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*Eius te suscitat*

Imago, cuius effigia, quo gnatus patre.

It is his ancestor mask and image that stirs you, that of the father by whom you were born. 


Introduction

The relationships between the Roman *imago*, the male ancestor mask, and elite male lives have been well established, notably by Harriet Flower¹. Yet very little has been said about their roles in the lives of elite

---

women. 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. 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). Then I 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 funerary practices 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). I conclude that *imagines* were an important mechanism for the transmission and reproduction of elite identities and symbolic capital.  

---

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, 119-139. 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 hers 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 legitimised 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. 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*). 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*. Nevertheless, *imagines* were an indelible part of elite women's lives, as I will argue below.

This *imago* was a life-like wax mask, created by *fictores* (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. *Brev. 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.


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. Such *imagines* were held and displayed in *armaria* (cupboards) within the *atrium* of an elite home. 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. In this way, the *imagines* and accompanying *tituli* materialised and memorialised the achievements of the male ancestors of a household, both patrilineal and matrilineal. Moreover, *imagines* were located near *imagines pictae* (painted family portraits) linked by lines to form a *stemma* (family tree). 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. 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. 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

---


11 — *Tituli*: Livy 10.7.11. Cf. Livy 8.40.4; 22.31.11; Hor. Sat. 1.6.17; *Panegyricus Messalae* 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. Pius* 12C.


simulated the behaviours of the ancestors. 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*. 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.

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.* 1.1.3) – but the exact terminus of their usage is uncertain. 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. 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, 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, 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.


attainment of magisterial public office, while its accompanying *titulus* lauded the extent of a man's public career and honours. 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. *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. 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. 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.

---


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. *Roh. 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. Inst.* 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 Salvito (*RE* 357, cf. Plin. *HN* 7.54; Plut. *Vit. Cat.* 52.5) adopted a Cornelius Scipio Pomponianus (*RE* 357) into the gens *Cornelia* via *adoptio testamentaria* (testamentary adoption); b) that Salvito was heir to the *imagines* of the Africani, 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)\(^{27}\).

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\(^{28}\). 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)\(^{29}\). The *imago*, then, constituted and reconstituted elite identities.

---


\(^{29}\) — 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. 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. ‘Paulla Cornelia, daughter of Cnaeus, wife of Hispallus’ ([P]aulla Cornelia Cn(ae) f(ilia) Hispalli [u]xor, CIL VI.1294, RE 445). 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. 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.

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. 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. 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; Valenti 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 (Tullinda mea); 14.19.1 (Tullia nostra); QFr. 2.6.1 (Tullia nostra). See: Kajava 1994, esp. 19-31, 118-124.

32 — Fathers: Cic. Catel. 33; Phil. 3.16; Rosc. Am. 147. Brothers: Cic. Rosc. Am. 147; Livy Per. 19; Val. Max. 8.1.dann.4; Gell. NA 10.6.2; Suet. Tib. 2. Husbands: C. Gracch. fr. 48 ORF; Cic. Catel. 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; Treiggiari 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.


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, consulare) senators, with consular senators and the princeps senatus at the summit. The formal cursus 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). 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. Moreover, by 184 CE, a consular wife formally held the title of consularis femina. 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. 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). 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. Nevertheless, elite women would have

---

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 Heligab. 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 elegion: CIL VI.1527 (lauudatio Turiae); VI.10230 (lauudatio Mundi); 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.

frequently walked through their own and others’ atria and observed the imagines throughout their daily lives. The armaria holding the imagines were not always open, but the tituli were (presumably) visible every day (if affixed to or nearby the armaria). During feriae (public festivals) and family celebrations, elite families opened the armaria and publicly displayed the imagines (imagines aperire). On certain special occasions (e.g., male electoral success) they decorated the imagines with laurel, while in times of mourning they closed the armaria. 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 uteque 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?

In eodem domicilio antequam nasceretur habitavi, in isdem incunabulis infantiae tempora peregi, eosdem appellavi parentes, eadem pro me voto excubuerunt, parem ex maiorum imaginibus gloriarm traxi (Val. Max. 5.5. praefer). 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!
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. 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 esse? 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 familia clarissimam nupsisses, cur tibi Q. 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 admovebat (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?

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

---


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.50 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)51. 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 well52. 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 her53.

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):
Quo evenit ut et humili loco nati ad summam dignitatem consurgant et generosisissimarum 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.\(^{54}\)

Many elite daughters, not just Clodia, would have been blessed and burdened with the lux of their imaginæ, 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 imaginæ occurred at the marriage of an elite nupta. For, after a bride entered her husband’s home and became his uxor, not only would telæ and a lectus genialis (ceremonial marriage bed) grace their marital atrium, but so too would copies of the bride’s imaginæ maiorum, joining those of her husband.\(^ {55}\) Her bridal imaginæ 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, fictores feasibly reproduced the imaginæ 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.\(^ {56}\) 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 imaginæ of the gens Antonia were transferred with Antonia M.f. (RE 111) into her husband Publius Vatinius’ home.\(^ {57}\)

---

\(^ {54}\) — For the lux of the imaginæ 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.

\(^ {55}\) — Telæ: n. 40. Lectus genialis: Cic. Cluent. 14; Hor. Epist. 1.1.87; Juv. 10.334; Gell. 16.9.4; Festus, 83L. Bridal imaginæ: Cic. Vat. 28; Livy 1.34.6; SCPP 76-82; Plin. Ep. 8.10.3. See: RE s.v. imaginæ maiorum; Flower 1996, 59, 103, 201-202.


\(^ {57}\) — On this marriage: Schol. Bob. In Vatin. 27 (149 St.). Julia 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]58, not into a family, but into a prison59.

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 image of her patrilineal grandfather and praetorian image of her father, both of whom had died by 56 BCE60. 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 image, that of Numia Pompilius (RE Numa Pompilius), acquired from his mother, Pompilia (RE Numa Pompilius), Numia’s daughter:

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

58 — Cf. OLD s.v. colloca (2, 3, 9).
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 Numa61.

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 past62. The existence of such legendary imagines is adduced by their inclusion in the pompa imaginum for Drusus Iulius Caesar (PIR2 I 219, cos. 15, 21 CE) in 23 CE63. 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, PIR2 C 287, cos. 7 CE) for maiestas (treason), was a case of official (senatorial) damnatio memoriae (condemnation of memory) and contained numerous penalties64. It is a penalty on imagines that provides further evidence for the practice of giving copies of imagines in marriage (SCPP 76-82)65. 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.
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 pompeae 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 *pompa imaginum* or in their *atria* alongside their other *imagines*:

[..., recte et ordine facturos, qui qu- | andoq(ue) familiae Calpurniae es- | ent, quive eam familiam cognitione | adfinitateve contingens, si dedissent operam, si quis eius gentis aut quis eo- | rum, qui cognatus adfini- | ve Calpurniae familiae fuisse, mortuus esse, lugen- | e, ne inter reliquas imagines, <quibus> exequias eorum funerum celebrare solent, | imago Cn. Pisonis patris ducturum neve imaginibus familiae Calpurniae i- | mago eius interponeretur (SCPP 76-82)66.

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 family67.

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 *pompa imaginum* and their *atria*68. 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, PIR² M 737), and daughter of their son Lucius (formerly Cnaeus) Calpurnius Piso (RE 76, PIR² C 293, cos. 27 CE)69. 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

---

68 — Interpretation: Flower 1996, 103.
the confiscated property (SCPP 104-105)\textsuperscript{70}. 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 pompaem imaginum or the marital atrium\textsuperscript{71}. She would, however, have transferred and displayed copies of the many imaginex of the gens Calpurnia\textsuperscript{72}. 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 imaginex 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 imaginex by, say, members of the gens Calpurnia\textsuperscript{73}. Plancina (presumably) transferred copies of the imaginex of the gens Munatia to Piso’s atrium, namely the consular imago of her patrilineal grandfather Lucius Munatius Plancus (RE 30, PIR\textsuperscript{2} M 728, cos. 42 BCE) and the praetorian imago of her patrilineal great-uncle Lucius Plotius Plancus (RE Munatius 26, PIR\textsuperscript{2} P 514, pr. 43 BCE). Perhaps, then, Calpurnia inherited these imaginex 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\textsuperscript{2} N 119, cos. suff. 29 CE) and thus the mother (or perhaps grandmother) of Nonius Calpurnius Asprenas (PIR\textsuperscript{2} N 132, cos. suff. ca. 71-72 CE), Asprenas Calpurnius Serranus (CIL VI.1371), and Asprenas Calpurnius Torquatus (PIR\textsuperscript{2} N 127)\textsuperscript{74}. 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 imaginex 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 imaginex by agnatic, cognatic, and marital relatives in the early Empire, as well as the practice of giving imaginex in marriage.

\textsuperscript{70} — Flower 1998, 164.
\textsuperscript{71} — Cf. Flower 1996, 58. Piso’s imago may simply have not been displayed.
\textsuperscript{72} — On the many imaginex of the Calpurnii Pisones, see e.g.: Cic. Pis. 1; Laus Pisonis esp. 8, 33. Three of the most notable individuals with imaginex from the Calpurnii Pisones follow, viz. those who were both consuls and triumphal generals or recipients of oramenta 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, oramenta triumphalia 11 BCE). Triumphs (all forms) after Rich 2014; Goldbeck & Wienand (eds.) 2017.
\textsuperscript{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.
The final testimony is a letter from Pliny (the Younger) to Lucius Calpurnius Fabatus (RE 34, PIR² C 263), grandfather of Pliny's last wife, Calpurnia (RE 130, PIR² C 326), on the unhappy occasion of Calpurnia's miscarriage in ca. 107 CE. 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:


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.

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, PIR² 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, PIR² 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. 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, PIR² 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.

The _imagines_ of the _gens Caecilia_ would certainly have been _non subitae._

---

75 — Date: 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; _PIR²_ C 30; _PIR²_ 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, _PIR²_ V 376, cos. suff. 92 CE) and Pompeia L.f. Celerina (RE 126, _PIR²_ P 670), herself a daughter of Lucius Pompeius Vopiscus C. Arruntius Caecilius Celer (RE 122, _PIR²_ 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. 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

---

79 — 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 νεώς καὶ θύουσαν τοῖς θεοῖς υπὲρ τάδελφου καὶ καθόλου μεγάλην προσδοκίαν ἔχουσαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ μέλλοντος, ἢς μόνης ἔμελεν αὐτῷ – τὸν μὲν γὰρ πατέρα τότε πλεῖν συνεβαίνει εἰς Ἰβηρίαν στρατηγὸν καθεσταμένον ἐπὶ τὰς προειρημένας πράξεις – ὑπὲρ τοῦ μέλλοντος ὑπὲρ τὰς θύρας καὶ περιπτύξασαν ἀσπάσασθαι. τῆς δὲ παθούσης τὸ γυναικεῖον πάθος καί τι προσεπιφθεγξαμένης ‘Εἰ γὰρ ἐμοὶ ταύτην ἰδεῖν γένοιτο τὴν ἡμέραν’ Βούλει φησὶ μῆτερ, πεῖραν 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 said80.

This passage and its preceding context contain some problems, namely errors regarding the implied dates of Africanus’ and Asiagenus’ aedileships and the brothers’ respective ages81. 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 success82. 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

81 — Walbank 1967, 199.
82 — Walbank 1967, 199-200.
the importance of *imagines* for elite families (Polyb. 6.53.4-54.3)\(^83\). Pomponia was not alone in her investment and engagement in her sons’ political careers: numerous other instances exist\(^84\). 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*\(^2\) C 1296) in the early second century CE\(^85\). In this exchange, Pliny indicates that his friend the rhetorician Iulius Genitor (*PIR*\(^2\) 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*\(^2\) C 1293, cos. ord. 122 CE)\(^86\):

\[
\text{Nihil ex hoc viro filius tuus audiet nisi profuturum, nihil discet quod nescisse rectius fuerit, nec minus saepe ab illo quam a te meque admonebitur, quibus imaginibus oneretur, quae nomina et quanta sustineat} \quad (\text{Plin. Ep. 3.3.6}).
\]

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\(^87\).

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*\(^2\) C 1294, cos. suff. 78 CE) and Hispulla (*RE* 1, *PIR*\(^2\) H 185) and wife of either Lucius Neratius Priscus (*RE* 15, *PIR*\(^2\) N 60, cos. suff. 97 CE) or his brother Lucius Neratius Marcellus (*RE* 9, *PIR*\(^2\) N 55, cos. suff. 95, 129 CE)\(^88\). Her husband and brother-in-law were sons of Lucius Neratius Priscus (*PIR*\(^2\) 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.
86 — Date: Sherwin-White 1998, 211.
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. 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.

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. 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 divorcée (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 1st 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 change 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)92. 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 died93. 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 marriage94. I propose that another factor is important to consider, namely, that the bridal *imagines* could constitute an inheritance for an elite woman’s children95. 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*96. 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

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. Inst.* 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.
96 — Children tended to remain with their father after a divorce. See: Dixon 1986, esp. 108-115; Treggiari 2002, 466-473 (with exceptions).
imagines. 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. 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. In her first marriage, she bore two children, Marcus Aemilius Scaurus (RE 141, pr. 56 BCE) and Aemilia M.f. (RE 154). In her second marriage, she bore two additional children, Faustus Cornelius Sulla (RE 377) and Fausta Cornelia L.f. (RE 436). 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. 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). Fausta Cornelia had two marriages as well: the first at a young age.

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 Caprararius (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 adfines and cognati in SCPP 76-82.


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

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


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)\textsuperscript{104}. Theirs were complex clusters of remarriage and divorce\textsuperscript{105}.

Amidst this complexity, what might have happened to the bridal \textit{imagines} of Caecilia, Aemilia, and Fausta Cornelia? Caecilia presumably transferred copies of her patrilineal and matrilineal (if her unknown mother had office-holding ancestors) \textit{imagines} to the \textit{atria} of both Marcus Aemilius Scaurus and Sulla. In their capacity as \textit{cognati}, Caecilia’s children – Marcus Aemilius Scaurus, Aemilia, Faustus Cornelius Sulla, and Fausta Cornelia – could have thus inherited the matrilineal \textit{imagines} of the Caecili Metelli\textsuperscript{106}. Aemilia, then, could have inherited these \textit{imagines} and those of the \textit{gens Aemilia} and transferred them to the \textit{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 \textit{imagines}, as well as those obtained from his father\textsuperscript{107}. Whether Cnaeus Pompeius Magnus kept her \textit{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 \textit{imagines} of the Caecili Metelli and the patrilineal ones of the \textit{gens Cornelia}, transferring them to the \textit{atria} of Caius Memmius and of Titus Annius Milo. Whether Caius Memmius kept these \textit{imagines} after the divorce is uncertain. Their son, Caius Memmius, despite the divorce, could have inherited her matrilineal and patrilineal \textit{imagines}. Certainly, he later memorialised his matrilineal heritage and descent from his matrilineal grandfather Sulla on the Monument of Memmius in Ephesus (\textit{IEph} 403.1-2)\textsuperscript{108}. I propose that Caius Memmius had access to a rich inheritance of consular \textit{imagines} (and \textit{tituli}), including those of the Caecili Metelli from his matrilineal grandmother Caecilia and the \textit{imago} of his matrilineal grandfather Sulla, \textit{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 \textit{imagines} as their half-siblings Faustus Cornelius Sulla or Fausta Cornelia, or whether Manius Acilius Glabrio

\textsuperscript{104} — Cic. \textit{Att}. 4.13.1; 5.8.2-3; Val. \textit{Max}. 6.1.13; Asc. \textit{Scaur}. 28C; \textit{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. \textit{Scaur}. 28C.

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

\textsuperscript{106} — If the principles of the \textit{SCPP} hold for the Republic.

\textsuperscript{107} — For his survival, note his presence at the trial of his uncle Marcus Aemilius Scaurus: Asc. \textit{Scaur}. 28C.

\textsuperscript{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*. An elite woman could have a *funus indicium* (public funeral), including a *laudatio funebris*, by 102 BCE at the latest, and probably much earlier. 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). 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:

---


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

Tu illam mortuam, tu imagines ipsas non perhorrescis? Quibus non modo imitandis, sed ne conlocandis quidem tibi locum ullam reliquisisti (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]112 for setting them up, let alone imitating them113.

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 great-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 BCE114.

Similar elaborate funera with pompa imaginum are attested for elite women elsewhere. Plutarch records one held in 69 BCE for Iulia C.f. (RE 541) (Plut. Vit. Cæs. 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 below115.

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.
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). 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 praefulgebant 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.

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). 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. 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, PIR² I 830, cos. ord. 25 BCE), may have married a (Quinctia) (Cri)spina (PIR² C 1581), thereby acquiring the imagines of the gens Quinctia, but her nomen is uncertain. 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. With all of these imagines, Tertia Iunia’s pompa ima-

---

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.
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. 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.

**Female maior**

By the second century BCE, elite women were treated as maiores, as Flower and Marja-Leena Hänninen have argued. 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 maior in his Pro Caelio. There, he directly compares the male imagines of the gens Claudia with the exempla of Clodia’s female maior Quinta Claudia P.f. (RE 435) and the Vestal Claudia A.p.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 triumpphantem ab inimico tribuno plebe de currui detrahi 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)?

---

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.

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 me125?

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*126. 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 BCE127. 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*128.

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 imagini-bus, 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.
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.  

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). 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 aedile-ship 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):

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

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.

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*. He and his family inhe-
rited 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 (Pf.) (RE 419, PIR² C 1475) illuminates the connection between an elite woman’s matrilineal ancestry and the tituli accompanying imagines (Prop. 4.11.29-32)¹³³. 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, PIR² C 1437) and the gens Scribonia through her mother Scribonia L.f. (RE 32, PIR² S 274) – and in this recollection she alludes to both her patrilineal and matrilineal tituli¹³⁴:

Si cui fama fuit per avita tropaea decori, / aera Numantinos nostra loquentur avos: / altera maternos exaequat turba Libones, / et domus est titulis utraque fulia sui (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]¹³⁵.

Cornelia, wife of Paullus Aemilius Lepidus (RE 82, PIR² A 373, cos. suff. 34 BCE) and sister of either Publius Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus (RE 223, PIR² C 1396, cos. 18 BCE) or Publius Cornelius Scipio (RE 333, PIR² 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 one¹³⁶. 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.
was daughter of Lucius Scribonius Libo (RE 19) and sister of Lucius Scribonius Libo (RE 20, PIR² S 264, cos. 34 BCE)\textsuperscript{137}. 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, PIR² 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, PIR² M 712), who died when he was young\textsuperscript{138}:

> Neroni Galba successit nullo gradu contingens Caesarum domum, sed haud dubie nobilissimus magna et vetere prosapia, ut qui statuarum titulis pronopem et Qunini Catuli Capitolini semper ascripsit, imperator vero etiam stemma in atrio proposuerit, quo paternam originem ad Iovem, maternam ad Pasiphaem Minonis uxorem referret. Imagines et elogia universi 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\textsuperscript{139}.

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, PIR² 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,

\textsuperscript{137} — On Scribonia’s *stemma*: Canas 2009, 198-209, esp. 209.

\textsuperscript{138} — For early death of Mummia Achaica: Suet. Galb. 3. Cf. Galba’s father’s second wife Livia Ocellina (PIR² L 305).

\textsuperscript{139} — Commentary: Shotter 1993, 100-101; Dondin-Payre 1994, 130-131.
cos. 146 BCE) victor over Corinth. 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 Pasippaea herself. Suetoniuss’ 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. 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 Pasippaea, might that suggest that she was represented by an *imago picta* or a *titulus* on this *stemma*? Suetoniuss’ *Pasiphae Minonis uxor* resembles elite female nomenclature and the brevity of *tituli* (Suet. Galb. 2). If Pasippaea 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

---


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 *gentes Servilia*, cf. n. 121.

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

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

144 — Cf. [P]aulia Cornelia Col(aei) f(ilia) Hispalli [uxor] (CIL VI.1294) and ns. 11, 31.
Caius Vitorius Hosidius Geta (RE 1, PIR² H 217), the son of his friend Marcus Vitorius Marcellus (RE 2, PIR² H 217, cos. suff. 105 CE), is blessed by his maternal *stemma*:

\[\text{Surge, agedum, iuvenemque puere preponde parentem, / stemmate materno felix, virtute paterna (Stat. Silv. 4.4.74-75).}\]

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 virtue¹⁴⁵!

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, PIR² H 217). Her father (or grandfather) received *ornamenta triumphalia* (triumphal ornaments) in 43 CE¹⁴⁶. 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 *titulus¹⁴⁷*. 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*:

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

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]¹⁴⁸:

\[\text{Stemmata vero lineis discurrebant ad imagines pictas (Plin. HN 35.6).}\]

The family trees moreover traced their lines to painted family portraits¹⁴⁹.

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-
ginus 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. 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 imagos. 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 *commen-datio 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!
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