ÍNDICE

CONTENTS

SUMARIO

BÉLO, Tais Pagoto, Fulvia and Octavia: the female warrior's and the matron's coins.

Resumen: Este trabajo destaca a dos mujeres, Fulvia y Octavia, personajes muy distintos entre sí: la primera no fue un modelo a ser seguido, y la última, una verdadera matrona. Para desarrollar el tema se investigaron fuentes escritas y materiales, tales como monedas. Sabidamente se utilizaron algunas fuentes escritas de origen romano para construir las jerarquías de un discurso idealizado en perspectiva con el predominio del pensamiento masculino. Sin embargo, las monedas cuñadas con el busto de estas mujeres fueron analizadas bajo la luz de lo que se quería comunicar en aquella época, especialmente sobre las estrategias de género construidas por ocasión de su acuñación, lo que sugería cuestionar la manera cómo se presentaba al público Fulvia y Octavia. Para comprender el contexto en el que vivían estas mujeres, hay que tener en cuenta que, teóricamente, en el período de la República Romana y comienzo del imperio, la familia permanecía bajo el poder del *paterfamilias* (*patria potestas*). Se concluyó que Fulvia y Octavia demostraban una diversidad femenina advenida de diferentes fuentes, y estaban intrínsecamente constituidas de manera múltiple, asumiendo múltiples posiciones o jerarquías dentro de la amplia gama de discursos y prácticas sociales en su entorno.

Palabras claves: Mujeres romanas; género; monedas; propaganda; actividad pública.

Abstract: This paper aims to discuss the representation of two Roman women, Fulvia and Octavia, who were very different characters: the former was a model not to be followed; and the latter, a real matron. To work with this theme, written and material sources such as coins were used. It is known that Roman written sources were used to build hierarchies linked to an idealized discourse related to male domination. However, coins of these women were analysed in terms of what they wanted to communicate, especially the gender strategies built in their coinage, which suggested questioning how Fulvia and Octavia were presented to the public. To introduce the context in which these women lived, it should be borne in mind that, theoretically, the family remained under the power of the *paterfamilias* (*patria potestas)* at the period of the Republic and beginning of Empire. It was concluded that Fulvia and Octavia showed a female diversity in different sources, which were multiple constituted and took up multiple positions within a range of social discourses and practices.

Keywords: Roman women; gender; coins; propaganda; public activity.

DOMINGO SOLÁ, Gerard, Heródoto y el consejo al líder.

Resumen: El objetivo final de este artículo es poner de manifiesto la posible disyuntiva entre destino y racionalidad en la obra de Heródoto. Desde el punto de vista metodológico, se ha seleccionado un concepto, el consejo al líder, como medio para visualizar el trasfondo racional de la obra de Heródoto, inmerso en un contexto en que el destino lo controla todo. Para poner de manifiesto la diferencia entre las dos visiones del mundo (destino y racionalidad) se ha usado intencionadamente un método basado en gráficas que permite un contraste entre los resultados cuantitativos y las claves tradicionales en las *Historias* de Heródoto.
Palabras clave: consejo; líderes; consejeros; balance; destino.
Abstract: The final objective of this article is to highlight the possible dilemma between destiny and rationality in the work of Herodotus. From the methodological standpoint, a concept has been selected, the advice to the leader, to visualize the rational background of the work of Herodotus, in a world where fate rules everything. A graphical method was purposely utilized to show the rational analysis and highlight the difference between the two worldviews (fate and rationality), allowing a comparison between the results of a quantitative study and the traditional keys in Herodotus' *Histories.*
Keywords: advice; leaders; advisers; balance; destiny.

MARTINS, Maria Manuela Brito, The Problem of Evil in Plotinus.

Abstract: First the aim of my study is to focus on Plotinus's conception of evil, as presented in both Ennead I 8 [51]. However, this is not the only place that Plotinus speaks about this subject. In other treatises he speaks about the evil in a context of human freedom and destiny, like Ennead III, 1 [3, III, 2 [47] and III 3 [48] or in the Ennead IV 8 [6] On the descent of soul into bodies. The big difference between Enneads I, 8, and Enneads III and IV is that the treatises that touch on evil are being analyzed in terms of mainly anthropological and existential issues. On the contrary, in Ennead I 8 [51] the problem of evil has a mainly metaphysical and theodicy treatment. We will mainly analyze the notion of absolute evil, and its consequences for the notion of matter.
Second, we intend to address the possible esoteric influences on the issue of evil in Plotinus. We will try to argue that Plotinus, in the confrontation with the Gnostics, particularly in the treaty 33, that we find elements consonant with the treaty 51, and that come from a Christian and not a Gnostic influence. This one will be more esoteric than exoteric, contrary to the doctrine professed by certain Neoplatonists, after Plotinus, where exoteric and esoteric elements are mixed with philosophical thought.
Keywords: Evil; Good; Matter; Non-Being; Exoteric; Esoteric; Platonic; Neoplatonic.

MONTIEL VALADEZ, Daniel, Los ascetas o monjes tardoantiguos y su proyección fílmica.

Resumen: En este artículo se compara la imagen de los primeros ascetas o monjes trasladada por diferentes películas ambientadas en la Antigüedad Tardía con la información histórica de esos mismos personajes. Se comprueba que sí hay traspaso de conocimiento

y que las películas presentan una imagen de los monjes primitivos como: soldados de Cristo contra la tentación de las mujeres (el demonio), santos con poderes mágicos, cristianos fanáticos y evangelizadores, en ocasiones violentos.

Palabras clave: imagen; ascetas; monjes; cine; Antigüedad Tardía.

Abstract: This paper compares the image of the first ascetics or monks appeared in different films, set in Late Antiquity with the historical information of these characters; and it verifies the transference of historical knowledge and a monk's image where they are: Christ's soldiers against women's temptation (the demon), saints with magical powers, fanatical christians and missionaries, sometimes violent.

Keywords: image; ascetics; monks; cinema; Late Antiquity.

ORTIZ CÓRDOBA, José, La depresión de Ronda entre el Alto Imperio y la Antigüedad Tardía: transformaciones, cambios y continuidades.

Resumen: En este trabajo presentamos las líneas generales de la evolución histórica del espacio urbano y rural en la depresión de Ronda durante el periodo imperial, prestando especial atención a los cambios que tuvieron lugar a partir de los siglos III-IV d.C. En este periodo la zona estudiada experimentó una serie de transformaciones que implicaron notables cambios respecto a la etapa altoimperial. Estas dinámicas se reflejaron tanto en las ciudades, que sufrieron una importante reestructuración de los espacios urbanos, como en el campo, donde se detecta un cambio en el régimen de propiedad en un contexto de progresiva concentración de tierras. Todo ello se produjo en un marco general caracterizado por el desarrollo de profundos cambios sociales y religiosos, pues la presencia de la nueva fe cristiana se documenta en las ciudades y estructuras rurales de la depresión de Ronda desde época temprana

Palabras clave: depresión de Ronda; *Acinipo; Arunda*; Alto Imperio; Antigüedad Tardía; cambio; continuidad.

Abstract: In this paper we present the general dynamics of the historical evolution of the urban and rural space in the depression of Ronda during the imperial period, with particular attention to the changes that happened in the 3rd-4th centuries AD. During this period, the area under study underwent transformations that implied notable changes respect to the high imperial period. These dynamics were reflected both in the cities, which suffered an important restructuring of urban spaces, and in the countryside, where a change in the property regime was detected in a context of progressive land concentration. All this took place within a general context characterised by the development of profound social and religious changes, as the presence of the new Christian faith is documented in the towns and rural structures of the depression of Ronda from an early period.

Keywords: depression of Ronda; *Acinipo; Arunda*; High Empire; Late Antiquity; change; continuity.

MARTÍNEZ CHICO, David, Anillo romano de plata con un raro cognomen: *Maricanus*.

Resumen: Esta nota tiene por objeto la publicación de un anillo de plata con una inscripción alusiva a su propietario: *Maricanus*. El nombre de dicho propietario representa un *cognomen* raramente documentado en el Imperio Romano. Además, el nuevo anillo puede fecharse entre los siglos I y II d.C.

Palabras clave: *Cognomina* latinos; epigrafía romana; anillos; onomástica.
Abstract: This note aims at publishing a Roman inscribed silver ring with Latin ownership inscription: *Maricanus*. The owner's name is a *cognomen* rarely documented in the Roman Empire. Furthermore, the new ring can be dated to between the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D.
Keywords: Latin *cognomina*; roman epigraphy; rings; onomastics.

Fulvia and Octavia: the female warrior's and the matron's coins

Tais Pagoto BÉLO
Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology of the University of São Paulo
Fapesp funding agency
taispbelo@usp.br
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5380-4884

Abstract

This paper aims to discuss the representation of two Roman women, Fulvia and Octavia, who were very different characters: the former was a model not to be followed; and the latter, a real matron. To work with this theme, written and material sources such as coins were used. It is known that Roman written sources were used to build hierarchies linked to an idealized discourse related to male domination. However, coins of these women were analysed in terms of what they wanted to communicate, especially the gender strategies built in their coinage, which suggested questioning how Fulvia and Octavia were presented to the public. To introduce the context in which these women lived, it should be borne in mind that, theoretically, the family remained under the power of the *paterfamilias (patria potestas)* at the period of the Republic and beginning of Empire. It was concluded that Fulvia and Octavia showed a female diversity in different sources, which were multiple constituted and took up multiple positions within a range of social discourses and practices.

Keywords: Roman women; gender; coins; propaganda; public activity.

Resumen

Este trabajo destaca a dos mujeres, Fulvia y Octavia, personajes muy distintos entre sí: la primera no fue un modelo a ser seguido, y la última, una verdadera matrona. Para desarrollar el tema se investigaron fuentes escritas y materiales, tales como monedas.

Sabidamente se utilizaron algunas fuentes escritas de origen romano para construir las jerarquías de un discurso idealizado en perspectiva con el predominio del pensamiento masculino. Sin embargo, las monedas cuñadas con el busto de estas mujeres fueron analizadas bajo la luz de lo que se quería comunicar en aquella época, especialmente sobre las estrategias de género construidas por ocasión de su acuñación, lo que sugería cuestionar la manera cómo se presentaba al público Fulvia y Octavia. Para comprender el contexto en el que vivían estas mujeres, hay que tener en cuenta que, teóricamente, en el período de la República Romana y comienzo del imperio, la familia permanecía bajo el poder del *paterfamilias* (*patria potestas*). Se concluyó que Fulvia y Octavia demostraban una diversidad femenina advenida de diferentes fuentes, y estaban intrínsecamente constituidas de manera múltiple, asumiendo múltiples posiciones o jerarquías dentro de la amplia gama de discursos y prácticas sociales en su entorno.

Palabras clave: Mujeres romanas; género; monedas; propaganda; actividad pública.

I. *Introduction*

The opposition between "Studies on Woman" and "Gender Studies" is still common today, and the confusion between "gender" and "woman" is frequent. There are understandable situations considering the history of feminist thought. Thus, "Gender Studies" encompass "Studies on Women," and even the "History of Women," as well as "Women's Archaeology." It is important to know that the concept of "gender" was developed as an alternative to works on patriarchy, which were the product of the same feminist concern with the causes of women's oppression. However, the elaboration of this concept is linked to the perception of the need to associate this political issue with a better understanding of how "gender" operates in societies, which required thinking about power in a more complex way (Piscitelli 2002: 16 and 21).

Gender studies in Archaeology had been already discussed since the mid-1970s, but it was only after Conkey and Spector's 1984 work «Archaeology and the study of gender» that such type of research began to increase in order to present severe criticisms of androcentrism and emphasize the search for women in archaeological records and their contributions to the past (Voss 2000; Bélo 2014: 28). In 1991, there was also the publication of Gero and Conkey's work «Engendering Archaeology: women and prehistory», which was influenced by feminist contributions from Anthropology (Meskell 1999). According to Wylie (1991), gender archaeology is divided into three parts: the first criticizes androcentrism; the second searches for women, calling themselves «the discovery of women», not only the prehistoric ones, but also for the archaeologist, women

erased from our history; the third, finally, makes a major reconceptualization (Meskell 1999; Bélo 2014: 28; Bélo, 2018: 35)[1].

Studies on the image of the ancient woman emerged timidly as a new subject through the work of Balsdon (1962). A feminist and revolutionary outlook came with Pomeroy's 1975 work, «Goddesses, whores, wives and slave». In 1980, despite all the excitement of the feminist movement, a large corpus of imperial portrait entitled «*Das römische Herrscherbild*», was organized, in which the emperors had a long section, and their women were featured only at the end. Imperial women began to stand out in academia in 1983, when Fittschen and Zanker (1986) published a catalog of roman portraits in the Capitoline Museums of Rome; this was the first volume on women that has ever been published. The year 1996 was a remarkable one. Some of the work that can be highlighted are the biography of Agrippina the Younger published by Barrett (1996); a study on imperial family groups stressing the importance of women for dynastic transmission by Rose (1997); and a monograph on Livia, Octavia the Younger, and Julia produced by Winkes (1996). In addition, it is important to mention the exhibition of imperial and ordinary women of Rome in the event called «I Claudia: Women in Ancient Rome», which portrayed the image of Roman women in material culture, including coins (Wood 2000; 3-4), as an extremely relevant event[2].

In the next decade, important works such as «I Claudia II: women in Roman art and society», edited by Diana Kleiner and Susan Matheson (2000); and «Imperial Women» by Susan Wood (2000), which presented a great breadth and wealth of material culture from the Julius-Claudian dynast came into being. Bar-

---

1. Following the third feminist wave, gender studies related to age, sexual orientation and ethnicity began bearing in mind that gender identity should have been conceived as something complex, classified by a network of meanings, varying from individual to individual throughout time by joining other networks of symbolic practices located in the concepts of class and race. Hence, it was defined that female exploitation varies according to social class, race and ethnic division in which it is inserted (Meskell 1999; Bélo 2014: 29; Bélo 2018: 36).

2. Scott (1995) demonstrated how the study of women is still being suppressed by the academia. Firstly, by the very exclusion, the scholar mentions that women are completely ignored due to the narratives of the Roman world, which were concentrated in activities in which men were dominant, such as politics in Rome and in the provinces. Second, the author states that there is a pseudo-inclusion in which women are included but only appear when anomalous to male norms. Third, inclusion occurs by alienation, when women are only considered in relation to men or when they threaten the male point of view of their "correct" behaviour (Scott 1995: 176-179). The difficulty is due to the Roman sources themselves, which were used to build hierarchies on an idealized discourse, instead of providing a true narrative that showed the lives of children, women or slaves. As material culture, these sources are part of the meanings by which the Romans defined their "minorities" (Revell 2016: 2-3; Bélo 2018: 38).

rett (2002) publishes his work «Livia: first lady of Imperial Rome», and Elaine Fantham (2006) launches «Julia Augusti», which dealt with historical sources and material culture; Ginsburg (2006) also published «Agrippina: constructions of female power in the Early Roman Empire»; Treggiari (2007), in «Terentia, Tullia, and Publilia», analysed textual evidence placing these women in a broader context of their contemporaneity. In addition, Cleopatra appeared in the work of Duane Roller (2010) called «Cleopatra: a biography»; Trimble (2011) also published the work called, «Women and visual replication in Roman imperial art and culture»; and «Turia», by Josiah Osgood (2014), revealed a similar analysis of a woman whose name was lost in history (Moore 2017: 3-4).

The purpose of this work is to highlight women of Antiquity, to raise a criticism of the androcentrism of that time, and to emphasise how they were described in written sources, and the difference in coins minted with their images. To that extent, this paper emphasizes two women, Fulvia and Octavia, who were very different characters: the former was a model not to be followed; and the latter, a real matron. This way, this proposal is not disconnected from contemporary times, considering that it is from the current viewpoint, values, beliefs, and behaviours experienced, and the problematics about women's current issues, that this knowledge is sought in the past. From this perspective, Shanks and Tilley (1992) emphasise that they are aware that the reconstruction of the past is fundamentally located in the present, and that the policies and social issues of the present impact on the reconstruction of past societies (Shanks & Tilley 1992; Revell 2016: 5).

To work with this theme written and material sources were used. It should be borne in mind that Roman written sources were used to build hierarchies linked to an idealized discourse related to male domination, rather than to provide a true narrative that depicted the lives of children, women, or slaves. Like material culture, these sources are part of the meanings by which the Romans defined their "minorities" (Revell 2016: 2-3; Bélo 2018: 38). However, it does not mean that material culture is valueless, but it gives symbolic meaning to specific contexts (Hodder 1986; Shanks & Tilley 1992). These meanings are formed according to the social construction existing between relationships, which influences how people from the past maintain their positions of power within a society.

Coin is a source which had influence to bring power and legitimation to whom were minted, since this kind of object in itself could be considered a public place of governmental expression, multiplied by its capacity and proper function of spreading and disseminating a discourse, which gained strength by the fact of having such a repercussion, which could also be limited, depending on the governmental power, the territory and the acceptance of the symbols that

this material culture bears. However, the coin was part of a power stratagem, which influenced the actions of these women and, in most times, limited their representations. Coins reflected the reality of a social time, with a face of the perception of power, which reproduced what the person did or was going to do (Tunner 2007: 5). In addition to their value, coins were not ephemeral, because they circulated even after the death of the person who had been minted and could continue circulating for over a hundred years later (Porto 2018: 142), being an object that contributed to the prevalence of the memory of such a person. Moreover, coins are the most deliberate of all objects within a public identity, since identity is not eternal, but as something that is actively constructed and contested, within a particular historical context, and is based on a subjectivity rather than an objective criterion. Furthermore, as everything that is contingently constructed, identity is a powerful guide to action. Following these thoughts, coin can demonstrate a huge range of character self-definition and explicit representations of public, official, and communal (Howgego 2005: 1) identity.

Thus, this work does not analyse economic aspects, such as currency circulation, value, currency transactions or soldiers' payments, but what coins want to communicate, especially the gender strategies built for their coinage, which suggests questioning how Fulvia and Octavia were presented to the public, considering that their images were built to send appropriate messages to public consumption, in accordance with the interests of the State.

To introduce the context in which these women lived, it should be borne in mind that, theoretically, the family remained under the power (*patria potestas*) of the *paterfamilias* during the Republic, and some of this tradition carries on in the beginning of Empire with some modifications. The *pater* could be the grandfather or even the great-grandfather, who had the *potestas* of some people (Gardner 1990: 5), as well as of his wife and children. Upon the death of the *pater*, his children and wife had to be under the control of another guardian (*alieni iuris*), or independent, under the protection of the State. The adult son became the *paterfamilias* and the mother, *materfamilias* (Gardner 1990: 6-7). The *patria potestas* was significant and marked the father's power relations within the Roman family, classifying women as unequal to men, as well as children. The ideology through each gender identity was legitimized, differently, with unequal values between men and women, which was accepted by both groups and internalized through everyday activities.

The husband could marry the wife in the form of *manus*, which was a type of marriage agreement in which the wife was under the power (*potestas*) of her husband. At the end of the Republic and the beginning of the Empire, the *cum manus* marriage fell into disuse with the advent of the *sine manus* marriage,

in which the woman would continue under the *potestas* of her father. However, when the *paterfamilias* died, she could gain relative independence, because she became *sui iuris*. In any case, the woman would have to be under the guard of someone (*tutela mulierum*). The guardian became the legal and business responsible on behalf of the woman (Berdowski 2007: 285).

Women were seen as beings who needed protection, which led this society to impose their seclusion in the *domus*; and that they would need the mandatory presence of a tutor, considered as a lifelong protector. This means that to get married or divorced at any age, or condition, they had to ask him for permission, receive or transmit inheritance and control or dispose of their possessions (Cid López 2011: 64). This norm of women's reclusion precisely illustrated the consolidation of a patriarchal society (Cid López 2011: 57). The only ones who were freed from *tutela mulierum* were the Vestal Virgins, some imperial princesses and from the government of Augustus onwards, citizens women who had had more than three children, or those freed with four or more children, in accordance with the law *ius trium liberorum*, which reduced the guardian's power and gave women effective control over their property (Hemelrijk 1999: 97). Otherwise, this measure from Augustus' time was not designed to help women in any way, but to enhance a pro-birth policy, which emphasised the role of motherhood for women (Cid López 2011: 64).

However, in societies such as the Roman one, constructed virility brings a male domination over female that keeps women as symbolic objects, which place them in a permanent state of bodily insecurity or symbolic dependence. The society expects actions from them, which are also socially constructed (Bourdieu 1998: 82). Women of the Roman elite were required to be feminine, loyal, submissive, fertile and in accordance with a *pudicitia*. In this way, Roman women were exposed to all effects of social judgment, because of their social position, which could reinforce the gender consequences, or attenuate them, but never cancel them (Bourdieu 1998: 83). The delineation of these rules and norms does not show the complexity of the Roman elite woman of this period, only a social ideal. However, this work aims to demonstrate the Roman female diversity by making comparisons between Fulvia and Octavia through textual and material sources.

II. *Fulvia, war and coin*

Fulvia (84-40 BC), who seems to have been born in Tusculum, was the only daughter of M. Fulvius Bambalius (Cɪᴄ. *Phil.* 3.16) and Sempronia, daughter of Sempronius Tuditanus (Asc. *Mil.* 35), but it is not clear which Sempronia

was her mother (Welch 1995: 197). Her father's family, the Fulvii, was a distinct one and had L. Fulvius Curvus as consul in 322 BC. Her father Bambalius was dismissed by M. Tullius Cicero, the orator and politician, as an insignificant man (Cic. *Phil.* 3.16; Weir 2007: 3).

Publius Clodius Pulcher, the demagogue, was Fulvia's first husband, with whom she had a daughter, Clodia, Octavian's first wife. However, Octavian did not endure his mother-in-law's difficult temper and ended up sending his wife back home with the remark that she was still a virgin, a fact that he confirmed by oath (D. C. *Historia Romana* 48.5.2-5). Fulvia took a large sum of money for the dowry of this first marriage (Brennan 2012: 357). Her husband was of patrician origin, given that he was linked to the Claudia family. He was son and grandson of a consul, grandson of a judge and brother of a future judge consul. His three sisters married consuls (Babcock 1965: 3). Clodius became a tribune in 58 BC (Weir 2007: 2). He had political tensions with Milo, which began in 52 BC with his candidacy for praetor. He ended up being killed by his political opponent.

Around 51 or 49 BC, she married Gaius Scribonius Curius (Weir 2007: 7), who came from a family that had reached the consulate only with her father in 76 BC (Babcock 1965: 3), who was a tribune by 50 BC. According to Weir (2007), he played a crucial role in the civil war with Caesar in 49 BC. In addition, he went as a tribune to the North Africa during the civil conflict (Brennan 2012: 357) and was killed by the army of Juba, king of Numidia, while fighting for Caesar (App. *BC* 2.7.45; Weir 2007: 6).

Fulvia's last husband was Mark Antony, whom she married circa 45 BC according to Babcock (1965), or 46 BC according to Weir (2007). Antony had an ancient and obscure origin; he seems to have come from a family of the plebeian nobility, which came back strong at the beginning of the first century (Babcock 1965: 3). He had already become a tribune before marriage in 49 BC; commanded Caesar's army in Pharsalus in 48 BC; became Horse Master in 47 BC; and become a consul in 44 BC (Weir 2007: 2 and 7). It seems that he had a maternal grandmother who belonged to Fulvia's family (Brennan 2012: 357); two consular grandfathers, one of them a judge; two uncles, one of whom also became a judge (Babcock 1965: 3). Fulvia had two children with Antony: Marcus Antonius Antyllus, who was chosen by Octavian to marry his daughter, Julia, in 36 BC, but killed in 31 BC; and Iullus Antonius, who married Marcella, Octavian's niece, reaching the consulate in 10 BC, but killed in 2 BC (Brennan 2012: 357).

All of Fulvia's husbands had promising careers and family connections that would lead to a successful marriage. Babcock (1965) points out that Fulvia's family was one of the most distinguished in the republican plebeian nobility.

However, no consul of Fulvia's family has been recognized since 125 BC. It is meaningful that Fulvia's father, M. Fulvius Bambalius, possibly the last of his lineage, married the last daughter of another noble plebeian family, Sempronii Tuditani, whose name came from Fulvia's grandfather, who did not seem to have had a good career. By 129 BC, he was the son and uncle of a consul through his sister's marriage to the orator Q. Hortensius Hortalus. These characteristics do not seem to have favoured Fulvia for a marriage with a good dowry. However, Babcock (1965) believes that she was rich, because she seems to have been the only daughter of Fulvia's and Sempronia's families, being the last in each of these lineages. Consequently, her inheritance would not be neglected by any young nobleman with expensive habits and a low income (Babcock 1965: 3-5).

Fulvia assumed a political role after Caesar's assassination in 44 BC. She had to represent Antony's interests in Rome while he was warring in the East and starting a relationship with Cleopatra (Brennan 2012: 358). She was seen with discontent for being in the political sphere. That may have occurred because of her actions at a troubled time when she had to display female authority and to represent her absent husband in order not to let her interests succumb (Rohr Vio 2015: 62-63).

Fulvia was an influential woman with leadership characteristics, which made her to be involved in military affairs while she was in Gaul. After this period, she also took control of businesses in the East, where she took an active role in the administration of Antony's political affairs. In addition, she supported her husband's cause in Italy together with Lucius, Antony's brother, during the Perusine War, in which she had considerable political-military influence, launching an attack on Rome. She went to that war along with her children, arming herself and commanding military orders (D. C. 48.10). This last action must have been interpreted as the worst thing she did, which could have ended up interfering with the troops' loyalty (Barrett 2002: 117). According to Brennan (2012), her behaviour was extremely transgressive. Cassius Dio mentioned that Fulvia got used to conducting all her deliberations with the help of Antony and his brother Lucius and even sending orders wherever needed (D. C. 48.10); moreover, no one should, at this point, be surprised by her, as she was already armed with a sword, giving orders and speeches to the soldiers (Brennan 2012: 360).

Most written sources belittle Fulvia's characteristics and discredit her military involvement. Strategies of contempt, which clearly affect her later portrayals, are driven by social strategies linked to male dominance. The sources that represent her as a female warrior portray her as an elite matron who was married three times, and as a fictional figure outside of marriage who wanted to exert control over men (Hallett 2015: 248-249).

When referring to Fulvia, Plutarch criticizes her manners, as it seems that she had no interest in spinning, managing the home, or even dominating a husband who had no ambition in public life. Her real desire, according to the author, was to dominate those who governed or those who commanded. With this observation, the author criticizes even Cleopatra for being indebted to Fulvia, who, according to him, taught her husband to obey (Plu. *Ant.* 10.1). Plutarch demonstrated that Fulvia would be a model of an elite woman who should not be followed. However, he does not clarify that women from this period, as the wives of the rulers, had a crucial role in the economic sphere, as they had to manage their families' finances and homes, and that, without a shadow of a doubt, she would have a political impact in some way, but away from the usual centres. Still, it was natural for such women to represent their husbands' interests in Rome in their absence (Brennan 2012: 359).

When Cassius Dio described her, he commented that when Publius Servilius and Lucius Antony became consuls, Mark Antony and his wife Fulvia were the active ones. He also reported that, like Octavian's mother-in-law, she had no respect for Lepidus due to his laziness, ending up managing the business herself, turning neither the Senate nor other businessmen against her will. In 41 BC, when she first interfered in a military context (Rohr Vio 2015: 67), Fulvia's power was already respected even by the victors, since Lucius had defeated certain peoples of the Alps and Fulvia, for some time, did not conceded him the triumph, but for Antony. The triumph's consent to her husband suggests the high importance of Fulvia, since she had the power to choose who would be triumphant. Fulvia's presence was so imposing that she was the one who seemed to be at the helm, whereas Lucius wore the triumphal costume, climbed up into the carriage, and performed the expected rituals (D. C. 48.4.1-5).

Regarding Fulvia's material culture, according to Barrett (2002), some coins appeared minted in *Lugdunum*, around the 40s BC, with the name of Antony on the reverse and with a winged bust on the obverse. This illustration appeared on coins in which the female image features *nodus* hairstyle, which may suggest a mortal woman, possibly Fulvia. Whether it is really Fulvia it marks her importance as the first Roman women to have her image depict in coins, right after the minting of Julius Caesar himself, in 44 BC. It was an innovation, since even the triumvirs only appeared in coins in the mid-forties before Christ (Barrett 2002:140; Grueber 1910: 291-292; Kleiner 1992: 358-360; Wood 2000: 41; Bartman 1999: 37 and 58).

In this context, the first coin that could have been made with Fulvia's portrait was a silver *quinarii* minted in 43 BC, in *Lugdunum*, from around the same period that Antony became governor of Gaul *Comata* and *Cisalpina* (Har-

vey 2020: 35-36). The next coin is an example of a silver *quinarius*, from Gaul *Cisalpina*, dated from 43/42 a.C., with a winged bust, that can be Fulvia as the personification of Victoria facing right, with the superscription III·VIR·R·P·C. On the reverse, it displays a lion, the symbol of the birth of Antony (Brennan 2012: 358), who was celebrating his forty-first birthday, and the superscription ANTONI IMP XLI.

Fig.01. Silver *quinarius*,[3] from *Gallia Cisalpina*, 43-42 a.C. Anverse: Fulvia, III·VIR·R·P·C (*Triumviri Rei Publicae Constituandae* = Triumvirate for the Restoration of Government[4]). Reverse: lion, ANTONI IMP XLI (*Antoni Anno Quadragesimus unus Imperator* = Emperor Antonio, [commemorating] his forty-first [birthday][5])[6].

Courtesy of the American Numismatic Society

In the same period, Roman mints started to make the same bust as Victoria, with the same *nodus* hair, apparently inspired by the *Lugdunum* model (Barrett 2002: 140). Several coins demonstrated the bust of a woman with the personification of the goddess Victoria, but with some particular characteristics that could be associated with Fulvia (Harvey 2020: 39). In this way, in 41 BC, an *aureus* was coined by *C. Numonius Vaala*, with an image similar to that of *Lugdunum* (Harvey 2020: 35-36). This type of currency seems to have been spread in the East (Barrett 2002: 140).

---

3. Reference: RRC: 489/6, available on: http://numismatics.org/collection/1944.100.4491, accessed on: 21/07/2021.
4. Available on: https://en.numista.com/catalogue/pieces66597.html, accessed on: 29/06/2021.
5. Available on: https://en.numista.com/catalogue/pieces58848.html, accessed on: 11/07/2021.
6. Available on: http://numismatics.org/crro/results?q=489%2F6, accessed on: 29/06/2021.

Fig. 02. Aureus[7], coined by *C. Numonius Vaala*, Rome, 41 BC, 8.1g. The bust is accepted as depicting Fulvia as Victoria on the obverse. Reverse inscription, *C. NUMONIUS VAALA*.

The explanation that Fulvia may have appeared as the personification of Victoria would be due to her actions, which would reflect her political influence and the loyalty of the troops and magistrates for Antony, an attitude that opened space for other women in the public sphere (Harvey 2020: 39).

The *aureus* coined by *C. Numonius Vaala* has on its obverse the bust of a winged female figure, which is an attribute of the goddess Victoria. The features of the face and the iconography are opposite to those of a goddess, crafted with much beauty, but it does not belong to a deity. The hairstyle is of Roman *nodus* kind, worn by matrons, identifying her as a Roman woman. However, there is still an academic debate about whether this woman could really be Fulvia, as there are no remnants of her sculptures or cameos to compare with the image. Grueber (1910) does not believe that she is Fulvia, because when the image was coined, Antony had not yet received such honor. However, in Gaul *Cisalpina* and *Transalpina*, it began to mint coins of Antony around 43 BC and in Rome around 42 BC (Harvey 2020: 36-37).

The winged bust that seems to be Fulvia's were also minted in the province of Phrygia, and even the city of *Eumeneia* changed its name in her honor (Zager 2014; Harvey 2020; Barrett 2002: 140)[8] in 41 BC. Whether this is really

---

7. Registration number: R.9272; C&M catalog number: RR1p570.4215; Museum number: R.9272. Available on: https://research.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=3071501&partId=1&searchText=Vaala&page=1, accessed on: 18/01/2020.

8. This information can be found in works such as that of Zager (2014) and Harvey (2020), without further explanation of how the name of the city in question was changed.

Fulvia, it is a proof of the praise that she earned. According to Grether (1946), these coins should have been minted to please Mark Antony (Grether 1946: 223). However, there is no mention of him in this exemplary.

Fig. 03. Bronze coin, from Phrygia, city of *Eumeneia*, 41-40 BC. Obverse: winged female figure. Reverse: Athena, [Ζ] ΜΕΡΤΟΡΙΓΟΣ / [Φ] ΙΛΩΝΙΔΟΥ[9].

Courtesy of *Classical Numismatic Group*

This is a bronze coin, dated from approximately 41 to 40 BC. On its obverse, there is a female figure, with the bust turned to the right, which seems to represent Fulvia as Victoria, for being winged. On the reverse, there is another female figure, which would be Athena holding a shield with her left arm and a spear with her right hand, in addition to the legend: [Ζ] ΜΕΡΤΟΡΙΓΟΣ / [Φ] ΙΛΩΝΙΔΟΥ.

What draws the most attention to Fulvia's coins is that she is always alone on the obverse, without male presence, demonstrating that the homage was paid directly to her and her actions, without considering Mark Antony and his position. The reference to her husband only appeared in the first coin, with the superscript: ANTONI. The expectation could be that images would appear celebrating the male individual, and captions emphasizing him, and not giving prominence to her. However, the actions of Roman women, who could have favoured the provinces, were probably instrumental in honouring them and, consequently, minting them in coins. There is a possibility that Fulvia's actions were decisive for her representation as the personification of the goddess Victoria, since this characterization

---

9. ID: 79000614. Denomination AE14. References: RPC 3139, SNG München - cop - Classical Numismatic Group. Available on: http://www.cngcoins.com/Coin.aspx?CoinID=127125 and http://www.coinproject.com/coin_detail.php?coin=247324, accessed on: 18/01/2020.

would bring her closer to respect and a *pudicitia*. In addition, the Victory mark was always a male symbol, linked to triumph and *virtus*, characteristics that could be associated with the act of courage and decision of this woman, and not with the consensus of the ideal Roman matrons, who carries symbols connected with representations of fertility, safety, and dynastic stability.

Fulvia was always linked to the personification of religious deity, Victoria/Nike, and sometimes with the presence on the reverse of the goddess Athena. These deities were linked to war-like and power activities. Cid López (2011) points out that since the dawn of time there were goddesses of war, power, and leadership. However, the more they earned male power the more they lost strength, so that war and guardianship became attributes of the gods, almost exclusively. In the meantime, the old female deities were reduced and new goddesses emerged, whose worship was linked to maternal activities, protection of women in labour and domestic functions (Cid López 2011: 61).

In this way, the role of these women was expected to be both to securing heirs and taking care of a husband's house and possessions, as well as being loyal. Through common ideological criteria of Roman society, Fulvia was characterized as a loyal woman, who did everything to guarantee her husband's political future, defending him against Octavian, and watching over her marriage, but she was considered to act in a transgressive way.

The final days of Fulvia were described by Plutarch, who said that Antony received the news that his brother, Lucius, and Fulvia joined forces against Octavian, but were defeated and expelled from Italy. During the period that he was going to defeat Labienus, commander of the army of Parthia, who was becoming the master of Asia, Antony received news from Fulvia, full of lamentations, which made him change his plans and go to meet her. On his way, Antony learned that the cause of all the trouble with Octavian was Fulvia's fault. Plutarch called her stubborn and stated that she loved to meddle in political matters, in addition to pointing out that the only way for Fulvia to make Antony leave Cleopatra would be to cause hostilities. However, Fulvia fell ill on her way to meet Antony in Sicyon. This event led to a reconciliation between Octavian and Antony since the author maintained that everything had been Fulvia's fault, as Antony believed that Octavian was responsible for the war. Consequently, the result was an agreement in which Octavian gave the territories of the East to Antony, the provinces of Africa to Lepidus and took the rest (Plu. *Ant.* 30.1).

Cassius Dio reproduced the same passage, noting that while the leaders were on guard, Fulvia died in Sicyon, where she was staying. Cassius Dio also blamed Fulvia for the civil war, he did not speak of Lucius, and even affirmed that Antony felt responsible for the death of his wife due to her involvement

with Cleopatra and her debauchery. However, when this news was announced, both sides laid down their arms and reconciled, because, in the author's words, Fulvia was indeed the cause of all the disagreements until then. However, Cassius Dio himself mentions that it might be preferable to make her death an excuse, in view of the fear that each one inspired in the other, inasmuch as the forces they had, as well as their ambitions, were equally matched, leaving Octavian with Sardinia, Dalmatia, Spain, and Gaul; Antony with all the districts that belonged to the Romans across the Ionian Sea, both in Europe and in Asia; Lepidus with the provinces of Africa; and Sextus with Sicily (D. C. 48.2-4).

All the disagreements between Octavian and Antony fell under Fulvia's responsibility, since the outbreak of war, according to Plutarch and Cassius Dio, who display rhetoric aimed at harming the female image in controversy with the male one. Fulvia dies accused of being responsible for the divergences between Octavian and Antony, and of being the cause+ of all the mistakes of the Perusine war. This also shows the result of a partial manipulation of this woman's memory through the emphasis on decontextualized facts and which even demonstrates a delegitimation of the matron, so that authors could shape a story that was in accordance with their contingent interests and adjusted to their political (Rohr Vio 2015: 77) and gender views.

After Fulvia's death, Antony married Octavian's sister, Octavia, whose husband had just died and was pregnant (D. C. 48.31.3-4). The marriage between Antony and Octavia sealed a new agreement between him and Octavian, while Fulvia's image was underrated, with socially negative characteristics, which were strongly distinct by gender inequalities, unduly marking her memory, that ended up enriching an advertisement designed to contemplate the pact between the two triumvirs. Subsequently, two hundred years after Fulvia died, two later historians made similar assertions about her. Appian spoke of her as an "interfering" (App. *B. C.* 5.59) woman who had stirred up a disastrous war because she was jealous of Cleopatra. Cassius Dio related that she "would gird herself with a sword, give out the watchword to the soldiers, and frequently harangue them" (D. C. 48.103–4; Hallett 2015: 247). This kind of consequence was constant among ancient writers to diminish the memory of women like Fulvia, Cleopatra, Agrippina Minor and others.

III. *Octavia, the ideal matron and coins*

Octavia Minor (69/66 BC - 11 BC) was Octavian's older sister, whose parents were Atia Balba Caesonia (85 BC - 43 BC) and Gaius Octavius (100 BC - 59 BC) and, later, she had a stepfather who was Lucius Marcius Philippus. Her

mother Atia was the daughter of Julia Minor, sister of Julius Caesar and Marcus Atius Balbus (Suet. *Aug.* 4.1). Atia's mother was the daughter of Gaius Julius Caesar and Aurelia of the Aurelii Cottae, a family of the former plebeian nobility. Octavia's father had already been married to Ancharia, with whom he had Octavia Major. In 61 BC, he became *praetor* and was assigned the government of Macedonia. And in 58 BC, before becoming consul, he died suddenly. Atia, in 57 BC, remarried again to Philippus, associating him with Pompey and Julius Caesar. He came from a family of the plebeian nobility, the Marcii Philippii, whose father had been consul in 91 BC. His family consisted of multiple consuls and praetors (Moore 2017: 12-15).

Octavia's first marriage was in 54 BC, with Gaius Claudius Marcellus, of the Claudii Marcelli family, of the plebeian nobility. He was a correspondent for Cicero, was a consul and a political opponent of his wife's family in 50 BC. Her mother-in-law, Junia, was also an example of a matron to be followed (Moore 2017: 27-28). The eldest daughter of the couple was Claudia Marcella Major, who married Agrippa in 28 BC (D. C. 53.1.2), had children with him (Suet. *Aug.* 63.1), but divorced in 21 BC, so that his cousin, Julia, would marry him (D. C. 54.6.5; Plu. *Ant.* 87.4; Vell. 2.100.4). Later, Marcella Major married Antony and Fulvia's youngest son, Iullus, in 21 BC (Moore 2017: 147).

Octavia's second son with Gaius Claudius Marcellus was Marcus Claudius Marcellus. He was betrothed, at the age of three, to the daughter of Sextus Pompey (D. C. 48.38.5), but this marriage never took place. He died at age 19, in 23 BC, just two years after he had married Julia, daughter of Augustus, taking away the prospect of him being one of his uncle heirs. This episode left Octavia desolated (Moore 2017: 137). The youngest daughter of Octavia and Gaius Marcellus was Claudia Marcella Minor, who was born around 40 or 39 BC (Balsdon 1962: 97-107; Syme 1986: 182-184).

Octavia's second marriage was to Mark Antony, in 40 BC, who was the biggest rival of her brother, Octavian. He had also been Fulvia's husband and had a connection with Cleopatra (Moore 2017: 5). The couple's eldest daughter was Julia Antonia Major, who was born in 39 BC, just before the couple left to live in Athens for a few years (D.C. 51.15.7). The couple's second daughter was Julia Antonia Minor, who was born in 36 BC, right after the Treaty of *Tarentum*, followed by Octavia's return to Rome (Bauman 1992: 138-156; Moore 2017: 150).

Iullus Antonius, son of Fulvia and Antony, who was born around 43 BC, was only three years old when his mother died and who along with his older brother, Antyllus, became Octavia's stepchildren in 40 BC, when she married Antony (Plu. *Ant.* 87). Another daughter Octavia had to raise was Cleopatra Se-

lene, daughter of Cleopatra VII. She grew up in her home and later she married Juba II (Moore 2017: 153).

Octavia was never placed in the category of a woman who was poorly spoken of by ancient writers, was never accused of adultery, of having poisoned a rival, of having unfeminine attitudes (Moore 2017: 1), or of having interfered with political actions. She never wanted public glory or any kind of notoriety. She was characterized by Plutarch, as a wonderful, beautiful, dignified, and common-sense woman, who had been Gaius Marcellus' widow (Plu. *Ant.* 31.1). The descriptions were of a woman who was not problematic (Moore 2017: 7), and fit the ideal pattern, considered by the ancients as the ideal Roman matron.

The matron was that woman of the Roman elite, associated with traditional feminine values such as beauty, fertility, who took care of the house, gave charity, was modest, linked to *pietas*, severity, simplicity, sobriety, self-restraint, she was reserved, domesticable and had total devotion to her husband and children. They were expected to live a life in seclusion, be chaste, devout wives and mothers, as well as marry only once (*univirae*), being faithful widows after the death of their husband, which had already changed in Octavia's time. The emphasis on moral qualities was linked to education for both boys and girls, but for girls the perspective was marriage and motherhood (Hemelrijk 1999: 13 and 57-58).

Augustus granted Octavia and his wife, Livia, the right to dismiss the guardians who were in control of their finances, so that they could spend money as they saw fit (D. C. 49.38.1; Purcell 1986; Flory 1993), which may have facilitated their performance as benefactors. This activity, which was typical of the Republic, but which survived during the Empire, was first carried out by men, and that is why it was called Patronage. It occurred when a wealthy and powerful individual in the community, who was regarded as the *patronus*, offered legal protection or money for public buildings, such as a bathhouse, amphitheatre, harbour, and so on. For this performance, he was honoured by the community with a statue or an inscription in which he was called the *patronus*, in the sense of "protector" or "benefactor." In this regard, Dixon (1983) presents evidence that, at the end of the Republic, women exercised patronage and used this position to influence men of their families in political matters. However, this activity was tolerable and according to the ideals, since the circumstances concerned family matters (Dixon 1983; Fischler 1994: 118). Women who became benefactors, such as Octavia and Livia, were closely linked to the status of sister and wife of the emperor (Helmerijk 1999: 101-102), which could have functioned as a way of propagandizing the imperial family, once that for such improvements they also guaranteed a tribute in the form of statues, plaques

with their names and other kind of materiality that helped them to be better publicly highlighted.

In her representations, Octavia was identified with the role of a good mother, which was a characteristic to be celebrated by the empire. Her position, highly praised as a moral model, was not very elusive, since even coins with her image were minted only during Antony's life. In fact, the coins with their image were only minted in Eastern Greece (Harvey 2020: 39). And she was only represented in coins to honor her union with Mark Antony, demonstrating that this union represented the end of the disagreements between Octavian and Mark Antony. Another relevant information is that whether it was not Fulvia in the first coins, with a winged bust, Octavia would have been the first Roman woman to be minted in coins.

Fig.04: A Silver Tridrachma[10], 39 BC, Ephesus (?), Turkey. Obverse: bust of Mark Antony and bust of Octavia, M ANTONIVS IMP COS DESIG ITER ET TERT (*Marcus Antonius Imperator Consul Designatus Iterum Tertium*[11] = Emperor Mark Antony, Consul appointed for the third time[12]). Reverse: Dionysus on *cista* between two twisting snakes, holding a cup and leaning on thyrsus, with the inscriptions: III VIR R P C (*Triumvir Republicae Constituendae* = Triumvir of the Constitutional Republic for the third time[13])[14].

10. Reference number: G.2206. Catalogue Number: RR2 (503) (136).
11. Available on: https://en.numista.com/catalogue/pieces66597.html, accessed on 27/10/2020.
12. Our translation, 16/08/2019.
13. Our translation, 16/08/2019.
14. Available on: https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/C_G-2206, accessed on 28/10/2020.

In this tridrachma, the figure of Antony is next to and superimposing that of Octavia. He is wearing an ivy crown, which associates him with his patron, the god Dionysus, who appears on the reverse standing on a *cista*, with a thyrsus in his left hand, flanked by two snakes entwined with upright heads. Octavia is at Antony's side, with part of her hair visible, and her position is secondary to her husband, in a portrait of positive Roman values (Harvey 2020: 43). In addition, the figure of the couple on the obverse demonstrates the importance of unity, since this marriage would have brought Octavian and Mark Antony together. Another element to take into account is the obverse inscription, M ANTONIVS IMP COS DESIG ITER ET TERT, which attributes values to Mark Antony and none to Octavia, as well as the inscription on the reverse, III VIR, RP C. Octavia does not appear with characteristics related to goddesses, as Fulvia's representations previously distinguished her, as well as the figures of Livia in coins.

The figure of Octavia is clearly used in this coin and others as part of a political agreement involving male political parties. In this sense, her image and marriage, confirmed by written sources, were not used for a particular tribute to her, but are inserted in a hierarchy of power marked by boasting an androcentric government.

In this coin, Octavia is not behind Antony, but in front of him, which shows a status almost equal to that of male family members, suggesting that the couple were partners in marriage and politics. The coin was minted by an Achaea mint. This type of figure, in which couples are facing each other, aims to convey an ideology linked to the divine royal couple, as had already occurred in images of Hellenistic kings and their wives, such as the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. This figure is not only linked to Hellenistic traditions, but is also politically significant for Antony (Harvey 2020: 44).

The figure of Octavia in the coin appears to wear a necklace, which contrasts with the first figures of women in coins that appeared without jewellery in Rome. However, the fact that it was minted in an unknown mint in Achaea may run counter to the rule that it was common for coins of real Hellenistic women to appear without jewellery. This aspect could link them to a divine character, since the goddess figures in coins always appeared with jewellery (Harvey 2020: 49), as in the next coin in which her necklace is also evident.

Fig.05: Dupondius[15] copper alloy, 38 – 37 BC, Achaea. Obverse: the busts of Antony and Octavia facing each other, M ANT IMP TERT COS DESIG ITER ET TER III VIR R P C (*Marcus Antonius Imperator Consul Designatus Iterum Tertium, Triumvir Reipublicae Constituendae* = Emperor Marco Antonio, Consul appointed for the third time, Third man for the Regulation of the Constitutional Republic [16]). Reverse: there are two ships sailing to the right; below, a denominational mark;[17] above, two Dioscuri[18] caps and inscription M OPPIVS CAPITO PRO PR PRAEF CLASS F C[19] (Marcus Oppius Capito Pro Prætore Præfectus Classis)[20].

15. Reference number: R.9565; Catalog number: RR2 (518) (159).

16. Our verified translation: https://www.davidrsear.com/academy/roman_legends.html, accessed on: 27/10/2020.

17. Greek inscription [B] and a number, two.

18. Indicates the Castor and Pollux twins gathered as stars in the sky by Zeus after Castor's death and considered patrons of athletes and sailors (Available on: https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/Dioscuri#:~:text=%3A%20the%20twins%20Castor%20and%20Pollux,patrons%20of%20athletes%20and%20sailors, accessed on: 30/10/2020).

19. Indicates the mint in which it was done.

20. Available on: https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/C_R-9565, accessed on: 28/10/2020.

Fig.06: Tressis[21] (three asses[22]), 38 – 32 BC, minted in an uncertain place in Greece, possibly at a naval base in Piraeus. Obverse: Mark Anthony next to Octavian and facing Octavia, M ANT IMP TERT COS DESIG ITER ET TER III VIR RPC (*Marcus Antonius Imperator Consul Designatus Iterum Tertium, Triumvir Reipublicae Constituendae* = Emperor Marco Antonio, Consul appointed for the third time, Third man for the Regulation of the Constitutional Republic[23]). Reverse: M OPPIVS CAPITO[24] PRO PR PRAEF CLASS FC[25], and three galleys sailing to the right[26].

Courtesy of the WildWinds

This last coin, with Mark Antony and Octavian facing Octavia, is the great proof of a political mark identified in this type of material culture. In this way, it can be interpreted that the combination of the three would be the demonstration of imperial peace and that the image of Octavia, once again, would be used for the benefit of her brother. For Barrett (2002), this type of currency is seen as an innovation (Barrett 2002: 140) due to the rarity of the appearance of the three figures. In AD 54, the confrontation of faces reappeared on coins, but only between two characters, Agrippina Minor and her son Nero, in a series of *aurei* and *denarii*. Such positioning of the faces is understood as figures of equal importance, also inferred by the obverse and reverse subtitles that consecutively emphasized Agrippina and Nero.

21. Reference number: 1860,0328.250. Catalogue number: RR2 (518) (154).

22. A denarius would be equal than ten asses (donkeys) (Available on: https://www.dictionary.com/browse/denarius#:~:text=Word%20Origin%20for%20denarius,WORD%20OF%20THE%20DAY; accessed on: 06/10/2020).

23. Our translation with verification in: https://www.davidrsear.com/academy/roman_legends.html, accessed on: 27/10/2020.

24. Coin master: M OPPIVS CAPITO (Von Hahn 2008: 43 and 96).

25. Indicates the mint in which it was minted.

26. Available on: http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/imp/marc_antony/i.html, accessed on: 16/08/2019 and https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/C_1860-0328-250, accessed on: 15/11/2020.

Fig.07: Tridrachma,[27] silver, de 39 BC, Ephesus (?), Turkey. Obverse: there is the bust of Antony, turned to the right, with ivy crown, *lituus* below, wrapped by ivy crown and flowers, with inscription M ANTONIVS IMP COS DESIG ITER ET TERT (*Marcus Antonius Imperator Consul Designatus Iterum Tertium* = Emperor Mark Antony appointed as Consul for the third time). Reverse: there is the draped bust of Octavia, turned to the right, on a *cista*, between snakes, III VIR R P C (*Triumvir Republicae Constituendae* = Triumvir of the Constitutional Republic for the third time[28]).[29]

This last coin is an Ephesus tridrachma, which has a mystical *cista* on the reverse, and like others similar to this one, features the couple with divine elements next to the mythological categories. At times, Antony appears associated with Neptune, but the affinity with Dionysus is greater and better attested in art and literature. This silver tridrachma shows the connection of Antony and Octavia with Dionysus, displaying the representation of religious symbols of worship of the god. The bust of Antony is on the obverse with a crown of ivy and on the reverse is the bust of Octavia, in a smaller figure, on a mystical *cista*, also between serpents, which are sacred symbols of the representation of Dionysus. It could be an association of the god Dionysus and his companion, Ariadne, corresponding to Antony and Octavia, who is recognized by her hairstyle. The presence of Antony's name in coins ranks him as a legal authority, while the absence of Octavia's name indicates that there would be no tribute to her. Although her image does not cease to represent that she held socio-political importance, it also reveals that the Senate's concession was restricted to promoting these women (Harvey 2020: 45-46).

---

27. Number of references: G.2204
28. Our translation, 16/08/2019.
29. Available on: https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/C_G-2204, accessed on: 28/10/2020.

According to Barrett (2002), this was a common type of figure used in the East in the Hellenistic period, when Octavia's portrait appears on the *cista* (Barrett 2002: 140). Octavia is once again in the background of the coin, taking into account that the reverse would be reserved for the less important figures. In addition, the captions do not even mention her, contributing only to celebrate and characterize Antony, as evidenced in the next coin too:

Fig.08. *Aureus*, 38 BC, Roman Republic, with Mark Antony's face turned to the right, on the obverse, M ANTONIVS M F M N AVGVR IMP TER (*Marcus Antonius Marcus Filius Marcus Nepos Augur Imperator Tertium* = Mark Antony, Mark's son, Mark's grandson, augur[30], Emperor for the third time). Reverse: there is Octavia's face, turned to the right, with the inscription: COS DESIGN ITER ET TER III VIR R P C (*Consul Designatus Iterum Tertium Triumviri Rei Publicae Constituandae* = Appointed consul for the third time in the Triunvirato for the restoration of the government[31])[32].

The coin, with Mark Antony on the obverse and Octavia on the reverse, marks the union of the couple. However, it shows, notably, the harmony between Antony and Octavian due to the Pact of *Brundisium* in 40 BC, an alliance that marked the Second Triumvirate, which was a political agreement established through a matrimonial arrangement. The coin's inscription refers to Antony's political life, not establishing any relationship with Octavia, which demonstrates the expected ideal of female passivity in the face of the political ties established there. Accord-

---

30. Mark Antony is imperator, augur and triumvir. *Augur* is the one who predicts, who recognizes omens. The adjective is derived from Augustus, consecrated by augur or under favorable auguries (Martins 2011: 66 and 75).

31. Our translation with consultation on https://en.numista.com/catalogue/pieces66597.html, accessed on: 09/11/2019.

32. Available on: https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/C_1842-0523-1, accessed on: 29/10/2020.

ing to Harvey (2020), Octavia presents in this coin a *nodus* hairstyle, a symbol of the status of the Roman matron without any divine attribute, very close to the figures of Hellenistic women, whose objective was to demonstrate the promotion of family relationships. According to the style of Hellenistic women, the figures of Roman women, as well as Antony's women, such as Octavia and Cleopatra, could appear with some physical characteristics of their husband (Hekster 2015; Harvey 2020: 41), but the name of Octavia is not mentioned in any coin and it has no divine attributes (Barrett 2002: 140). The fact that in no caption the name of Octavia is written is a mark of the gender relations constituted in terms of her position in society, composing her as the one who only lent herself to that position through her brother and her husband, demonstrating the social irrelevance of this character, who seems to have been manipulated to fulfil an alliance between Octavian and Antony, without receiving special honours.

When Plutarch referred to Octavia, he claimed that she had continued to act as an exemplary woman, staying in Rome and working for her husband's benefits while he did business with Cleopatra. The virtues of Octavia exemplify the ideal Roman matron, in contrast to the decaying archetype of Cleopatra's image of the East ensured by the Roman point of view (Fischler 1994: 118).

Fig.09. Silver tetradrachm[33], 36 BC, Syria. Obverse: Cleopatra's draped bust to the right, with diadem on the head, ΒΑCΙΛΙCCΑ ΚΛΕΟΠΑΤΡΑ ΘΕΑ ΝΕΩΤΕΡΑ, transliteration BASILISSA KLEPATRA THEA NEOTERA. Reverse: bust of Marco Antônio to the right, ΑΝΤWΝΙΟC ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤWΡ ΤΡΙΤΟΝ ΤΡΙWΝ ΑΝΔΡWΝ e transliteration ANTONIOS AUTOKRATOR TRITON TRION ANDRON[34].

33. Reference number: TC, p 237.1.CleMA. Catalog number: GC20 (BMC Greek (Galatia) (158) (56).
34. Available on: https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/C_TC-p237-1-CleMA, accessed on: 29/10/2020.

After the divorce of Octavia and Mark Antony in 32 BC, coins with the bust of Cleopatra on the obverse and Mark Antony on the reverse began to be minted in the East, demonstrating the couple's agreement to conquer the Orient, as a celebration of their union. In contrast to the coins of Octavia and Antony, the last coin exemplary shows that the most important side of the object, which is the obverse, is Cleopatra's and not Antony's, suggesting his surrender to the Queen of Egypt, and demonstrating that she was not a subordinate woman. As a foreigner, Cleopatra would never be considered an ideal matron. She was seen as a "barbarian" and possessed great political and governmental power, which led the Romans to consider her abnormal. However, this coin celebrates Cleopatra as the youngest Seleucid queen and Antony as a Roman magistrate and general (Buttrey 1954: 109).

Octavia's coins only were minted after she got married to Antony with the purpose to legitimize the pact of *Brundisium*. Her name is not mentioned in any of the coinage, but there is a tribute in caption to Antony in addition to his position's description. The images of Roman women such as Octavia were generally minted subordinated to men, as emperors, who generally were their husbands, sons, brothers, and so on. What is assumed is that Octavia, and other women of the same status and society were used as objects in the social construction of Rome, in addition to being linked with kinship relations, marriage and mainly dynastic continuity, which defined them as a social status and objects of exchange between the families, designated to contribute to male continuity and success. The exchange of these "objects" between men granted equal communication between them, thus they were symbolic instruments of male politics, destined to be fiduciary signs and to establish relationships between men, reduced to the condition of tools of production or reproduction of the symbolic and the social. Consequently, this demonstrates a symbolic violence that rested on these women, which also legitimized them as chaste women, linked to *pudicitia*. Hence, there was a hidden dimension to the politics of the matrimonial transaction (Bourdieu 1998: 56) that they were included.

IV. *Conclusion*

The purpose of this paper was to present two different Roman women as well as the analysis of Roman society gender complexity through written and material sources. In this way, it is common to link women from the Roman elite to sources that refer to the house, family, and heredity, since the documents about them, both written and material, refer to this path; or women who followed these paths were better represented. Thus, when giving importance to the feminine,

society and social status of that time, the male opposition is soon considered, because men recognized women as the "others," submissive to social reality and in symbolic terms. Ancient Rome provided several examples of matrons, characterized as wives, mothers, and procreators; created feminine patterns, which were part of the gender assumptions of this society, which persisted in the Roman collective consciousness for centuries. Many of these female models could have made them cover their bodies, act modestly, possess self-control, chastity, severity, firmness, in addition to spending their lives preparing to wait for a husband (Cid López 2011: 55-56).

Female virtue was linked to *pudicitia*, which would classify virtuous women of the Roman elite as those who should refuse sexual temptation, but who would be supported by various institutional protections (Giddens 1992: 16) such as guardianship, family, and religion. By taking this stance, Roman women were placing themselves in relation to others in society, having interrelationships with other individuals —intersubjectivities— that would also determine the positions taken by them. The agencies and choices of women in the Roman elite were related to issues of institutional power in dominant discourses, where there were many benefits to be gained from building their self as a particular type of person, interacting with other people in a specific way. Furthermore, this investment was not only a matter of emotional satisfaction, but of real material, social and economic benefits that were attributed to the respectable man, the good wife, the powerful mother, or the well-behaved daughter (Moore 2000: 37).

In societies such as the Roman one, where dominant discourses on gender constructed categories such as "woman" and "man" as exclusive and hierarchically related, violence was created highly sexualized and inseparable from the notion of gender, related to the difference in gender, which may have served to maintain identities and power (Moore 2000: 43-44). Following this thought, Roman literary texts tended to convey the image that their women were passive, subordinate and in need of protection. However, if they performed other behaviors, as Fulvia did, they would be described as dangerous, adulterous, and requiring male control (Dieleman 1998; Matić 2021a; Orriols-Llonch 2007; Matić 2021b: 5), not to mention with the depreciation of these women's memories after their death, which was a strategy to control the forgetfulness of them.

Thus, women who were said to be respectable, like Octavia, were those lovely wives who were venerated by their husbands, who sacrificed their lives for their family, who were sociable, educated and morally impeccable (Riess 2012: 492). However, consideration must be given to Octavia's position as Octavian's sister, which could bring her some protection from the calumnies of some writers. She could have been seen as a woman favorable to male success, since Ro-

man social institutions, as well as the religious and judiciary, were legitimizers and shapers of a Roman patriarchy. This social characterization linked to male domination contributed to a symbolic violence on the female (Bourdieu 1996a: 30-31), both for transgressive women, such as Fulvia, who was criticized and her memory was delegitimized, obtaining a lower historical popularity; as for so-called ideal women, like Octavia, who was used as an object of political agreements between her brother and her husband.

The female diversity of Fulvia and Octavia observed in the written and material sources directly demonstrates that gender identity is constructed and lived (Moore 2000: 15), since it took into account the relationship between them and the social. The two characters had lives related to structures of power and domination, but they acted differently. This demonstrates that identities are not passive and acquired only through socialization, but are diverse and forged by practical involvement through life experiences, with individual and collective dimensions. Social representations of gender can affect subjective constructions and social constructions. Individuals are born into cultures and become members of them through processes of learning and socialization, but individuals as units are unique entities that require a cultural imprint. However, gender is ambiguous, and it is not fully defined by cultural categorizations and normative understandings (Moore 2000: 21-22).

The characterization of female transgression, like Fulvia's, happens when gender identity is seen as an enigma or something that requires explanation, both subjectively and collectively, making her inadequacy in the standard category obvious (Moore 2000: 21-22) of the society. However, for the Romans, women with leadership, political, and going to war attitudes were described by ancient authors as inadequate, or as a role model not to be followed, such as Fulvia, Cleopatra, Livia, Agrippina Major, and Agrippina Minor. While material culture idealized them as personifications of goddesses, such as in Fulvia's and Livia's coins; or with elements that would link them to fertility, as in Livia's case; or with null subsidies that did not defame them, but that did not celebrate them either, as in the case of Octavia's coins.

It is concluded that the sources analyzed in this work demonstrate that Fulvia and Octavia were examples of women who were multiple constituted and could assume multiple subject positions within a range of social discourses and practices (Moore 2000: 23). In addition to these two examples of Roman women, it is noted the large number of women linked to men of power and who were in the public focus that were criticized in literary texts. The reason for the delegitimization of women from the Roman elite could have been because, at different times, most of them were taken to represent a variety of positions and had to

build their social practices, considering that such practices themselves could have been subversive, since they could contradict a competing set of discourses about what it was to be an "elite Roman woman" (Moore 2000: 25).

Consequently, women and men could have different understandings of themselves as people marked by gender, as they would have different positions in relation to discourses related to gender and sexuality, resulting in different positions for them within these discourses (Moore 2000: 36). However, it can be said that the society of the Roman elite had the construction of an ideal model of a woman, but their women encompassed a subjective multiplicity of gender, which could vary both contextually and biographically.

V. Bibliography

A. Ancient authors

APPIANUS (1477), *Historia Romana – De bellis civilibus*, Translated by Petrus Candidus Decembrius. Venice, Bernhard Maler, Erhard Ratdolt and Peter Löslein.

ASCONIUS (2006), *Commentaries on five speeches of Cicero*. Ed. with a Translation by Simon Squires. Wauconda (IL), Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers.

CASSIUS DIO (1925), *Roman History*. Edited by E. Cary. London, G. B. Putman.

CICERONIS (1918), *Orationes: Pro Milone; Pro Marcello; Pro Ligario; Pro Rege Deiotaro; Philippicae 1-14,* Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Albertus Curtis Clark. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

PLUTARCH (1965), *Makers of Rome*. Translated by Ian Scott-Kilvert. London, Penguin Books.

SUETONIUS (1957), *The Twelve Caesars*. Translation by Robert Graves. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.

VELLEIUS PATERCULUS, C. (1924), *The Roman History*. Loeb Classical Library. Available in: https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/e/roman/texts/velleius_paterculus/2c*.html.

B. Bibliographical references

BABCOCK, C. L. (1965), «The early career of Fulvia», *The American Journal of Philology* 86: 1-32

BALSDON, J. P. V. D. (1962), *Roman women*. New York, The Bodley Head.

BARRETT, A. (1996), *Agrippina: sex, power, and politics in the early empire*. London, Yale University Press.

BARRETT, A. (2002), *Livia: first lady of Imperial Rome*. New Haven, Yale University Press.

BARTMAN, E. (1999), *Portraits of Livia: imaging the imperial woman in Augustan Rome*. Cambridge, University Press.

BAUMAN, R. A. (1992), *Women and Politics in Ancient Rome*. London, Routledge.

BÉLO, T. P. (2014), *Boudica e as facetas femininas ao longo do tempo: nacionalismo, feminismo, memória e poder*. Tese de doutoramento - Instituto de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas da Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas.

BÉLO, T. P. (2018), «Os estudos de gênero na Arqueologia», in P. P. A. Funari & V. R. T. Camargo (orgs.), *Divulgando o patrimônio arqueológico*. Rio de Janeiro, Bonecker: 31-42.

BOURDIEU, P. (1996), «Novas reflexões sobre a dominação masculina», in M. J. M.Lopes, D. E. Meyer & V. R.Waldon (orgs.), *Gênero & Saúde*. Porto Alegre, Artes Médicas: 28-40.

BOURDIEU, P. (1998), *A dominação masculina*. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil.

BRENNAN, C. T. (2012), «Perceptions of women's power in the Late Republic: Terentia, Fulvia, and the generation of 63 BCE», in S. L. James & S. Dillon (eds.), *A companion to women in the Ancient World*. Malden (MA), Wiley-Blackwell: 354-366.

BRUBAKER, L. & TOBLER, H. (2000), «The gender of money: Byzantine empresses on coins (324 – 802)», *Gender & History* 12.03: 572-594.

CID LÓPEZ, R. M. (2011), «La matrona y las mujeres de la Roma antigua. Um estereotipo feminino a través de las imágenes religiosas y las normas legales», en M.ª E. Martínez Quinteiro, D. Hidalgo Rodríguez & N. Cubas Martín (eds.), *Mujeres em la Historia, el arte y el cine. Discursos de género, variantes de contenidos y soportes: de la palabra al audiovisual*. Salamanca, Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca: 55-70.

CONKEY, M. W. & SPECTOR, J. D. (1984), «Archaeology and the study of gender», in M. Schiffer (ed.), *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*, vol. 7. New York: Academic Press: 1-38.

DIELEMAN, J. (1998), «Fear of women? Representation of women in Demotic wisdom texts», *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 25: 7-46.

DIXON, S. (1983), «A family business: women's role in patronage and politics at Rome, 80-44 B.C.», *Classica et Mediaevalia* 34: 91-112.

FISCHLER, S. (1994), «Social Stereotypes and Historical Analysis: the case of the imperial women at Rome», in L. J. Archer, S. Fischler, M. Wyke (eds.), *Women in Ancient Societies*. London, The Macmillan Press: 115-133.

FITTSCHEN K. & ZANKER, P. (1983), *Katalog der römischen portraits in den Capitolinischen Museen und den anderen kommunalensammlunger der stadt Rom 3, Kaiserinnen und Prinzessinnenbildniss, Frauenporträts*. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zanbern.

FANTHAM, E. (2006), *Julia Augusti: the Emperor's Daughter*. London and New York: Routledge.

FLORY, M. B. (1993), «Livia and the history of public honorific statues for women in Rome», *The American Philological Association* 123: 287-308.

GARDNER, J. F. (1990), *Women in Roman law and society.* London: Routledge.

GERO, J. M. & CONKEY, M. W. (1991), *Engendering archaeology: women in prehistory*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell

GIDDENS, A. (1992), *A transformação da intimidade: sexualidade, amor & erotismo nas sociedades modernas*. São Paulo, Editora UNESP.

GINSBURG, J. (2006), *Representing Agrippina: Constructions of female power in the Early Roman Empire*. New York, Oxford University Press.

GRETHER, G. (1946), «Livia and the Roman Imperial Cult», *The American Journal of Philology* 67.3: 222-252.

GRUEBER, H. A. (1910), *Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum, v. 1*. London, British Museum.

HALLETT, J. (2015), «Fulvia: the representation of an elite Roman woman warrior», in J. Fabre-Serris & A J. Keith, *Women & war in Antiquity*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Universty Press.

HARVEY, T. (2020), *Julia Augusta: images of Rome's first empress on the coins of the Roman empire.* London and New York, Routledge.

HEKSTER, O. (2015), *Emperors and ancestors: Roman rulers and the constraints of Tradition*. Oxford, University Press.

HEMELRIJK, E. A. (1999), *Matrona docta: educated women in the Roman elite from Cornelia to Julia Domna.* London and New York, Routledge.

HOWGEGO, C. (2005), «Coinage and identity in the Roman provinces», in C. Howgego, V. Heuchert & A. Burnett (eds.), *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces.* Oxford, University Press.

HODDER, I. (1986), *Reading the past: current approaches to interpretation in archaeology.* Cambridge, University Press.

KLEINER, D. (1992), «Politics and gender in the pictorial propaganda of Antony and Octavian», *Echos du Monde Classique* 36: 357-367.

KLEINER E. E. & MATHESON S. B. (eds.) (2000), *I, Claudia II. Women in Roman art and society*. Austin, University of Texas Press.

MATIĆ, U. (2021a), *Violence and gender in ancient Egypt.* London and New York, Routledge.

Matić, U. (2021b), *Gender-based violence*, in A. Austin and W. Wendrich (eds.), *UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology*. Los Angeles.

Meskell, L. (1999), *Archaeology of social life: age, sex, class et cetera in Ancient Egypt*. Oxford, Blackwell.

Millar, F. (1993), *The Roman Near East, 31 BC-AD 337*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Moore, H. L. (2000), «Fantasias de poder e fantasias de identidade: gênero, raça e violência», *Cadernos Pagu* 14: 13-44.

Moore, K. (2017), *Octavia Minor and the transition from Republic to Empire*. A thesis presented to the graduate school of Clemson University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts History. Clemson, South Caroline, USA.

Osgood, J. (2014), *Turia: A Roman woman's civil war*. Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press.

Orriols-Llonch, M. (2007), «La violencia contra las mujeres en el antiguo Egipto», in M.ª D. Molas Font (ed.), *Violencia deliberada: Las raíces de la violencia patriarcal*. Barcelona, Icaria: 57-70.

Piscitelli, A. (2002), «Re-criando a (categoria) mulher?», in L. M. Algranti (org.), *A prática feminista e o conceito de gênero*. Campina, Textos Didácticos: 7-42.

Pomeroy, S. B. (1975), *Goddesses, whores, wives and slaves: women in Classical Antiquity*. Berlin, Schocken Books.

Porto, V. C. (2018), «O culto imperial e as moedas do Império Romano», *Phoînix* 24.1: 138-154.

Purcell, N. (1986), «Livia and the womanhood of Rome», *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 212 (n.s. 32): 78-105.

Rawson, B. (2006), «Finding roman women», in N. Rosenstein & R. M. Marx (eds.), *A companion to the roman republic*. Oxford, Blackwell Publishing: 324-341.

Revell, L. (2016), *Ways of being roman: discourses of identity in the roman west*. Oxford & Philadelphia, Oxbow Books.

Riess, W. (2012), «*Rari exempli femina*: female virtues on Roman Funerary Inscriptions», in S. L. James & S. Dillon (orgs.), *A companion on women in the Ancient World*. Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell: 491-501.

Rose, C. B. (1997), *Dynastic commemoration and imperial portraiture in Julio-Claudian period*. Cambridge, University Press.

Rohr Vio, F. (2015), «Dux femina: Fulvia in armi nella polemica politica di età triunvirale», in T. M. Lucchelli & F. Rohr Vio, *Viris Militaris: rappresentazione e propaganda tra Reppublica e Principato*. Trieste, Edizioni Università di Trieste: 61-89.

ROLLER, D. W. (2010), *Cleopatra: A Biography*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

SCOTT, E. (1995), «Women and gender relations in the Roman empire», in P. Rush (ed.), *Theoretical Roman Archaeology: second conference proceedings*. Aldershot, Avebury: 174-189.

SHANKS, M. & TILLEY, C. (1992), *Reconstructing Archaeology: theory and practice.* London, Routledge.

SYME, R. (1986), *The Augustan aristocracy.* Oxford, University Press.

TREGGIARI, S. (1991), *Roman Marriage:* Iusti Coniuges *from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian.* Oxford, University Press.

TRIMBLE, J. (2011), *Women and visual replication in Roman Imperial art and culture: Greek culture in the Roman world.* Cambridge, University Press.

TUNNER, M. (2007), «Foreword», in P. Brennan, M. Tunner, & L. Wright, (eds.), *Faces of power: imperial portraiture on Roman coins. Nicholson Museum.* Sidney, University Press: 5.

VON HAHN, B. B. (2008), *The characterisation of Mark Antony*, Dissertation, University of South Africa, Pretoria.

VOSS, B. L. (2000), «Feminism, queer theories and the archaeological study of past sexualities», *World Archaeology* 32.2: 180-192.

WEIR, A. J. (2007), «A study of Fulvia», Phd thesis, department of Classics, Queen's University, Ontario.

WELCH, K. E. (1995), «Antony, Fulvia, and the Ghost of Clodius in 47 B.C», *Greece & Rome* 42.2: 182-201.

WINKES, R. (1995), *Livia, Octavia, Julia. Porträts und Darstellungen*. Louvain-la-Neuve and Providence, Université catholique de Louvain.

WOOD, S. E. (2000), *Imperial women: a study in public images, 40 BC - AD 68*. Leiden-Boston-Köln, Brill Academic Pub.

WYLIE. A. (1991), «Gender theory and the archaeological record: why is there no archaeology of gender?», in J. Gero & M. Conkey (eds.), *Engendering archaeology: Women and prehistory*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell: 31-56.

ZAGER, I. (2014), *The political role of women of the Roman elite, with particular attention to the autonomy and influence of the Julio-Claudian women (44 BCE to CE 68)*. Master of Arts - University of South Africa, Pretoria.

FlorentiA iliberritana

Nº32/2021

eug EDITORIAL
UNIVERSIDAD
DE GRANADA