

LIEN FOUBERT (Nijmegen)

The Palatine dwelling of the *mater familias*: houses as symbolic space in the Julio-Claudian period

Part of Augustus' architectural programme was to establish „lieux de mémoire“ that were specifically associated with him and his family.¹ The ideological function of his female relatives in this process has remained underexposed.² In a recent study on the Forum Augustum, Geiger argued for the inclusion of statues of women among those of the *summi viri* of Rome's past.³ In his view, figures such as Caesar's daughter Julia or Aeneas' wife Lavinia would have harmonized with the male ancestors of the Julii, thus providing them with a fundamental role in the historical past of the City. The archaeological evidence, however, is meagre and literary references to statues of women on the Forum Augustum are non-existing.⁴

A comparable architectural lieu de mémoire was Augustus' mausoleum on the Campus Martius.⁵ The ideological presence of women in this monument is more straight-forward. In much the same way as the Forum Augustum, the mausoleum offered Augustus' fellow-citizens a canon of excellence: only those who were considered worthy received a statue on the Forum or burial in the mausoleum.⁶ The explicit admission or refusal of Julio-Claudian women in Augustus' tomb shows that they too were considered *exempla*.

¹ The concept of lieu de mémoire is indebted to Pierre Nora, who defines it as follows: „a lieu de mémoire is any significant entity, whether material or non-material in nature, which by dint of human will or the work of time has become symbolic element of the memorial heritage of any community“. Nora (1996) xvii. For the application of the concept of lieux de mémoire to the study of the Ancient World, see for instance Jung (2006); Stein-Hölkeskamp/Hölkeskamp (2006). All translations of ancient authors are taken from the Loeb Classical Library editions, unless stated otherwise. Translations of Tacitus' *Annales* are taken from Woodman (2004). I would like to thank the Royal Netherlands Institute in Rome for supporting me during my research stay and for providing an inspiring place to work. Furthermore, I would like to thank O. J. Hekster, E. A. Hemelrijk, E. M. Moormann, S. T. A. M. Mols and G. J. L. Burgers for their comments on earlier drafts.

² For a recent contribution to the debate on the use of „gender“ to make an ideological point, see Milnor (2005) 50–53 (on the Danaid portico) and 53–64 (on the porticoes of Livia and Octavia).

³ Geiger (2008) esp. 107–115, 131–133.

⁴ On the Forum of Augustus, see also Zanker (1988) 210–215; Spannagel (1999); Geiger (2008) 129–137. Perhaps one should rather look at the Porticus Octaviae for a female equivalent of the *summi viri*. The presence of a statue dedicated to one paragon of female virtue, Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi, in a building dedicated to another ideal matron, Octavia, sister of Augustus, might allude to a place of memory for Roman heroines. This, of course, remains highly tentative.

⁵ Strabo 5.3.8.

⁶ Augustus' active policy of creating lieux de mémoire did not go unnoticed by his contemporaries, as appears from Vitruvius (1 praef. 3): „I observe that you (i.e. Augustus) have built much and still are building; and that in the future, too, you will show a concern for both public and private buildings commensurate with the greatness of our history, so that they will be consigned to memory for the benefits of our descendants.“ On the subject of Rome as memory landscape see Edwards (1996) 27–43 and Gowing (2005) 132–159.

The present article focuses on the role of Julio-Claudian women in the creation of Augustan lieux de mémoire, emphasizing their ideological presence on the Palatine Hill. From both literary and non-literary sources, it appears that Augustus wanted to turn his house on the Palatine into a lieu de mémoire. Its location besides the so-called Casa Romuli and the construction of the temple of Apollo, among many other things, contributed highly to this. Though it has been agreed upon that there was a strong association between Augustus' house as a physical entity and the *persona* of Augustus, the association between his female relatives and the house has never been fully studied. This study aims to fill in this lacuna by focusing, firstly, on Livia's role in the construction of an Augustan lieu de mémoire on the Palatine, and, secondly, the function and preservation of the Augustan complex as a symbolic space during the Julio-Claudian period and shortly after.

The construction of a lieu de mémoire: Livia's actions on the Palatine

The construction of Augustus' Palatine lieu de mémoire started in 42 B.C.⁷ After having lived near the Forum for several years, Octavian moved to the house of Q. Hortensius on the Palatine Hill. After their marriage in 39 B.C., Livia went to live with her husband in his newly purchased house.⁸ Over the years, he expanded his house by acquiring adjoining sites through his agents.⁹ At some point, possibly in 36 B.C., his property was struck by lightning. The auspices were taken and Octavian decided to consecrate the damaged area to Apollo by building him a temple and porticoes. His own house was replaced at public expense in compensation for his gift to the Roman people.¹⁰ In A. D. 3, parts of the house together with the temple of Magna Mater had to be rebuilt after destruction by a fire.¹¹ In modern scholarship, the house is often solely associated with the figure of Augustus, but the ancient sources make it clear that the residence played an essential role in the self-representation of both Augustus and Livia, during as well as after their lifetime.

Whether Livia had a separate residential building within the Augustan complex, as is often believed based on the presence of the so-called Casa di Livia, is under the present archaeological circumstances still impossible to determine. In 1869, Pietra Rosa started the excavation of what is now called the Casa di Livia. Few detailed reports on these early excavations are preserved, which makes any interpretation of this complex even

⁷ Since several recent studies have been dedicated to the house of Augustus, it will suffice here to give a concise overview of the historical background and the architectural structures of the building. See most recently Iacopi (2008); Carandini (2008).

⁸ Barrett (2002) 26. Cf. according to Vell. 2.95.1, Drusus was born *intra Caesaris penates*.

⁹ Suet. Aug. 72; Vell. 2.81.3. Little is known about the identity of the properties purchased by Augustus. Besides the house of Hortensius, the house of Catullus definitely belonged to the *Domus* of Augustus, since, according to Suetonius, Gaius and Lucius Caesar received part of their education in what used to be the *atrium* of Catullus (Suet. gramm. 17). It is, however, uncertain when the house was added. Every reconstruction of Augustus' house remains tentative, since the area has not yet been completely excavated and several of the findings have not been published. On the formation and character of Augustus' residence see Degraasi (1966–1967) 77–116; Carettoni (1983); Corbier (1992) 871–916; Donderer (1995) 621–630; Royo (1999) 77–78, 119–123, 144–171; Tomei (2000) 7–36; Meyboom (2006) 219–274, with footnotes. See also Iacopi, s.v. *domus*: Augustus (Palatium), in: LTUR, 46–48. Carandini/Bruno (2008) 30–50, 138–179, name as possible other republican owners Q. Caecilius Metellus Celer, P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther and Q. Lucretius Vespillus.

¹⁰ Suet. Aug. 29.3; Cass. Dio 49.15.5; See also Meyboom (2006) nn. 86–107; Hekster/Rich (2006) 151–152.

¹¹ Vell. 2.81.3; Suet. Aug. 72.

more difficult.¹² The identification of this house with the figure of Livia rests on the discovery of a lead pipe by Rosa with the inscription IULIAE AUG. in an underground *cryptoporticus*, which led from the Casa di Livia to the archaeological complex underneath the Domus Flavia.¹³ Rosa did not hesitate to identify this Julia Augusta with the wife of Augustus and hence the house took her name.¹⁴ The identification, however, is still under discussion. In the same area, two other lead pipes were found. One was situated in the underground *cryptoporticus* going from the Casa di Livia to the temple of Apollo and bears the name of Domitian.¹⁵ A third pipe connected the Casa di Livia with the Domus Tiberiana and probably belongs to the Severan period.¹⁶ All three pipes were connected with each other and some scholars take it that the Julia Augusta of the *fistula* should be dated later than the Augustan period, favoring identification with Julia, daughter of Titus, or even Julia Domna.¹⁷ In most studies, however, identification with Livia is still considered the most likely, but one should bear in mind that the only material evidence for this is open to question.¹⁸ In any case, neither the archaeological context nor the ancient literature allows to distinguish between a separate residence for Livia and one for Augustus.

It has been widely admitted that in much the same way as the republican owners before him, Augustus attributed a great symbolic value to his residence.¹⁹ On the one hand, the location near religious monuments such as the temple of Magna Mater and the alleged hut of Rome's legendary founder Romulus provided Augustus' *domus* with a sacred aura. As is well-known, he further exploited this by building the temple of Apollo and integrating the cult of Vesta in his house. On the other hand, Augustus contributed to the symbolic value of his *domus* through the creation of stories and impressions concerning his house and relatives, almost mythologizing the building and its inhabitants. For instance, his explicit reference in the *Res Gestae* to the gift by senate's decree of the *corona civica* and the laurel trees, which were attached to his doorpost, clearly illustrates how he made his *domus* a public affair.²⁰ The ideological impact later became clear from certain coin types, both in Rome and the provinces, showing images of the *corona civica* and the laurel, in one case even with the inclusion of Augustus' front door.²¹ Obviously, a *domus* without a *mater familias* is incomplete.²² From the ancient sources it clearly appears that

¹² For a history of the excavations, together with excerpts from Rosa's letters treating these excavations, see Tomei (1999) 363–440. See also Iacopi, s.v. *domus*: Livia, in: LTUR, 130–132.

¹³ CIL XV 7264. Tomei (2000) 18–20.

¹⁴ Cf. the letter by Pietro Rosa, quoted in Tomei (2000) 18, n. 18. See also Tomei (1990) 98.

¹⁵ CIL XV 7285: IMP DOMITIANI CAESAR AUG. SUB CURA // EUTYCHI L. PROC. FEC. HYMNUS CAESAR N. SER.

¹⁶ CIL XV 7265: L. PESCENNIUS EROS CAESARUM. On the excavation of these pipes, see also Tomei (1999) 422–428. The date of this *fistula*, however, remains uncertain; cf. De Kleijn (2001) 151, n. 156 and Solin (2003) 354, who suggest a Julio-Claudian date.

¹⁷ E.g. Lugli (1946) 459; Lugli (1970) 167; Richardson (1992) 73; Claridge (1998) 129; Tomei (2000) 19–20. Iacopi (n. 12) 130.

¹⁸ Most recently, see, Adams (2008) 59.

¹⁹ See Wiseman (1987); Corbier (1992); Hekster/Rich (2006).

²⁰ R. Gest. div. Aug. 34.

²¹ E.g. RIC I² Augustus 33a–b, 36a–b, 50a–b, 51, 52a–b, 277, 327–9, 419, 549. Cf. Zanker (1988) 92–93.

²² In Roman society, a precise definition or a specialized usage in legal discourse of the term *mater familias* did not exist in the same way as it did with regard to the term *pater familias*. Modern studies often define *mater familias* as 'the mistress of the house', 'a respectable married woman' or 'a matron'. Already in antiquity the term was not clear and ancient authors considered various criteria, including the right to own property,

Augustus also attributed an important role to his wife in the elevation of his residence from the private to the public sphere. Suetonius states that Augustus presented his house as a stage of matronal display, claiming that the clothes he wore were hand-made by Livia and his daughter and granddaughters, thus associating them with one of the activities par excellence of an ideal Roman *matrona*.²³ Her role as a supervising *mater familias* in the upbringing of several children living with her in the Augustan residence confirmed her role as an exemplary matron. It is known that Caligula and Claudius, among others, spent their childhood under Livia's care and that other imperial children had received teachers from Livia's household staff.²⁴ These examples clearly show that until his death Augustus deliberately attempted to create a lieu de mémoire on the Palatine and that he believed that Livia had her role to play.

After A.D. 14, Livia emphasized her role as a *mater familias* of the imperial family and legitimized her presence on the Palatine by recalling the image of her husband and her marriage to him, and connecting this *memoria* to the location of their residence. Both Tacitus and Cassius Dio state that after the death of Augustus, probably already in A.D. 14 but a later date is also possible,²⁵ Livia organised the *ludi Palatini*, a festival on the Palatine in her husband's honour.²⁶ Lasting three days originally but soon extending to a longer period, the festival was celebrated by many emperors to come.²⁷ The festivities started with a sacrifice to Augustus and included various theatrical displays, for which a theater made of wood was temporarily constructed in the *area palatina*. Though a consensus of where this area should be located has not yet been reached, most scholars agree that it was near the house of Augustus.²⁸ In addition, it has been established that the first day of the festival took place on 17 January, which was the anniversary of the wedding of Livia and Augustus.²⁹ From the *fasti Verulani*, it appears that this day became a public holiday by senatorial decree.³⁰ The celebration of this holiday seems to have been centred on the

motherhood, or marital status. In this article, the definition of Ulpian (Dig. 50.16.46.1) is maintained which claims that a *mater familias* is she [...] *quae non inhoneste vixit. Matrem enim familias a ceteris feminis mores discernunt atque separant; proinde nihil intererit, nuptia sit an vidua, ingenua sit an libertina; nam neque nuptiae neque natales faciunt matrem familias, sed boni mores.* — „[...] who lives not dishonorably. For character distinguishes and separates a *mater familias* from other women; accordingly it makes no difference whether she is married or a widow, freeborn or freed; for neither marriage nor birth make a *mater familias*, but good character.“ Saller (1999) 195, established that the term was most often used with this meaning, though an additional meaning of ‚mother of the family‘ or ‚mistress of the household‘ is not excluded.

²³ Suet. Aug. 64.73. On *lanam facere* as a characteristic of ideal Roman women, see Larsson Lovén (1998).

²⁴ CIL VI 33787; VI 3998; VI 4352; Suet. Aug. 48; Suet. Cal. 10; Suet. Tib. 3. Cf. Kunst (1998) on the social function of Livia's *domus* after the death of Augustus.

²⁵ On the conflicting passages of Tacitus and Dio, see Goodyear (1981) 156–157. See also Taylor (1937).

²⁶ Tac. ann. 1.73.3; Cass. Dio 56.46.5; Ios. ant. Iud. 19.70–114. Cf. Swan (2004) 357.

²⁷ The emperor Caligula was murdered during the *ludi palatini*: Cass. Dio 59.29.2; Suet. Cal. 56.1; Suet. Cal. 58.1; Ios. ant. Iud. 19.77. Barrett (2002) 184–185, 329–330.

²⁸ Generally, it is assumed that the *area Palatina* was located at the top of the *clivus Palatinus*, in the open space between the Domus Tiberiana and the Domus Augustana. On the location of the *area palatina*, see M. Torelli, s.v. *Area Palatina*, LTUR, 119; Wiseman (1991) 104–105; L. Richardson, s.v. *Area Palatina*, in: Richardson (1992) 32; Royo (1999) 138–141. See, however, also Tomei (2000) 27, who locates the area in the narrow space between the Casa di Livia and the Domus Flavia.

²⁹ *Fasti Furi* Filocali and *Fasti Polemii Silii*: I(nscriptiones) It(aliae) 13.2.239, 264, 400–401. *Fasti Verulani*: IIt. 13.2.160–161. See also Royo (1999) 276; Swan (2004) 357.

³⁰ *Feriae ex s(enatus) c(onsulto) quod eo die Augusta nupsit divo Aug[us]t[us]* — „Holiday by senatorial decree, because on this day the Augusta married the divine Augustus“ (IIt. 13.2.161, own translation). The entry relating to the marriage in the *Fasti Verulani* has been called into question by Deggrassi (IIt. 13.2.401–402), who sug-

Palatine Hill. The veneration of the first imperial couple was firmly established in Rome. Besides the importance of their wedding day, a well-known earlier example of this is Livia's dedication of an aedes Concordiae in 7 B.C., which, according to Ovid, she dedicated on the Oppian Hill to celebrate her harmonious marriage to Augustus.³¹ After Augustus' death, Livia tried to maintain a symbolic status quo on the Palatine, using his memory for her own strategies of self-representation. The *ludi Palatini* with its sacrifices to the divine Augustus would have highlighted Livia's new role as *sacerdos* of her husband.³²

The same veneration of their exemplary marriage also appears on the Palatine Hill after Livia's death. In A.D. 41, Claudius deified Livia on her wedding anniversary and the Arvals sacrificed to the divine couple on the Palatine.³³ Furthermore, Claudius put her statue next to that of her husband in an Augusteion.³⁴ An identification of this Augusteion with the shrine Pliny visited and of which he states that it was erected by Livia to her deified husband remains uncertain and the possibility remains that there were two shrines to Augustus on the Palatine, of which at least one was set up by Livia.³⁵

In short, it is clear that Livia emphatically tried to keep the symbolic association between the Palatine Hill and her husband alive. As a natural consequence, her efforts and the emphasis that was put on the anniversary of the wedding day of the imperial couple gave her own presence on the Palatine a symbolic character as well. After her death, this symbolic nature was acknowledged and enhanced when the cult of the Diva Augusta was added to that of the Divus Augustus on the Palatine by Claudius.

Exploiting a symbolic space: the Palatine residence of the mater familias

The creation of the Palatine complex as a lieu de mémoire by Augustus and its preservation by Livia after his death provided their relatives with a space that had both private and public connotations. The symbolic power of the residence showed to be a useful means of self-representation for Augustus' family, as becomes clear from the occupation of the house during the remainder of the Julio-Claudian period. From the literary sources it appears that the residence was primarily reserved as the living space of the imperial *matres familias*.³⁶

gests that the actual reason for making 17 January a public holiday was not the wedding day of Livia and Augustus (whoever inscribed it as such in the *Fasti* did so in error), but because of Tiberius' dedication of the Ara Numinis Augusti. Cf. Taylor (1937); Barrett (2002) 320.

³¹ Ov. fast. l.649. See Flory (1984); Purcell (1986); Simpson (1991); Severy (2003) 131–138; Barrett (2002) 315–316.

³² Cass. Dio 56.46.2.

³³ CIL VI 2032, ll. 15–18; *Commentarii fratrum arvalium qui supersunt* 17.1.16–17. Cf. Flory (1995) 133–134.

³⁴ Cass. Dio 60.5.2. Cf. Cecamore (2002) 159–164.

³⁵ Plin. nat. 12.94; on this passage see Rehak (1990) 117–125. Different denotations in literary sources for shrines and temples to Divus Augustus have led to some confusion on which shrine is meant by Pliny. Ancient sources make mention of *Sacrarium Divi Augusti*, *Templum Divi Augusti quod est in Palatio*, *Templum Novum Divi Augusti*, *Templum Augusti*, *Aedes Caesarum*, *Aedes Divorum*. For an overview of the sources and the various modern theories concerning the location of each of these shrines or temples, see Cecamore (2002) 159–164. For the purpose of this contribution it suffices to determine that there was at least one sacred place on the Palatine that became closely associated with both Augustus and Livia. See also M. Torelli, s.v. Augustus, Divus, Sacrarium; Aedes, in: LTUR, 143–145.

³⁶ Note that Augustus' successors built their own living arrangements: Tiberius moved to his so-called Domus Tiberiana, which was later modified by Caligula and reoccupied by Claudius, and Nero started with the Domus Transitoria and ended with the Domus Aurea. Cf. e.g. Tamm (1963); Royo (1999).

After her divorce from Mark Antony in 32 B.C., Octavian's sister Octavia moved to the Palatine *domus*.³⁷ Only Plutarch refers to her dwelling, though the meaning of his words are debated. He claims that after Octavia had returned from Athens around 35 B.C., where she was humiliated by Antony and sent back to Rome, she remained in the house of her husband. She took care of all Antony's children and received and helped all of his friends. Plutarch emphasizes that she acted as if Antony was at home, even though her brother asked her to come to live with him and Livia, an offer which Octavia declined. In 32 B.C., however, Antony evicted Octavia from his house, after which she moved out taking all of Antony's children, except his eldest son by Fulvia, with her. We do not know with certainty where Octavia lived after her divorce, but the house of her brother Octavian and his wife Livia seems the most likely choice.³⁸ The presence of Octavia and her children in the Augustan residence would have emphasized the symbolic value of the *domus*. The imperial household centred around Octavia and Livia as *matres familias* strengthened the idea that the imperial residence could be perceived as a place where traditional behaviour was considered of paramount importance. In the literary sources, Livia and Octavia functioned as flag-bearers of the Augustan family-values.

A third female member of the Julio-Claudian family who lived in the Palatine house and played a prominent role in the imperial self-representation was Antonia the Younger. In his *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*, Valerius Maximus states that after the death of her husband Drusus in 9 B.C., Antonia went to live with her mother-in-law Livia.³⁹ Antonia's presence contributed to the positive representation of the Palatine *domus*. Not only did she share the supervision of the imperial children with Livia, later on in Tiberius' reign she also took care of a circle of young foreign princes and princesses.⁴⁰ With Livia, Octavia and Antonia as *matres familias*, the Augustan residence achieved a highly symbolic value as a *domus* where ideal matronal behaviour was on display.

The final mention of a Julio-Claudian woman living on the Palatine appears in Tacitus' *Annales*. This passage on Agrippina the Younger illustrates perhaps most clearly the symbolic power of a house and the role it could play in the representation of women. In his account of Nero's reign, Tacitus pays much attention to the relationship between the emperor and his mother. As is well-known, the discord between them grew continuously and resulted in Agrippina's eviction of Nero's palace. Tacitus states:

Ac ne coetu salutantium frequentaretur, separat domum matremque transfert in eam, quae Antoniae fuerat, quotiens ipse illuc ventitaret, saeptus turba centurionum et post breve osculum digrediens. Nihil rerum mortalium tam instabile ac fluxum est quam fama potentiae non sua vi nixa[e]. statim relictum Agrippinae limen: nemo solari, nemo adire praeter paucas feminas, amore an odio incertas.
(Tac. ann. 13.18–19)

„To prevent her from being surrounded by a throng of well-wishers, Nero made his house separate and transferred his mother to that

³⁷ Plut. Ant. 54.2; 57.3. Kokkinos (2002) 10, 148.

³⁸ Kokkinos (2002) 147–148.

³⁹ Val. Max. 4.3.3: *quae post eius excessum forma et aetate florens conivictum socrus pro coningio habuit* – „After his death, in the flower of her age and beauty, she slept with her mother-in-law in lieu of her husband.“ Cf. Kokkinos (2002) 16, 148.

⁴⁰ E.g. Ios. ant. Iud. 18.103; 18.143; 18.164–167; Cass. Dio 59.24.1; Tac. ann. 6.40. Cf. Braund (1984) 142–143; Kokkinos (2002) 25.

which had been Antonia's, surrounding himself, whenever he paid a personal visit there, with a crowd of centurions and withdrawing after only a brief kiss. Nothing in mortal affairs is so unstable and fleeting as the fame of a power that relies on a strength not its own. Immediately, Agrippina's threshold was deserted: no one consoled her, no one approached her, except a few ladies, whether from love or hate being uncertain."

According to Tacitus, Nero's measure to remove his mother from the palace was one in a series of attempts to reduce her influential position in Roman society.⁴¹ The move of Agrippina to Antonia's *domus* had a direct bearing on the number of visitors at her daily *salutatio*.⁴² Not because Antonia's house was farther away, as Tacitus makes clear, but because Agrippina was no longer near the emperor, the person who actually mattered.⁴³ It is most likely that Agrippina was transferred to the Augustan complex in which Antonia had lived with Livia.⁴⁴ A remark of Suetonius on this same episode seems at first sight to contradict this conclusion, but a closer reading will show that in fact both his and Tacitus' passage complement each other. In his „Life of Nero“, Suetonius writes:

Matrem facta dictaque sua exquirentem acerbius et corrigentem hactenus primo gravabatur, ut invidia identidem oneraret quasi cessurus imperio Rhodumque abiturus, mox et honore omni et potestate privavit abductaque militum et Germanorum statione contubernio quoque ac Palatio expulit; neque in divexanda quicquam pensi habuit, summissis qui et Romae morantem litibus et in secessu quiescentem per convicia et tocos terra marique praetervehentes inquietarent. (Suet. Nero 34)

„His mother offended him by too strict surveillance and criticism of his words and acts, but at first he confined his resentment to frequent endeavours to bring upon her a burden of unpopularity by pretending that he would abdicate the throne and go off to Rhodes. Then depriving her of all her honours and of her guard of Roman and German soldiers, he even forbade her to live with him and drove her from the Palace. After that he passed all bounds in harrying her, bribing men to annoy her with lawsuits while she remained in the city, and after she had retired to the country, to pass her house by land and sea and break her rest with abuse and mockery.“

Both authors clearly agree on the fact that at first Nero and Agrippina lived in the same palace, which at this point would still have been the so-called *Domus Transitoria*. Suetonius, however states that Agrippina was driven *ac Palatio*. Some scholars have taken this to mean that she was expelled from the Palatine Hill all together.⁴⁵ However, as Suetonius clearly makes a distinction between a period shortly after her eviction during which she remained in the city and a later period during which she retreated to

⁴¹ First one of Agrippina's influential *liberti*, Pallas, was removed from office (Tac. ann. 13.14); later Nero also deprived his mother of her guard (Tac. ann. 13.18).

⁴² Cassius Dio (57.12.2; 60.32.6^a) states that both Livia and Agrippina were allowed to hold official *salutationes* and that this privilege was even recorded in the public records.

⁴³ Paterson (2007) 128–130.

⁴⁴ See also Barrett (1996) 173.

⁴⁵ See, for instance, Winterling (1999) 56 n. 52.

the coast,⁴⁶ one should remark that there is no other *domus* of Antonia in Rome attested besides the one on the Palatine Hill.⁴⁷ In addition, Suetonius' usage of *Palatium* can be explained through the development of the word *Palatium* as a synonym for wherever the emperor lived. Studies of the usage of the Latin words *Palatium*, *Palatia* or *Palatinus* have revealed that over time the meaning of the word *Palatium* shifted.⁴⁸ In the literary works of authors writing in the Augustan period, the word *Palatium* was still solely used to refer to the Palatine Hill.⁴⁹ The meaning of the word started to change with the construction of the palace of Domitian. Authors like Statius, Juvenal and Martial, who wrote during this period, used *Palatium* both to mean the hill and the residence of the emperor.⁵⁰ After this period, however, *Palatium* became established as the building in which the emperor lived and the word was often used anachronistically with regard to the Julio-Claudian period. In Suetonius' „Lives“ in general as well as in his „Life of Nero“ in particular, *Palatium* is applied unsystematically: both *Palatium* meaning ‚Palatine Hill‘ and *Palatium* meaning ‚imperial residence‘ appear.⁵¹ It is clear, therefore, that the passage of Suetonius does not necessarily indicate Agrippina's removal of the Palatine Hill all together and that identification between Agrippina's new residence and the Augustan *domus* remains the strongest possibility.

How this house should be envisioned is more difficult. Opinions disagree on how the Augustan complex was constructed, and recent excavations might indicate that the entire structure was even bigger than what is now believed to be the Domus Augusti.⁵² Based on the present status of the excavations, however, scholars have come to divide the house of Augustus in a private and a public residence.⁵³ The remains that are currently on

⁴⁶ Suetonius probably refers to the *villa maritima* at ancient Bauli, which had previously belonged to Hortensius and which Agrippina the Younger had inherited from Antonia the Younger. This *villa* is also the location of Agrippina's murder. Cf. Bicknell (1963); Katzoff (1963); Barrett (1996) 244–246; Kokkinos (2002) 153–154; D'Arms (2003) 173–175.

⁴⁷ Note further that Tacitus too denotes Antonia's quarters as *domus* (and not as e.g. *villa*), which also hints at a location in the city.

⁴⁸ Viarre (1961); Tamm (1963) 57–59; Royo (1991); Royo (1999) 157–171, 375–377; Winterling (1999) 209–217; Alessio (2006).

⁴⁹ One has often seen an exception in Ov. met. 1.175–176, but Winterling (1999) 210, has shown that the Ovidian phrase *Palatia caeli* should be understood as a heavenly equivalent of the Palatine Hill in its entirety and not as a mere residence. See also Tamm (1963) 58–59.

⁵⁰ E.g. Stat. silv. 1.1.34; 4.1.8; 3.4.38; 3.3.85; Iuv. 2.106; 4.31; 6.117; Mart. Epigr(ammata) 4.5.7; 9.91.3. In this context it should be noted that in Pliny's *Panegyricus*, the attribution of *Palatium* to the residence was avoided. Instead Pliny referred to the dwelling of the emperor as *domus*, perhaps as a deliberate attempt to distance Trajan from Domitian (Plin. paneg. 47.6; 49.2; 79.6; only once is the palace called *Palatium*, i.e. 23.6, but in this case Pliny verbatim equals it to *domus*). Winterling (1999) 212.

⁵¹ Suet. *Nero* 25.2 (Palatine Hill); Suet. *Nero* 31 (imperial residence); Suet. *Nero* 34 (Palatine Hill). See Winterling (1999) 213–214, nn. 36–40, for examples in Suetonius' other „Lives“. Why Winterling (1999) 213, claims that „Suetons Sprachgebrauch ist im Vergleich zu Tacitus weniger systematisch, aber auch weniger anachronistisch; bis zur Nerovita benutzt er *Palatium* noch in der alten Bedeutung ‚Palatin‘, danach nicht mehr“ is puzzling. Especially when one considers not only the usage of *Palatium* in the „Life of Nero“, but also the anachronistic application of the word in the „Life of Caligula“ (Suet. Cal. 54.2) as Winterling himself indicates.

⁵² In a press release in January 2008, Tomei announced that excavations in the area of the so-called Domus Tiberiana revealed a system of *cryptoportici* which might be dated to the Augustan period. If so, according to Tomei, the Domus Augusti might have extended as far as the Domus Tiberiana. Nothing on these excavations has been published so far. See Bucci (2008). Cf. Tomei (2000) 20.

⁵³ Tomei (2000) 28–29; Carandini/Bruno (2008) 70–72, 77–81, 180–183, 188–198. A parallel of this division can be found in studies on the Domus Flavia, which is often divided in public and private quarters.

display belong to an early construction phase of the private quarters,⁵⁴ while the public *domus* was first integrated in the Neronian complex and later built over by Domitian. The temple of Apollo stood in between. The so-called ‚Casa di Livia‘ was integrated in the Domus Augusti.⁵⁵ Based on the current state of the excavations, it is impossible to determine whether a special part of the Augustan structure was reserved for Livia, and perhaps consequently for the other imperial women living there. In their recent reconstruction of the house of Augustus, Carandini and Bruno tentatively identify two *triclinia* and *cubicula* as the (separated) personal quarters of Augustus and Livia, but there is no solid reason for this.⁵⁶ The assumption, therefore, is that these women lived in the Augustan complex in its broadest sense, though not necessarily in the same quarters.⁵⁷ In any case, for the purpose of this contribution, the exact determination of their living quarters would not make that much of a difference, since it is hard to imagine that ancient authors would specify the different living arrangements within the same walls in their literary descriptions.

The afterlife of the Augustan complex

A study of the afterlife of the Augustan residential complex will add to the proposed idea of symbolic importance of the *domus*. Based on a passage in Suetonius' ‚Life of Augustus‘ in which the author describes the austerity of the house and the simplicity of its furniture, scholars have regularly assumed that the residence, or at least a part of the residence, was still existent and accessible to visitors in Suetonius' time.⁵⁸ Though the passage is open to interpretation, the preservation of Augustus' living arrangements on the Palatine would not have been a unique example. Suetonius further makes mention of a nursery room in a house near Velitrae, where according to local legends Augustus was born.⁵⁹ Though the house seemed to have been the property of a private citizen, the nursery room itself was kept unaltered and no one was allowed to enter without the appropriate ceremonial acts. Furthermore, a part of the Roman house where he was born according to another tradition, located *ad capita bubula* in the Palatine quarters, was also consecrated as a *sacrarium*.⁶⁰ In addition, Dio states that the house in Nola, where Augustus died, was also consecrated to him.⁶¹ The veneration of these buildings associated with Augustus originated from the Roman belief that the design and decoration of a

⁵⁴ On the various construction phases, see below pp. 74–75.

⁵⁵ During Rosa's excavations a Republican street was revealed south of the Casa di Livia. Because of this street, Kokkinos (2002) 148 believes that there should be a strict division between the house of Livia and that of Augustus (see also Kleiner [1996] 34). Nowadays, however, most scholars agree that both houses were connected and that Octavian built over this street during the second phase of his building activities. See, e.g., Carettoni (1953) 126–147 (for the excavation report of this street); Carettoni (1960) 202; Iacopi (2008) 14; Carandini/Bruno (2008) fig. 82a. Donderer (1995) 625–626, sees the house as a residential complex resembling a small city with narrow streets in between the various parts.

⁵⁶ Carandini/Bruno (2008) 53 fig. 23b, 189 fig. 82b, 191.

⁵⁷ On the difficulties of assigning rooms to particular persons or groups within the household, see Ellis (2000) 166–170.

⁵⁸ Suet. Aug. 72–73. Note, however, Milnor (2005) 81 n. 69, who rightly argues that Suetonius only claims that he saw some of Augustus' furniture. Whether he saw them in the Domus Augusti or somewhere else he does not state. See also Carandini/Bruno (2008) 83–84; Iacopi (2008) 14.

⁵⁹ Suet. Aug. 6. Cf. Donderer (1995) 649–650.

⁶⁰ Suet. Aug. 5., M. Torelli, s.v. Domus: Augustus (*ad Capita Bubula*), in: LTUR, 45. Cf. Donderer (1995) 650.

⁶¹ Cass. Dio 56.46.3–4.

house captured the character of the owner. A house, or parts of it, was regarded as an extension of the man, „a tangible symbol of his accomplishments“, as Bodel puts it.⁶² As a result, residences of illustrious Romans, like Augustus, could become objects of veneration and even tourist attractions.⁶³

Though the archaeological context of the Palatine residence is far from clear, there are sufficient indications to assume that there has in fact been a preservation of the Augustan residential complex in antiquity. Partly because of the absence of detailed reports on the early excavations by Pietro Rosa, it is difficult to reconstruct the various building phases of the residence. With regard to the later preservation of the house, for instance, it is hard to determine how far-reaching the building activities of Domitian were in this area of the Palatine. That he constructed his palace on top of what is now called the public part of the Domus Augusti has been widely agreed upon, but opinions differ on the exact nature of his interventions in the so-called private *domus*. Until recently, scholars believed that Domitian filled in the by then abandoned house of Augustus to construct his own residence.⁶⁴ The most recent research, however, has revealed that parts of the Domus Augusti were indeed filled in, levelling the complex with the temple of Apollo, but these construction activities should be ascribed to Octavian himself and not Domitian.⁶⁵ If correct, the house of Augustus, or at least a part of it, was preserved as an object of veneration throughout the Julio-Claudian period and probably even later until at least part of the reign of Domitian.

The fact that Domitian undertook a lot of building activities in the city of Rome, after some areas were severely damaged by the fires of A.D. 64 and 80, is well-known. The precise nature or extent of these activities, however, is not. Domitian focused on both the creation of new architectural projects and the restoration of existing buildings and areas.⁶⁶ Several attestations of restorations on the Palatine Hill appear in the literary sources. Domitian is credited for the restoration of the Bibliotheca Apollonis Palatini, the Domus Tiberiana, the Templum Divi Augusti and the Bibliotheca Templi Divi Augusti.⁶⁷ Though no literary source makes explicit mention of a restoration of the house of Augustus, it would certainly fit the list.⁶⁸ Some post-Augustan architectural remains in the so-called Casa di Livia do in fact suggest an intervention by Domitian. When trying to uncover the wall-paintings in the Casa di Livia, Rosa came upon walls that cut some of

⁶² Bodel (1997) 5.

⁶³ Examples of this are the house of Scipio Africanus at Liternum, to which he withdrew in his old age and of which both Livy and Seneca claim that they have visited it (Liv. 38.56.3–4; Sen. epist. 86. Cf. Plin. nat. 14.49), and the villa of Horace near Tivoli (Suet. *vita* Hor.). Examples also exist in the Greek world, e.g. the houses associated with Pindar (Plut. Alex. 11; Plin. nat. 7.29) and Alexander the Great (Cass. Dio 68.30.1). See also Donderer (1995) 648–649; Bodel (1997) 5–6; Gowing (2005) 80–81.

⁶⁴ See, for instance, Richmond (1914) 198–199; Carettoni (1988) 265. Monaco (1998) 78–82, on the other hand, dates the filling in to the eighteenth century.

⁶⁵ Carandini/Bruno (2008) 178–179; Iacopi/Tedone (2006) 353, 370–371; Iacopi (2008) 11–12.

⁶⁶ With regard to the emperor's restoration policy, Suetonius reproaches Domitian with putting his own name on the completed building instead of that of the original builder, claiming that he only did these restorations for his own glory (Suet. Dom. 5). Cf. Adams (2005) 1–15, on the representation of Domitian in Suetonius' „Lives“, with p. 7 on the role of his building programme; Darwall-Smith (1996) 179–215, on Domitian's other building activities on the Palatine.

⁶⁷ See Mart. 8.80.6; Suet. Dom. 5; Cass. Dio 66.10.1a–2; and the Chronographer of A.D. 354 in Mommsen (1961) 146. Cf. On these and other sources, Anderson (1983). For a list of Domitian's building programme, see Jones (1992) 77–94.

⁶⁸ On the incompleteness of the remaining sources, see Jones (1992) 81.

the wall-paintings in half. Calling them „costruzioni delle epoche barbariche“ and dating them to the Middle Ages, Rosa indignantly destroyed these walls, leaving hardly any trace to facilitate later interpretations.⁶⁹ Nowadays, the common opinion is that these walls follow Augustus' residential building activities of the second phase, when he levelled his house with the temple of Apollo, and that they were restored by Domitian.⁷⁰ In addition, Domitian's restoration of the system of *cryptoporticus*, which had the so-called Casa di Livia as a nuclear centre, together with the previously mentioned Domitianic *fistula* found in the underground passageway leading from the Casa di Livia confirm Domitian's building activities in this area and suggest that this part of the Augustan complex still served its purpose after the Julio-Claudian period.⁷¹

In addition, the vicinity of the so-called Casa Romuli would have made the entire area of the Domus Augusti an area of interest with regard to veneration and preservation for later emperors. On the south slope of the Palatine, near the Scalae Caci, remains of iron-age huts were identified with what the Romans believed to be the ‚huts of Romulus‘. Numerous literary sources state the importance of this area in antiquity and the efforts to preserve the memory of the legendary founder of Rome.⁷² Dionysius of Halicarnassus in particular claims that the huts were preserved in his day and that no ornaments were added to it, unless damage had made it necessary, in which case they tried to restore the hut as nearly as possible to its former condition.⁷³ The house of Augustus, therefore, would have been an ideal candidate for preservation, not only because it was located in a symbolic space that was associated with Rome's foundation, but also because of Augustus' own association between his *persona* and Romulus. In this context, one of Martial's „Epigrams“ provides an interesting addition to this argument. In this epigram, Martial treats Domitian's restoration policy and states:

*Sanctorum nobis miracula reddis avorum
nec pateris, Caesar, saecula cana mori,
cum veteres Latiae ritus renovantur harenae
et pugnat virtus simpliciore manu.
Sic priscis servatur honos te praeside templis
et Casa tam culto sub Iove numen habet;
sic nova dum condis, revocas, Auguste, priora:
debentur quae sunt quaeque fuere tibi.
(Mart. Epigrammata 8.80)*

„You give us back, Caesar, the wonders of our venerable forebears, nor suffer ancient epochs to die, when the old usages of the Latin arena are revived and valor fights with simpler hand. Even so under your rule antique temples keep their honors and the Cot beneath a Jupiter so amply worshipped has sanctity. Thus, Augustus, while founding the new, you bring back the old. What is and what was alike are owed to you.“

⁶⁹ Rizzo (1936) 5, fig. 2 (the walls are denoted as A and B); Tomei (1999) 397, 400.

⁷⁰ Lugli (1946) 461; Tomei (1990) 97; Donderer (1995) 630; Tomei (1999) 381–383, 423, n. 177. Cf. Carandini/Bruno (2008) 188, fig. 82a. On the other hand: Richmond (1914) 198–199; Carettoni (1988) 265.

⁷¹ Romanelli (1973) 207–218.

⁷² Prop. 4.1.6; Verg. Aen. 8.654; Liv. 5.53.8; Ov. fast. 1.199; Sen. dial. 12.9.3; Mart. Epigr. 8.80.

⁷³ Dion. Hal. ant.1.79.11.

Martial clearly alludes to Domitian's restoration of a 'house of Romulus'. Unfortunately, there is no certain way to determine which of the different houses of Romulus is meant by Martial: both the hut of Romulus on the Capitoline near the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus and the hut of Romulus on the Palatine near the temple of Jupiter Victor are possible.⁷⁴ However, Martial's implicit allusion to the figure of Augustus, in his usage of the title 'Augustus' as well as in the subject of the emperor as the restorer of ancient *mores*, seems to evoke the image of the Palatine. In this light, a preservation of (a part of) the Domus Augusti together with the huts of Romulus would have contributed highly to Domitian's image as a restorer.⁷⁵

In any case, the veneration of the residence of the *princeps* was not a unique case and the preservation of living quarters continued also after Augustus. Vespasian was particularly fond of the *villa* of his grandmother at Cosa, where he had been reared, and besides visiting it frequently he left the house unaltered in order to preserve his childhood memories.⁷⁶ Domitian converted his father's house on the Quirinal, where he was born, into the temple of the *gens Flavia*.⁷⁷ Considering these examples, it should not come as a surprise that at least a part of the Domus Augusti was preserved for later generations.

In a parallel line of thinking, it should be noted that not only houses associated with men were considered symbolic space. Houses associated with women could equally constitute lieux de mémoire. With regard to Julio-Claudian women, examples exist of houses that were thought of as symbolic for the female owner or resident. The attitude of some emperors towards the houses of their female relatives after they were discredited alludes to the proposed idea of a female symbolic space.

The physical destruction of a house was a practice that was deeply rooted in Roman history. When it came into being or when it was applied for the first time cannot be determined with certainty. According to late republican and imperial authors, it had its precedents in the early republican period, though references to it remain vague.⁷⁸ In the Greek world, destruction of a house had been used since the archaic period as a punishment for traitors, murderers and thieves.⁷⁹ In the Roman world, the procedure was associated more specifically with the idea of tyranny. Suspicions of regal ambitions could lead to the annihilation of the suspect's house. Over time, the simple accusation of treason could be enough reason to proceed to such an action.⁸⁰ The most famous example of the destruction of a politician's house in the Roman Republic is of course Cicero's house on the Palatine. The confiscation and destruction of Cicero's residence was not only a fiscal sanction, robbing him from his capital, it was also a *damnatio* of the *memoria* which Cicero, a *homo novus*, had gathered over time.

With regard to the destruction of houses associated with Julio-Claudian women, two examples come to mind: Augustus' destruction of his granddaughter's *villa* and Caligula's

⁷⁴ Besides the temple of Jupiter Victor, other shrines to Jupiter are attested on the Palatine by the ancient sources. None of them, however, have been identified with actual archaeological remains. On the various houses of Romulus, see, F. Coarelli, s.v. Casa Romuli, in: LTUR, 241–242; Balland (1984) 57–80.

⁷⁵ See also Schöffel (2002) 667–675. On the symbolic association between the Casa Romuli and the Domus Augusti, see recently Rea (2007) 21–43.

⁷⁶ Suet. Vesp. 5.2.

⁷⁷ Suet. Dom. 1.1.

⁷⁸ Cf. Flower (2006) 44–51.

⁷⁹ For the Greek world, see Connor (1985) 79–102.

⁸⁰ For introductory remarks, see, Flower (2006) 44–51.

destruction of the *villa* in Herculaneum where his mother Agrippina the Elder was held by Tiberius.⁸¹ Though of a different nature, both episodes show how the house was closely connected with the memory of the woman who lived in it. The often overlooked anecdote about Augustus' destruction of Julia the Younger's house can be seen in the same light. After discussing Augustus' modest taste in domestic architecture, Suetonius claims that the *princeps* disliked large and sumptuous country palaces.⁸² The author sees an example of this dislike in Augustus' demolition of a *villa* which his granddaughter had built on a lavish scale and of which the exact location remains uncertain. Though Suetonius, who is our only source on this fact, does not specify the date of the event, it is likely that it is to be associated with Julia's disgrace of A. D. 8. Julia was exiled, like her mother Julia the Elder, the official charge being adultery though some scholars believe that Julia took part in a conspiracy against Augustus.⁸³ As a result, a certain number of measures was taken to publicly declare that Julia did no longer belong to the family. First of all, her daughter, who was born during the first year of her exile, was not recognized by Augustus. Secondly, she was not allowed burial in Augustus' mausoleum. And thirdly, her villa was razed to the ground, the implication being that the inhabitants could no longer coexist with the community at large.⁸⁴

The second example similarly shows how the image of an imperial woman could be associated with the house she had lived in. One of the first things Caligula did after his accession to the throne was to rehabilitate the reputations of his parents and his siblings. He sailed to Pontia and Pandateria to recover the remains of his mother Agrippina the Elder and his brother Nero. Tiberius had refused them burial in the mausoleum of Augustus, claiming that, like Julia the Elder and Julia the Younger, they too could no longer belong to the family. In a highly public spectacle, Caligula brought the ashes back to Rome and placed them in Augustus' funerary monument. The villa at Herculaneum, where Agrippina was held in imprisonment before her exile, was destroyed.⁸⁵ Caligula's action is described in Seneca's moral essay „On Anger“. The author presents several examples of cruel deeds which stemmed from unrestrained anger and absence of all accountability. In each case rulers endure a perceived affront, insult or indignity and react with excessive and arbitrary retribution. According to Seneca, these should be regarded as examples to be avoided.⁸⁶ His final example treats the disgrace of Agrippina:

Hic furor — quid enim aliud voces? — Romanos quoque contigit. C. enim Caesar villam in Herculanesi pulcherrimam, quia mater sua aliquando in illa custodita erat, diruit fecitque eius per hoc notabilem fortunam; stantem enim praenavigabamus, nunc causa dirutae quaeritur. (Sen. *De Ira* 3.22.1)

„Such madness — for what else can you call it? — has befallen Romans also. For Gaius Caesar destroyed a very beautiful villa near Her-

⁸¹ Suet. *Aug.* 72.3; Sen. *De Ira* 3.21.5.

⁸² Suet. *Aug.* 72.

⁸³ See, for instance, Levick (1976) 301–339; Fantham (2006) 109–110 with references.

⁸⁴ With regard to a possible parallel example, it should be noted that in their recent study on the paintings of the Villa della Farnesina in Rome, Mols and Moormann propose the *damnatio memoriae* of Julia the Elder as one of the possible reasons for the abandonment and „obliterazione intenzionale“ of the Villa (Mols/Moormann [2008] 80). The authors, however, emphasize the hypothetical nature of their suggestion.

⁸⁵ On the dating of Agrippina's imprisonment, see Scott (1939) 459–462.

⁸⁶ Sen. *De Ira* 3.22.1.

culaneum because his mother had once been imprisoned in it, and by this very act gave publicity to her misfortune; for while the villa stood, we used to sail by unconcerned, but now people ask why it was destroyed.“

The idea behind Caligula's action is clear. By razing the house, he tried to erase a memory, not of the woman herself, as Augustus' tried to do by razing Julia's house, but of what was done to her during the reign of his predecessor.⁸⁷

From the above, it clearly appears that the physical house played an essential role in the self-representation and the representation by others of Julio-Claudian men and women. The house represented the status of imperial women and their position in society. Just like the male residence, the female residence became a place of memory. The necessity of Augustus to destroy the house of his granddaughter Julia the Younger illustrates how closely the building was associated with her *persona*. Julia's social network virtually seized to exist after the destruction of the place where they met. The symbolic significance of a house associated with a woman, however, differed from that of the house of a male owner in that it had the image of the ideal Roman matron at its core. Activities taking place within the house were often evaluated along the lines of the ideal of female conduct. The Domus Augusti deserved praise because it was a stage of matronal display. Livia's actions on the Palatine Hill show that she was well aware of the symbolic power of her residence and of the importance of presenting herself as being in agreement with the traditional standards for female behaviour. She emphatically manifested her presence on the Palatine and added to the symbolic meaning of the Augustan residence. The celebration of Diva Augusta on the Palatine and the preservation of (a part of) the Domus Augusti, first as the living space of the *matres familias* of the Julio-Claudian dynasty and later as an object of veneration, shows that the Palatine structure should not only be seen as the living space of emperors. The female component was just as present and played a role in the creation of lieux de mémoire.

Summary

The physical *domus* represented the status of imperial women and their position in society. Just like the male residence, the female residence was a lieu de mémoire. Activities taking place within the house were often evaluated along the lines of the ideal of female conduct. Livia's actions on the Palatine Hill show that she was well aware of the symbolic power of her residence and of the importance of presenting herself as being in agreement with the traditional standards for female behaviour. The celebration of Diva Augusta on the Palatine and the preservation of (a part of) the Domus Augusti, first as the living space of the *matres familias* of the Julio-Claudian dynasty and later as an object of veneration, shows that the Palatine structure should not only be seen as the living space of emperors. The female component was just as present and played a role in the creation of lieux de mémoire.

Key words: Frühe Kaiserzeit, domus Augusti, Palatin, Lieu de mémoire

⁸⁷ See Flower (2006) 276.

Bibliography

- Adams (2005): G. W. Adams, Suetonius and his Treatment of the Emperor Domitian's Favourable Accomplishments, *Studia Humaniora Tartuensia* 6, 2005, 1–15.
- Adams (2008): G. W. Adams, *Rome and the Social Role of Elite Villas in its Suburbs*, Oxford, 2008.
- Alessio (2006): S. Alessio, *Praetorium e palatium* come residenze di imperatori e governatori, *Latomus* 65, 2006, 679–689.
- Anderson (1983): J. C. Anderson, A Topographical Tradition in Fourth Century Chronicles: Domitian's Building Program, *Historia* 32, 1983, 93–105.
- Balland (1984): A. Balland, La Casa Romuli au Palatin et au Capitole, *REL* 62, 1984, 57–80.
- Barrett (1996): A. A. Barrett, *Agrippina. Sex, Power, and Politics in the Early Empire*, New Haven/London 1996.
- Barrett (2002): A. A. Barrett, *Livia. First Lady of Imperial Rome*, New Haven/London 2002.
- Berg (1997): B. Berg, Cicero's Palatine Home and Clodius' Shrine of Liberty: Alternative Emblems of the Republic in Cicero's *De domo sua*, in: C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 8, Brussels 1997, 122–143.
- Bicknell (1963): P. J. Bicknell, Agrippina's Villa at Bauli, *CR* 13, 1963, 261–262.
- Bodel (1997): J. Bodel, Monumental Villas and Villa Monuments, *JRA* 10, 1997, 5–35.
- Braund (1984): D. Braund, *Rome and the Friendly King. The Character of the Client Kingship*, London 1984.
- Bucci (2008): C. A. Bucci, Palatino. Il tunnel segreto di Augusto, *Repubblica* 05/01/2008 [http://ricerca.repubblica.it/repubblica/archivio/repubblica/2008/01/05/palatino-il-tunnel-segreto-di-augusto.rm_012palatino.html, consulted on 09/06/2006].
- Cantarella (2001): E. Cantarella, *Passato prossimo. Donne romane da Tacita a Sulpicia*, Milano 2001.
- Carandini/Bruno (2008): A. Carandini/D. Bruno, *La casa di Augusto dai Lupercalia al Natale*, Bari 2008.
- Carettoni (1953): G. Carettoni, Roma (Palatino). Saggi per uno studio topografico della casa di Livia, *NSA* 1953, 126–147.
- Carettoni (1957): G. Carettoni, Roma (Palatino). Saggi nell'interno della casa di Livia, *NSc* 1957, 72–119.
- Carettoni (1960): G. Carettoni, Excavations and Discoveries in the Forum Romanum and on the Palatine during the Last Fifty Years, *JRS* 50, 1960, 192–203.
- Carettoni (1965): G. Carettoni, L'accesso al Palatino del lato sud-occidentale (Scalae Caci): sondaggio stratigrafico, *NSc* 1965, 130–140.
- Carettoni (1966–67): G. Carettoni, I problemi della zona augustea del Palatino alla luce dei recenti scavi, *RPAA* 39, 1966–1967, 55–65.
- Carettoni (1978): G. Carettoni, Roma. Le costruzioni di Augusto e il tempio di Apollo sul Palatino, in: *Archeologia laziale. I: Incontro di studio del Comitato per l'archeologia laziale*, Rome 1978, 72–74.
- Carettoni (1983): G. Carettoni, *Das Haus des Augustus auf dem Palatin*, Mainz 1983.
- Carettoni (1988): G. Carettoni, Die Bauten des Augustus auf dem Palatin, in: W.-D. Heilmeyer/M. Hoffer (eds.), *Kaiser Augustus und die verlorene Republik*, Berlin 1988, 263–267.
- Cecamore (2002): C. Cecamore, *Palatium: topografia storica del Palatino tra III sec. a. C. e I sec. d. C.*, Rome 2002.
- Cenerini (2002): F. Cenerini, *La donna romana: modelli e realtà*, Bologna 2002.
- Claridge (1998): A. Claridge, *An Oxford Archaeological Guide*, Oxford 1998.
- Cluett (1998): R. Cluett, Roman Women and Triumviral Politics, 43–37 B. C., *EMC* 17, 1998, 67–84.
- Coarelli (2007): F. Coarelli, *Rome and Environs. An Archaeological Guide*, Berkeley 2007.
- Connor (1985): R. Connor, The Razing of the House in Greek Society, *TAPhA* 115, 1985, 79–102.
- Corbier (1992): M. Corbier, De la maison d'Hortensius à la Curie sur le Palatin, *MEFRA* 104, 1992, 871–916.
- D'Arms/Zevi (1970): J. H. D'Arms/F. Zevi (eds.), *Romans on the Bay of Naples, and other Essays on Roman Campania*, Bari 2003 (contains reprint of J. H. D'Arms, *Romans on the Bay of Naples*, Cambridge [Mass.] 1970).
- Darwall-Smith (1996): R. H. Darwall-Smith, *Emperors and Architecture. A Study of Flavian Rome*, Brussels 1996.
- Degrassi (1966–67): N. Degrassi, La dimora di Augusto sul Palatino e la base di Sorrento, *RPAA* 39, 1966–67, 77–116.

- De Kleijn (2001): G. De Kleijn, *The Water Supply of Ancient Rome. City Area, Water, and Population*, Amsterdam 2001.
- Donderer (1995): M. Donderer, *Zu den Häusern des Kaisers Augustus*, MEFRA 107, 1995, 621–660.
- Edwards (1996): C. Edwards, *Writing Rome. Textual Approaches to the City*, Cambridge 1996.
- Ellis (2000): S. P. Ellis, *Roman Housing*, London 2000.
- Fantham (2006): E. Fantham, *Julia Augusta. The Emperor's Daughter*, Routledge 2006.
- Flory (1984): M. B. Flory, *Sic exempla parantur: Livia's Shrine to Concordia and the Porticus Liviae*, *Historia* 33, 1984, 309–330.
- Flory (1995): M. B. Flory, *The Deification of Roman Women*, *AHB* 9, 1995, 127–134.
- Flower (2006): H. I. Flower, *The Art of Forgetting. Disgrace and Oblivion in Roman Political Culture*, Chapel Hill 2006.
- Foubert (forthcoming): L. Foubert, *The Representation of Julio-Claudian Women*, Diss. Radboud University Nijmegen, forthcoming.
- Geiger (2008): J. Geiger, *The First Hall of Fame. A Study of the Statues in the Forum Augustum*, Leiden/Boston 2008.
- Goodyear (1981): F. R. D. Goodyear, *The Annals of Tacitus* 2, Cambridge 1981.
- Gowing (2005): A. M. Gowing, *Empire and Memory. The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture*, Cambridge 2005.
- Hales (2000): S. Hales, *At Home with Cicero*, *G&R* 47, 2000, 44–55.
- Hallett (2004): J. P. Hallett, *Matriot Games? Cornelia, Mother of the Gracchi, and the Forging of Family-Oriented Political Values*, in: E. Marshall/F. McHardy (eds.), *Women's Influence on Classical Civilization*, London/New York 2004, 26–39.
- Hekster/Rich (2006): O. Hekster/J. Rich, *Octavian and the Thunderbolt: the Temple of Apollo Palatinus and Roman Traditions of Temple Building*, *CQ* 56, 2006, 149–168.
- Hillard (1989): T. Hillard, *Republican Politics, Women and the Evidence*, *Helios* 16, 1989, 165–182.
- Iacopi (2008): I. Iacopi, *The House of Augustus: Wall Paintings*, Milan 2008.
- Iacopi/Tedone (2006): I. Iacopi/G. Tedone, *Bibliotheca e Porticus ad Apollonis*, *MDAI(R)* 112, 2006, 351–378.
- Jones (1992): B. W. Jones, *The Emperor Domitian*, London/New York 1992.
- Jung (2006): M. Jung, *Marathon und Plataiai. Zwei Perserschlachten als „lieux de mémoire“ im antiken Griechenland*, Göttingen 2006.
- Katzoff (1973): R. Katzoff, *Where was Agrippina murdered?*, *Historia* 22, 1973, 72–78.
- Kleiner (1996): D. E. E. Kleiner, *Imperial Women as Patrons of the Arts in the Early Empire*, in: D. E. E. Kleiner/S. B. Matheson (eds.), *I Claudia. Women in Ancient Rome*, New Haven 1996, 28–41.
- Kokkinos (2002): N. Kokkinos, *Antonia Augusta. Portrait of a Great Roman Lady*, London 2002.
- Kunst (1998): C. Kunst, *Zur sozialen Funktion der Domus. Der Haushalt der Kaiserin Livia nach dem Tode des Augustus*, in: P. Kneissl/V. Losemann (eds.), *Imperium Romanum. Studien zu Geschichte und Rezeption*. FS K. Christ, Stuttgart 1998, 450–471.
- Larsson Lovén (1998): L. Larsson Lovén, *Lanam Fecit. Woolworking and Female Virtue*, in: L. Larsson Lovén/A. Strömberg (eds.), *Aspects of Women in Antiquity. Proceedings of the First Nordic Symposium on Women's Lives in Antiquity* (Göteborg 12–15 June 1997), *Jonsered* 1998, 85–95.
- Leen (2000–2001): A. Leen, *Clodia Oppugnatrice: The Domus Motif in Cicero's Pro Caelio*, in *CJ* 96, 2000–2001, 141–162.
- Lefkowitz (1983): M. R. Lefkowitz, *Influential Women*, in: A. Cameron/A. Kuhrt (eds.), *Images of Women in Antiquity*, London 1983, 49–64.
- Levick (1976): B. Levick, *The Fall of Julia the Younger*, *Latomus* 35, 1976, 301–339.
- Lugli (1946): G. Lugli, *Roma antica. Il centro monumentale*, Rome 1946.
- Lugli (1951–1952): G. Lugli, *Il tempio di Apollo Aziaco e il gruppo augusteo sul Palatino*, *Atti della Accademia nazionale di San Luca* 1, 1951–1952, 26–55.
- Lugli (1970): G. Lugli, *Itinerario di Roma Antica*, Milan 1970.
- McCoy (2006): M. McCoy, *The Politics of Prostitution. Clodia, Cicero, and Social Order in the Late Roman Republic*, in: C. A. Faraone/L. K. McClure (eds.), *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World*, London 2006, 177–185.

- Meyboom (2001): P. G. P. Meyboom, Wandelingen rond het huis van Augustus op de Palatijn te Rome, *Lampas* 34, 2001, 164–192.
- Meyboom (2005): P. G. P. Meyboom, The Creation of an Imperial Tradition. Ideological Aspects of the House of Augustus, in: K. A. E. Enekel/I. L. Pfeijffer (eds.), *The Manipulative Mode. Political Propaganda in Antiquity*, Leiden/Boston 2005, 219–274.
- Milnor (2005): K. Milnor, *Gender, Domesticity and the Age of Augustus: Inventing Private Life*, Oxford 2005.
- Mols/Moormann (2008): S. T. A. M. Mols/E. M. Moormann, *La villa della Farnesina. Le pitture*, Milan 2008.
- Monaco (1990): E. Monaco, Casa di Livia. Lastre Campane, *Bollettino di Archeologia* 3, 1990, 78–82.
- Mommsen (1961): T. Mommsen (ed.), *Chronica Minora*. Saec. IV. V. VI. VII, Berlin 1961.
- Nora (1996): P. Nora, *Realms of Memory. Rethinking the French Past*, vol. 1, New York 1996.
- Paterson (2007): J. Paterson, Friends in High Places. The Creation of the Court of the Roman Emperor, in: A. J. S. Spawforth (ed.), *The Court and Court Society in Ancient Monarchies*, Cambridge 2007, 121–156.
- Pinza (1910): G. Pinza, Il tempio di Apollo Palatino, *BCAR*, 1910, 3–41.
- Purcell (1986): N. Purcell, Livia and the Womanhood of Rome, *PCPhS* 32, 1986, 78–105.
- Rea (2007): J. A. Rea, *Legendary Rome. Myth, Monuments, and Memory on the Palatine and Capitoline*, London 2007.
- Rehak (1990): P. Rehak, Livia's Dedication in the Temple of Divus Augustus on the Palatine, *Latomus* 49, 1990, 117–125.
- Richardson (1992): L. Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, London 1992.
- Richlin (1984): A. Richlin, Invective against Women in Roman Satire, *Arethusa* 17, 1984, 67–80.
- Richmond (1914): O. L. Richmond, The Augustan Palatium, *JRS* 4, 1914, 193–226.
- Rizzo (1936): G. E. Rizzo, *Le pitture della „Casa di Livia“ (Palatino)*, Rome 1936.
- Romanelli (1963): P. Romanelli, Lo scavo al tempio della Magna Mater sul Palatino e nelle sue adiacenze, *Monum. ant. Accad. Lincei* 46, 1963, 201–330.
- Romanelli (1973): P. Romanelli, Il criptoportico del Palatino, in: *Les cryptoportiques dans l'architecture romaine* (Ecole Française de Rome, 19–23 avril 1972), Rome 1973, 207–218.
- Royo (1991): M. Royo, Du Palatin au Palatium. Organisation spatiale et enjeux politiques à l'avènement d'Auguste, in: M. Pani (ed.), *Continuità e trasformazioni fra Repubblica e Principato. Istituzioni, politica, società*, Bari 1991, 83–101.
- Royo (1999): M. Royo, *Domus imperatoriae*. Topographie, formation et imaginaire des palais impériaux du Palatin (IIe siècle av. J.-C. – Ier siècle ap. J.-C.), Rome 1999.
- Saller (1994): R. P. Saller, *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family*, Cambridge 1994.
- Saller (1999): R. P. Saller, *Pater familias, Mater familias, and the Gendered Semantics of the Roman Household*, CPh 94, 1999, 182–197.
- Schöffel (2002): C. Schöffel, *Martial*, Buch 8. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar, Stuttgart 2002.
- Scott (1939): K. Scott, Notes on the Destruction of Two Roman Villas, *AJP* 60, 1939, 459–462.
- Severy (2003): B. Severy, *Augustus and the Family at the Birth of the Roman Empire*, New York/London 2003.
- Simpson (1991): C. J. Simpson, Livia and the constitution of the Aedes Concordiae. The evidence of Ovid *Fasti* 1.637 ff., *Historia* 40, 1991, 449–455.
- Skinner (1983): M. B. Skinner, Clodia Metelli, *TAPhA* 113, 1983, 273–287.
- Solin (2003): H. Solin, *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom. Ein Namenbuch*, Berlin/New York 2003.
- Spannagel (1999): M. Spannagel, *Exemplaria Principis*. Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Ausstattung des Augustusforums, Heidelberg 1999.
- Stein-Hölkeskamp/Hölkeskamp (2006): E. Stein-Hölkeskamp/K.-J. Hölkeskamp (eds.), *Erinnerungsorte der Antike: die römische Welt*, München 2006.
- Swan (2004): P. M. Swan, *The Augustan Succession. An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History, Books 55–56* (9 B. C.–A. D. 14), Oxford 2004.
- Tamm (1963): B. Tamm, *Auditorium and Palatium: A Study on Assemblyrooms in Roman Palaces during the 1st Century BC and the 1st Century AD*, Stockholm 1963.
- Taylor (1937): L. R. Taylor, Tiberius' *ovatio* and the Ara Numinis Augusti, *AJPh* 58, 1937, 185–193.

- Tomei (1990): M. A. Tomei, Gli scavi di Pietro Rosa per Napoleone III (1861–1870), in: Gli orti Farnesiani sul Palatino, Rome 1990, 61–107.
- Tomei (1997): M. A. Tomei, Museo Palatino, Milan 1997.
- Tomei (1998): M. A. Tomei, Cave e cavità sotterranee del monte Palatino, in: C. Giavirini (ed.), Il Palatino area sacra sud-ovest e Domus Tiberiana, Rome 1998, 155–176.
- Tomei (1999): M. A. Tomei, Scavi Francesi sul Palatino. Le indagini di Pietro Rosa per Napoleone III (1861–1870), Rome, 1999.
- Tomei (2000): M. A. Tomei, Le case di Augusto sul Palatino, MDAI(R) 107, 2000, 7–36.
- Tomei (2004): M. A. Tomei, Die Residenz des ersten Kaisers – der Palatin in augusteischer Zeit, in: A. Hoffmann/U. Wulf (eds.), Die Kaiserpaläste auf dem Palatin in Rom, Mainz am Rhein 2004, 6–17.
- Treggiari (1999): S. M. Treggiari, The Upper-Class House as Symbol and Focus of Emotion in Cicero, JRA 12, 1999, 33–56.
- Viarre (1961): S. Viarre, Palatium, palais, RPh 35, 1961, 241–248.
- Wikander (1991): C. Wikander, Roman Women of the Nobility: Potentates or Puppets?, in: E. Rystedt et al. (eds.), *Munuscula Romana*: Papers Read at a Conference in Lund (October 1–2, 1988), in: Celebration of the Re-Opening of the Swedish Institute in Rome, Stockholm 1991, 65–71.
- Winterling (1999): A. Winterling, *Aula Caesaris*. Studien zur Institutionalisierung des römischen Kaiserhofes in der Zeit von Augustus bis Commodus (31 v. Chr.–192 n. Chr.), München 1999.
- Wiseman (1987): T. P. Wiseman, *Conspicui postes tectaque digna deo*: the Public Image of Aristocratic and Imperial Houses in the Late Republic and Early Empire, in: *L'Urbis*. Espace urbain et histoire (Ier siècle av. J.-C.–IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.). Actes du colloque international organisé par la Centre national de la recherche scientifique et l'École française de Rome (Rome, 8–12 mai 1985), Rome 1987, 393–413.
- Wiseman (1991): T. P. Wiseman, Death of an Emperor. Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary, Exeter 1991.
- Woodman (2004): A. J. Woodman, Tacitus. The Annals, Indianapolis 2004.
- Zanker (1988): P. Zanker, The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus, Ann Arbor 1988.