didactic tools<sup>90</sup>.

### ***Remarriage, divorce, and complex (re)configurations of bridal imagines***

What happened to bridal *imagines* on the occasions of a remarriage or divorce? This is a question without clear answers in our extant sources, but one that I shall grapple with nevertheless. The frequencies of remarriage and divorce in the Republic and Empire are a matter of considerable scholarly speculation and debate, partly due to the poverty of the surviving data<sup>91</sup>. Whatever the frequencies may have been, what happened to the bridal *imagines* when such events occurred? As mentioned previously, some of our sources term *imagines* part of the *hereditas* or *patrimonium* for the descendants of an office-holder, and I have suggested that the *imagines* could function as both an inheritance and *dos* for an elite woman – in that she inherited them from her natal family (inheritance) and transferred copies of them to her marital home (*dos*). By the second century BCE, a widow or divorcee (or her *paterfamilias* if he was still alive) could sue to

89 — On this particular honour: Carlon 2009, 74.

90 — See: n. 25.

91 — See extensive discussions and accompanying bibliographies: Raepsaet-Charlier 1981-2; Bradley 1991; Treggiari 1991; 2002, 473-482, 516-519; Saller 1994, 2, 43, 46, 220; Hin 2013, 149. Susan Treggiari has collated the sparse surviving sources on divorces in the Republic and Empire, tallying 38 divorces in the Republic – with the majority (32) of these occurring in the 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE – and 27 in the early Empire (Augustus to Domitian): Treggiari 2002, 516-519. Cf. Raepsaet-Charlier 1981-2, 171-173 (early Empire); Treggiari 1991, 43 (late Republic). Moreover, she has estimated that among the elite there was 'about one chance in six of a first marriage being dissolved by divorce within the first decade and about the same chance of its being dissolved by death' (Treggiari 1991, 45). Cf. Bradley's assessment of (high) remarriage frequency in consular families between 80-50 BCE: Bradley 1991, 83. Richard Saller has rightly concluded that we may never know the frequencies of remarriage and divorce: Saller 1994, 220. Nevertheless, Saller claims that 'divorce and remarriage were easy, carried little stigma, and were experiences so common that any prudent woman or father would take the possibility into account in making a dotal pact or will' (Saller 1994, 220). In contrast, Treggiari warns that the available data cannot be generalised to 'argue for a high frequency of divorce among the senatorial or equestrian class in general during the period c. 100 BC to AD 200' (Treggiari 2002, 481). A vexed question indeed.

recover the *dos* by an *actio rei uxoriae* (action on a wife's property)<sup>92</sup>. This recovery was subject to any pre-existing *pacta dotalia* (dotal contracts) and to certain rules and deductions for the maintenance of children, moral offences, expenses, and gifts in the case of divorce, but the recovery was not subject to such deductions if the husband died<sup>93</sup>. If bridal *imagines* could function as a *dos*, did the dissolution of a marriage by death or divorce constitute a reason to recover, return, remove from display, or destroy the bridal *imagines*? The *SCPP* attests to the proliferation and widespread reproduction of *imagines* of the *gens Calpurnia* among agnatic, cognatic (*cognati*), and marital relatives (*adfinis*) by 20 CE – the inference being that any family connected by blood or marriage could have had copies of their *imagines* (*SCPP* 76-82). As mentioned previously, the creation, inheritance, and display of *imagines* were the province of custom, family arbitration, and law – perhaps there were many possible context-dependent outcomes for the bridal *imagines* after the dissolution of a marriage<sup>94</sup>. I propose that another factor is important to consider, namely, that the bridal *imagines* could constitute an inheritance for an elite woman's children<sup>95</sup>. If an elite woman bore children by one husband and she or her husband died or she subsequently was divorced from him, presumably these children could inherit copies of her bridal *imagines*<sup>96</sup>. These children would be *cognati*, and, as the *SCPP* suggests, thus inherit these bridal *imagines* and be able to display them. If an elite woman bore no children by one husband and died or was divorced from him, would there be any reason or inclination besides affection for him to retain the bridal *imagines*? This childless widower or divorced husband was not an *adfinis* or *cognatus* – perhaps he was not thus able to display her bridal

92 — On *actio rei uxoriae*: Cic. *Top.* 66; Tit. *Ulp.* 6.6; *Cod. Iust.* 5.13. For the recovery of dowry in the second century BCE: Polyb. 18.35.6; 31.22.4; Livy *Per.* 46; Val. Max. 4.4.9. See: Saller 1984; Evans 1991, 66-71; Treggiari 2002, 324-326, 350-353.

93 — On dotal contracts: these contracts controlled the fate of a dowry – who retained it after divorce or the death of a wife – and Saller, Crook, and Treggiari suggest they may have been frequently used by the elite. See: Saller 1984, 197; Crook 1986, 68; Treggiari 2002, 357-361. On rules and deductions: according to the *Tituli Ulpiani*, if the husband was found to be at fault (adultery or lesser moral offences) in the divorce, he had to repay the *dos* in full; if he was found to be faultless and his wife or her *paterfamilias* initiated the divorce, or if his wife was found to be at fault and he initiated the divorce, the husband could retain up to a half of the *dos* to maintain their children, and a sixth of the *dos* for moral offences; moreover, in the case of a divorce, the husband could claim deductions based on certain expenses incurred during the marriage and on certain gifts he made to his wife. See: Tit. *Ulp.* 6. Cf. Cic. *Top.* 19; *Cod. Iust.* 5.13. The exact rules for and proportions of the deductions may have differed between the Republic and Empire, but the underlying principle of the possible retention of a proportion of the dowry by the husband was probably the same. See: Saller 1984; Treggiari 2002, 350-361.

94 — Cf. use of *solere* in *SCPP* 80 and n. 26. See: Flower 1996, 56-59.

95 — Cf. n. 26. On women and cognatic inheritance: Crook 1986.

96 — Children tended to remain with their father after a divorce. See: Dixon 1986, esp. 108-115; Treggiari 2002, 466-473 (with exceptions).

*imagines*<sup>97</sup>. In the absence of surviving evidence, I shall now consider the case of one elite woman and her two daughters, all of whom remarried and divorced, and speculate on the possible (re)configurations of their bridal *imagines*.

We turn now to the case of Caecilia L.f. Metella (*RE* 134) and her daughters, selected as examples due to their elite social position (and access to *imagines*) and the substantial surviving evidence for their remarriages and divorces. Caecilia was daughter of Lucius Caecilius Metellus Delmaticus (*RE* 91, cos. 119 BCE) and thus an heir to a long line of patrilineal consular *imagines* stretching back to the aforementioned Lucius Caecilius Metellus (*RE* 72, cos. 251, 247 BCE), as well as those of her many consular uncles and consular great-uncle<sup>98</sup>. She had two marriages: one to Marcus Aemilius Scaurus (*RE* 140, cos. 115 BCE), dissolved by his death in 89 BCE; and the second to Lucius Cornelius Sulla Felix (*RE* 392, cos. 88, 80 BCE), dissolved by a divorce Sulla initiated on her deathbed in 81 BCE<sup>99</sup>. In her first marriage, she bore two children, Marcus Aemilius Scaurus (*RE* 141, pr. 56 BCE) and Aemilia M.f. (*RE* 154)<sup>100</sup>. In her second marriage, she bore two additional children, Faustus Cornelius Sulla (*RE* 377) and Fausta Cornelia L.f. (*RE* 436)<sup>101</sup>. Caecilia's elder daughter Aemilia also had two marriages: the first to Manius Acilius Glabrio (*RE* 38, cos. 67 BCE), dissolved by a divorce in 82 BCE prompted by her stepfather Sulla and Caecilia; and the second to Cnaeus Pompeius Magnus (*RE* 31, cos. 70, 55, 52, BCE), dissolved by her death when she bore Manius Acilius Glabrio (*RE* 39), the son of her first husband<sup>102</sup>. After the death of Caecilia and then Sulla, their son Faustus Cornelius Sulla – and perhaps also by implication their daughter Fausta Cornelia – became a ward of Lucius Licinius Lucullus (*RE* 104, cos. 74 BCE)<sup>103</sup>. Fausta Cornelia had two marriages as well: the first at a young

97 — Although perhaps in a *manus* marriage the husband had the right to keep her *imagines* after her death as she was *filiafamilias*, but this is uncertain. His retention of the *imagines* was more likely controlled by personal preferences, custom, and community pressures. Cf. n. 26.

98 — Caecilia was thence first cousin once removed of Clodia's husband Celer. Her grandfather was Lucius Caecilius Metellus Calvus (*RE* 83, cos. 142 BCE), her great-grandfather was Quintus Caecilius Metellus (*RE* 81, cos. 206 BCE), and her great-great-grandfather was Lucius Caecilius Metellus (*RE* 72, cos. 251, 247 BCE). Her uncles and great-uncles with consular *imagines* included: Quintus Caecilius Metellus Numidicus (*RE* 97, cos. 109 BCE); Caius Caecilius Metellus Caprarius (*RE* 84, cos. 113 BCE); Marcus Caecilius Metellus (*RE* 77, cos. 115 BCE); Lucius Caecilius Metellus Diadematus (*RE* 98, cos. 117 BCE); Quintus Caecilius Metellus Balaricus (*RE* 82, cos. 123 BCE); Quintus Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus (*RE* 94, cos. 143 BCE). For the presence of the *imagines* of uncles in *atria*, cf. Cic. *Cael.* 33 and *adfinēs* and *cognati* in *SCPP* 76-82.

99 — Cic. *Scaur.* 45; *Sest.* 101; Asc. *Scaur.* 27-28C; Plin. *HN* 36.116; Plut. *Vit. Sull.* 6.10-12; 33.3; 35.2. Cf. Treggiari 2002, 516.

100 — Cic. *Scaur.* 45; *Sest.* 101; Asc. *Scaur.* 27-28C; Plut. *Vit. Pomp.* 9.2-3; *Vit. Sull.* 33.3.

101 — Asc. *Scaur.* 28C; Plut. *Vit. Sull.* 34.3; 37.4.

102 — Asc. *Scaur.* 28C; Plut. *Vit. Pomp.* 9.2-3; *Vit. Sull.* 33.3. Cf. Treggiari 2002, 516.

103 — Plut. *Vit. Luc.* 4.5 (mentioning only Faustus Cornelius).

age to Caius Memmius (*RE* 8, pr. 58 BCE), dissolved by divorce in ca. 55 BCE, long after the birth of their son Caius Memmius (*RE* 10, cos. suff. 34 BCE); and the second to Titus Annius Milo (*RE* 67, pr. 55 BCE)<sup>104</sup>. Theirs were complex clusters of remarriage and divorce<sup>105</sup>.

Amidst this complexity, what might have happened to the bridal *imagines* of Caecilia, Aemilia, and Fausta Cornelia? Caecilia presumably transferred copies of her patrilineal and matrilineal (if her unknown mother had office-holding ancestors) *imagines* to the *atria* of both Marcus Aemilius Scaurus and Sulla. In their capacity as *cognati*, Caecilia's children – Marcus Aemilius Scaurus, Aemilia, Faustus Cornelius Sulla, and Fausta Cornelia – could have thus inherited the matrilineal *imagines* of the Caecilii Metelli<sup>106</sup>. Aemilia, then, could have inherited these *imagines* and those of the *gens Aemilia* and transferred them to the *atria* of Manius Acilius Glabrio and of Cnaeus Pompeius Magnus. After her death during childbirth, her son Manius Acilius Glabrio could have inherited her patrilineal and matrilineal *imagines*, as well as those obtained from his father<sup>107</sup>. Whether Cnaeus Pompeius Magnus kept her *imagines* is an open question – would he or his subsequent wives have appreciated their presence? He may have returned them or chosen not to display them. Fausta Cornelia could have likewise inherited the matrilineal *imagines* of the Caecilii Metelli and the patrilineal ones of the *gens Cornelia*, transferring them to the *atria* of Caius Memmius and of Titus Annius Milo. Whether Caius Memmius kept these *imagines* after the divorce is uncertain. Their son, Caius Memmius, despite the divorce, could have inherited her matrilineal and patrilineal *imagines*. Certainly, he later memorialised his matrilineal heritage and descent from his matrilineal grandfather Sulla on the Monument of Memmius in Ephesus (*IEph* 403.1-2)<sup>108</sup>. I propose that Caius Memmius had access to a rich inheritance of consular *imagines* (and *tituli*), including those of the Caecilii Metelli from his matrilineal grandmother Caecilia and the *imago* of his matrilineal grandfather Sulla, *imagines* that may have facilitated his own election to the suffect consulship in 34 BCE. It is uncertain whether Marcus Aemilius Scaurus and Aemilia had access to the same *imagines* as their half-siblings Faustus Cornelius Sulla or Fausta Cornelia, or whether Manius Acilius Glabrio

104 — Cic. *Att.* 4.13.1; 5.8.2-3; Val. Max. 6.1.13; Asc. *Scaur.* 28C; *Mil.* 31, 34C. Cf. Treggiari 2002, 517. Fausta Cornelia must have married Caius Memmius at an early age, as their son supported his half-uncle Marcus Aemilius Scaurus during his trial in 54 BCE: Asc. *Scaur.* 28C.

105 — For a tabulation of their divorces: Treggiari 2002, 516-517.

106 — If the principles of the *SCPP* hold for the Republic.

107 — For his survival, note his presence at the trial of his uncle Marcus Aemilius Scaurus: Asc. *Scaur.* 28C.

108 — Alzinger & Bammer 1971.

had access to the same *imagines* as his half-cousin Caius Memmius, but it is probable that all received copies of the *imagines* of Caecilia.

The example of Caecilia and her daughters indicates a few of the many possible (re)configurations of bridal *imagines* during remarriage and divorce. Despite the silence in our sources, I have argued that if a marriage produced children and was subsequently dissolved, the children of that marriage could feasibly inherit copies of bridal *imagines*, as they constituted their inheritance, but if the marriage did not produce children, the fate of the bridal *imagines* is uncertain.

### **Funus and female maior**

Finally, we turn to the relationships between the *imagines* and an elite woman at the end of her life: at her *funus* (funeral), and when she became a female *maior*.

### **Funus**

Beyond their numerous roles in elite funerals and other funerary practices – including as principal mourners and, in one recorded instance, as funeral arranger – some elite women themselves had funerals that incorporated *imagines*<sup>109</sup>. An elite woman could have a *funus indictivum* (public funeral), including a *laudatio funebris*, by 102 BCE at the latest, and probably much earlier<sup>110</sup>. Moreover, by ca. 91 BCE at the latest, these funerals included a *pompa imaginum*. The inclusion of the *pompa imaginum* in funerals for elite women is attested by Lucius Licinius Crassus (*RE* 55, cos. 95 BCE), in a forensic speech of ca. 91 BCE against Marcus Iunius Brutus (*RE* 50), retained by Cicero (Lucius Licinius Crassus fr. 45 *ORF* = Cic. *De or.* 2.225-226)<sup>111</sup>. In this speech, Crassus evokes the contemporary funeral of Iunia (*RE* 190), a recently deceased female relative of Brutus, and the attendant *pompa imaginum*, as a means to condemn Brutus:

109 — On elite women and their numerous roles in Roman funerary practices, especially mourning, see recent extensive discussions: Šterbenk Erker 2009; 2010; Valentini 2012, 119-199. See also: Östenberg (forthcoming). Cf. elite women as principal mourners in *SCPP* 73-75 and Atia M.f. (*RE* 34) as testamentary funeral arranger for Caesar in Nicolaus of Damascus fr. 130 *FGvHist*. See: Flower 1996, 28-29, 116-117; 1998, 159, 177. The question of female arrangement of *funera* – and perhaps thus of *pompa imaginum* – is worth examining, but is not one I shall address here.

110 — Popil(l)ia's (*RE* 32) elaborate funeral and *laudatio* of 102 BCE: Cic. *De or.* 2.44. See: Hillard 2001. Earlier elaborate funerals for elite women: Livy 8.22.2-4 (328 BCE); *CIL* VI.5.3403 (probably spurious, 168 BCE); Polyb. 31.26.1-6 and Gran. Lic. 28.14-16 (ca. 163-162 BCE). See: Walbank 1979, 503, 505; Lintott 1986; Oakley 2009, 625-627. For elaborate funerals and *laudationes* as a privilege for elite women from 390 BCE: Livy 5.50.7; Plut. *Mor.* 242F (*De mul. vir. praef.*). See: Ogilvie 1965, 741; Hillard 2001; Valentini 2012, 119-199. See also: Östenberg (forthcoming).

111 — Date: Flower 1996, 152; Hillard 2001, 50 n.27.

*Brute, quid sedes? Quid illam anum patri nuntiare vis tuo? Quid illis omnibus, quorum imagines duci vides? Quid maioribus tuis? Quid L. Bruto, qui hunc populum dominatu regio liberavit? Quid te agere? Cui rei, cui gloriae, cui virtuti studere? [...] Tu illam mortuam, tu imagines ipsas non perhorrescis? Quibus non modo imitandis, sed ne conlocandis quidem tibi locum ullum reliquisti* (Lucius Licinius Crassus fr. 45 ORF = Cic. *De or.* 2.225-226).

Brutus, why do you sit? What do you want that old woman [Iunia] to announce to your father [Marcus Iunius Brutus]? What do you want her to announce to all those whose ancestor masks you see being led [in the *pompa imaginum*]? What do you want her to announce to your ancestors? What do you want her to announce to Lucius [Iunius] Brutus, who liberated the people from the dominion of the kings? What do you want her to announce you are doing? What thing, what status [glory], what virtue do you want her to announce you are striving for? [...] Do you not tremble before that dead woman – before the ancestor masks themselves? You have not left yourself any place [home or social position]<sup>112</sup> for setting them up, let alone imitating them<sup>113</sup>.

The Brutus condemned in this speech was the son of Marcus Iunius Brutus (*RE* 49, pr. ca. 142 BCE), grand-son of Marcus Iunius Brutus (*RE* 48, cos. 178 BCE), nephew of Decimus Iunius Brutus Callaicus (*RE* 57, cos. 138 BCE), and grand-nephew of Publius Iunius Brutus (*RE* 54, pr. 190 BCE). All of these men would have had *imagines*. If theirs were the *imagines* Crassus was referring to, then Iunia was feasibly an aunt or great-aunt (or similar female relative) of Brutus. The reference to the legendary first consul Lucius Iunius Brutus (*RE* 46a, cos. 509 BCE) suggests the presence of his mask in her *pompa imaginum* too. What is pertinent here is that many *imagines* were led before Iunia in her *funus*, indicating that they were a vital part of an elite woman's *funus* by 91 BCE<sup>114</sup>.

Similar elaborate *funera* with *pompae imaginum* are attested for elite women elsewhere. Plutarch records one held in 69 BCE for Iulia C.f. (*RE* 541) (Plut. *Vit. Caes.* 5). Iulia was daughter of Caius Iulius Caesar (*RE* 129) and Marcia Q.f. (*RE* 113), wife of Marius, and aunt of Caesar himself. The *pompa imaginum* for her *funus* included the *imago* of her husband Marius, but it is an extant fragment of her *laudatio* that proves particularly illuminating, on which more below<sup>115</sup>.

112 — Crassus' assertion that Brutus has no place (*locus*) to set up (*conlocare*) these *imagines* may mean that Brutus has none of the prerequisites for setting up an *imago*, neither an *atrium* for setting up his ancestral *imagines* nor the aedileship (or higher curule magistracies) to set up his own (cf. Cic. *De Or.* 2.226).

113 — Commentary: Wilkins 1881, 308-309.

114 — Cf. Flower 1996, 152-153.

115 — Plut. *Vit. Caes.* 5.2. Cf. Suet. *Iul.* 6.1 and discussion below. See: Flower 1996, 124, 237.

Tacitus records another *funus* held in 22 CE for the wealthy widow Tertia Iunia D.f. (*RE* 206), daughter of Decimus Iunius Silanus (*RE* 163, cos. 62 BCE) and Servilia Q.f. (*RE* 101), wife of the tyrannicide Caius Cassius Longinus (*RE* 59, pr. 44 BCE), and half-sister of the tyrannicide Marcus Iunius Brutus (*RE* 53, pr. 44 BCE) (*Tac. Ann.* 3.76)<sup>116</sup>. Tertia Iunia's *funus* included a myriad of *imagines* from twenty of the most illustrious families, including the *gentes Manlia, Quinctia*, and presumably the *gentes Iunia, Servilia*, and *Cassia*, but excluded the *imagines* of her husband and half-brother:

*Viginti clarissimarum familiarum imagines antelatae sunt, Manlii, Quinctii aliaque eiusdem nobilitatis nomina. Sed praeefulgebant Cassius atque Brutus eo ipso quod effigies eorum non visebantur* (*Tac. Ann.* 3.76).

The ancestor masks of twenty of the most illustrious families were borne before her [Tertia Iunia], of the Manlii and Quinctii, and other names of the same aristocracy [nobility]. But Cassius and Brutus were the most conspicuous precisely because their portraits were not to be seen<sup>117</sup>.

The *lux* of many *imagines*, even that of the invisible *imagines* of Cassius and Brutus, shone upon Tertia Iunia at her *funus*. The presence of the *imagines* of the *gens Manlia* can be explained by the adoption of Decimus Iunius Silanus (Manlianus) (*RE* 161, pr. 141 BCE), biological son of Titus Manlius Torquatus (*RE* 83, cos. 165 BCE), by Tertia Iunia's distant patrilineal ancestor, Decimus Iunius Silanus (*RE* 160)<sup>118</sup>. Consequently, their presence suggests that if a person entered another *gens* via adoption he or she was still able to inherit and display the *imagines* of biological ancestors<sup>119</sup>. The explanation for the presence of the *imagines* of the *gens Quinctia* is more fraught. A male relative of Tertia Iunia, Marcus Iunius Silanus (*RE* 172, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 830, cos. ord. 25 BCE), may have married a (Quinctia) (Cri)spina (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 1581), thereby acquiring the *imagines* of the *gens Quinctia*, but her *nomen* is uncertain<sup>120</sup>. The presence – if secure – of the *imagines* of these *gentes* at Tertia Iunia's *funus* provides further confirmation of the transfer of copies of a bride's *imagines maiorum* into her marital home. The *gentes Manlia, Quinctia, Iunia, Servilia*, and *Cassia* had numerous *imagines* of past consuls and triumphal generals, too many to enumerate here<sup>121</sup>. With all of these *imagines*, Tertia Iunia's *pompa ima-*

116 — Nomenclature: Kajava 1994, 206-207.

117 — Commentary: Woodman & Martin 2004, 496-498.

118 — On Silanus and his adoption: *Cic. Fin.* 1.24; *Val. Max.* 5.8.3; *Livy Per.* 54. See: Woodman & Martin 2004, 496.

119 — Cf. n. 26. See: Flower 1996, 85, 243. Thus Clodia's husband Celer and Pliny (the Younger) probably inherited the *imagines* of their biological ancestors.

120 — (Quinctia) (Cri)spina: *IG VII.1851*. On nomenclature speculation: *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 1581 and Syme 1989, 190-191. Woodman & Martin 2004, 496-497 do not notice this possibility.

121 — A list of some of the most notable follow, viz. individuals who were both consuls and

*ginum* would have been a spectacular paean to the Republican aristocracy of office, a direct challenge to Tiberius as Flower has discussed elsewhere, and a powerful statement about her illustrious social position and place among the *maiores*<sup>122</sup>. The *funera* for Iulia and Tertia Iunia may have been atypical for elite women, given their relationships and contexts, but that for the other Iunia in ca. 91 BCE was probably more representative. Iunia's *funus* indicates that an elite woman could, at least from ca. the first century BCE until perhaps the third century CE, expect to have a *pompa imaginum* at her *funus*<sup>123</sup>.

### **Female maior**

By the second century BCE, elite women were treated as *maiores*, as Flower and Marja-Leena Hänninen have argued<sup>124</sup>. Given that matrilineal *imagines* existed in *atria*, were any connections made between a female *maior*, matrilineal ancestry, and these *imagines*? If we return to the case of Clodia, Cicero clearly indicates a connection between the *imagines* and female *maiores* in his *Pro Caelio*. There, he directly compares the male *imagines* of the *gens Claudia* with the exempla of Clodia's female *maiores* Quinta Claudia P.f. (*RE* 435) and the Vestal Claudia Ap.f. (*RE* 384):

*Nonne te, si nostrae imagines viriles non commovebant, ne progenies quidem mea, Q. illa Claudia, aemulam domesticae laudis in gloria muliebri esse admonebat, non virgo illa Vestalis Claudia quae patrem complexa triumphantem ab inimico tribuno plebei de curru detrabi passa non est? Cur te fraterna vitia potius quam bona paterna et avita et usque a nobis cum in viris tum etiam in feminis repetita moverunt* (Cic. *Cael.* 34)?

---

triumphal generals. *Gens Manlia*: Aulus Manlius Vulso (*RE* 89, cos. 474, triumph 474 BCE), Marcus Manlius Capitolinus (*RE* 51, cos. 392, triumph 392 BCE), Titus Manlius Imperiosus Torquatus (*RE* 57, cos. 347, 344, 340, triumph 340 BCE), Lucius Manlius Vulso Longus (*RE* 101, cos. 256, 250, triumph 256 BCE), Aulus Manlius Torquatus Atticus (*RE* 87, cos. 244, 241, triumph 241 BCE), Titus Manlius Torquatus (*RE* 82, cos. 235, 224, triumph 235 BCE), Cnaeus Manlius Vulso (*RE* 91, cos. 189, triumph 187 BCE), and Lucius Manlius Acidinus (Fulvianus) (*RE* 47, cos. 179, triumph 185 BCE). *Gens Quinctia*: Titus Quinctius Capitolinus Barbatu (*RE* 24, cos. 471, 468, 465, 446, 443, 439, triumph 468 BCE), Titus Quinctius Cincinnatus Capitolinus (*RE* 32, Mil. Tr. c. p. 388, 385, 384, triumph 380 BCE), Titus Quinctius Pennus Capitolinus Crispinus (*RE* 35, cos. 351, 354, triumph 361 BCE), and Lucius Quinctius Crispinus (*RE* 37, pr. 186, triumph 184 BCE). *Gens Iunia*: Caius Iunius Bubulcus Brutus (*RE* 62, cos. 317, 313, 311, triumph 311, 302 BCE), Caius Iunius Bubulcus Brutus (*RE* 56, cos. 291, 277, triumph 277 BCE), Decimus Iunius Pera (*RE* 124, cos. 266, triumph 266, 266 BCE), and Decimus Iunius Brutus Callaicus (*RE* 57, cos. 138, triumph ca. 133 BCE). *Gens Servilia*: Quintus Servilius Caepio (*RE* 49, cos. 106, triumph 107 BCE) and P. Servilius Vatia Isauricus (*RE* 93, cos. 78, triumph 88, 74 BCE). *Gens Cassia*: Spurius Cassius Vicellinus (*RE* 91, cos. 502, 493, 486, triumph 502, 486 BCE).

122 — Flower 1996, 253; Woodman & Martin 2004, 497-498. The challenge to Tiberius is apparent from the context: Tac. *Ann.* 3.76.

123 — On the restrictions on *pompa imaginum* for non-imperial elite funerals in the third century CE: n. 21.

124 — Flower 2002; Hänninen 2011.

If our male ancestor masks haven't moved you, didn't my descendant [sc. granddaughter], that famous Quinta Claudia, admonish you to compete with her in familial renown for female status? What about that famous Vestal Claudia, who grasped onto her father [Appius Claudius Pulcher] during his triumph and wouldn't allow him to be dragged from his triumphal chariot by a hostile plebeian tribune? Why were you moved more by brotherly vices than by paternal and ancestral good qualities, often reappearing in both men and women, all the way back to me<sup>125</sup>?

Here Cicero equates the *imagines viriles* with the famous Quinta Claudia and the Vestal Claudia, thence implying a correspondence between the didactic effects of *imagines* and the exempla of female *maiores*<sup>126</sup>. Moreover, Cicero reminds his audience here of the statue of Quinta Claudia in the temple of the Magna Mater and her memorialisation on stage, lasting testaments to the status she obtained for her prominent role in the inaugural procession for Magna Mater in 204 BCE<sup>127</sup>. Quinta Claudia was the daughter of Publius Claudius Pulcher (*RE* 304, cos. 249 BCE) and granddaughter of Caecus, while the Vestal Claudia was the daughter of Appius Claudius Pulcher (*RE* 295, cos. 143 BCE): both would have been well aware of the didactic effects of *imagines*<sup>128</sup>.

Cicero further indicates that the social position of an elite man could be constituted by the inheritance of matrilineal *imagines* in his *Pro Plancio* of 54 BCE. In his defense of Cnaeus Plancius (*RE* 4, curule aedile 54 BCE) against the charge of *ambitus* (electoral corruption), Cicero suggests that the aristocratic (noble) ancestry of Marcus Iuventius Laterensis (*RE* 16, pr. 51 BCE), by virtue of his consular patrilineal and matrilineal *maiores* and attendant *imagines*, did not help him win the aedilician election of 54 BCE:

*Est tuum nomen utraque familia consulare. Num dubitas igitur quin omnes qui favent nobilitati, qui id putant esse pulcherrimum, qui imaginibus, qui nominibus vestris ducuntur, te aedilem fecerint? Equidem non dubito* (Cic. *Planc.* 18).

Your name [Marcus Iuventius Laterensis] is a consular one on both sides [patrilineal and matrilineal] of your family. So can you doubt that all who favour the aristocracy [of office], who think it is the most beautiful

125 — Commentary: Austin 1977, 93.

126 — Cf. Flower 2002, 162-165; Webb (forthcoming); Webb & Brännstedt (forthcoming).

127 — Statue: Val. Max. 1.8.11; Tac. *Ann.* 4.64. Stage: Ov. *Fast.* 4.326. Procession: Cic. *Har. Resp.* 27; Livy 29.14.10-14; Ov. *Fast.* 4.291-346. See: Flower 2002, 164.

128 — For identity of Quinta Claudia: Cic. *Cael.* 34. See: Austin 1977, 93. For identity of Vestal Claudia: Cic. *Cael.* 34; Val. Max. 5.4.6. Contra: Suet. *Tib.* 2.4. For this misidentification and a possible copyist error or confusion (e.g. *fratrem* for *patrem*): Austin 1977, 93; Rüpke 2008, 609, esp. n. 2; DiLuzio 2016, 225-228. The evidence of Cic. *Cael.* 34 and Val. Max. 5.4.6 should be preferred to that of Suetonius.

thing, who are led by your ancestor masks and your names [e.g. *nomen* and *tituli*], would have made you aedile? I cannot doubt it<sup>129</sup>.

Here Cicero is referring to the relationship between electoral success and the *commendatio maiorum*, those deposits of symbolic capital in the form of *imagines*, inherited by Laterensis from his unknown father and (probable) mother Otacilia (*RE* 19)<sup>130</sup>. These (admittedly ancient and thus obscure) deposits can be identified, namely the patrilineal *imago* and consular *titulus* of Manius Iuventius Thalna (*RE* 30, cos. 163 BCE) and the matrilineal *imagines* and consular *tituli* of Manius Otacilius Crassus (*RE* 10, cos. 263, 246 BCE) and Titus Otacilius Crassus (*RE* 11, cos. 261 BCE). This inheritance did not help Laterensis obtain the curule aedileship of 54 BCE, but it presumably helped him obtain the praetorship of 51 BCE, despite the antiquity of the *imagines*. In this case, Otacilia (if her identity is secure) bequeathed the *lux* of her distant ancestors' *imagines* to her son.

Suetonius provides further supporting evidence. In his account of the aforementioned *funus* for Iulia C.f. (*RE* 541) in 69 BCE, he retains a fragment of her *laudatio funebris*, delivered by her nephew Caesar when he was quaestor (Caius Iulius Caesar fr. 29 *ORF* = Suet. *Iul.* 6.1). In this speech, Caesar emphasises the illustrious patrilineal and matrilineal ancestry of Iulia, particularly through her mother Marcia Q.f. (*RE* 113):

*Amitae meae Iuliae maternum genus ab regibus ortum, paternum cum diis immortalibus coniunctum est. Nam ab Anco Marcio sunt Marcii Reges, quo nomine fuit mater; a Venere Iulii, cuius gentis familia est nostra. Est ergo in genere et sanctitas regum, qui plurimum inter homines pollent, et caerimonia deorum, quorum ipsi in potestate sunt reges* (Caius Iulius Caesar fr. 29 *ORF* = Suet. *Iul.* 6.1).

The maternal stock of my aunt Iulia arose from kings, her paternal stock is linked to the immortal gods. For the Marcii Reges come from Ancus Marcius, and her mother [Marcia] was of that name [family]; the Iulii, which is our family's clan, are from Venus. Therefore our stock has the sanctity of kings, who are most powerful among men, and the ceremony [sacredness] of the gods, who have power over the kings themselves<sup>131</sup>.

While Caesar does not explicitly refer to *imagines* in this extract of the speech, legendary *imagines* clearly existed: the *imago* of Ancus Marcius may have been part of Iulia's *pompa imaginum*<sup>132</sup>. He and his family inhe-

129 — Cf. Cic. *Planc.* 15, 51. Commentary: Kerin & Allcroft 1891, 67, 69.

130 — Cf. Kerin & Allcroft 1891, 69. On *commendatio maiorum* see: n. 24. On Otacilia (Laterensis): Val. Max. 8.2.2. On her identification and trial of ca. 66 BCE: Alexander 1990, 182.

131 — Commentary: Crawford 1941, 20; Flower 1996, 143-145; Hillard 2001, 46 n. 4.

132 — *Pompa*: Plut. *Vit. Caes.* 5. Legendary *imagines*: n. 63. See: Flower 1996, 143-145.

herited the *sanctitas* of kings through Iulia's mother Marcia, herself a daughter or sister of Quintus Marcius Rex (*RE* 90, pr. 144 BCE) and thus sister or aunt of Quintus Marcius Rex (*RE* 91, cos. 118 BCE). Presumably, this *sanctitas* was inherited by virtue of the *imago* of Ancus Marcius that Marcia provided in marriage to Caius Iulius Caesar (*RE* 129). Caesar's invocation of Ancus Marcius recalls Livy's reference to Ancus Marcius (*RE* 9) acquiring an *imago* of Numa Pompilius from his mother Pompilia (Livy 1.34.6). Perhaps Numa's *imago* was present in Iulia's *pompa imaginum* too. It was through his aunt Iulia and her mother Marcia that Caesar inherited the *lux* of such regnal *imagines*. Caesar makes it abundantly clear that matrilineal ancestry mattered.

Propertius' famous elegy for Cornelia (P.f.) (*RE* 419, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 1475) illuminates the connection between an elite woman's matrilineal ancestry and the *tituli* accompanying *imagines* (Prop. 4.11.29–32)<sup>133</sup>. In this elegy, Propertius' Cornelia recalls the ancestral trophies denoting her patrilineal and matrilineal ancestry – via the *gens Cornelia* through her (uncertain and poorly attested) father (Publius) Cornelius (*cognomen* uncertain, Lentulus Marcellinus or Scipio) (*RE* 332, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 1437) and the *gens Scribonia* through her mother Scribonia L.f. (*RE* 32, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> S 274) – and in this recollection she alludes to both her patrilineal and matrilineal *tituli*<sup>134</sup>:

*Si cui fama fuit per avita tropaea decori, / aera Numantinos nostra loquuntur avos: / altera maternos exaequat turba Libones, / et domus est titulis utraque fulta suis* (Prop. 4.11.29–32).

If fame from ancestral trophies has distinguished anyone, our bronzes [statues] speak of Numantine ancestors: another crowd, the [Scribonii] Libones of [my] maternal side [Scribonia], equals these, and each of the two houses is supported by its descriptive inscriptions [*tituli*]<sup>135</sup>.

Cornelia, wife of Paullus Aemilius Lepidus (*RE* 82, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 373, cos. suff. 34 BCE) and sister of either Publius Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus (*RE* 223, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 1396, cos. 18 BCE) or Publius Cornelius Scipio (*RE* 333, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 1438, cos. 16 BCE), would have inherited many patrilineal and matrilineal *imagines* and *tituli* of the *gentes Cornelia* and *Scribonia*, transferring copies of them from her natal home into her marital one<sup>136</sup>. In this elegy, Propertius' Cornelia explicitly invokes the matrilineal *tituli* (and thus *imagines*) she received from her mother Scribonia, who

133 — I am indebted to Judith Hallett for this suggestion.

134 — On the problematic identity of her father: Tansey 2000, 265–266; Canas 2009, 183–195.

135 — Commentary (small selection): Richardson 1977, 484–485; Hallett 1984b, esp. 257–258; Hutchinson 2006, 237; Hardie 2012, 370.

136 — On the problematic identity of her brother: Canas 2009, 183–195.

was daughter of Lucius Scribonius Libo (*RE* 19) and sister of Lucius Scribonius Libo (*RE* 20, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> S 264, cos. 34 BCE)<sup>137</sup>. Scribonia would have received the *tituli* and *imagines* of her distant patrilineal ancestors Lucius Scribonius Libo (*RE* 16, pr. 204 BCE) and Lucius Scribonius Libo (*RE* 17, pr. 192 BCE). Propertius' Cornelia, then, is referring to the consular *titulus* of her matrilineal uncle and the praetorian *tituli* of her distant matrilineal ancestors. Matrilineal ancestral trophies – statues, *tituli*, and *imagines* – graced and supported Cornelia's marital home, conspicuously memorialising and glorifying her matrilineal ancestry.

Suetonius' account of the emperor (Servius Sulpicus) Galba's (*RE* 63, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> S 1003, cos. ord. 33, 69 CE) ancestry and *imagines* offers further insight. In this account, Suetonius stresses the illustrious patrilineal and matrilineal ancestry and *imagines* of Galba's mother Mummia Achaica (*RE* 26, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> M 712), who died when he was young<sup>138</sup>:

*Neroni Galba successit nullo gradu contingens Caesarum domum, sed haud dubie nobilissimus magnaue et vetere prosapia, ut qui statuarum titulis pronepotem se Quinti Catuli Capitolini semper ascripserit, imperator vero etiam stemma in atrio proposuerit, quo paternam originem ad Iovem, maternam ad Pasiphaam Minonis uxorem referret. Imagines et elogia uniuersi generis exequi longum est* (Suet. *Galb.* 2-3).

Nero was succeeded by Galba, who was related in no degree [cf. social position, rank] to the house of the Caesars, but was without doubt of the highest aristocracy [nobility] with a great and ancient lineage, for he always added to the inscriptions on his statues that he was the great-grandson of Quintus [Lutatius] Catulus Capitolinus, and when he became emperor he even displayed a family tree in his entrance hall on which he traced back his paternal origins to Jupiter and his maternal origins [through Mummia Achaica] to Pasiphaë wife of Minos. It is a long thing [exercise] to follow the ancestor masks and elogia [= *tituli*] of the entire stock<sup>139</sup>.

Here Suetonius reports that Galba treasured his matrilineal ancestry through Mummia Achaica, perhaps even more so than his patrilineal ancestry. While Galba inherited consular *imagines* and *tituli* from his father Caius Sulpicius Galba (*RE* 53, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> S 999, cos. suff. 5 CE) and patrilineal great-great-great-great grandfather Servius Sulpicius Galba (*RE* 58, cos. 144 BCE), his matrilineal ancestry and matrilineal *imagines* were equally (if not more) illustrious. For Mummia Achaica's patrilineal great-grandfather was the famed Lucius Mummius (Achaicus) (*RE* 7a,

137 — On Scribonia's *stemma*: Canas 2009, 198-209, esp. 209.

138 — For early death of Mummia Achaica: Suet. *Galb.* 3. Cf. Galba's father's second wife Livia Ocellina (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> L 305).

139 — Commentary: Shotter 1993, 100-101; Dondin-Payre 1994, 130-131.

cos. 146 BCE) victor over Corinth<sup>140</sup>. Moreover, her matrilineal grandfather was the Quintus Lutatius Catulus (*RE* 8, cos. 78 BCE) that Galba so cherished, her matrilineal great-grandfather thence Quintus Lutatius Catulus (*RE* 7, cos. 102 BCE), who himself received the *imagines* of the gens *Servilia* in marriage, and Mummia's family reputedly stretched back to the legendary Pasiphaë herself<sup>141</sup>. Suetonius' direct references to matrilineal ancestry in the *stemma* of Galba's *atrium*, as well as to the many (presumably patrilineal and matrilineal) *imagines* and *tituli*, indicate that during Galba's reign female *maiores* and matrilineal ancestry were important to his elite (imperial) identity – even though his reign was short and his Republicanism exceptional<sup>142</sup>. Galba's deceased mother Mummia Achaica was a female *maior*: it was she who bequeathed the inheritance of illustrious *imagines* and *tituli* on Galba, including those of the gentes *Mummia*, *Lutatia*, and *Servilia*.

The *stemma* in Galba's *atrium* provokes another question. If Galba traced back his maternal origins on his *stemma* to Pasiphaë, might that suggest that she was represented by an *imago picta* or a *titulus* on this *stemma*<sup>143</sup>? Suetonius' *Pasiphaa Minonis uxor* resembles elite female nomenclature and the brevity of *tituli* (Suet. *Galb.* 2)<sup>144</sup>. If Pasiphaë was represented by either or both of these, what would preclude the inclusion of other *imagines pictae* or *tituli* for female *maiores*, legendary or otherwise, in *stemmata*? Plutarch indicates that many elite families sought lineages from Numa through either his sons or his daughter Pompilia (Plut. *Vit. Num.* 21), recalling Livy's account of Ancus Marcius and his matrilineal *imago* of Numa (Livy 1.34.6), as well as Caesar's evocation of Ancus Marcius and Marcia in his *laudatio* for his aunt Iulia (Caius Iulius Caesar fr. 29 *ORF*). Perhaps then *imagines pictae* or *tituli* of the historical Marcia and the legendary Pompilia existed in the *stemma* in Iulia's *atrium*. Statius offers some support for this supposition in his *Silvae*. He suggests that

140 — For Mummia Achaica: Suet. *Galb.* 4. Cf. maternal heritage in Suet. *Iul.* 6.1. See: Wiseman 1974, 156.

141 — For the *imagines* of the gens *Servilia*, note the marriage of Quintus Lutatius Catulus (*RE* 7, cos. 102 BCE) to Servilia Q.f. (*RE* 98), daughter of Quintus Servilius Caepio (*RE* 48, cos. 140 BCE), sister of Quintus Servilius Caepio (*RE* 49, cos. 106 BCE), and mother of Mummia's matrilineal grandfather Quintus Lutatius Catulus (*RE* 8, cos. 78 BCE) and Lutatia Q.f. (*RE* 24). The maternity of the son is uncertain. He may have been born to an earlier wife, the conjectural Domitia Cn.f. (*RE* 90), daughter of Cnaeus Domitius Ahenobarbus (*RE* 20, cos. 122 BCE) and sister of Cnaeus Domitius Ahenobarbus (*RE* 21, cos. 96 BCE), but her existence is far from certain. If she was the mother, then the *imagines* of the gentes *Domitia* and *Servilia* would have entered Catulus' *atrium*. At the very least, through Catulus' marriage to Servilia, the *imagines* of the gens *Servilia* entered Catulus' *atrium* and, through his great-granddaughter Mummia Achaica, entered Galba's *atrium*. On the *imagines* of the gens *Servilia*, cf. n. 121.

142 — On Galba's Republicanism: Wilkinson 2012, esp. 77-80.

143 — On *stemma*: n. 13. I am indebted to C. Brian Rose for this suggestion.

144 — Cf. [P]aulla Cornelia Cn(aei) filia Hispalli [uxor] (*CIL* VI.1294) and ns. 11, 31.

Caius Vitorius Hosidius Geta (*RE* 1, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> H 217), the son of his friend Marcus Vitorius Marcellus (*RE* 2, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> H 217, cos. suff. 105 CE), is blessed by his maternal *stemma*:

*Surge, agedum, iuvenemque puer deprende parentem, / stemmate materno felix, virtute paterna* (Stat. *Silv.* 4.4.74-75).

Arise, be doing, boy [Caius Vitorius Hosidius Geta], and overtake your young parent [Marcus Vitorius Marcellus], blessed by your maternal family tree and your paternal virtue<sup>145</sup>!

Here Statius refers to the *stemma* of a conjectural Hosidia Geta (*RE* Vitorius 1, 2), wife of Marcellus and daughter (or granddaughter) of a Caius (or Cnaeus) Hosidius Geta (*RE* 5, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> H 217). Her father (or grandfather) received *ornamenta triumphalia* (triumphal ornaments) in 43 CE<sup>146</sup>. If Statius' *stemma materna* is not simply a literary evocation, it may suggest that Hosidia Geta was represented in some way in the *stemma* in Marcellus' *atrium*, perhaps with an *imago picta* or *titulus*<sup>147</sup>. Cicero and Pliny's (the Younger) aforementioned allusions to patrilineal and matrilineal *nomina* could also support the existence of *tituli* for elite women in *stemmata*, if by *nomina* they meant *tituli* (Cic. *Planc.* 18; Plin. *Ep.* 3.3.6; 8.10.3). Moreover, Seneca (the Younger) and Pliny's (the Elder) paradigmatic statements about *stemmata* do not preclude the existence of such elite female *tituli* or *imagines pictae*:

*Qui imagines in atrio exponunt et nomina familiae suae longo ordine ac multis stemmatum inligata flexuris in parte prima aedium conlocant, non noti magis quam nobiles sunt* (Sen. *Ben.* 3.28.2)?

Those who display ancestor masks in their entrance hall and set up the names [= *tituli*] of their family in a long order and fastened [attached] in the multiple bends of family trees in the first part of the house, are they not notable rather than noble [aristocratic]<sup>148</sup>?

*Stemmata vero lineis discurrebant ad imagines pictas* (Plin. *HN* 35.6).

The family trees moreover traced their lines to painted family portraits<sup>149</sup>.

Perhaps, then, female *maiores* were memorialised in *atria*, not with wax *imagines* of their own, but in the form of *nomina familiae* (*tituli*) and *ima-*

145 — Commentary: *RE* Vitorius 2; White 1973, 280; Coleman 1988, 152.

146 — Stat. *Silv.* 4.4.73; Dio 60.20.4. See: White 1973, 280; Coleman 1988, 151-152; Frere & Fulford 2001, 47. The *domi triumphi* in Stat. *Silv.* 4.4.73 suggests that in Marcellus' *atrium* there may have been either a triumphal *titulus* of Caius (or Cnaeus) Hosidius Geta or an *imago picta* of him with his *ornamenta triumphalia*. Such triumphal themes on *imagines pictae* are evinced by: *Laus Pisonis* 8-9; Iuv. 8.3. See: Coleman 1988, 151-152; Flower 1996, 212. Cf. Corbier 2007.

147 — Cf. similar themes: Stat. *Theb.* 1.392, 2.215-222.

148 — Commentary: Flower 1996, 40-41.

149 — Commentary: Flower 1996, 40-41.

*gines pictae* in *stemmata*. If elite female *tituli* and *imagines pictae* existed, they would have elucidated family connections and matrilineal ancestry. These, in conjunction with elite male *imagines* and *tituli*, may even have functioned as a formal measure of an elite woman's social position before the passage of the *lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* (18 BCE) and the *lex Papia Poppaea* (9 CE), though we cannot be certain<sup>150</sup>. Nonetheless, the aforementioned evidence demonstrates that matrilineal ancestry and *imagines* could constitute and signify elite female and male social position and status in the Republic and Empire.

### Conclusions

*Imagines* were a constant presence throughout the lives of elite women. Like Clodia, a *filia* would have felt the *lux* of the *imagines* – both a blessing and burden – and their constant didactic presence in her natal home, for they loomed over her when she walked through the *atrium* or when (if) she worked wool on the *telae* there. Like Antonia and Calpurnia, a *nupta* and *uxor* inherited her patrilineal and matrilineal *imagines maiorum* and transferred these bridal *imagines* to her marital family, bringing copies from her natal *atrium* to her marital *atrium*. Her bridal *imagines* were a kind of inheritance and *dos* that embodied her social position and status vis-à-vis her ancestors. Like Pomponia, a *matrona* and *mater* would have encouraged her sons to attain the aedileship (or the higher curule magistracies) and the attendant *imago*. Like Corellia, she would have also used *imagines* as didactic tools with her own children. As with Caecilia, Aemilia, and Fausta Cornelia, remarriage and divorce might affect the (re)configurations of her bridal *imagines*: if her marriage was dissolved by death or divorce, her bridal *imagines* might become an inheritance for any surviving children, but otherwise their fate is uncertain. At an elite woman's *funus*, patrilineal and matrilineal *imagines* might accompany her in a *pompa imaginum*, as with the *funera* for Iunia, Iulia, and Tertia Iunia. Beyond her death, when an elite woman became a female *maior* like Marcia, Scribonia, or Mummia Achaica, her patrilineal and matrilineal ancestry and *imagines* could constitute her own and her descendants' social position and status. Finally, these descendants may have memorialised a female *maior* with her own *titulus* or *imago picta* in the *stemmata* in their *atria*, thence elucidating their matrilineal ancestry. Thence the *imagines maiorum* were not just symbols of paternal *gloria*, but also of maternal *gloria*. Matrilineal ancestry mattered. An elite *atrium* and a *pompa imaginum* could be full of both patrilineal and matrilineal *imagines*. Consequently, the ancestry of an elite woman could be physically present

150 — On these laws: n. 36.

and on display in elite homes and funerary practices. For an elite married woman, her bridal *imagines* were a physical reminder of *her* natal family and *her* presence in the marital home, and a potential source of comfort, inspiration, pride, or even shame.

We must, then, reconsider the *imago*. While there may have been no wax *imagines* of elite women, elite women were certainly coupled, identified, and connected with them in both the Republic and Empire. These *imagines* and their accompanying *tituli* could function as an inheritance and *dos* for an elite woman, transmitting the social position and status of an elite woman from her natal family to her marital family. Thus, for example, the consular *imagines* and *tituli* of Otacilia and Mummia Achaica elevated their descendants. For, as Cicero suggests, their descendants now had consular names (*tituli*) from the matrilineal side (Cic. *Planc.* 18). Thence an elite woman's social position and status, as inherited from her patrilineal and matrilineal ancestors, could be conferred upon any husband(s) and subsequent children, and the *imagines* were part of this conferral. An elite woman's *imagines maiorum* were her own *commendatio maiorum*: her social position and status materialised. Truly, an elite woman could say:

*Parem ex maiorum imaginibus gloriam traxi* (Val. Max. 5.5.praef!)  
I drew equal status from the ancestor masks!

### ***Bibliography***

- Alexander M., (1990), *Trials in the Late Roman Republic, 149 BC to 50 BC*, Toronto.
- Allison P., (2007), 'Engendering Roman Domestic Space', in: R. Westgate, N. Fisher, and J. Whitley (eds.), *Building Communities. House, Settlement and Society in the Aegean and Beyond*, London, 342-350.
- (2004), *Pompeian Households. An Analysis of the Material Culture*, Los Angeles.
- Alzinger W. and Bammer A., (1971), *Das Monument Des C. Memmius*, Vienna.
- Austin R., (1977), *Cicero. Pro M. Caelio Oratio. Third Edition*, Oxford.
- Beck H., (2005), *Karriere und Hierarchie: Die römische Aristokratie und die Anfänge des cursus honorum in der mittleren Republik*, Berlin.
- Beck H., Duplá A., Jehne M. and Pina Polo F., (2011), 'The republic and its highest office: some introductory remarks on the Roman consulate', in H. Beck, A. Duplá, M. Jehne and F. Polo (eds.), *Consuls and Res Publica. Holding High Office in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge, 1-15.
- Berg R., (2002), 'Wearing Wealth. *Mundus muliebris* and *Ornatus* as Status Markers for Women in Imperial Rome', in: R. Berg, R. Hälikkää, P. Raitis and

- V. Vuolanto (eds.), *Women, Wealth and Power in the Roman Empire*, Rome, 15-73.
- Billows R., (1982), 'The Last of the Scipios', *American Journal of Ancient History* 7.1, 53-68.
- Boëls-Janssen N., (2008), 'Maiestas Matronarum', *Latomus* 67.1, 37-55.  
(1993), *La vie religieuse des matrones dans la Rome archaïque*, Rome.
- Bourdieu P., (1985), 'The Social Space and the Genesis of Groups', *Theory and Society* 14.6, 723-744.
- Bradley K., (1991), 'Remarriage and the Structure of the Upper-Class Roman Family', in: B. Rawson (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome*, Oxford, 79-98.
- Briscoe J., (2012), *A Commentary on Livy, Books 41-45*, Oxford.  
(2008), *A Commentary on Livy, Books 38-40*, Oxford.  
(2003), *Commentary on Livy, Books XXXIV-XXXVII*, Oxford.
- Broughton T., (1952), *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic. Volume II. 99 B.C. – 31 B.C.*, New York.  
(1951), *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic. Volume I. 509 B.C. – 100 B.C.*, New York.
- Canas M., (2009), 'Scribonia Caesaris et le stemma des Scribonii Libones', *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* 83.2, 183-210.
- Carlson J., (2009), *Pliny's Women: Constructing Virtue and Creating Identity in the Roman World*, Cambridge.
- Champlin E., (1991), *Final Judgments. Duty and Emotion in Roman Wills, 200 B.C.-A.D. 250*, Berkeley.
- Chastagnol A., (1979), 'Les femmes dans l'ordre sénatorial : titulature et rang social à Rome', *Revue Historique* 262.1, 3-28.
- Coleman K., (1988), *Statius, Silvae IV*, Oxford.
- Corbier M., (2007), 'Painting and Familial and Genealogical Memory (Pliny, Natural History 35, 1-14)', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 50.S100, 69-83.
- Cornell T. (ed.), (2013), *The Fragments of the Roman Historians. Volume 1. Introduction*, Oxford.
- Cornell T., (1995), *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000-264 B.C.)*, London.
- Crawford O., (1941), 'Laudatio Funebri', *The Classical Journal* 37.1, 17-27.
- Crook J., (1986), 'Women in Roman Succession', in: B. Rawson (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome: New Perspectives*, Ithaca, 58-82.
- DiLuzio M., (2016), *A Place at the Altar: Priestesses in Republican Rome*, Princeton.
- Dixon S., (2007), *Cornelia: Mother of the Gracchi*, London.  
(1988), *The Roman Mother*, London.

- (1986), 'Family finances: Terentia and Tullia', in: B. Rawson (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome: New Perspectives*, Ithaca, 93-120.
- (1985), 'Polybius on Roman Women and Property', *The American Journal of Philology* 106, 147-170.
- Dondin-Payre M., (1994), 'Choix et contraintes dans l'expression de la parenté dans le monde romain', *Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz* 5, 127-163.
- Drerup H., (1980), 'Totenmaske und Ahnenbild bei den Römern', *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung* 87, 81-129.
- Eck W., Caballos A. and Fernández F., (1996), *Das senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre*, Munich.
- Evans J., (1991), *War, Women and Children in Ancient Rome*, London.
- Favro D. and Johanson C., (2010), 'Death in Motion: Funeral Processions in the Roman Forum', *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 69.1, 12-37.
- Flory M., (1998), 'The integration of women into the Roman triumph', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* H. 4, 489-494.
- (1993), 'Livia and the History of Public Honorific Statues for Women in Rome', *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-)* 123, 287-308.
- Flower H., (2014), 'Memory and Memoirs in Republican Rome', in: K. Galinsky (ed.), *Memoria Romana. Memory in Rome and Rome in Memory*, Michigan, 27-40.
- (2006), *The Art of Forgetting: Disgrace and Oblivion in Roman Political Culture*, Chapel Hill.
- (2004), 'Spectacle and Political Culture in the Roman Republic', in: H. Flower (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Republic*, Cambridge, 377-398.
- (2002), 'Were Women ever "Ancestors" in Republican Rome?', in: J. Munk Højte (ed.), *Images of Ancestors*, Aarhus, 157-182.
- (1998), 'Damnatio Memoriae: The Case of Cn. Calpurnius Piso Pater in AD 20', *Classical Antiquity* 17.2, 155-187.
- (1996), *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, Oxford.
- Frere S. and Fulford M., (2001), 'The Roman Invasion of A. D. 43', *Britannia* 32, 45-55.
- Galinsky K. (ed.), (2014), *Memoria Romana. Memory in Rome and Rome in Memory*, Michigan.
- Galinsky K. and Lapatin K. (eds.), (2015), *Cultural Memories in the Roman Empire*, Los Angeles.
- Gardner J., (1995 [Reprint]), *Women in Roman Law and Society*, Bloomington.
- (1985), 'The Recovery of Dowry in Roman Law', *Classical Quarterly* 35.2, 449-453.

- Goldbeck F. and Wienand J. (eds.), (2017), *Der römische triumph in Prinzipat und Spätantike*, Berlin.
- Gowing A., (2005), *Empire and Memory. The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture*, Cambridge.
- Hallett J., (2002), 'Women Writing in Rome and Cornelia, Mother of the Gracchi', in: L. Churchill, P. Brown and J. Jeffrey (eds.), *Women Writing Latin. From Roman Antiquity to Early Modern Europe. Volume 1. Women Writing Latin in Roman Antiquity, Late Antiquity, and the Early Christian Era*, London, 13-24.
- (1984a), *Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society. Women and the Elite Family*, Princeton.
- (1984b), 'The Role of Women in Roman Elegy: Counter-Cultural Feminism', in: J. Peradotto and J. Sullivan (eds.), *Women in the Ancient World: The Arethusa Papers*, Albany, 241-262.
- Hänninen M-L., (2011), 'Curus avorum: Roman Noble Women in Family Traditions', in: H. Whittaker (ed.), *In Memoriam: Commemoration, Communal Memory and Gender Values in the Ancient Graeco-Roman World*, Newcastle upon Tyne, 42-59.
- Hardie P., (2012), *Rumour and Renown: Representations of Fama in Western Literature*, Cambridge.
- Hemelrijk E., (2015), *Hidden Lives, Public Personae: Women and Civic Life in the Roman West*, Oxford.
- (2012), 'Fictive Motherhood and Female Authority in Roman Cities', *EuGeStA* 2, 201-220.
- (2005), 'Octavian and the introduction of public statues for women in Rome', *Athenaeum* 93.1, 309-317.
- (1999), *Matrona Docta: Educated Women in the Roman Élite from Cornelia to Julia Domna*, London.
- (1987), 'Women's demonstrations in republican Rome', in: J. Blok and P. Mason (eds.), *Sexual Asymmetry. Studies in Ancient Society*, Amsterdam, 217-240.
- Hersch K., (2010), 'The Woolworker Bride', in: L. Larsson Lovén and A. Strömberg (eds.), *Ancient Marriage in Myth and Reality*, Newcastle upon Tyne, 122-136.
- Hillard T., (2001), 'Popilia and *laudationes funebres* for women', *Antichthon* 35, 45-63.
- Hin S., (2013), *The Demography of Roman Italy. Population Dynamics in an Ancient Conquest Society 201 BCE-14 CE*, Cambridge.
- Hölkeskamp K.-J., (2011), 'Self-serving sermons: oratory and the self-construction of the republican aristocrat', in C. Smith and R. Covino (eds.), *Praise and Blame in Roman Republican Rhetoric*, Swansea, 17-34.

- (2010), *Reconstructing the Roman Republic: An Ancient Political Culture and Modern Research*, Princeton.
- (2006), 'History and Collective Memory in the Middle Republic', in: N. Rosenstein and R. Morstein-Marx (eds.), *A Companion to the Roman Republic*, Oxford, 478-495.
- (1993), 'Conquest, competition and consensus: Roman expansion in Italy and the rise of the *nobilitas*', *Historia, Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte* 42, 12-39.
- Hudson J., (2016), 'Carpento certe: Conveying Gender in Roman Transportation', *Classical Antiquity* 35.2, 215-246.
- Hutchinson G., (2006), *Propertius. Elegies Book IV*, Cambridge.
- Jehne M., (2011), 'The rise of the consular as a social type in the third and second centuries bc', in: H. Beck, A. Duplá, M. Jehne and F. Polo (eds.), *Consuls and Res Publica. Holding High Office in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge, 211-231.
- Kajava M., (1994), *Roman Female Praenomina: Studies in the Nomenclature of Roman Women*, Rome.
- Kaplow L., (2008), 'Redefining *Imagines*: Ancestor Masks and Political Legitimacy in the Rhetoric of New Men', *Mouseion, Series III* 8, 409-416.
- Kerin R. and Allcroft A., (1891), *Cicero. Pro Plancio*, London.
- Lacey W., (1963), 'Nominatio and the Elections under Tiberius', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 12.2, 167-176.
- Langlands R., (2006), *Sexual Morality in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge.
- Larsson Lovén L., (1998), 'Lanam Fecit. Woolworking and Female Virtue', in: L. Larsson Lovén and A. Strömberg (eds.), *Aspects of Women in Antiquity. Proceedings of the First Nordic Symposium on Women's Lives in Antiquity*, Jonsered, 85-95.
- Levick B., (1999), *Tiberius the Politician*, London.
- (1967), 'Imperial Control of the Elections under the Early Principate: Commendatio, Suffragatio and "Nominatio"', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 16.2, 207-230.
- Lindsay H., (2009), *Adoption in the Roman World*, Cambridge.
- Lintott A., (1986), 'Acta Antiquissima: A Week in the History of the Roman Republic', *Papers of the British School at Rome* 54, 213-228.
- Lushkov A., (2015), *Magistracy and the Historiography of the Roman Republic*, Cambridge.
- Matthews J., (1981), 'Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius', in: M. Gibson (ed.), *Boethius: His Life, Thought and Influence*, 15-43.
- McGinn T., (2003), *Prostitution, Sexuality, and the Law in Ancient Rome*, Oxford.
- Morstein-Marx R., (1998), 'Publicity, Popularity and Patronage', *Classical Antiquity* 17.2, 259-288.

- Nicols J., (1989), 'Patrona Civitatis: Gender and Civic Patronage', *Latomus. Revue d'etudes Latines* 206, 117-142.
- Oakley S., (2009), *A Commentary on Livy. Books VII-VIII*, Oxford.
- Ogilvie R., (1965), *A Commentary on Livy. Books 1-5*, Oxford.
- Östenberg I., (forthcoming), 'Gendering the elite Roman funeral', in: H. Cornwell and G. Woolf (eds.), *Gendering Roman Imperialism*.
- Pocock L., (1926), *A Commentary on Cicero In Vatinius*, London.
- Pollini J., (2007), 'Ritualizing Death in Republican Rome: Memory, Religion, Class Struggle, and the Wax Ancestral Mask Tradition's Origin and Influence on Veristic Portraiture', in N. Laneri (ed.), *Performing Death. Social Analyses of Funerary Traditions in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean*, Chicago, 237-285.
- Potter D. and Damon C., (1999), 'The *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre*', *American Journal of Philology* 120.1, 13-42.
- Purcell N., (1986), 'Livia and the Womanhood of Rome', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 32, 78-105.
- Raepsaet-Charlier M.-T., (1999), 'Werner Eck, Antonio Caballos & Fernando Fernández, *Das senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre*', *L'antiquité Classique* 68, 549-551.
- (1987), *Prosopographie des femmes de l'ordre sénatorial (I<sup>er</sup>-II<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, Leuven.
- (1981-2), 'Ordre sénatorial et divorce sous le Haut-Empire. Un chapitre de l'histoire des mentalités', *Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis* 17-18, 161-173.
- Ramsay J., (2003), *Cicero: Philippics I-II*, Cambridge.
- Rich J., (2014), 'The Triumph in the Roman Republic: Frequency, Fluctuation and Policy', in Carsten Hjort Lange and Frederik Vervaet (eds.), *The Roman Republican Triumph. Beyond the Spectacle*, Rome, 197-258.
- Richardson J., (2011), 'L. Iunius Brutus the Patrician and the Political Allegiance of Q. Aelius Tubero', *Classical Philology* 106.2, 155-160.
- Richardson L., (1977), *Propertius. Elegies 1-IV*, Norman.
- Rose C., (2008), 'Forging Identity in the Roman Republic: Trojan Ancestry and Veristic Portraiture', in S. Bell and I. Hansen (eds.), *Role Models in the Roman World. Identity and Assimilation*, Rome, 97-131.
- Rose, C. and Lovink M., (2014), 'Recreating Roman Wax Masks', *Expedition Magazine* 56.3, 34-37.
- Rüpke J., (2008), *Fasti Sacerdotum. A Prosopography of Pagan, Jewish, and Christian Religious Officials in the City of Rome, 300 BC to AD 499*, Oxford.
- (2006), 'Triumphator and Ancestor Rituals Between Symbolic Anthropology and Magic', *Numen* 53, 251-289.
- Ryan F., (1998), *Rank and Participation in the Republican Senate*, Stuttgart.

- Saller R., (1994), *Patriarchy, property and death in the Roman family*, Cambridge.
- (1984), 'Roman Dowry and the Devolution of Property in the Principate', *Classical Quarterly* 34.1, 195-205.
- Schultz C., (2006), *Women's Religious Activity in the Roman Republic*, Chapel Hill.
- Shelton J., (2013), *The Women of Pliny's Letters*, New York.
- Sherwin-White A., (1998), *The Letters of Pliny. A Historical and Social Commentary*, Oxford.
- Shotter D., (1993), *Suetonius. Lives of Galba, Otho & Vitellius*, Warminster.
- Smallwood E., (1968), 'Consules Suffecti of A.D. 55', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 17.3, 384.
- Šterbenk Erker D., (2010), 'Gender and Roman funeral ritual', in: V. Hope and J. Huskinson (eds.), *Memory and Mourning: Studies on Roman Death*, Oxford, 40-60.
- (2009), 'Women's Tears in Ancient Roman Ritual', in: T. Fögen (ed.), *Tears in the Graeco-Roman World*, Berlin, 135-160.
- Strong A., (2016), *Prostitutes and Matrons in the Roman World*, Cambridge.
- Syme R., (1989), *The Augustan Aristocracy*, Oxford.
- Tansey P., (2000), 'The Perils of Prosopography: The Case of the Cornelia Dolabellae', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 130, 265-271.
- Taylor L., (1939), 'Cicero's Aedileship', *The American Journal of Philology* 60.2, 194-202.
- Treggiari S., (2002 [Reprint]), *Roman marriage. Iusti Coniuges from the time of Cicero to the time of Ulpian*, Oxford.
- (1991), 'Divorce Roman Style: How Easy and how Frequent was it?', in: B. Rawson (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome*, Oxford, 31-46.
- Valentini A., (2012), *Matronae tra novitas e mos maiorum: spazi e modalità dell'azione pubblica femminile nella Roma medio repubblicana*, Venice.
- Walbank F., (1979), *A Historical Commentary on Polybius. Volume III. Commentary on Books XIX-XL*, Oxford.
- (1967), *A Historical Commentary on Polybius. Volume II. Commentary on Books VII-XVIII*, Oxford.
- (1957), *A Historical Commentary on Polybius. Volume I. Commentary on Books I-VI*, Oxford.
- Walter U., (2004), *Memoria und res publica: zur Geschichtskultur im republikanischen Rom*, Frankfurt.
- Webb L., (forthcoming), 'Mibi es aemula: Elite female status competition in Mid-Republican Rome and the example of Tertia Aemilia', in: C. Damon and C. Pieper (eds.), *Eris vs. Aemulatio. Competition in the Ancient World*, Leiden.

- Webb L. and Brännstedt L., (forthcoming), 'Gendering the Roman triumph: Elite women and the triumph in the Republic and early Empire', in G. Woolf and H. Cornwell (eds.), *Gendering Roman Imperialism*, Cambridge.
- White P., (1973), 'Notes on Two Stasian ΠΡΟΣΩΠΑ', *Classical Philology* 68.4, 279-284.
- Wilkins A., (1881), *Cicero. De Oratore II*, Oxford.
- Wilkinson S., (2012), *Republicanism during the Early Roman Empire*, London.
- Wiseman T., (1974), 'Legendary Genealogies in Late-Republican Rome', *Greece & Rome* 21.2, 153-164.
- Woodman A. and Martin R., (2004), *The Annals of Tacitus. Book 3*, Cambridge.