

Summer 2016

# Filiae Augustorum: The Ties That Bind in the Antonine Age

Rachel Meyers

*Iowa State University*, [rlmeyers@iastate.edu](mailto:rlmeyers@iastate.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/language\\_pubs](http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/language_pubs)

 Part of the [Ancient History, Greek and Roman through Late Antiquity Commons](#), and the [Classical Archaeology and Art History Commons](#)

The complete bibliographic information for this item can be found at [http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/language\\_pubs/111](http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/language_pubs/111). For information on how to cite this item, please visit <http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/howtocite.html>.

---

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the World Languages and Cultures at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in World Languages and Cultures Publications by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [digirep@iastate.edu](mailto:digirep@iastate.edu).



PROJECT MUSE®

---

*Filiae Augustorum: The Ties That Bind in the Antonine Age*

Rachel Meyers

Classical World, Volume 109, Number 4, Summer 2016, pp. 487-505 (Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/clw.2016.0043>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/628828>

---

# *Filiae Augustorum:* The Ties That Bind in the Antonine Age

RACHEL MEYERS

ABSTRACT: While the titles of imperial family members on Roman coins have been used to establish chronology, I argue that the specific titulature on the coins of Faustina II and Lucilla promotes their roles as the ties among three emperors. Though other scholars have commented on their basic roles, crucial evidence for how the Antonines promoted the roles of these women has been overlooked. By highlighting this intentional language compared to coins of prior imperial women, I show that Faustina and Lucilla not only represented the continuing harmony of the empire during the Antonine Age but also legitimated the rule of their husbands.

*“Si uxorem dimittimus, reddamus et dotem.”*<sup>1</sup>

These words were said to be uttered by the emperor Marcus Aurelius when, in reference to a story that Commodus was fathered not by the emperor but by a gladiator, he was asked whether he might divorce Faustina for adultery. Her dowry, of course, was the Roman Empire, which had passed into the hands of Marcus Aurelius when Faustina’s father Antoninus Pius died in 161. Marcus had been groomed for the position, having been made Caesar and then having been married to Faustina early in the reign of Pius. Though certainly the verity of the *Historia Augusta* can be called into question on any number of items—whether the empress committed adultery or whether the emperor actually spoke these words—that this statement is recorded demonstrates that the writer of the *HA*, at least, and probably a wider slice of the population, believed that Marcus owed his position entirely to the fact that his father-in-law passed the principate on to him.

---

<sup>1</sup> *HA*, *Marcus Aurelius* 19.8.

Scholars have acknowledged the roles Faustina played as Antoninus' daughter and Marcus' wife and the importance, in general, of imperial women in maintaining the dynastic family line. Yet they have overlooked crucial evidence for how both Faustina and Lucilla were portrayed not only as emblems of dynastic continuity but also as forces legitimating the rule of their respective husbands. Faustina the Younger holds a prominent position in Roman history as the daughter of one emperor, wife of another, and mother of a third emperor. Her daughter Lucilla was the daughter of one emperor and wife of another (Lucius Verus) as well. Coins minted with their portraits include legends with their own names and the name of their respective fathers. To see why this is significant, it will be necessary to briefly review the coinage of the imperial women who came before them. With the coins of Faustina and Lucilla, there comes a change in the nomenclature of the imperial women. Although previous generations of imperial women were referred to as the wife of the emperor on coins, the only link stated on the coins of both Faustina and Lucilla is that of daughter of the emperor. Because empresses had no official power in the empire, their nomenclature explains their status; the change in the nomenclature of Faustina and Lucilla signals the importance of the father-daughter link between Antoninus Pius and Faustina and between Marcus Aurelius and Lucilla. In this article, I demonstrate that the innovative titulature on the coinage of Faustina and Lucilla is significant because it fosters and promotes their roles in ensuring the peaceful continuity of the imperial house, and thus the prosperity of the empire. Furthermore, these women were the transmitters of imperial power, and their coinage constructs and publicizes this development.<sup>2</sup>

Though Faustina and, to a lesser extent, Lucilla attracted the (negative) attention of ancient writers, they have more commonly been overshadowed by Julia Domna in modern scholarship. While a few studies

---

<sup>2</sup> I am not the first to see the imperial women as transmitters of legitimacy. M. Corbier ("Male Power and Legitimacy Through Women: The *Domus Augusta* under the Julio-Claudians," in R. Hawley and B. Levick, eds., *Women in Antiquity: New Assessments* [London 1995] 191) points out that after the death of Caligula, Josephus remarked "there were some who aspired to the throne by reason both of their distinguished birth and of their marriage connections. For instance, Marcus Vinicius had a good claim to both because of his noble birth and by his marriage to Gaius' sister Julia [Livilla]" (*AJ* 19, 251). Of course Marcus Vinicius did not become emperor, Claudius did, and Corbier points out that Claudius promoted his relationships to Livia and Antonia (Augustus' niece) to legitimate his power.

have examined the portraits of the Antonines<sup>5</sup> and even some of the images on the coins as examples of propaganda, no scholar has paid attention to the specific naming conventions of the imperial women used on the coinage produced during the reigns of Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, and Lucius Verus.<sup>4</sup> The titulature of the imperial women is as significant as their portraits on the obverse and iconography on the reverse of the coins because all these elements were components of how the imperial family presented itself to Roman society. Since the very beginning of the principate, the imperial family was represented in certain ways and associated with ideas and messages that changed over time.<sup>5</sup> The titulature of the Antonine women, never considered in detail, or within the context of the imperial women before and after them, is an essential aspect of the self-presentation of the whole Antonine family.

Since the appellation Augusta figures into the discussion of women's titulature, a brief history of its origin is in order.<sup>6</sup> Romans did not have

---

<sup>5</sup> See K. Fittschen, *Die Bildnistypen der Faustina minor und die Fecunditas Augustae* (Göttingen 1982), a fundamental starting point for any examination of the representations of Faustina that also includes a short investigation of the portraits of Lucilla. Other works that treat the portraiture and coinage of the Antonine period include A. Alexandridis, *Die Frauen des römischen Kaiserhauses: eine Untersuchung ihrer bildlichen Darstellung von Livia bis Iulia Domna* (Mainz 2004); W. Szaivert, "Zur Chronologie der Lucillaprägungen," *Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte* 30 (1980) 7–14; M. Wegner, *Die Herrscherbildnisse in antoninischer Zeit* (Berlin 1939). B. Levick (*Faustina I and II* [Oxford 2014]) pulls together a great deal of information from a variety of ancient sources and their modern interpretations, though her treatment is brief on every topic. Levick refers (63–64) to coinage mainly when coins help fill in chronological details, such as the birth of the twin boys in 161, but does not attempt a careful analysis of the titulature or imagery on the coinage.

<sup>4</sup> On the matter of whether the images on coins had any meaning to contemporary Roman society, there has been much discussion. C. H. V. Sutherland (*Coinage in Roman Imperial Policy* 31 B.C.–A.D. 68 [London 1951]) declared that the images and words were significant, while A. H. M. Jones ("Numismatics and History" in P. A. Brunt, ed., *Essays Presented to H. Mattingly* [London 1956]) pointed out that most Romans would not have been able to decipher the images or messages on coins. B. Levick ("Propaganda and Imperial Coinage," *Antichthon* 16 [1982] 104–116 and "Messages on the Roman Coinage: Types and Inscriptions," in G. Paul and M. Ierardi, eds., *Roman Coins and Public Life under the Empire. E. Togo Salmon Papers II* [Ann Arbor 1999] 41–61) and A. Wallace-Hadrill ("Image and Authority in the Coinage of Augustus" *JRS* 67 [1986] 66–87) share Sutherland's view. See also R. Wolters, *Nummi Signati: Untersuchungen zur römischen Münzprägung und Geldwirtschaft* (Munich 1999). Certainly the production of coins with varying portraits, titles, and, especially, reverse iconography lends credence to the idea that great thought was given to coinage during the imperial period.

<sup>5</sup> P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (Ann Arbor 1988).

<sup>6</sup> A. Kolb, "Augustae—Zielsetzung, Definition, prosopographischer Überblick," in A. Kolb, ed., *Augustae. Machtbewusste Frauen am römischen Kaiserhof?* (Berlin 2010) 11–35.

a system in place for honoring women as they did for men. Thus when Augustus began the principate and special honors and privileges were given to Livia and Octavia, the Romans had to come up with appropriate ways to acknowledge the roles of imperial women, just as Octavian had been given the title Augustus.<sup>7</sup> One way in which early imperial women began to be honored was with the title Augusta. Flory has shown that throughout most of the Julio–Claudian period, the cognomen Augusta designated the mother of the Augustus, the ruling emperor.<sup>8</sup> When Claudius and then Nero extended the title to a wife who had borne children, Augusta gradually became a less rigid title and came to refer to the wife of the emperor and, therefore, mother of the imperial heir.<sup>9</sup> By the early second century, the designation Augusta had loosened to encompass any close female relative of the emperor, including his wife.<sup>10</sup> Under Trajan the name Augusta was granted not only to his wife Plotina but also to his sister Ulpia Marciana and his niece Matidia the Elder.<sup>11</sup> Faustina the Elder was endowed with the title Augusta shortly after Antoninus Pius became *princeps* in 138, and after her, the emperor's wife was awarded this honor either upon her marriage or immediately after her husband's accession to power.<sup>12</sup> Other women in the imperial court could also receive this title. In fact, Faustina the Younger became Augusta in 147, after the birth of her first child but many years before her husband became emperor.<sup>13</sup> Thus she was given the honorary title as daughter of the emperor and mother of an heir.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> M. Flory "Livia and the History of Public Honorific Statues for Women in Rome," *TAPA* 125 (1995) 287–308.

<sup>8</sup> M. Flory, "The Meaning of Augusta in the Julio-Claudian Period," *AJAH* 13.2 (1988) 113–38.

<sup>9</sup> An exception to this trend is the case of Julia Flavia, the daughter of Titus, who was called Augusta and appeared on coinage minted during her father's and uncle's reigns.

<sup>10</sup> H. Temporini, *Die Frauen am Hofe Traians: Ein Beitrag zur Stellung der Augustae im Principat* (Berlin 1978) 27–35. For a chronological perspective on the bestowal of the title Augusta and an argument for increasingly more specific titles for the empress, see W. Kuhoff, "Zur Titulatur der römischen Kaiserinnen während der Prinzipatszeit," *Klio* 75 (1993) 244–56.

<sup>11</sup> D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie* (Darmstadt 1996) 125–26.

<sup>12</sup> See Kuhoff (above, n.10) 252. Julia Domna was granted the title Augusta right after Septimius Severus became emperor by ousting Didius Julianus.

<sup>13</sup> See further below on this point.

<sup>14</sup> Of course, her first child was a girl and therefore not as significant as a male heir; nevertheless, as we see with Faustina herself, a daughter could transmit imperial power to her husband.

When the practice of naming female relatives Augusta was taking hold, the practice of portraying Roman women on coins also developed. The practice of placing the rulers' female relations on coins began slowly in the triumvirate period and strengthened by the mid-first century CE. The practice began subtly with portraits of women, unidentified in the coin legend but assumed to be Julia and Livia. A coin of Augustus illustrates on the reverse the portrait heads of a woman and two boys, thought to be Julia and her sons Gaius and Lucius.<sup>15</sup> Livia does not appear on any coin minted under Augustus at Rome. Perhaps the earliest coin with Livia struck in Rome is a bronze, minted circa 15–16, with Tiberius on the obverse and the portrait of a woman, thought to be Livia, on the reverse, though no inscription on the coin confirms this.<sup>16</sup> Not until 22–23 does Livia appear for certain, now identified by her new name: Julia Augusta.<sup>17</sup> The coins of imperial women are not numerous during the Julio–Claudian and Flavian eras, and when the women are identified in the coin legend, their nomenclature always includes their relationship to the emperor, as if justifying their representation on coins. Throughout the first century, there is no one standard way in which the imperial women are named on coins. Agrippina the Elder is referred to as the mother of Caligula during his reign, and his three sisters appear on the reverse of his coins with just their names.<sup>18</sup> Domitia is identified on some coins along with the name of her husband Domitian, and on others simply by her own name.<sup>19</sup>

On an undated aureus, Plotina is designated PLOTINA AVGVSTA IMP(ERATORIS) TRAIANI CAES(ARIS), with the titles of Trajan continued onto the reverse—GER(MANICI) DAC(ICI) PARTHICI P(ONTIFICIS) M(AXIMI) TR(IBVNICIA) P(OTESTATE) CO(N)S(VLIS) VI P(ATRIS) P(ATRIAE).<sup>20</sup> In this series of coins, the name of Plotina is accompanied by the official titles of her husband. However, in another series the obverse legend identifies the empress simply with

---

<sup>15</sup> *RIC* 404–405.

<sup>16</sup> *BMC* Tiberius 65.

<sup>17</sup> *BMC* Tiberius 76. Through Augustus' will, she was adopted into the Julian family and given the title Augusta.

<sup>18</sup> For Agrippina I: *RIC* 13, 21, 30; for Caligula's sisters: *RIC* 33, 41.

<sup>19</sup> With titlature of Domitian: *RIC* 210, 212–14; as Domitia Augusta: *RIC* 211, 230.

<sup>20</sup> *RIC* 729. Trajan's titlature appears in a similar fashion on his coins dated from 114 to 117.

the dative, PLOTINAE AVG(VSTAE), with her husband's abbreviated nomenclature filling the reverse.<sup>21</sup> Her successor, Sabina, is named in a similar fashion on coinage during the reign of Hadrian: certain coins provide only her name with the designation Augusta, while others include part of Hadrian's titles in the genitive, indicating her relationship as his wife.<sup>22</sup>

Faustina the Elder, wife of Antoninus Pius, was alive only briefly during her husband's principate. However, her early death did not prevent the minting of a large number of coins with her portrait both while she was alive and after her death.<sup>23</sup> On some of the coins, Faustina the Elder is referred to simply as FAVSTINA AVGVSTA; but on others her name includes the reference to her husband, designating her as Pius' wife. This longer legend is as follows: FAVSTINA AVG(VSTA) ANTONINI AVG(VSTI) P(ATRIS) P(ATRIAE).<sup>24</sup> The extensive posthumous coinage reproduces three similar legends: DIVA AVGVSTA FAVSTINA, DIVA AVGVSTA FAVSTINA, and DIVA FAVSTINA. Thus, over a period of about 150 years of imperial rule, there was no established protocol for giving imperial women the title Augusta or minting coins in their names, as had been instituted for the emperors themselves. The coin legends of the imperial women up to the mid-second century most commonly refer to the empress either as the wife of the emperor (indicated by the inclusion of all or part of his titlature in the genitive) or merely by her own name and the title Augusta.

Faustina the Younger was granted the title Augusta in 147, the day after giving birth to her first child, Domitia Faustina, and coins with her name began soon after.<sup>25</sup> On the coins minted at Rome during the period circa 148–157, Faustina is nearly always referred to by her patronymic.

---

<sup>21</sup> *RIC* 33.

<sup>22</sup> For instance, *RIC* 390: SABINA AVGVSTA; 398 and 399a: SABINA AVGVSTA HADRIANI AVG(VSTI) P(ATRIS) P(ATRIAE).

<sup>23</sup> See R. Meyers, *Visual Representations of the Antonine Empresses* (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 2006) 18–42; M. Beckmann, *Diva Faustina: Coinage and Cult in the Rome and the Provinces* (New York 2012).

<sup>24</sup> *RIC* 327–34. Rarely the title of Antoninus is ANTONINI AVG(VSTI) PII P(ATRIS) P(ATRIAE).

<sup>25</sup> L. Vidman, *Fasti Ostienses, edendos, etc.* (Prague 1982) 51: [ex A]nnia Faustina filia nata est. K. Decem. Aurelius Caesar [trib(uniciam)] pot(estatem) iniit et Faustina Aug(usta) cognominata est. Since she received the title Augusta so late in the year 147, it is possible that coins were not begun until 148. An exact date cannot be determined. See Fittschen (above, n.3) 38–39.



One of the most common coin legends is FAVSTINAE AVG(VSTAE) PII AVG(VSTI) FIL(IAE).<sup>26</sup> Variations on this title include the abbreviation “F” instead of “FIL” for *filia* and the inclusion of Pius’ chief *nomen*, Antoninus, in the genitive.<sup>27</sup> Three variations have her name in the dative and four in the nominative. However, in the obverse legends of all seven variants, the key components are the same: her name, the title Augusta, her father’s name, and her designation as daughter.

The inclusion of the label *filia* clarifies the relationship of this Faustina and Antoninus Pius, since coins of the emperor’s deceased wife Faustina the Elder continued to be minted during his reign as well. Imperial children had very rarely been portrayed on coins. In fact, the only other emperor before Pius to place his daughter’s portrait on coins was Titus, for his daughter Julia.<sup>28</sup> Since by the imperial period a Roman girl was no longer called by the feminine form of her father’s name, as had been the case in the Republic and through the time of Augustus, a girl is not automatically identified as her father’s daughter simply by her name.<sup>29</sup> Thus, most of the coins minted for Faustina during the reign of her father include his name in her own title. On the coins minted during the reign of Marcus—and probably even for a few years before—she is referred to only with the legend FAVSTINA AVGVSTA.<sup>30</sup> The title *Mater Castrorum*, bestowed upon the empress in 174, was also included subsequently on some coins, though only on the reverse.<sup>31</sup> After her death and consecration, the coins commemorate her with the legend

---

<sup>26</sup> See, for example, *RIC* 503–507. It should be noted that all metals reflect the same changes in titulature for both Faustina II and Lucilla.

<sup>27</sup> For instance, *RIC* 517 and 512, respectively.

<sup>28</sup> *RIC* 54–58. The coins (*RIC* 404–405) thought to portray Gaius and Lucius, adopted sons of Augustus, do not name them.

<sup>29</sup> See J. P. Hallett, *Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society: Women and the Elite Family* (Princeton 1984) 66–67; Olli Salomies, “Names and Identities: Onomastics and Prosopography” in John Bodell, ed., *Epigraphic Evidence: Ancient History from Inscriptions* (London 2001) 83–87; M. Kajava, *Roman Female Praenomina. Studies in the Nomenclature of Roman Women (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 14, 1995)*.

<sup>30</sup> Most scholars agree that the legend Faustina Augusta most likely began ca. 157 and continued through the reign of Marcus Aurelius until the *Diva* series started. See P. Strack, *Untersuchungen zur römischen Reichsprägung des zweiten Jahrhunderts. Teil III. Die Reichsprägung zur Zeit des Antoninus Pius* (Stuttgart 1937) 17f–18; W. Szaivert, *Die Münzprägung der Kaiser Marcus Aurelius, Lucius Verus und Commodus (161–192)* (Vienna 1986) 67.

<sup>31</sup> *BMC* Marcus Aurelius 929–931. The title was added to some obverse types (*RIC* 742, 748–49, 1700, 1709) minted after her death.

DIVA FAVSTINA through the remaining years of Marcus' reign.<sup>32</sup> None of the coins refers to Faustina as daughter of Pius or wife of Marcus in the period 161–180.

A quick overview of the reverse iconography of Faustina's coinage will serve to heighten the significant nature of the series. While a number of coins represent the by then common images of Venus, Juno, Ceres, and other goddesses and personifications, the coinage of Faustina was also the place for innovation. One of the common reverse types represents Fecunditas, always portrayed with at least one child and sometimes with as many as six. Coins with these reverse types easily amounted to 20 per cent of the production of Faustina's coins during the reign of her husband.<sup>33</sup> The representation of Fecunditas is completely new to Roman coins with the coinage of Faustina but is not unknown in Roman mythology and art. This deity was apparently first introduced into Roman religion by the Senate in 63, after Nero's wife Poppaea had given birth to a girl.<sup>34</sup> There are no known depictions of Fecunditas in monumental art; all representations are from coins or medallions. After Faustina, Fecunditas appears on coins and medals of Lucilla, Crispina, Julia Domna, Julia Maesa, Julia Mamaea, Sallustia Orbiana, and Otacilia Severa.<sup>35</sup>

The type with Juno Lucina, the goddess of childbirth, was first used on the coins of Faustina II,<sup>36</sup> and there is a variety of representations

<sup>32</sup> *BMC* Marcus Aurelius 698–703. The obverse legend DIVA AVGVSTA PIA also appears, *BMC* 706–708.

<sup>33</sup> See N.A. Mouchmov, *Le trésor numismatique de Réka-Davnia* (Marcianopolis 1934) 2. The Réka-Devnia hoard, discovered in Bulgaria in 1929, contained 81,044 silver coins, the earliest of which featured Marcus Antonius and the latest Trajan Decius. Of the total, 3,504 are in the name of Faustina, and 2,051 of those can be dated to the reign of Marcus Aurelius. The examples with Fecunditas (and variants) amount to 426, thus 20.7 percent of her coinage. This hoard is large enough to be considered exemplary.

<sup>34</sup> *Tac. Ann.* 15.23.2.

<sup>35</sup> *LIMC* Suppl. (1997) s.v. Fecunditas 583–85 (Ganschow); T. Mikocki, *Sub Specie Deae: Les Imperatrices Et Princesses Romaines Assimilées a Des Deesses* (Rome 1995) 97–98.

<sup>36</sup> There is one type of Faustina I (*BMC* 484, Pl. 10.16) which included the representation of Juno Lucina, identified in the legend, but it seems suspect for a number of reasons. First, it is a posthumous issue, and it is not clear why the goddess of childbirth would be celebrated on the coin of a deceased woman. Juno Lucina does not appear on the consecration coins of Faustina II. The representation is also peculiar: Juno holding a torch and scepter without any children around her. This is different from the portrayal on coins of Faustina II. Therefore, it is possible that this coin was a mistake of some kind, which coincided with the Juno Lucina types of Faustina II. Not having done further analysis of this type, I cannot propose a more specific explanation here.

of this goddess, both under Antoninus Pius and under Marcus.<sup>37</sup> Ovid indicates that new mothers gave thanks to Lucina for having bestowed on them the light of life and that expectant mothers should unbind their hair while presenting their votives to the goddess so as to have an easy childbirth.<sup>38</sup>

Clearly the coins of Juno Lucina made an impact, as suggested by the dedication by a minor official in August 166 of an altar to Juno Lucina *pro salute domus Augustorum*—meaning Marcus and Faustina, co-emperor Lucius Verus and his new wife Lucilla, and all their children.<sup>39</sup> Thus, Lucina appears not only on the official coins but also on a private dedication from the same time period. Apart from the coins of Faustina II, the only other numismatic representations of Lucina come from coins of Lucilla, Septimius Severus, and Caracalla.

The last new type to discuss is that with the legend MATRI CASTRORVM. Faustina received the title *Mater Castrorum* in 174, when she had been traveling with Marcus on campaign in the East for a couple of years.<sup>40</sup> This title is in fact unknown before this time and must testify to the feeling that Faustina was seen as a mother figure even to the soldiers in the camps.<sup>41</sup> It was fairly common for the empress to travel with her husband on campaign, and we know that Plotina was with Trajan in the field when he died in 117.<sup>42</sup> No other empress had received this title, though later it was also bestowed on Julia Domna and Julia Mamaea. A few types were minted during her lifetime and show, on the reverse, Faustina veiled, sacrificing on a decorated altar, holding a patera and incense box, with

---

<sup>37</sup> *BMC* no. 145, p. 159, nos. 116–17, p. 401 in gold and silver; *RIC* 1577 and *BMC* no. 2153–54, p. 374, sestertii.

<sup>38</sup> *Fasti* 3.245–258

<sup>39</sup> *ILS* 366.

<sup>40</sup> Cassius Dio 72.5; Kienast (above, n.11) 141.

<sup>41</sup> On the conferral of the same title on Julia Domna and its meaning under the Severans, see J. Langford, *Maternal Megalomania: Julia Domna and the Imperial Politics of Motherhood* (Baltimore 2013), 23–47. For another interpretation of the *Mater Castrorum* title, see M. A. Speidel, “Faustina—*Mater Castrorum*. Ein Beitrag zur Religionsgeschichte,” *Tyche* 27 (2012) 127–52. K. Toepfer (“The Empress and Her Relationship to the Roman Army,” in P. Bidwell, ed., *Proceedings of the 21<sup>st</sup> International Limes [Roman Frontiers] Congress 2009 at Newcastle upon Tyne [BAR International Series]* [Oxford 2009] 1–7) sees the title as a way of securing the loyalty of the army to Commodus, the heir. See also M. Boatwright, “Faustina the Younger, ‘Mater Castrorum’” in R. Frei-Stolba et al., eds, *Les femmes antiques entre sphere privée et sphere publique* (Bern 2003), 249–68.

<sup>42</sup> *HA*, *Hadrian* 5.9–10. Sabina also traveled with Hadrian when he was in Egypt in 130, but that was not a military expedition.

either two or three military standards at the side.<sup>45</sup> Several posthumous issues depict a similar scene or variant: Faustina seated, holding a scepter and globe surmounted by a phoenix with two or three standards.<sup>44</sup> A couple of posthumous types actually include in the obverse and reverse legends her title *Mater Castrorum*, emphasizing its significance through reiteration.<sup>45</sup> Thus, with only a quick perusal of the reverse iconography of Faustina's coinage, it is clear that attention was being paid to promote certain ideas, namely the fertility of the empress and her essential role as mother, establishing the continuity of the empire.

The body of coinage produced with the portrait of Lucilla includes two different obverse legends: LVCILLAE AVG(VSTAE) ANTONINI AVG(VSTI) F(ILIAE) and LVCILLA AVGVSTA.<sup>46</sup> Here the Antoninus referred to is not Antoninus Pius but Lucilla's father Marcus Aurelius, who began using the *nomen* Antoninus after he ascended to the principate in 161.<sup>47</sup> The exact chronology of the coinage minted for Lucilla is difficult to pin down because of a lack of internal cues on the coins themselves. While some scholars have proposed that the coinage for Lucilla began in 161 when her father became emperor<sup>48</sup> or in 165 when she likely gave birth to her first child,<sup>49</sup> it seems most probable that coins with the likeness of Lucilla began to be minted after her marriage to Verus in 164, perhaps coinciding with the granting of the title Augusta as well.<sup>50</sup> Even after the death of Verus in 169, it seems likely that coins

---

<sup>45</sup> *RIC* 1659–62.

<sup>44</sup> *RIC* 751–54.

<sup>45</sup> *RIC* 742, 748–49, 1700, 1709.

<sup>46</sup> Another version of the short legend LVCILLA AVGVSTA appears in the dative, LVCILLAE AVGVSTAE, though it is much less common than the nominative spelling.

<sup>47</sup> Kienast (above, n.11) 137; *BMC* IV, xxii.

<sup>48</sup> Szaivert (above, n.3) 7–14.

<sup>49</sup> Fittschen (above, n.3) 72–73.

<sup>50</sup> Both the *HA*, *Marcus* 7.7 and Cassius Dio 71.1.1 report that Lucilla was engaged to Lucius Verus when he was made co-emperor; it seems more likely, however, that coinage began after her marriage. Engagements can be broken easily, as both Marcus and Lucius knew, while marriage is a more consequential life event. We cannot rely on the example of precedent here, since there was not a very established pattern for when the title of Augusta was granted or when coinage was initiated for female imperial family members. Literary sources do not record when Lucilla became an Augusta, though all inscriptions that name her as the wife of Lucius Verus also include her designation as Augusta. See Temporini, (above, n.10) 33–34. B. Levick (above, n.3) 71 states that Lucilla was made Augusta upon her marriage “in glorious compensation for the provincial ceremony” at Ephesus, which seems like an overly dramatic interpretation, and the evidence on which she bases her statement is not unequivocal.

were minted for Lucilla at Rome since there are provincial issues dated after 169.<sup>51</sup> Furthermore, Herodian mentions that Lucilla retained her imperial privileges even into the reign of Commodus, though it is not clear if coinage was among these.<sup>52</sup> The only clear *terminus ante quem* for the coinage with Lucilla's portrait must be the end of her father's principate, due to the fact that *Divi* would have been added to the name of Marcus in the coin legend after his death if coins for Lucilla had continued.<sup>53</sup> Therefore it is likely that coins were minted for Lucilla during the period 164–180.

Of the two obverse legends utilized on the coins of Lucilla, the longer version is more common than the shorter version on all denominations.<sup>54</sup> That is, Lucilla is more often referred to as the daughter of (Marcus) Antoninus than simply by her name alone on the coins minted at Rome. The longer legend is the earlier one, being paired with Lucilla's first portrait type, while the short legend was used on coins with her second and third portrait types.<sup>55</sup> The switch to the short legend could have been prompted by the birth of a child, the death of Lucius, or no specific event at all.<sup>56</sup> There was no apparent trigger for the switch to Faustina's shorter title either. The evidence presented thus far demonstrates that Faustina and Lucilla are each designated either as daughter of the ruling emperor or by her own name and the title *Augusta* alone.

In short, in one key aspect we see that none of the coins of Faustina the Younger or Lucilla features legends that correspond to those of their predecessors. That is, their coins do not include the relationship of wife of the emperor. Faustina is never referred to as the wife of Marcus

---

<sup>51</sup> A specimen from Aelia Capitolina contains a portrait of Commodus on the obverse along with the portraits and names of Lucilla and Crispina. See L. Kadman, *The Coins of Aelia Capitolina* (= *Corpus Nummorum Palaestinensium* vol. 1) (Jerusalem 1956) 84, 96. The coin must be dated after the middle of 178 when Commodus married Crispina. H.-D. Shultz ("Zur Chronologie des Lucilla-Porträts auf Münzen," *WissZBerl* 51 [1982] 283–86) also supports the argument that coins were minted for Lucilla after 169.

<sup>52</sup> Herodian 1.8.3.

<sup>53</sup> For instance, LVCILLA AVGVSTA DIVI MARCI ANTONINI PII FILIA, similar to a legend appearing on coinage minted under Commodus to honor the consecration of his father. See *RIC* 264–275 (coins of Commodus). The fact that Lucilla was implicated in the conspiracy against her brother ca. 181/182 would also likely rule out the production of coins for Lucilla after the reign of her father.

<sup>54</sup> See *RIC* 755–792 and 1728–1781.

<sup>55</sup> See Fittschen (above, n.3) 72; Meyers (above, n.23) 86–87.

<sup>56</sup> Szaivert (above, n.3) 10 proposes that the short legend came about after her marriage in 164. This theory does not coincide with my own interpretation of events.

Aurelius on her coinage, nor is Lucilla designated as the wife of Lucius Verus on hers. Why was there no change in Faustina's titulature when her husband Marcus became *princeps* in 161? The coin legend could have read FAVSTINA AVG(VSTA) M(ARCI) AVREL(II) ANTONINI AVG(VSTI) in order to correspond to the titulature on the coinage of Marcus himself at the start of his reign, following the format of the most recent empresses.<sup>57</sup>

The more peculiar situation is with the coinage of Lucilla. As was stated above, the coins with her portrait probably began to be produced in the year 164 upon her marriage to Lucius Verus.<sup>58</sup> Nevertheless, none of the coins includes as part of her nomenclature a reference to her husband, the co-emperor. She is always designated as the daughter of Marcus or merely as Lucilla Augusta. The innovation in the coinage of Faustina and Lucilla is emphasized by the fact that the coinage produced for Crispina reverts to the previously used naming conventions, being designated as "the wife of" or simply as Augusta.<sup>59</sup> A quick look at a sampling of inscriptions serves as further support to my idea that the language on the coinage was intentional.

Inscriptions provide a different sort of evidence, for whereas the coins under discussion came through the official imperial mint, the inscriptions were set up by assorted individuals or town councils without imperial oversight. If the inscriptions carry the same titulature as the coins, then we might deduce that there was a new imperial directive for the naming conventions of the imperial women. Based upon examination of twenty-six statue bases of Faustina and nine of Lucilla from Rome and the provinces, as well as numerous dedicatory inscriptions, I conclude that there is little consistency in the name of Faustina or Lucilla.<sup>60</sup> Inscriptions that can be dated to the reign of Antoninus Pius more

<sup>57</sup> See for example *RIC* 1, 8 – 10.

<sup>58</sup> Kienast (above n.11) dates the marriage to "163(?)." Fittschen (above n.3) states that Lucilla and Lucius Verus were probably married in 164, but the date is not certain.

<sup>59</sup> Coinage with Crispina's name designates her CRISPINA AVG IMP COMMODI AVG (*RIC* 672B) or CRISPINA AVGVSTA (*RIC* 670).

<sup>60</sup> Statue base inscriptions of Faustina II: *CIL* VI 1019 = *ILS* 382; *IGUR* I, 25 = *IGR* I Nr. 120 = *IG* XIV 1050; *CIL* IX 254 = *ILS* 379; *ILS* 380; *CIL* X 5824 = *ILS* 381; *InscrIt* 10, 1, 671; *AE* 1979, 340; *CIL* II 3591; *CIL* II 4097 = *RIT* Nr. 76; *CIL* III 1449; *SEG* 39 (1989) 245; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3400; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3599; *Olympia V* (1896) Nr. 614; *Olympia V* (1896) Nr. 382; *IGR* IV, 1507; *TAM* II, 2, 419; *IvE* 287, 4; *SEG* 39 (1989) 1497; *SEG* 4, 404; *IAM* 2, 385; *AE* 1922, 27; *CIL* VIII pt. 1, 5525; *CIL* VIII suppl pt. 4, 26532; *CIL* VIII suppl. pt. 1, 12289; *CIL* VIII suppl. pt. 4, 26252. Statue base inscriptions of Lucilla: *CIL* III 1307;

often call Faustina both daughter and wife or one or the other,<sup>61</sup> while those dated to the reign of Marcus Aurelius almost all refer to her as his wife.<sup>62</sup> Variations include her distinction as daughter of the deified Antoninus, sometimes with the deified Faustina also included.<sup>63</sup> After her death, she is simply *Diva Faustina* as well.<sup>64</sup> There are fewer inscriptions with Lucilla's name on them, but we can identify two trends. During her marriage to Lucius Verus, she is referred to as his wife, but post-169, she is more likely the daughter of Marcus Aurelius, titlature that was also used before and during her marriage.

These statues and dedications were set up all over the Roman Empire by individuals and towns, and the dedicators therefore chose the language of the inscriptions. The inconsistency with which the imperial women are named suggests that—far from there being a court mandate—individual dedicators selected the nomenclature, perhaps based on the reason for the dedication or the physical limits of the stone on which the text was inscribed.<sup>65</sup> While there is general consistency in the naming conventions for the emperors, there did not exist a particular

---

*IG* IP 3402; *IG* IV 703; *IvE* 287, 3; *IvE* 288; , *CIL* VIII suppl. pt. 4, 27777; A. Mastino, Faustina e Lucilla nell'età del *pagus*," in M. Khanoussi and A. Mastino, eds., *Uchi Maius I. Scavi e ricerche epigrafiche in Tunisia* (1997)129 no. 2; *AE* 1978, 840; *IRT* 33 Nr. 25.

<sup>61</sup> See *AE* 1979, 340: Faustinae Aug(ustae) | Aureli Caesaris | Antonini Aug(usti) | Pii Fil(iae) Res P(ublica) and *InscrIt* 10, 1, 671: [F]austinae | Aug(ustae) | Aeli Antonini | Aug(usti) Pii Fil(iae) | Aureli Caes(aris) uxori | d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)

<sup>62</sup> For example, *CIL* X, 5824: Faustina[a]e Aug(ustae) | imp(eratoris) Caes(aris) M(arci) Aureli | Antonin[i] Aug(usti) Germanici Tr(ibunicia) [Po]t(estate) XXVII | co(n) s(ulis) I[III] P(atris) P(atriciae) | C(aius) Laberiu[s] Quartinus | co(n)s(ul) VII[vi]r epul(onium) and *IAM* 2, 385: Fau[st]inae Augustae | Im[pera]toris Caesaris | M(arci) [Aurelii] A ntonini Aug(usti).

<sup>63</sup> *CIL* III, 1449 and *SEG* 39 (1989) 245.

<sup>64</sup> *CIL* VI, 1019; *IvE* 287.4; *SEG* 39 (1989) 1497.

<sup>65</sup> C. F. Noreña (*Imperial Ideals in the Roman West: Representation, Circulation, Power* [Cambridge 2011]) demonstrates that coinage and inscriptions could be vehicles for spreading ideological messages and imperial virtues throughout the empire. While Noreña shows, (esp. in ch. 5) that “unofficial” inscriptions erected in honor of the emperor around the empire reflect some of the ideas and virtues represented on official coins, suggesting that locals were receiving and being influenced by official ideology, he also concedes that some of these inscriptions bear linguistic divergences, such as the introduction of different adjectives for praising the emperor or a variation in the order of the emperor's titles. Thus the unofficial inscriptions reflect more ideological coherence than specific linguistic reproduction. Noreña's study does not treat the imperial women directly. See U. Hahn, *Die Frauen des römischen Kaiserhauses und ihre Ehrungen im griechischen Osten. Saarbrücker Studien zur Archäologie und alten Geschichte*, 8 (Saarbrücken 1994).

naming protocol for the imperial women.<sup>66</sup> With the coinage produced at the imperial mint, on the contrary, we can be quite certain that the naming conventions would be up-to-date and verified by the imperial court. The titulature on the coinage, therefore, is intentional; it reflects the intention of the imperial family to promote certain messages.<sup>67</sup> While it is difficult to judge the degree to which messages on coins were received by the public around the empire, the formation of the messages and what was important to the imperial family at a particular time can be observed. The titles and the iconography on coinage are relevant to how the imperial family envisioned itself and desired to position itself within Roman society.

Why, when most empresses were identified by their relationship to their husband, should Faustina and Lucilla not be linked to their respective husbands on their coins? I assert that the unusual titulature on the coinage can be attributed to the special imperial status of Faustina and Lucilla. Each was related to more than one emperor, and thus each played different roles with the different rulers. The fact that both of these women filled different roles in the imperial court, but are referred to by designations on their coinage that highlight only one role for each, is therefore significant.<sup>68</sup> The father-daughter relationship is being prioritized on the coinage.

This finding is consistent with Hallett's view that "even after Roman women had come to occupy more 'mature' familial roles, they continued

---

<sup>66</sup> See M. Hammond, "Imperial Elements in the Formula of the Roman Emperors during the First Two and a Half Centuries of the Empire," *MAAR* 25 (1957) 17–64, for the formulaic titles of the emperors.

<sup>67</sup> One might argue that the lack of consistency in the statue base inscriptions could reflect that the official message propagated by the court through the coinage was not being received by citizens around the empire. However, a number of factors must be considered, including local customs or the preferences of the dedicator. While the court would be able to control the messages emanating from an official source, it could not control the people who have the means to set up an honorary statue. One should also consider a parallel situation with portraits themselves. Official portrait models were circulated in the empire but that practice did not prevent the creation of portraits that were unfaithful likenesses, as Fronto writes to Marcus Aurelius himself (*Aur.* 4.12.6).

<sup>68</sup> In the first century, Julia, the daughter of Titus, was honored with coinage during the reign of her father and designated as his daughter (*RIC* 54–58). Coinage with the obverse legend *IVLIA AVGVSTA* (and later *DIVA IVLIA AVGVSTA*) was minted under Domitian (*RIC* 217–20), her uncle, with whom she reportedly had an affair, though she was never married to him.



to be symbolically and publicly defined as *daughters*.<sup>69</sup> A woman's role as daughter, therefore, was a central role for her throughout her life.<sup>70</sup> Even in several of the tales about early Rome that the Romans repeated in text and art, a woman's role as a daughter is highlighted. For example, when the Sabines were besieging Rome for the return of their daughters, the women themselves intervened as mediators between their fathers and their new husbands. Livy also emphasizes instances in Roman history when the father-daughter bond was violated. Tullia, for example, not only took part in the coup to overthrow her father but also desecrated his body by driving her chariot over it, an act condemned as "*foedum inhumanumque . . . scelus*."<sup>71</sup> These stories, legends though they may be, thus establish the importance of the father-daughter bond in Rome's earliest times, at least in anecdotal form. A more concrete parallel can be found in some inscriptions recording benefactions by women, who are referred to as daughters of their fathers, rather than in association with their husbands when it is known they were married.<sup>72</sup> These female benefactors could be carrying on a family tradition of benefaction or emphasizing their more well-known family over their husband's family, but whatever the reason, it is clear that the relationship between the woman and her father was given prominence. However, promoting the father-daughter relationship had never been attempted on imperial coinage to such a degree as we see during the Antonine period.

The nomenclature of Faustina and Lucilla is particularly important for what it reveals about imperial succession during the second century. By the mid-second century the principate passed to a successor via adoption because each emperor after the Flavians had no son of his own or close male relative (like the Julio-Claudians) to name as heir.<sup>73</sup> With

---

<sup>69</sup> Hallett (above, n.29) 66–67.

<sup>70</sup> A woman's importance as a daughter does not rule out the significance of the husband-wife relationship. A number of texts from different time periods relate the mutual devotion and affection between certain husbands and their wives. See Pliny, *Ep.* 6. 4, 6.7, letters to his wife Calpurnia that express their affection for one another, and 4.19, a letter to his wife's aunt Calpurnia Hispulla, in which Pliny praises his wife for her devotion to him and his activities and for her affection.

<sup>71</sup> For the Sabines, see Livy 1.13; for the account of Tullia, see 1.47–48.

<sup>72</sup> K. Mantas, "Independent Women in the Roman East: Widows, Benefactresses, Patronesses, Office-Holders," *Eirene* 33 (1997) 86.

<sup>73</sup> M. Boatwright ("Imperial Women of the Early Second Century A.D.," *AJP* 112 [1991] 536) states that the power of the Trajanic and Hadrianic imperial women was not linked to their function as mothers of potential heirs, as had earlier been the case. Others who treat the succession in the second century include Levick (above, n.3) 41–47 and O.

Antoninus Pius the situation changed. Although neither of his own sons survived to adulthood, Antoninus adopted Marcus and Lucius, respectively the nephew of Faustina the Elder and the son of Aelius Caesar, according to Hadrian's plan. Since Antoninus had a daughter, she was married to Marcus in a political union.<sup>74</sup> Even though Marcus Aurelius was in line to become emperor eventually when he was adopted by Antoninus Pius, the marriage between Marcus and Antoninus' daughter Faustina in 145 would have made the imperial link even stronger.<sup>75</sup> The fact that Faustina was never referred to as the wife of Marcus on her coins from his principate—breaking away from the tradition of the coin legends of earlier empresses—seems to suggest that this type of link (that is, wife of the emperor) was not as important at this time as it seems to have been in previous reigns. From 161 onwards Faustina, as a blood relative, is actually the closer link to the preceding emperor. It is as though she is of higher rank than even her husband, the new emperor. She had in fact been given the title *Augusta* in 147, when Marcus was merely Caesar, and had thus in a sense outranked him for more than a decade.<sup>76</sup>

The relationship between Faustina and her father was favored during the time in which Marcus filled various offices and solidified his role as heir. In 157 Antoninus Pius was approaching his seventy-first birthday and about to celebrate his *vicennalia*, and it was clear that Marcus would succeed him as emperor.<sup>77</sup> It was no longer necessary to rely on Faustina as the link between the two emperors. Thus the titulature on her coinages changes to Faustina Augusta. The line of succession had been in place for two decades by the time this change in titulature occurred. The imperial court was emphasizing, through repetition over time, that the ruling family had a plan for a smooth transition. The selection of a successor did not take place at the last moment of an emperor's

---

Hekster, "All in the Family: The Appointment of Emperors Designate in the Second Century A.D.," in L. de Blois, ed., *Administration, Prosopography and Appointment Policies in the Roman Empire* (Amsterdam 2001) 35–49, although Hekster focuses on the literary sources with hardly a mention of coinage.

<sup>74</sup> Likewise Augustus married his daughter Julia to three of his chosen heirs, Marcellus, Agrippa, and Tiberius, and Claudius married his daughter Octavia to his adopted son Nero.

<sup>75</sup> Kienast (above, n.11) 137.

<sup>76</sup> Kienast (above, n.11) 137, 141. Of course the title *Augusta* had more ceremonial eminence than actual power.

<sup>77</sup> Kienast (above, n.11) 134.

reign or even after his death.<sup>78</sup> Faustina was designated as the daughter of Antoninus Pius in order to connect him with his successor and to remove any doubt among the people about the future of the empire.

The nomenclature of Lucilla on the coinage also serves to reinforce the legitimacy of Lucius Verus as co-emperor of Rome. Even though Antoninus Pius, under the direction of Hadrian, had adopted both Marcus and Lucius, it is clear that, during his reign, Antoninus did not favor the latter boy as he did the former.<sup>79</sup> One of the first actions Antoninus took in July 138 when he became *princeps* was to nullify the engagement between his daughter Faustina and the young Lucius, which had been part of the adoption ceremony earlier in the year. Instead he betrothed her to Marcus, who was engaged to another woman at the time.<sup>80</sup> Whereas Marcus was elevated to the role of Caesar in 139, Lucius served only as quaestor once and consul twice during the principate of Antoninus.<sup>81</sup> Marcus also appeared on a range of coins from 139 to 161, with nomenclature reflecting his various titles and consulships, while Lucius did not have his own series of coinage during the reign of Antoninus.<sup>82</sup> From these three major decisions, it seems apparent that Antoninus wished to maintain a stronger link with Marcus while keeping Lucius in the background.

However, in March 161, when Marcus became emperor, he elevated his adopted brother Lucius to equal standing as Augustus and therefore

---

<sup>78</sup> Consider the possible circumstances of Hadrian's succession as one example.

<sup>79</sup> *HA, Antoninus* 4.1–6. For the argument that from 138 (if not as early as 136), Hadrian had intended Lucius, not Marcus, to stand more directly in the line of imperial succession, see T. D. Barnes ("Hadrian and Lucius Verus," *JRS* 57 [1967] 77–79), who however, makes his claims based on close readings of the *Historia Augusta*. Even if Hadrian had it in mind that Lucius should eventually become *princeps*, it seems apparent that Antoninus did not share the same inclination for Lucius' advancement. Perhaps relevant to Antoninus' favoring of Marcus is Hallett's notion (above, n.29) 102–107 that the father-in-law to son-in-law relationship was of great importance in Roman society. Hallett contends that a man had a special closeness with his daughter's husband, which is exemplified by the sentiments of Julius Caesar for his unlikely son-in-law Pompey.

<sup>80</sup> *HA, Verus* 2.2–3. Marcus was first engaged to Ceionia Fabia, the daughter of L. Aelius Caesar. S. Priwitzer (*Faustina minor—Ehefrau eines Idealkaisers und Mutter eines Tyrannen* [Bonn 2009] 63–83) proposes that there was never an engagement between Faustina and Lucius Verus but that Faustina was always intended to marry Marcus Aurelius.

<sup>81</sup> Kienast (above, n.11), 143–4.

<sup>82</sup> *RIC* 95 is an aureus, dated 140–143 that depicts on the reverse Antoninus Pius in a triumphal *quadriga* accompanied by Marcus and Lucius. No coins were minted in the name of Lucius Verus during the principate of Pius.

co-ruler of the empire.<sup>85</sup> In order to solidify the legitimacy of Lucius, Marcus betrothed his eldest daughter Lucilla to him. Thus the coins of Lucilla emphasize her relationship to her father, the man groomed for the principate for more than twenty years, in order to strengthen the standing of Lucius, who had been denied the honors and privileges accorded to Marcus during the reign of Antoninus. Marcus used the marriage between his daughter and Lucius as a political tool and as a way to put Lucius on equal footing with himself because his adopted brother had not accrued the same honors and ranking as he had.<sup>84</sup> Leveraging the marriage of one's daughter for political purposes was possibly one of the reasons why daughters filled a principal role for their fathers, though surely it is not the only reason. The letters of Marcus Aurelius to Fronto are filled with an affectionate tone toward his children, especially the health of his young daughters.<sup>85</sup>

Support for the idea that Faustina held a powerful role in the imperial family can also be found in ancient sources. In his retelling of the revolt by Avidius Cassius in 175, Cassius Dio accuses Faustina the Younger of enticing the insurgent general with the promise that, if anything should happen to Marcus, Cassius could gain both her and the empire.<sup>86</sup> Although it is unlikely that Faustina actually lured in Cassius, or participated in the revolt in any capacity, the point is that Dio strongly implies that Faustina was the transmitter of imperial power, much as does the *Historia Augusta* in the quotation at the beginning of this article. In spite of Hadrian's adoption strategies, the reign of Marcus can be attributed to his connection to Pius through Faustina. Whether or not this and the anecdote presented at the beginning of this article contain any element or truth is beside the point. What matters is that Faustina was recognized and given credit for her role in the transfer of imperial power from one emperor to another.

It is not new to state that the primary role of imperial women was to ensure the peaceful continuity of the empire, whether through an heir or

---

<sup>85</sup> Kienast (above, n.11) 143. Cf. *HA, Verus* 3.8.

<sup>84</sup> Indeed, the only other link to the imperial house that Lucius possessed was the fact that he was the son of Aelius Caesar, Hadrian's choice as heir before Antoninus Pius. Aelius Caesar died before Hadrian, requiring that he designate a new successor. See R. M. Geer, "Second Thoughts on the Imperial Succession from Nerva to Commodus," *TAPA* 67 (1936) 53.

<sup>85</sup> For example, *Aur.* 5.50 and *Ant.* 2.1. When a dispute over the will of Matidia arises, Fronto also urges Marcus Aurelius to consider the position of his daughters who were beneficiaries along with Faustina the Younger (*Amic.* 1.14 and *Ant.* 2.1–2).

<sup>86</sup> Cassius Dio, 72.22.3.

through behind-the-scenes brokering.<sup>87</sup> However, what is new in the Antonine age is the way in which this concept was developed and propagated through official media.<sup>88</sup> Fertility, harmony, and *felicitas* were not newly found messages in the mid-second century, but the way in which they were publicized on the coinage of Faustina and Lucilla is noteworthy. These repeated virtues, as well as the innovative titulature, contributed to a message, a form of communication spread throughout the empire. Noreña argues that “it was the cumulative effect of the same (or similar) types, produced in bulk, for years and years on end, that made it possible for imperial coin types . . . to disseminate imperial ideals across the Roman empire.”<sup>89</sup>

Therefore, in the cases of Faustina the Younger and Lucilla, we see that the empress was a stronger link to the preceding (or, in the case of Lucius, the current) emperor than the new emperor himself. It is clear that, in the middle of the second century, these two women helped legitimate the succession of emperors.<sup>90</sup> The fact that their coinage names both as daughters of their father-emperors instead of as wives of their husband-emperors, as previously done, demonstrates that their roles were important in linking three generations of the imperial family. The coinage of Faustina and Lucilla stands apart from that of the preceding empresses due to a new usage: the identification of a woman either as the daughter of the emperor or simply by her name and the title *Augusta*, instead of the designation as wife of the emperor, which had been the practice for more than a century. Faustina and Lucilla played substantial roles in the imperial family, and the official coinage of the period both constructs and advertises their contributions.

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY  
rlmeyers@iastate.edu

---

<sup>87</sup> S. Wood (“Who was Diva Domitilla? Some Thoughts on the Public Images of the Flavian Women,” *AJA* 114 [2010] 45–57) suggests one reason Julia, daughter of Titus, may have remained on the coinage under Domitian was as a potential provider of heirs. However, she died before having any children.

<sup>88</sup> S. Tuck (“The Origins of Roman Imperial Hunting Imagery: Domitian and the Redefinition of *Virtus* under the Principate,” *G&R* 52.2 [2005] 221–45) made a similar suggestion when explaining scenes of hunting and the concept of *virtus* during the reign of Domitian. Levick (above, n.3) 91 also stresses the “theatricality” of the imperial court and its actions in the mid-second century in particular.

<sup>89</sup> Noreña (above, n.65) 197.

<sup>90</sup> L. Brubaker and H. Tobler (“The Gender of Money: Byzantine Empresses on Coins [324 – 802],” *Genl Hist* 12 [2002] 581) make a similar argument, that the empress legitimized the status of the emperor, for the marriage of Pulcheria and Marcian.