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Abstract: This thesis employs arguments developed by historians on the British Empire to explore the essential relationship between empire and the control of female bodies. I argue that the imperative to regulate the reproductive habits of women to expand imperial projects and state power is not a modern British phenomenon; rather, a careful analysis of Roman sources on the early imperial period reveals that the integral link between empire and female bodies was recognized during the Augustan era. Prior to the passage of the Augustan legislation, Roman women were certainly viewed as vehicles for the transmission of wealth and property. Yet, I highlight that the laws are particularly significant because they regulate this function within the legal sphere; furthermore, I demonstrate how upper-class Roman women subsequently increased their ideological presence in the legal and public realms as a consequence of the Augustan laws. Ancient sources expose how Roman women played a crucial role in Augustus’ efforts to increase the population by encouraging the production of legitimate children among the upper-classes. Therefore, this legislation can be viewed as part of a broader imperial strategy carefully enacted by the emperor as a means of cultivating the power and longevity of the Roman Empire. In utilizing gender and sexuality as central categories of analysis, I make an intervention into a broader discussion on empire-building. A comparative historical approach reveals several parallels between the British and Roman cases; thus, I argue that the method of managing the reproductive capacities of women in order to increase specific classes among the population is visible during ancient periods of imperialism. My analysis suggests that this strategy of controlling female bodies that was practiced under Augustus can be understood as part of an “imperial paradigm” that resurfaces in modern imperial endeavors.

I. Introduction

Under the leadership of Augustus (r. 27 BCE – 14 CE), Rome experienced important poltical and social changes as the new *princeps* initiated the transformation of the Roman State from a Republic to an Empire.[[1]](#footnote-1) Perhaps one of the most distinguishing actions that is often associated with the reign of Augustus is the passage of two pieces of legislation: the *lex Iulia de Maritandis Ordinibus* and the *lex Iulia de adulteriis*, which were later revised under the *lex Papia Poppaea*. These laws, which were based on a system of legal rewards and punishments, respectively encouraged marriage and the subsequent reproduction of legitimate children and prohibited adulterous relations among married Roman citizens. This legislation is noteworthy because it marks the first major instance where there is direct governmental intervention into the mechanics of the family; matters that were previously considered to be under the legal control of the *pater familias,* the male head of the household, were now subject to the authority of the law. Therefore, under the power of the new Principate, the domestic and legal realms intersected in unprecedented ways, as ideologies about what issues properly belong to the family and those that belong to the government collided.

The first half of this thesis examines ancient Roman sources in order to explore the role that the Augustan marriage legislation played in legally positioning females within Roman society. I briefly demonstrate how, although Roman women were previously considered critical vehicles for the transmission of wealth, the Augustan legislation regulated this function within the legal sphere. The laws intervened in the most private aspects of the Roman *familia* and legally superseded the authority of the *pater familias*. As a consequence of this, I suggest that the State became the metaphorical *pater familias*, which displaced the boundaries between the public and private spheres. Sources on the laws reveal that one of the main purposes of this legislation was to manage inheritance patterns among specific classes of Roman citizens – particularly the upper-class. Thus, by making matters of marriage and reproduction governmental concerns with legal ramifications, the laws established a legal role for women as child-bearers and child-rearers. Therefore, I posit that Roman women subsequently increased their ideological presence in issues that extended beyond the household, as their role as mothers took on greater legal importance.

Furthermore, I also discuss how one of the primary consequences of the Augustan era was a noticeable shift in power structures from the senatorial classes to the imperial court itself. Ancient sources explain how authority became increasingly concentrated in the hands of the *princeps* during the reign of Augustus. Interestingly, a close investigation of references to Livia, the wife of Augustus, suggests that women in the imperial family, specifically the wife of the emperor, possessed the capacity to exercise power to a greater extent than was possible during the Republican period. Livia’s ability to maneuver herself within both the private and public spheres is certainly exceptional due to her privileged status; yet, I argue that the empress’ role as the one who produced and raised the heir to the monarchy is a primary source of increased power for her beginning during the Augustan era. I suggest that a noteworthy link between the Augustan marriage legislation and the larger importance attributed to direct familial ties under monarchies is that both granted elite Roman women more political power. The laws passed under Augustus ensured that upper-class women were legally positioned as necessary vehicles for the transmission of property, status, and subsequently, political power; likewise, during this same time period, women in the imperial family also transmitted political power to the next generation through their capacity to bear future heirs to the throne. Thus, my analysis suggests that the ideological boundaries between the public, private, legal, and domestic realms were displaced during the reign of Augustus and consequently situated upper-class Roman women in an important position at the intersection of these various spheres.

In the second half of this thesis, I investigate why a thorough regulation of the inner domain, by which I mean the intimate sexual habits and relationships that typically occur within the confines of the household, appears to be so necessary for the successful functioning of the outer domain under imperial projects. I posit that there is a necessary link between regulating sex (and thus consequently female bodies and their reproductive habits) and imperial expansion; more importantly, my analysis reveals that this link was understood in the Augustan age and not just during later periods of British and European imperialism. A brief comparison of British imperial tactics during eighteenth through twentieth centuries in the metropole and in the colonies with Augustan imperial policy exposes that similar strategies were implemented by both the British and the Romans in order to gain and sustain power. Furthermore, this comparative method solidifies my claim that a critical aspect of both British and Roman imperialism was the control and regulation of female reproductive habits. Therefore, the striking similarities between these cases suggest that one important aspect of empire-building is the careful control of women’s bodies; more specifically, both British and Roman authorities intentionally tried to regulate sexual relationships between individuals of different social statuses.

II. Methodology

The primary sources that I examine in order to provide evidence for my assertions include the prominent Roman jurist, Gaius, who wrote the *Institutes* in the second century CE. Additionally, I include evidence from the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, “The Achievements of the Deified Augustus,” written by the emperor himself in the first century CE as well as the *Annals* by Tacitus, the biographies of *Divus Augustus* and *Tiberius* by Suetonius, and the *Historia Romana* by Cassius Dio. Tacitus and Suetonius wrote between the end of the first century CE and the first half of the second century CE; Dio wrote during the late second through early third centuries CE. It is worthwhile to stress that, with the exception of the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, all of these sources were written a considerable amount of time after the legislation – and Augustus’ reign itself – had passed. Each of these authors also had their own prejudices and goals and thus shaped their respective narratives to fit their personal agendas. These accounts cannot be taken as impartial sources and thus my analysis naturally derives from biased viewpoints. Nonetheless, given that these are the surviving sources, I carefully analyze each of these texts in order to ascertain how the legislation positioned Roman women legally as vehicles for the transmission of wealth; furthermore, I explore how these sources expose Augustan anxieties about population, class hierarchies, morality and power. By exploring these themes in the primary sources and building on secondary source scholarship, I draw out the connection between the control of female bodies and the Roman Empire.

Ann McClintock’s *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* analyzes the complex and contradictory nature of British imperialism; McClintock importantly argues that “imperialism cannot be fully understood without a theory of gender power… gender dynamics were, from the outset, fundamental to the securing and maintenance of the imperial enterprise.”[[2]](#footnote-2) I acknowledge that the British and Roman Empires are separated by almost two millennia and certainly existed and operated within vastly different contexts; yet, the similarities between the two should not be overlooked, as the repeated parallels suggest that these correlations are not merely coincidence. Therefore, I employ McClintock’s framework and I deliberately center gender and sexuality as primary categories through which to explore ancient Roman sources and the inception of Roman imperialism under Augustus. Whereas scholars on British imperialism have demonstrated the importance of an attention to reproduction and the management of female sexual behavior for the British Empire’s expansion and dominance, using gender and sexuality as my main categories of analysis allows me to show that a concern with Roman females and their procreative habits likewise functioned as a vital component of Augustan ideology and imperialist tactics.

Kristina Milnor, in *Gender, Domesticity, and the Age of Augustus*, argues that gender can be conceptualized as an unstable and precarious force that must be both contained and controlled. Furthermore, she elaborates that employing gender as a principal category of analysis does have useful potential for questioning modern fixed binaries; yet, perhaps more pertinent to this project, Milnor also points out that “the ancient world had its own categories and assumptions within which gender might be a (sometimes deliberately) destabilizing force.”[[3]](#footnote-3) Likewise, David Cohen mentions that popular beliefs about women in Roman society included the ideas that females possessed the power to enact social chaos and that their nature compelled them towards this behavior; he informs readers that fears about the power of female sexuality seem to have been prominent in the Roman male imaginary.[[4]](#footnote-4) I want to suggest that Augustus was conscious of the possible destabilizing power that gender *and* sexual habits possessed and thus he intentionally regulated and capitalized on this power to both destabilize old hierarchies of power and stabilize his own sovereignty. Likewise, it is plausible that Augustus wanted to reduce the number of sexual relationships that could potentially create social chaos – specifically those between members of different social statuses. Thus, he legally restricted them in order to control the flow of wealth and property and ultimately to ensure his own political dominance, as will be discussed in greater detail below.

As the evidence provided by other scholars on the British Empire reveals, British authorities also recognized the power of gender as a destabilizing force. Additionally, it should not be minimized that in both the Roman and British instances it is specifically male authorities that aim to control female bodies and reproduction – this raises important questions about why a female ability to engage in unregulated sex was seen as such an intimidating challenge to masculine control. Furthermore, studies on the British Empire emphasize how anxieties about the population, interracial sexual relations and reproduction, and morality are all critical components of the imperial project. This thesis draws attention to Roman sources that discuss the Augustan legislation and highlights how this evidence reveals a concern with increasing the population, managing the transmission of wealth and property within families, limiting sexual relations among Romans of different classes and social groups, and restoring a moral code that was allegedly upheld by the ancestors. Whereas the British were concerned with interracial sex, Augustus was concerned with interclass sex; in both instances, the primary issue seems to be an anxiety about the progeny produced by these relationships and the threat that their indeterminate status poses to the empire more broadly. I want to stress that all these various factors are entangled with attempts to assert masculine authority and are all connected in some way to the need to control female bodies.Therefore, these interconnected strands form a complicated web that centers around the linkage between the sexual habits exercised by female citizens and imperialism.

It is important to note from the onset that the Augustan laws do not appear to have been effective in actually spurring Roman citizens towards marriage and away from adulterous relations or sexual encounters between unmarried individuals. As evidence for this, Tacitus informs his readers that the legislation failed to “make marriage and the family popular – childlessness remained the vogue” (Tacitus, *Ann*. 3.25). Likewise, the claim that these laws were largely ineffective is reiterated by Suetonius, who writes that Augustus discovered “the spirit of the law was being evaded by betrothal with immature girls and by frequent changes of wives” (Suetonius, *Aug*. 34.2).[[5]](#footnote-5) Thus, at least according to the Roman authors writing several decades after the laws were enacted, the legislation was generally unsuccessful and did not alter the norms of actual social practices.

Furthermore, Roman sources suggest that not only was the legislation unsuccessful, but it was actively resisted by the senatorial and upper-classes and caused widespread opposition. As evidence, Tacitus uses imagery of chains and fetters to describe the laws. Tacitus argues that the laws, as “sentries” over the people, went too far; many people “suffered from their attacks, and the positions of many had been wholly ruined” (Tacitus, *Ann*. 3.28). Tacitus goes so far as to state that the Augustan laws fostered a “reign of terror” and credits Tiberius, the heir to Augustus, with remedying the situation by “untying many of the legal knots” (Tacitus, *Ann*. 3.28). Likewise, Suetonius also mentions that Augustus “found the people utterly averse to submit” to the laws and was thus “unable to carry [the mandate] out because of an open revolt against its provisions” (Suetonius, *Aug*. 34.1). Therefore, both of these historians stress that the Roman people did not merely evade the laws, but engaged in some sort of serious resistance.

Likewise, in addition to the later sources, the Latin love elegist Propertius also exposes important evidence about the reception of the laws. Propertius lived and wrote during the reign of Augustus and thus his poems provide critical insight regarding contemporary reactions. In the first three lines of elegy 2.7, the poet writes “How you must have rejoiced, Cynthia, at the repeal of that law, whose erstwhile issuance caused us to weep for many an hour in case it parted us!” (Propertius, *Elegies* 2.7). First, these lines are significant because they confirm later sources’ claims that the legislation itself was rescinded. Propertius implies that the resistance to the legislation was so extreme that it led to the laws being revoked. Second, Propertius shows that both he and his lover Cynthia wept over the laws because they feared that they would be forced to separate. The specific use of the verb “weep” conveys that the laws were not merely inconvenient; instead, they appear to have fostered a sense of grief or despair for those who were legally prevented from being sexually united. Thus, these lines expose how the Augustan legislation not only intervened in the private, sexual lives of the Roman populace, but also perhaps felt to some like an attack that affected their emotional states.

Additional evidence from 2.7 confirms that the legislation felt like a deeply personal and invasive violation into the private lives of the Roman people. In the last phrases of the poem, Propertius declares boldly, “You are my only joy: be I your only joy, Cynthia: this love means more to me than the name of father” (Propertius, *Elegies* 2.7). In this assertion, the poet informs readers that, although the Augustan legislation attempted to legally mandate who Propertius could love and find pleasure in, he refuses to be obedient to the laws because he firmly believes that only his lover Cynthia can please him and bring him lasting joy. Additionally, the final phrase also seems to imply that efforts to justify the laws based on tradition or the customs of the ancestors is futile; Propertius claims that this love, though perhaps deemed unlawful and unauthorized, means far more to him than his familial name and reputation. Therefore, the lines from Propertius reveal both that there was there strong emotional resistance to the legislation and that Romans actively chose to disobey the rules. This poem also implies that the explanations or reasoning provided for the laws actually failed to legitimize them in the eyes of the people.

Therefore, a warning highlighted by Cohen is important to reiterate. Cohen stresses that many societies “manifest sharp divergences between the ideological representation of sex and gender and actual social practices.”[[6]](#footnote-6) This distinction is critical for this project. Furthermore, as is discussed in greater detail in the following sections, these restrictions were targeted at a specific group of Roman citizens, namely those who had enough wealth and property to pass on to their heirs, and therefore could only have impacted a portion of the populace.[[7]](#footnote-7) Although existing evidence indicates that the laws did not successfully change the norms of behavior and realistically could only have influenced certain classes, it is clear that the legislation did have noteworthy ideological implications. Thus, I want to emphasize that this thesis is principally concerned with the ideological significance of the laws and how they ideologically situated Roman women within Roman society.

Finally, it is relevant to stress that the extant Roman sources are male-dominated. There is an unfortunate lack of existing ancient sources authored by women from the Roman Empire period; this perhaps unsurprisingly has resulted either in scholarly attention directed towards Roman males or attempts to understand Roman women and their position in society from an explicitly male perspective. I want to underscore that my analysis and arguments therefore pertain to the possible ways that the Augustan legislation *might have* created an ideological space for Roman women to assert some level of legal and political influence outside of the domestic sphere; at the very least, the mere enactment of the laws brings a new level of attention to women and their reproductive habits. Therefore, a critical aspect of this study is an attempt to increase awareness on imaginable Roman female agency.

III. Part 1: The Augustan Laws on Marriage and Adultery

In her article “Decrying White Peril: Interracial Sex and the Rise of Anticolonial Nationalism in the Gold Coast,” Carina Ray provides clear evidence regarding the crucial link between the British empire and female bodies, specifically African women’s bodies and sexual practices. She explores how African and European men alike appear to have recognized the potency of female sexual habits and its implications for both imperial and nationalist projects. Ray usefully employs the phrase “the carnal politics of imperial rule” to refer to the ways in which gender and sexuality factor into the dynamics of imperial and colonial projects and she describes how British colonialists aimed to transform African culture by placing deliberate “emphases on women, the family, sexuality and religion.”[[8]](#footnote-8) I argue that this exact same statement is applicable within the Augustan context, as Roman sources reveal that Augustus sought to both ideologically and physically transform the Roman State through the enactment of legislation that centered around women, the family, sexuality, and moral renewal.

i. Context

First, the context during which Augustus seized authority helps explain some of the pragmatic purposes of the legislation. The rise to power of the first emperor required careful maneuvering and cautious administration of both the Roman senate and the people. Augustus became *princeps* after a tumultuous period of civil war, conflict, and population decline; furthermore, some ancient authors expressed their belief that the last decades of the Roman Republic were filled with moral corruption, licentiousness, and lack of appropriate moderation.[[9]](#footnote-9) It is undoubtable that the Roman population was impacted as a consequence of several decades of intense civil war. As Dieter Nörr notes, underpopulation not only threatened extinction of entire families, but also signaled military weakness.[[10]](#footnote-10) Likewise, Nörr describes that in addition to the frequent civil wars that marked the last decades of the Republican Era, there was also a noticeable decrease in the number of Roman marriages combined with a surge in the use of preventative methods such as infant exposure and abortion.[[11]](#footnote-11) Therefore, all of these issues clearly posed potential problems for the Augustan regime and for an emperor looking to expand his empire and power. Thus, attempting to mitigate the threat of population decline and its consequences, Augustus decided on legal measures. These various factors certainly seem to have played a critical role in inciting the enactment of the laws; however, additional contextual clues suggest that the Augustan legislation was not merely a practical solution to a real problem, but was also partly fueled Augustus’ efforts to secure greater imperial power.

Another notable aspect related to Augustus’ attempt to achieve authority pertains to his competition with Marc Antony. Suetonius writes that Augustus “levied armies and henceforth ruled the State” with Antony for nearly twelve years, and then ruled by himself for forty-four years (Suetonius, *Aug*. 8.3). Suetonius also discloses that after Augustus broke off his alliance with Antony, which the historian notes was always “doubtful and uncertain,” he eventually defeated Antony at the Battle of Actium and “forced him to commit suicide” (Suetonius, *Aug*. 17.4). Importantly, the ancient author says that Augustus was prompted to end his alliance with Antony because he desired “to be able to carry out his plans with more authority,” a statement that clearly highlights his aspirations for power (Suetonius, *Aug*. 10.2). Suetonius briefly reveals that after Augustus defeated his rival, he “nipped in the bud at various times several outbreaks, attempts at revolution, and conspiracies” (Suetonius, *Aug*. 19.1).[[12]](#footnote-12) Thus, it is necessary to consider that certain groups among both the Roman people and senate supported Antony in favor of Augustus and were angered by the eventual victory of Augustus. For example, Tacitus writes that Augustus “wrung” or “extorted” the consulate from “the *unwilling* senate,” and furthermore, although there was peace under Augustus following the civil wars, it was “peace with bloodshed” (Tacitus, *Ann*. 1.10) (emphasis my own). This brief inclusion implies violent opposition to the authority of Augustus. Therefore, it appears clear that at least some Romans doubted the legitimacy of the *princeps* as the sole ruler.[[13]](#footnote-13)

Both Suetonius and Tacitus portray Augustus as hungry for power; yet, it does appear that the *princeps* attempted to disguise his dominance by trying to convey that he was doing what was best for the State and the people. Given the likelihood of doubts and opposition to his rule, it is unsurprising that Augustus tried to mask his desire for sole sovereignty by presenting his political decisions as advantageous for all Romans. For example, Suetonius writes that Augustus believed it was too “hazardous” for power to be divided among the Roman State; rather, Augustus thought it best to keep authority concentrated in his own hands (Suetonius, *Aug*. 28.1). Suetonius also records that the *princeps* often affirmed his good intentions and says that Augustus desired to “establish the State in a firm and secure position,” with the hope that he would be called the author “of the best possible government” (Suetonius, *Aug*. 28.2). The historian likewise notes that the *princeps* made “every effort to prevent any dissatisfaction with the new regime” (Suetonius, *Aug*. 28.2). This sort of diction perhaps permitted Augustus to mask his imperial ambitions by emphasizing the benefits that his position as sovereign allowed him to bestow on the people by strengthening the State.

ii. The *Pater Familias* and the Structure of the Roman *Familia*

This desire for authority over the Roman people manifests itself clearly in the marriage laws. A central consequence of the Augustan legislation was its direct governmental and legal invasion into the mechanisms of the family. As Cohen discusses, during the Republican era, the family was conceived of as a social unit that possessed a substantial degree of legal autonomy; therefore, the new marital laws represented “a massive and deliberate appropriation by the state of a new regulatory sphere: marriage, divorce, and sexuality.”[[14]](#footnote-14) Many scholars have argued that these laws were not merely an updated version of previous practices; rather, they were quite revolutionary because Augustus and the Roman State were radically interfering with the rights of the family. Cohen emphasizes that under these new laws and the Augustan regime, the Roman family, reproductive relationships, and marriage became “the objects of legal categorizations, official discourses and political strategies;” he notes that this not only had legal ramifications but suggests that the laws were an essential component of the Augustan strategy to create “an axis of power and knowledge in the development of a new form of government.”[[15]](#footnote-15) Ultimately, this new form of government was the Roman Empire – launched by Augustus himself. Thus, it is noteworthy that the location where this transformation of government occurred was within the domestic realm: the household. In extending governmental power beyond the public and political domains and into the household itself, I want to suggest that Augustus strategically increased the authority of the monarch by widening his legal sphere of influence.

Prior to the Augustan legislation, the marriages (and consequently the reproductive capacities) of Roman women were largely controlled and managed within the *familia* by the *pater familias*. Eva Cantarella explains that the Roman *familia* referred to a group that was subject to the authority of the *pater familias*; she notes that a father’s male and female offspring and their descendants were subject to him by nature, while his wife and slaves were accountable to his authority by law.[[16]](#footnote-16) She also importantly points out that *patria* *potestas*, which refers to the rights and powers that were entitled to Roman fathers, permitted the male head of the household to decide to whom to give his daughters in marriage to; additionally, he also exercised significant power over his wife.[[17]](#footnote-17) Therefore, the Augustan laws intervened in the traditional rights of the *pater familias* by making marriage and the reproductive and sexual habits of the family liable to the government, not Roman fathers.

In addition to the ways in which the *pater familias* executed control over the social dynamics of his family members, Richard Saller importantly stresses that the phrase itself predominantly signified an “estate owner” and is found most frequently in legal texts.[[18]](#footnote-18) Saller explains that *pater familias* as a concept was a central component of legal ideas in the Roman law of persons and property; interestingly, he also describes how the requirement to be legally considered a *pater familias* was one’s capacity to own property. Saller then emphasizes that this means that “fatherhood was *not* an essential aspect” of the concept.[[19]](#footnote-19) Furthermore, Saller also discusses how a survey of classical literary texts reveals that the term *pater familias* was most frequently used to refer to property ownership and he argues that this indicates that the meaning of the phrase to signify “fatherhood” was undoubtedly secondary.[[20]](#footnote-20) He also notes that the intersection between family relationships and the family line with property ownership was fundamental for the transmission of wealth and property by will.[[21]](#footnote-21) This analysis provided by Saller is relevant to this project because it highlights how the responsibilities of the *pater familias* were deeply imbricated with the management of property; therefore, I argue that the Augustan laws, by intervening in the family, actually position the State as the ideological *pater familias*. Essentially, the *princeps* guarenteed that female members of the Roman *familia* were legally accountable to Roman laws and not merely to their fathers; it thus appears that Augustus simultaneously reduced the power of the *pater familias,* expanded governmental authority, and gave Roman women some level of legal obligation via the enactment of his laws.

Additionally, Augustus himself was granted the honorific title of *pater patriae* in 2 BCE. Dio notes the title of *pater* gave the rulers a certain authority over the Romans and he claims that the phrase connotes “the authority which fathers once had over their children” (Dio, *His*. *Rom*. 53.18). He further stresses the parallels between the State and the *familia* when he writes that emperors “should love their subjects as they would their children” and that the Roman people “should revere [the emperors] as they would their fathers” (Dio, *His*. *Rom*. 53.18). Weinstock says that this phrase was first employed by Cicero, which then inspired historians to grant the title *parens patriae* to Romulus and Camillus and he notes that no one else held the title until Julius Caesar.[[22]](#footnote-22) Weinstock claims that, following Caesar’s death, a cult in the Forum was instituted and a statue with the inscription ‘*Parenti patriae*’ was put up in honor of him; the author argues that Augustus must have received an early offer of the same title since he “was in fact called ‘father of his country’ in literature, on inscriptions, and on coins long before he accepted the title officially” in 2 BCE.[[23]](#footnote-23) He concludes that this was one of the official titles granted to Roman emperors after Tiberius and he stresses that the relationship of emperor to citizen was significantly changed as a result of its usage – “[the Roman citizens] were all now bound to him, like the son to his father.”[[24]](#footnote-24)

Therefore, the State became the metaphorical *pater familias* through its attainment of legal authority over the household; furthermore, ancient sources reveal that Augustus himself and subsequent emperors were deemed *pater patriae,* an appellation that quite literally stresses the idea of the ruler as the father over the Roman people. Thus, the official granting of this honorific title to the *princeps* provides further evidence that the ideological boundaries between the domestic and the political were displaced during the Augustan era. The nature of the term *pater* implies a sense of closeness and intimacy between the emperor and his subjects; therefore, it seems plausible to argue that the use of this title demonstrates that the power of the monarch increased during the Augustan era as a consequence of his deeper entanglement, at least in the ideological and legal senses, in the lives of the Roman people. The laws permitted the State greater involvement in the mechanisms of the family; likewise, as head of the new imperial regime, *Pater* Augustus and subsequent emperors were also granted heightened access into the dynamics of people’s most intimate sexual habits by nature of their position as sovereign.

iii. Roman Women and Ideological Displacement

Although the exact specifications of the laws are unknown, the ancient sources all reveal that the Augustan legislation placed a strong emphasis on encouraging the reproduction of children among Roman citizens; importantly, these sources also disclose the fact that women received special benefits through their commitment to reproduction and the birth of children. For instance, the jurist Gaius writes that under the Augustan laws women were released from guardianship if they produced a certain number of children. Gaius elaborates that freedwomen could also receive this reward; furthermore, women were permitted to make wills without the consent of their guardians in exchange for the reproduction of children (Gaius, *Inst.* 1.45, 1.194, 3.44). In his discussions of Livia, Dio also confirms that the new Augustan laws granted special privileges on parents who had three or more children; he writes that men or women who had at least this number of offspring were “not subject to the penalties imposed for childlessness” and that they received the rewards granted to large families (Dio, *His*. *Rom*. 55.2). It is therefore clear that the laws used a system of rewards and special legal privileges as a method of incentivizing the Roman people to produce children. These sources also importantly highlight how Roman women could achieve a certain level of legal freedom if they fulfilled their duty as mothers. In exchange for contributing to the Roman population through their capacities as child-bearers, Roman women can seemingly use their bodies and sex to gain some independence. Likewise, the Roman State capitalized on this incentive to ensure that the population increased.

Although impossible to discern whether this was intentional or not, the Augustan legislation did result in a sort of ideological displacement of traditional boundaries as the government and household increasingly overlapped. Milnor argues that a specific gendered discourse was implemented during the Augustan era that targeted the domestic sphere in an effort to renew a sense of national purpose.[[25]](#footnote-25) She suggests that, by placing public attention on the inner workings of the domestic realm, Augustus was able to invoke a sense of tradition, virtue, and morality which helped the new imperial government “find a way for Rome, in the aftermath of civil war, to imagine herself once again as a community of shared values.”[[26]](#footnote-26) Milnor makes a critical distinction when she articulates that “the fact of a gendered divide between public and private life” is not what was created by Augustus; rather, she claims that what was fostered by the *princeps* was “the celebration, negotiation, and continuous anxious return” to this divide.[[27]](#footnote-27) I suggest that women were placed at the crux of this divide and experienced a complex and contradictory sense of displacement as a consequence of Augustan policy. While women were legally encouraged to increase their “domestic” activities by marrying and reproducing children, they also could increase their independence through the same behavior. Furthermore, these laws granted women a central and positive role in legal policy both explicitly as vehicles for the transmission of wealth and implicitly as mothers of future Roman citizens and empire-builders.

This displacement is also evident in Tacitus’ account, as he suggests that the Augustan legislation caused some Romans to conceive of the household as a metaphor for the Roman Empire and the workings of the State writ large. Tacitus writes that if a male citizen avoided his responsibilities of paternity, “the state, as universal parent, might step into the vacant inheritance” (Tacitus, *Ann*. 3.28). Likewise, Tacitus claims that, if Roman males “shirked the privileges of paternity,” it became the responsibility of the State to intervene (Tacitus, *Ann*. 3.28). These statements are significant for several reasons: first, Tacitus exposes the fact that the State, as the “universal parent” who can now legally intervene in matters related to reproduction, was responsible to ensure that Roman men did not evade their duties of paternity. This is additional evidence that the State was directly intervening in the sexual behavior of the populace under the intentional direction of Augustus. Second, these statements also highlight that the State was interested in patterns of inheritance. Therefore, this not only provides evidence for my argument that the Augustan laws allowed the State to become the metaphorical *pater* *familias* over the body of citizens, but this language also reiterates how deeply intertwined the household and the State became as a consequence of Augustan policies. Therefore, boundaries between private and public were increasingly blurred.

iv. The Power of the Empress: Livia’s Role in the Imperial Court

In this section, I argue that an investigation of the references to Livia and discussions of her behavior throughout the primary sources provides evidence that, beginning during the age of Augustus, the wife of the emperor possessed the capacity to exercise considerable political power through her role as the producer of an heir to the monarchy. Although it is conceivable to conclude that the Augustan legislation merely reinforced strict gender roles and tried to contain women within the private realm by encouraging domestic activities such as child-bearing and child-rearing, this conclusion problematically limits the potential for discussions on how females might have exercised agency in antiquity. Therefore, by choosing instead to imagine the ways that other women could have increased their presence in the legal and political realms via their function as mothers, it is possible to argue that both upper-class Roman females and women in the imperial court increased their influence by being the primary means through which property, status, and political power were transmitted. Additionally, Livia’s ability and determination to transgress boundaries between the household and the public signals that an important, albeit subtle, ideological shift occurred about the appropriate place for imperial women in Roman society as a consequence of the Augustan reign – a brief examination of Livia’s behavior suggests that emperors’ wives were able to exert power to a greater extent than during the Republican era.

Prior to a discussion of Livia, it is important to briefly expand on my earlier claim regarding the significant shift in power structures from the senatorial classes to the imperial court that occurred during the age of Augustus. Evidence for this transfer of power can be traced in the accounts of Suetonius, Tacitus and Cassius Dio. For example, Tacitus says that Augustus possessed a “lust” or “desire for domination” and he states that the emperor “enticed the soldiery with gifts, the people with food, and everyone with the sweetness of inactivity” which permitted him to draw to himself “the responsibility of senate, magistrates, and laws” (Tacitus, *Ann*. 1.10, 1.2). Likewise, Suetonius states that Augustus believed it would be “dangerous to the public to have the government placed again under the control of the people” so he instead “resolved to keep it in his own hands,” which clearly highlights how power became united in the person of the emperor (Suetonius, *Aug*. 28.1). Additionally, Dio explicitly writes that “the power of both people and senate passed entirely into the hands of Augustus, and from his time there was, strictly speaking, a monarchy” (Dio, *His*. *Rom*. 53.17). The language used in these statements stresses that power became firmly concentrated in the hands of the emperor beginning under Augustus. Ultimately, this shift necessarily afforded direct familial ties, and subsequently the production of heirs, greater significance; therefore, as a consequence of the imperial family’s expanded power, the responsibility of the emperor’s wife to produce and raise an heir to the monarchy obviously also carried more importance.

The way in which Tacitus presents Livia throughout his account exposes the author’s desire to present a negative portrayal of the *princeps* *femina*. Yet, close attention to some of the statements from passages that mention Livia does provide additional useful evidence for how she transgressed boundaries between the domestic and the political spheres via her position as the mother of Tiberius, heir to Augustus’ throne. Ancient authors reveal that Tiberius, the son of Livia and her former husband Tiberius Claudius Nero, and Augustus’ youngest grandson, Agrippa Postumus, were both formerly adopted by Augustus after the death of his two grandsons, Gaius and Lucius Caesar (Suetonius, *Tib*. 15.2; Tacitus, *Ann*. 1.3, 1.10). Tacitus blames Livia and Tiberius for the politically-motivated murder of Agrippa Postumus, stating that they “hurriedly procured the murder of a youth whom they suspected and detested” (Tactus, *Ann*. 1.6). Suetonius claims that Agrippa was “slain by a tribune of the soldiers appointed to guard him, who received a letter in which he was bidden to do the deed,” noting that it is unknown whether the letter was left by Augustus or if it was written by Livia herself using the name of her husband (Suetonius, *Tib*. 22.1). Nonetheless, both authors say that Tiberius denied the deed and Suetonius remarks that “he did not hesitate at once to assume and to exercise imperial authority” (Suetonius, *Tib*. 24.1). Therefore, not only was Livia the vehicle through which the heir to the monarchy was produced, but the ancient authors also imply that she likely played a critical role in ensuring that none of the other potential successors could threaten Tiberius for the throne.

Notably, in the section where Tacitus describes the death of Agrippa, the ancient author explicitly includes Livia as a culpable agent in the murder. This is significant because it implies that Livia had her own political ambitions and took action to accomplish these goals. Likewise, Suetonius’ decision to mention that it is possible that “Livia wrote [the letter] herself in the name of her husband” in order to eliminate Agrippa, the logical rival for the monarchy, is especially important because it clearly allows readers to view Livia as strategically exercising political power. Tacitus also bitterly states that Livia was “as a mother, a curse to the realm; as a stepmother, a curse to the house of the Caesars” (Tacitus, *Ann*. 1.10). He thus argues that she caused both domestic problems within the household and caused political problems for the Caesars more broadly; therefore, although the impression of Livia is clearly unfavorable in this account, it should still be noted that depiction of Livia by both Tacitus and Suetonius nonetheless presents the empress as a powerful, calculating woman who possessed the ability to affect change. Most importantly, she guaranteed that Tiberius became the emperor following Augustus’ death. Therefore, these references to Livia and her behavior certainly suggest that she was not passive.

Interestingly, another piece of evidence regarding the shift in power structures to the imperial court is visible in the account of Agrippa Postumus’ murder. Tacitus writes that when the action was discovered by Sallustius Crispus,

“he warned Livia that the mysteries of the household… should not be made public and that Tiberius should not dissipate the essence of the principate by calling everything to the attention of the senate: it was a condition of commanding that the account would not balance unless it were rendered to a single individual” (Tacitus, *Ann*. 1.6).

Thus, my interpretation of this metaphorical statement is that it reveals a belief that, under the new Principate, it was necessary for power to be centralized in the hands of the emperor in order for his rule to be successful. Likewise, this section also explicitly highlights an awareness that certain matters ought to be intentionally kept a secret from the senate. Given the recommendation made by Crispus that important political information should be carefully contained within the imperial household and *not* reported to the senate, it seems logical to conclude that the desire to keep those outside of the imperial court in the dark on political matters indicates that the senate’s power was reduced.

The central function Livia has in producing and raising the next heir to the monarchy arguably grants her a significant amount of political power; however, ancient authors portray the wife of the *princeps* as exercising power in other ways as well. For instance, a provocative piece of evidence for this appears in Cassius Dio’s account. In this scene, the historian depicts Livia as playing an important role in matters that extend beyond the domestic realm. As Dio describes an exchange between the *princeps* and his wife, he portrays Livia as actively engaging in political affairs and discussions with important political implications. Dio claims that, one night while trying to sleep, Livia noticed Augustus’ restlessness. After being questioned by Livia about the cause, the emperor apparently responded by asking,

“What man, wife, could even for a moment forget his cares, who always has so many enemies and is so constantly the object of plots on the part of one set of men or another? Do you not see how many are attacking both me and *our* sovereignty?” (Dio, *His*. *Rom*. 55.14). (emphasis my own)

As the conversation progressed, Livia allegedly stated,

“I have some advice to give you, that is, if you are willing to receive it, and will not censure me because I, though a woman, dare suggest to you something which no one else, even of your most intimate friends, would venture to suggest, not because they are not aware of it, but because they are not bold enough to speak” (Dio, *His*. *Rom*. 55.16).

In the first quote, Dio presents Augustus as using the phrase “our sovereignty” to describe the position of himself and Livia. The use of “our” raises certain problems for scholars, as it is unclear if Dio intended this to be an example of the royal “we” or if he truly meant to suggest that Augustus believed his wife shared a critical position in the sovereignty.[[28]](#footnote-28) A variety of suggestions about how this scene and this phrase ought to be interpreted have been offered by scholars; yet, my research indicates that there appears to be widespread reluctance to make a firm claim on whether the pronoun was actually intended to mean “our” in its precise sense. For example, Jesper Madsen believes that Dio intentionally depicted Livia in this scene as an “adept political analyst” and Melissa Dowling argues that Livia’s sex should not prevent her from being a useful critic.[[29]](#footnote-29) In contrast, Eric Adler believes that Dio was attempting to present Livia throughout this scene as manipulative and calculating.[[30]](#footnote-30) In his consideration of the full dialogue between Augustus and Livia, Adler claims that “by casting Augustus as in part a moralist and Livia as a steadfast realist, Dio can leave the reader with the impression that Livia was the more cold and calculating of the two – that, perhaps, she took advantage of her husband.”[[31]](#footnote-31) These scholars seem cautiously undecided on the question of the phrase “our sovereignty;” yet, they all agree that Livia is portrayed by Dio as exercising agency – whether this display of female power is supposed to be positive or negative is controversial.

Peter Swan raises the question: “Is Dio accommodating Severan sensibilities by admitting (contrary to his own view) a notion of female corulership?”[[32]](#footnote-32) Swan does take the “our” as genuinely referring to both Augustus and Livia; yet, he qualifies this argument by suggesting that Livia’s influence is countered by the fact that the conversation occurs within the privacy of the imperial bedchamber and not a public council, even though she is clearly presented as an advisor to Augustus.[[33]](#footnote-33) Thus, Swan suggests that Dio did purposefully use the plural pronoun to include Livia as a part of the sovereignty; however, because she offers political guidance in the private realm, she does not threaten the ultimate authority of Augustus himself and his role as sovereign in the male-dominated public sphere. It seems to me that Swan is suggesting that the literal boundaries of the household serve as a safeguard to prevent any threat of feminine power extending beyond the domestic sphere.

I want to argue that the ambiguity of the phrase “our sovereignty” and the debate surrounding its proper interpretation is what makes this episode in Dio’s account so significant. Adler claims that the assessment of Livia presented by Dio throughout his account is “decidedly mixed,” noting several instances where Dio stresses Livia’s positive features.[[34]](#footnote-34) Likewise, whereas Dio might have chosen to simply present Augustus as stating “my sovereignty,” he uses the plural pronoun intentionally. Furthermore, the following exchange between the emperor and his wife and the arguments attributed to Livia are particularly noteworthy. Dio depicts a dynamic and reciprocal relationship where Livia is permitted to speak her opinions on political issues.

Although Livia does observe that her position as a female might prevent her husband from giving her permission to comment, she also acknowledges her boldness and even goes so far as to claim that Augustus’ friends, who are unnamed but assumedly male, are not bold enough. Therefore, the ambiguous nature of the phrase “our sovereignty” combined with the presentation of Livia immediately after its employment permits multiple interpretations of Livia’s character; importantly, rather than opting for a straightforward remark, Dio’s mixed portrayal leaves open the possibility for readers to understand Livia as possessing political agency. Although perhaps safeguarded by the walls of the imperial bedchamber, Livia’s advice nonetheless has ramifications that extend into the political realm.

Other scholars have also discussed how Livia exercised considerable power for a female at the time. For instance, in his examination of the extent to which Livia was involved in the public life of Augustan Rome, Nicholas Purcell dissects the use of the term *princeps* *femina*. Purcell suggests that the mixing of these two words results in a contradictory expression: *princeps*, which connotates a distinctly political and public idea, with *femina*, “the essentially and basically unpolitical, apolitical idea.”[[35]](#footnote-35) Thus, the very combination of these two words exposes that Livia successfully blurred the boundaries between these spheres. It seems to me that even the mere use of this phrase to refer to Livia is evidence that the markers between public versus private and domestic versus political were displaced during the Augustan era.

Livia’s ability to exercise power that extends beyond the imperial household was undoubtedly exceptional due to her status as the empress and thus it is impossible to assume that her ability to transgress boundaries between the public and private spheres served as a model that allowed upper-class Roman women to do the same. However, as demonstrated by scholars like Suzanne Dixon, certain aspects of the patronage network during the end of the Republican period certainly did involve women of the political elite.[[36]](#footnote-36) Dixon argues that the social and economic position of an upper-class Roman woman “was such that she was implicated, by means of ties of family and patronage, in actions which a modern commentator would term political.”[[37]](#footnote-37) Notably, Dixon also stresses that the marriages of upper-class citizens necessarily took into account the political advantages that were to be gained from certain matches, and she suggests that women were likely involved at some level in conversations on marriage.[[38]](#footnote-38) Therefore, it is plausible that elite women during the end of the Republican period were involved in the political realm and exercised agency – though largely indirectly – in the public sphere to some extent.

Yet, a critical distinction between the late Republic and the early imperial period is outlined by Beth Severy, who argues that “what was new in the Augustan era was not the role of late republican matrons involved in public activities, but the public recognition and commemoration of these actions.”[[39]](#footnote-39) As evidence for this public celebration, Severy points to the fact that civic buildings were named for Livia and Octavia (the sister of Augustus) and she also notes how statues of women in the imperial family were placed on triumphal arches and coins.[[40]](#footnote-40) This evidence further solidifies my claim that women in the imperial family increased their presence and capacity to exert political influence during the Augustan era. The example of Livia demonstrates that women in the imperial family did increase their capacity to wield political power starting in the Augustan age. Ultimately, I conclude that the ability for both the wives’ of emperors and upper-class Roman women to control the transmission of property, status and power through their function as producers of heirs affords them heightened influence that extends beyond the domestic realm.

v. Paradox between Ideology and Practice

It is worthwhile to briefly note that Augustan ideology is full of paradoxes. The concept of ideology itself and its relationship to social practice is highly complicated. Terry Eagleton provides several useful definitions of ideology; he stresses that ideology often entails an emphasis on power and “has to do with legitimating the power of a dominant social group or class,” or, in this case, the power of the *princeps* and the imperial family.[[41]](#footnote-41) Eagleton also mentions how another scholar identifies ideology as a “set of ideas by which men posit, explain and justify ends and means of organized social action, and specifically political action” and Eagleton describes how the promotion of ideology by a dominant power is not merely a matter of imposing ideas on other groups but is a matter of “securing the complicity of subordinated classes and groups.”[[42]](#footnote-42) These definitions importantly remind readers that Augustan ideology was entangled in the attempts to assert and increase the power of theemperor and the imperial family over the senatorial class and the Roman citizens more broadly. Therefore, Cohen’s warning that the norms of actual social behavior and practice can operate in a state of “conflict, ambiguity and tension” with the norms of ideology is helpful.[[43]](#footnote-43) It appears that the *princeps* tried to cultivate an ideology surrounding women, marriage, and the family as a means of securing greater imperial power; thus, it is perhaps unsurprising that the conduct practiced by the imperial family members themselves did not align with the ideological standards that the regime tried to implement, as the primary concern seems to have been the legitimization and expansion of power.

One of the most obvious instances of the discrepancy between the moral standards supposedly upheld by the laws versus the individual conduct of Augustus himself is his relationship with Livia.[[44]](#footnote-44)Sources reveal that Livia was abducted by Augustus while she was married to Tiberius Claudius Nero; the fact that Livia was already pregnant with Tiberius’ child at the time is especially interesting.[[45]](#footnote-45) Thomas Strunk demonstrates how Tacitus presents the marriage of Augustus and Livia as “founded on calculation and aggression, indicative of the political violence and despotism of Augustus.”[[46]](#footnote-46) Therefore, while Augustus passed legislation surrounding marriage and reproduction under the guise of morality and ancestral tradition, it certainly seems to be paradoxical that he was simultaneously engaging in questionable moral conduct himself. Additionally, the contradiction between ideologies about the family, marriage and morality that Augustus wanted to uphold versus the familial and marital conduct of the imperial family is highlighted by a noteworthy phrase in the *Odes*. Horace writes of Livia, “Let the lady who rejoices in her incomparable husband come forth”(Horace, *Odes* 3.14.5). The word *unico*, which is translated here as “incomparable,” also can be translated as “sole” or “singular.” The poet praises Livia as if her behavior were in accord with the Augustan marriage legislation; yet, she clearly had not rejoiced in only *one* husband. Thus, the tension between the actual behavior of the imperial family and the norms of ideology is subtly visible in these examples.

Finally, another provocative paradox worth considering is the disparity between the expectations for women within the imperial household versus those outside of this space. Livia is permitted considerable power and authority both within and outside of the imperial household; yet, the Augustan legislation and its attempt to regulate the habits of Roman females is extremely controlling. As mentioned above, Livia is allowed to increase her presence in the public sphere while the laws, on the surface, attempt to relegate women into the domestic sphere by stressing their duty to motherhood. Thus, the behavior of the imperial family – particularly women within the imperial household – seems paradoxical to the standards expected of Roman female citizens more broadly. Interestingly, Eagleton also references Sloterdijk’s idea of ‘enlightened false consciousness,’ which describes how people can live by false values while being ironically aware of doing so.[[47]](#footnote-47) It seems plausible that this idea is applicable within the Augustan context; the monarchy endeavored to legislate rigorous guidelines while ironically engaging in conduct that did not reflect these standards.

The direct governmental intervention into the mechanisms of the family by the Augustan laws resulted in a clear displacement of boundaries between the household and the Roman State. The laws allowed women to occupy a critical aspect of Augustan ideology by legally ensuring that their sexual and reproductive habits had directly political consequences. The legislation, in legally mandating marriage and the reproduction of children, consequently created a legal role for women by positioning them as vehicles for the transmission of wealth and property; likewise, it enabled Augustus and future emperors to extend their power beyond the political domain and into the most intimate aspects of the Roman people’s lives – their sex lives specifically. As a consequence of these measures, the State became the metaphorical *pater familias* and this legal intervention shifted boundaries between private and public. Ultimately, at the center of Augustan policies is a crucial connection between controlling female bodies and the extension of imperial authority. The following section discusses how concerns with the population, class, and morality all relate to imperial aspirations in both Roman and British cases. Most importantly, the fact that these concerns are intertwined with the need to control female reproduction and sexual habits in *both* Roman and British imperialism suggests that this linkage is fundamental to imperial projects more broadly.

IV. Part 2: An Augustan Imperial Paradigm

Scholarship on British imperialism exposes numerous similarities between strategies of empire-building employed by both the British and the Romans. This is important for two primary reasons. First, the repeated parallels suggest that the methods used by modern imperial regimes were actually not modern at all – I argue that they are clearly visible in ancient Rome and specifically under the Augustan regime. Second, both the Roman Empire and the British Empire were arguably highly successful in expanding their respective control across conquered territories and colonies; thus, it is possible to speculate that the shared tactics implemented by both of these authorities can be concluded to be important components of imperial endeavors more broadly. I primarily employ the findings posited by Ray in her article regarding the British Empire’s involvement in the African Gold Coast and Anna Davin’s article on imperialism and motherhood in the British metropole in order to present a provocative comparison with Augustan imperialism. Therefore, in demonstrating how the control of female bodies was not only an essential aspect of British imperialism but also Augustan imperialism, I conclude that there is a necessary link between imperial success and the careful regulation of female bodies, sexual habits, and reproductive capacities that cannot be ignored.

i. Population Management

A necessary concern for any imperial endeavor is managing the population. A low population threatens not only economic growth but also reduces the number of male bodies able to serve in the military, which obviously inhibits the ability for an empire to conquer others and expand its territory. In her article titled “Imperialism and Motherhood,” Anna Davin explores how anxieties about underpopulation within the British metropole related to broader concerns about British imperial aspirations. She highlights how these concerns resulted in intense scrutiny and modification of British women’s reproductive and child-rearing habits. Davin describes how the British imperial authorities understood the birth rate and population growth as “a matter of national importance,” because “population was power.”[[48]](#footnote-48) Thus, when the British discovered that the birth rate had fallen at the start of the twentieth century, Davin claims that there was “a surge in concern about the bearing and rearing of children – the next generation of soldiers and workers, the Imperial races.”[[49]](#footnote-49) She describes how “the solution to a national problem of public health and of politics” was sought after in mothers and the family.[[50]](#footnote-50) Therefore, Davin’s article draws attention to the link between population and imperial power; most importantly, she demonstrates that the British government focused its efforts to strengthen the population and subsequently their empire by concentrating on reforming motherhood and the family.

Davin notes that the relationship between family and State changed during this period; she claims that child-rearing was understood as both a national and moral duty. “If [child-rearing] was done badly the state could intervene… if it was done well parents should be rewarded at least by approval for their patriotic contribution.”[[51]](#footnote-51) As has already been stressed throughout the first part of this thesis, the relationship between the Roman State and the Roman *familia* changed significantly during the Augustan era as a consequence of the marriage laws. Notably, just as the British government saw it appropriate to reward parents for contributing to the “patriotic” project of empire and expansion, so too the Augustan laws rewarded Roman parents for producing children. Likewise, it is worthwhile to reiterate Tacitus’ statement from the *Annals* where he writes that the Roman State could intervene as the “universal parent” if Roman citizens failed to perform their national duty (Tacitus, *Ann*. 3.28). Thus, the logic expressed by both the British and the Roman governments on matters of child-rearing and its critical relationship to the nation and empire is strikingly similar.

Additionally, Dio presents an account of a speech that Augustus supposedly delivered to a body of unmarried Roman male citizens; the way in which he portrays Augustus reveals what Dio understood to be the purpose and motivation of the marriage laws. Augustus allegedly said:

“For you see for yourselves how much more numerous you are than the married men, when you ought by this time to have provided us with as many children besides, or rather with several times your number. How otherwise can families continue? How can the State be preserved, if we neither marry nor have children?” (Dio, *His*. *Rom*. 56.7).

Scholars have pointed out that this speech is not otherwise directly attested by other ancient authors besides Dio, and therefore it is impossible to know whether or not it is accurately recorded.[[52]](#footnote-52) Yet, the diction used and the way in which Dio conceptualizes the impetus of the marriage laws is important. In highlighting that there was a wide discrepancy between the number of single Roman males and married ones, Augustus is presented as expressing an anxiety about the population and subsequently the longevity of the Roman State. The *princeps* targets marriage and children as the solution to the preservation of the State; furthermore, he explicitly implies that singleness and the failure to reproduce will result in the State’s dissolution.

Therefore, this speech stresses a belief that there is a fundamental link between the preservation of the Roman Empire with marriage, reproduction and population. Although Augustus directly targeted single male citizens as a critical factor contributing to the threat of underpopulation and the weakening of the State, it is obvious that Roman women are also an implied and essential part of the solution – after all, Roman marriage and reproduction necessitated female bodies. Thus, just as the British imperial authorities focused on marriage and the family as a way to address a population crisis, Augustus directed legal measures towards these same social constructs in order to increase the Roman population. Ultimately, the diction used in both instances stresses the correlation of marriage and population with the strength of the State.

Finally, the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* (abbreviated *RGDA*) exposes Augustan anxieties about underpopulation while underscoring his imperial accomplishments. The *princeps* asked that his *RGDA* be inscribed and put up in front of his Mausoleum; although no physical remains of this inscription have been found in Rome, three copies of the text fortunately exist in Ancyra, Antioch and Apollonia.[[53]](#footnote-53) Alison Cooley argues that, “above all, the *RGDA* offers an invaluable insight into the political ideology of the Augustan era, in the words of Augustus himself.”[[54]](#footnote-54) Cooley stresses that the syntax of the text “conveys the unambiguous message that Augustus is central to the state;” furthermore, she claims that the implicit message of the *RGDA* is that “the Roman empire was in the best possible condition, through the actions of one man, Augustus, who had solved all the problems… without infringing sovereignty of the senate and people of Rome.”[[55]](#footnote-55) Importantly, she also notes that Augustus clearly “juxtaposes fact and interpretation” throughout the text and “disguises the subjectivity of his account” in order to make what is interpretation seem to be fact.[[56]](#footnote-56) Therefore, it is essential to keep in mind that the *RGDA* reflects Augustus’ own agenda and reveals how the *princeps* desired to be portrayed positively.

As Cooley notes, a concern with the population emerges several times throughout the inscription; she states that the support of the population was especially important because it played an important role both in securing Augustus’ rise to power and his position in the long term.[[57]](#footnote-57) In the eighth section of the inscription, Augustus mentions the census three separate times; he specifies the number of Roman citizens that were counted on the census roll in each instance (Aug., *Res*. *Ges*. 8). While 4,063,000 Romans were counted during the first census, 4,937,000 Romans were counted during the third one; a comparison that shows a significant increase. Notably, in this same section, Augustus also links his attention to the population with the marriage legislation. He writes, “By the passage of new laws I restored many traditions of our ancestors which were then falling into disuse, and I myself set precedents in many things for posterity to imitate” (Aug., *Res*. *Ges*. 8). This mention of posterity in the same section that emphasizes population growth seems to expose a concern with the longevity of the Roman empire. Additionally, Cooley suggests that “by juxtaposing his new laws with the steadily increasing numbers of citizens,” Augustus is attempting to imply that his laws did effectively boost the population.[[58]](#footnote-58) Thus, it is plausible that Augustus wanted to convey that his laws were successful as a means of justifying his legal actions.

ii. Anxieties on Mixed-Status Sex: The Threat of Interracial and Interclass Relations

Another integral aspect of both Roman and British imperialism was a concern with the progeny produced by sexual relationships between two individuals of differing statuses. As briefly mentioned above, one of the primary differences between British imperial rule and Augustan imperialism was the significance placed on race. British imperialist tactics rested on asserting and trying to maintain a firm distinction between whiteness and non-whiteness. In contrast, Nörr points out that some of the Augustan policies did favor freedmen (former slaves) who were married and had children. She thus argues that, since many slaves generally would have been from non-Italian origin, the Augustan policies on the family should not be viewed in racialist terms.[[59]](#footnote-59) Freedman in Rome were defined not according to race but according to status.[[60]](#footnote-60) Yet, it is worthwhile to note that Suetonius does mention how Augustus considered it greatly important “to keep the people pure and unsullied by any taint of foreign blood” and thus set a limit on manumission, the process by which slaves were freed (Suetonius, *Aug*. 40.3). Nonetheless, although the Augustan laws were not strictly racialist in the same way that British imperial tactics were, I argue that the desire to prohibit interracial sexual relationships in the British case is similar to Augustus’ desire to limited the kind of sexual relationships occurring between Romans of different classes. It appears that, in both instances, the primary concern relates to the children produced in these relationships.

Both the British and Roman officials appear to have recognized the potential for mixed-status sexual relationships to destabilize traditional structures of power. Interestingly, Ray’s study demonstrates that not only did British officials want to prevent sexual relations between white and non-white individuals in the colonies, but non-white Gold Coast African men were also keenly aware of the potential for interracial sex to destabilize hierarchies of rule.[[61]](#footnote-61) She writes that both colonizing powers, such as the British, and the colonized were concerned with the “subversive potentialities” of interracial relationships.[[62]](#footnote-62) Ray even notes how one Gold Coast writer posited that interracial relationships are “capable of threatening the body politic.”[[63]](#footnote-63) Therefore, it is apparent that British and Africans alike believed that sexual relationships among people of different races posed a threat not only to national and imperial goals but to the community at large. I believe that the destabilizing potential of sexual relationships between members of different social groups and the threat they posed to hierarchies of rule was recognized during the age of Augustus; although not concerned strictly with interracial sex, the Augustan laws do appear to be concerned with interclass sex.

Both ancient sources and secondary scholarship on Augustan legislation exposes that the *princeps* had distinct anxiety about sex between members of different social groups. As mentioned previously, Wallace-Hadrill usefully argues that the laws necessarily only impacted certain classes of Roman citizens. He shows that, since the laws functioned based on a system of rewards and punishments, they could only influence those with substantial property.[[64]](#footnote-64) He importantly notes that Augustus’ social legislation would only be effective if there was already in existence a popular practice of leaving property to people out of the family; additionally, Wallace-Hadrill suggests that Augustus intentionally mitigated the benefits that bachelors received by being childless. Thus, in demonstrating that marriage was one of the primary vehicles for the transmission of property from one generation of Romans to the next, Wallace-Hadrill argues that Augustus desired to stabilize the transmission of property – and status – under the guise of encouraging marriage and the family.[[65]](#footnote-65) The traditional pattern of inheritance in the case of a male with a child ensured that wealth was transmitted from this parent to his child; yet, “the equilibrium is disrupted by the bachelor or childless” because his property flows not to heirs but to friends and clients for the exchange of services, which increases his purchasing power.[[66]](#footnote-66)

Therefore, Wallace-Hadrill argues that the legislation ought to be interpreted as inheritance laws; he claims that the aim of the laws certainly did pertain to a concern with increasing the population, but he stresses that reproduction was necessarily linked with the transmission of property.[[67]](#footnote-67) Thus, according to the author, by strategically ensuring both that the childless bachelor suffered legal consequences and that fathers received certain advantages, Augustus could stabilize the transmission of property and status.[[68]](#footnote-68) Most importantly, he concludes by arguing that the focus of the laws was primarily to guarantee order and security, and he notes that intervention into patterns of succession gave emperors greater control over wealth and status.[[69]](#footnote-69) Ultimately, I want to reiterate that, given the fact that female bodies play an imperative role in the reproductive process, Augustus used the laws to regulate female bodies, promote marriage and prevent singleness in order to stabilize the transmission of property and maintain status boundaries between social groups. Just as British imperialists aimed to prevent the destabilizing effects of interracial marriages, Wallace-Hadrill’s analysis helps demonstrate that Augustus too aimed to prevent the destabilizing effects of interclass sex and bachelorhood. This clearly makes female bodies a legal and public issue for the empire.

iii. Moral Legitimacy and Restoration

A concern with morality features both in British and Augustan imperialism; in both instances, an emphasis on morality is intertwined with marriage and the family. As Milnor points out, “morality and immorality are not absolutes but constructs, built to serve the particular ideological needs of particular social systems operating at particular moments in time.”[[70]](#footnote-70) According to my analysis, morality appears to be a means of legitimizing rule (for both the British and Augustus) and is tied into discourses concerning the durability of the nation. For example, Ray notes how non-white African men largely believed that European males corrupted local African women and thus threatened “the moral fiber and future of the nation.”[[71]](#footnote-71) She argues that attempts to regulate female sexuality by Gold Coast Africans must “be read as an expression of male anxiety about the loss of patriarchal authority” over women.[[72]](#footnote-72) These men apparently disguised their anxiety about this loss of control by arguing that the fall of nations is often hasted by licentiousness; thus, they claimed that in order to prevent this from happening in the Gold Coast, the women must be morally protected.[[73]](#footnote-73) Ray explains that interracial sex and sexual morality were understood “as pivots around which the fate of the nation turned” and thus were seen as useful concepts around which political ambitions could be mobilized.[[74]](#footnote-74) Likewise, Davin too notes the ways in which morality was entangled with discourses on motherhood and the female duty to the British Empire; she describes how the British government stressed that a mother’s responsibility to raise strong children was a moral job and she highlights that the British solution to the population crisis was a deeply “moralistic elevation of motherhood.”[[75]](#footnote-75) Thus, morality and motherhood surface as interrelated components to imperial continuity.

Likewise, the ancient Roman sources are full of references to morality. In the *Res Gestae*, Augustus places repeated emphasis on the ways in which he restored the morality of the Roman State through his renewal of familial values and recovery of ancestral customs and traditions (Aug., *Res*. *Ges*. 8, 12, 13, 34, 35).[[76]](#footnote-76) Likewise, Suetonius mentions that Augustus was granted “the supervision of morals and of the laws for all time” (Suetonius, *Aug*. 27.5). In the speech recorded by Dio, Augustus is portrayed as stressing that Roman males who are unmarried lead immoral lives:

“For surely it is not your delight in a solitary existence that leads you to live without wives, nor is there one of you who either eats alone or sleeps alone; no, what you want is to have full liberty for wantonness and licentiousness” (Dio, *His*. *Rom*. 56.7).

This statement suggests that Augustus wanted to present lawful marriage as a more appealing and morally appropriate option that bachelorhood. Furthermore, it is important to observe how morality here is not only connected with marriage, but correlates directly with the preservation of the State. It is worthwhile to briefly note Cohen’s observation that adultery, which assumedly was categorized as immoral conduct, can be viewed as a symptom of the “degeneracy of an elite who are perceived as failing to adequately reproduce themselves as a social group.”[[77]](#footnote-77) Thus, the language of morality can usefully mask concerns about the population and the continuity of the specific classes.

Additionally, Horace emphasizes fertility, reproduction and renewal throughout his *Carmen Saeculare*. Interestingly, the poet invokes Ilithyia, the goddess of childbirth, and beseeches her to “be pleased to rear our young, and to grant success to the Fathers’ edicts on the yoking together of men and women and on the marriage law for raising a new crop of children” (Horace, *Car*. *Saec*. 10-20). Horace seems to deliberately connect the Augustan marriage legislation with the divine perhaps in order to further legitimize the laws; by asking for the goddess to bless and permit the edicts to be successful, he suggests that Augustus and his laws are in accordance with the will of the gods. It should also not be overlooked that this section of the *Carmen* *Saeculare* also blatantly reveals a desire for population increase with the phrase “a new crop of children.” Ultimately, it seems that both the British and the Romans used an emphasis on morality as a means of justifying their imperial methods and authority.

iv. Imperial Power

Although the abovementioned concerns with the population, interclass sexual relations and morality are all clearly related to imperial projects and are visible in both Roman and British sources, I argue that these factors are closely intertwined with the desire to control female bodies and reproductive habits ultimately as a means of increasing both individual power and imperial longevity. Cohen suggests that the Augustan legislation, which he notes has often been regarded as an attempt to enforce morality, can actually be read as a “massive attempt to expand state power over sexuality and the family for the sake of power itself.”[[78]](#footnote-78) Likewise, Milnor, in agreement with Wallace-Hadrill, argues that “we must look deeper into the various discourses which made up Augustan culture to discover what larger political purposes they served.”[[79]](#footnote-79) Thus, I posit that an exploration of the Augustan marriage laws reveals that the ideological, social, and cultural transformations that occurred during the early Roman Empire centered around gaining and maintaining control of female bodies for the sake of power.

This final section incorporates and builds on useful evidence presented by Shreyaa Bhatt. Using the concept of *biopower* outlined by Foucault, Bhatt posits that Augustan Rome can be viewed through a biopolitical lens. He convincingly proves that “the modern state was not original in its use of disciplinary and biopolitical methods of domination.”[[80]](#footnote-80) This is useful for my analysis because I similarly claim that modern imperialist states, and specifically the British Empire, were not original in their attempts to control female bodies and reproductive capacities as a means of increasing imperial power. Bhatt concludes by reiterating that the Foucauldian model of biopower can be employed as a trans-historical analytics and he argues that the relationship between modernity and antiquity, at least in this regard, “was much closer than [Foucault] allowed.”[[81]](#footnote-81) Likewise, I posit that the relationship between modern imperialism and ancient imperialism is also much closer than might be expected; this thesis demonstrates that it is possible to view the Augustan era strategy of carefully regulating female reproductive capacities as a trans-historical imperial paradigm.

Bhatt employs the Foucauldian notion of biopower in order to argue that biopolitical societies have a much earlier and more extensive history than merely the one said to have begun at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Bhatt emphasizes that “biopower,” a the term advanced in *The History of Sexuality Volume I*, refers to the effort to improve and invest in life; furthermore, he quotes and discusses Foucault’s triangular matrix of modern power, sovereignty-discipline-government, and highlights how this matrix works to target the population and is used by governmental regimes to maintain security.[[82]](#footnote-82) Bhatt argues that a specifically Foucauldian conception of power can provide a “fruitful model for the analysis of power in Augustan Rome.”[[83]](#footnote-83) He further claims that Augustus did not exercise power in a merely authoritarian mode. Rather, according to Bhatt, Augustan authority was more multi-faceted and involved cautiously managing a relationship between the enactment of power and the formation of knowledge. As my above analysis shows, a specific gendered discourse about marriage and reproduction was cultivated during the Augustan era; thus, in broadening the emperor’s sphere of influence into the sexual lives of the populace, the imperial court’s power was extended as it had the capacity to shape knowledge about the family and Roman citizens’ duties to the State.

Bhatt argues that the *Res Gestae* reveals how Augustus stressed his provision of social goods and social security; he employs the inscription as further evidence for the claim that the Roman State exercised biopolitical control under the direction of the emperor. Bhatt suggests that, not only did Augustus provide grain and peace to the Roman populace, but he also protected the Roman people from extinction through the passage of the marriage laws.[[84]](#footnote-84) Other sections of *Res Gestae* highlight Augustus’ desire to increase the dependence of the Romans on himself. He claims that – during a time “of the greatest scarcity of grain” – he freed the Roman people at his own expense “from the fear and danger in which they were” (Aug., *Res*. *Ges*. 5). Augustus also underscores his payments to the Roman plebs and distribution of grain to the people at his own expense, thus presenting himself as a generous provider for the people (Aug., *Res*. *Ges*. 15). Furthermore, the language used by the *princeps* helps foster the sense that the Roman people quite literally depended on his provision in order to remain alive. By claiming the he himself gave the people food and saved them from starvation, while also stressing the various ways he improved and restored Rome, Augustus ensures his power over the State and the people by guaranteeing that he is indispensable for their survival. Therefore, as Bhatt concludes, under the sovereignty of the *princeps*, the monarchy increasingly tried to acquire and sustain its “control of the biological.”[[85]](#footnote-85)

The fact that Augustus saw himself as central to the creation and expansion of the Roman Empire is unmistakably clear in the *Res Gestae*. In the opening section of the inscription, Augustus emphasizes that “he placed the whole world under the sovereignty of the Roman people” (Aug., *Res*. *Ges*. 1). He further stresses his imperial feats when he writes, “wars, both civil and foreign, I undertook throughout the world, on sea and land,” thus employing diction that highlights how he himself expanded the empire (Aug., *Res*. *Ges*. 3).Thus, from the onset, the *princeps* emphasizes not only that the Roman Empire spread across “the whole world,” but he also claims that it was he who achieved this accomplishment. By directly crediting himself with the achievement of world conquest for the Roman Empire, Augustus links Roman dominance with the emperor and thereby underscores the necessity of the monarch in order for Rome to be on top of the world hierarchy. Additionally, the entire text is written in the first person, which allows Augustus to continually accentuate the primary role that he played in all of the various achievements listed.

Finally, a desire for power and its correlation with female sexuality is visible in the British case. Ray stresses that within British imperial projects, women play a central role “as agents of their own sexuality, in fomenting anxieties about racial degeneracy and the viability of the body politic” which in turn provokes “intensified assertions of patriarchal control.”[[86]](#footnote-86) Thus, a complex matrix between female sexuality, racial degeneracy and the survival of the body politic at large is linked with the desire to uphold patriarchal control by men over women in this British example. It seems that the same might be said of the Augustan era. The *princeps* perhaps sensed the various threats posed by underpopulation, immorality, and class degeneracy – by which I mean the increased tendency for sexual relationships to occur between Romans of different social statuses. Thus, he responded with legal measures targeted at the family and marriage as a means of regulating reproduction; the location of reproduction and child-bearing occurs, of course, at the female body. Ultimately, I have demonstrated how these strategies appear to be closely linked with the desire for power, control and imperial expansion. Therefore, a comparative analysis reveals that the control of female bodies was an essential aspect of both British and Roman imperial projects.

V. Conclusion

As a consequence of the Augustan legislation, the emperor and the State were able to legally intervene in the most private aspects of the Roman *familia*. I have argued that these laws allowed the monarch to extend his sphere of influence and legal authority beyond the public realm and into the domestic sphere, which thus changed the relationship between the household and the government significantly. Furthermore, a critical shift in power structures occurred during the Augustan era as power became increasingly concentrated within the imperial court and not the senate. While the Augustan legislation established a legal role for Roman women as vehicles for the transmission of wealth and status, the shift in power structures created a space for the empress to exercise agency by producing an heir to the monarchy. Therefore, beginning under the Principate, women in the imperial family and those in the upper-classes increased their ability to wield political power through their capacity to produce heirs.

Ultimately, this thesis has incorporated the arguments presented by scholars on the British Empire in order to draw attention to the necessary link between the control of female bodies with imperial expansion and dominance. In making gender and sexuality my primary categories of analysis, I have intervened in conversations regarding modern imperialism in order to prove that the Augustan regime implemented similar strategies as the British over two-thousand years ago. Therefore, I conclude that Augustus laid an ancient imperial paradigm that stressed the importance of managing female bodies and their reproductive potentialities for the sake of power – a tactic that seems to have reappeared in modern empire-building endeavors.
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