Abstract: In order to promote a family ethic as the fundamental pillar in the reestablishment of the *mos maiorum*, the complicity of those intellectuals and artists who were close to the *princeps*, dependent on him and participants of the new moral order was sought. It was through all and every literary genre that it was defended and exalted an ethic that was trying to put an end to the excesses and deviations, the luxury (*luxuria*) and the complacency (*mollitia*) which, for many, had undermined the fundamental values of the Republic.

The visual arts, as well as the power of images were put at the service of that moral reform due to the force they were granted. The new tendencies brought a change in clothing and in feminine ornaments, the *mundus muliebris*, and the mode was preferably made the focus of attention with the objective of moralising the habits. This clothing reform was seen as an effective mechanism put at service of the old morality code that Augustus wished to restore.

Undoubtedly, the premeditated ideology of the Augustean Age had a less tangible success in everyday reality, but for us it is a priceless source on textiles in the Roman Empire.
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Resumen: Con el fin de promover una ética familiar como pilar fundamental en el restablecimiento del *mos maiorum*, se buscó la complicidad de los intelectuales y artistas próximos al *princeps*, dependientes de él y partícipes del nuevo orden moral. Fue a través de todos y cada uno de los géneros literarios como se defendió y exaltó una ética que pusiese fin a los excesos y desviaciones, al lujo (*luxuria*) y a la molicie (*mollitia*) que, para muchos, habían socavado los valores fundamentales de la República.

Las artes visuales, así como el poder de las imágenes fueron puestas también al servicio de esa reforma moral. Las nuevas tendencias comportaron un cambio en la vestimenta y en el adorno femenino, el *mundus muliebris*, y la moda se convirtió en el centro de atención con el objetivo de moralizar las costumbres. Esta reforma en el vestir fue vista como un mecanismo eficaz al servicio de la antigua moral que Augusto deseaba restaurar.

Sin lugar a dudas, la premeditada ideología de la Edad de Augusto tuvo un éxito menos tangible en la realidad cotidiana, pero para nosotros se revela como una fuente de incalculable valor sobre el vestido en el Imperio Romano.

The Golden Age in Latin literature, visual arts and, ultimately, Latin culture culminated during the Augustan era. Even though the first years were defined by anxiety, fears and political revenges which lasted until the battle of Actium in 31 BC against Mark Antony, Cleopatra, the Eastern comforts and luxury. They were soon fulfilled all the expectations of the hopes reborn in a *pax Augusta* in which the reestablishment of the *mos maiorum* -as it was properly highlighted by Ronald Syme, not a code of constitutional law, but a vague and emotional concept-- the *pietas* and the *clementia*, considered to be the *princeps’* cardinal virtues. The ancestors’ *mores* would guarantee the return of a new Golden Age, the age of harmony, of *pudicitia* as well as a moral restoration in which Augustus would play a very important role as the *curator morum*. The *princeps* himself would explicitly express this idea in his *Res gestae*: *legibus nouis me auctore*...
latis multa exempla maiorum exolescentia iam ex nostro saeculo reduxi et ipse multarum rerum exempla imitanda posteris tradidi (Aug. Anc. 9).

Even though we do not intend to use a strict chronological frame, we understand the Augustan age as the period comprised between Cicero’s death in 43 BC—or Virgil’s early work on his Georgics in 42 BC—and Augustus’s death in 14 AD or Ovid’s death in 17 AD. This should by no means lead us to exclude the critical thoughts and anxieties which defined the end of the Republic and the civil wars so dramatically present in Virgil, Horace and Propertius’s works and in which some of the previous distinguished writers were both actors and victims.\(^2\) Paul Zanker\(^3\) has appropriately highlighted two values which were undermined at the troubled end of the Late Republic and the way these values conditioned the moralizing answer given in Augustus’s age: the first one is the idea that the Roman citizen conceived the maintenance of the Empire imbued by the self-consciousness of having a moral mission, an aim which was threatened by the dominating vices at the time, generally referred in the sources as *luxuria*, and to be found in the ubiquity of the soft living (*mollitia*) or in the confusion of the luxurious *licentia* with the strict *libertas*, especially in the dissolute life (ἀξοσύμπα) of women and youth (D.C. 54.16.3),\(^4\) and the second value, an invasion of the images stemming from Greece in which the nude embodied the process of social dissolution (Cic., Tusc. 4.70) which threatened *pudicitia* and the strictness of Roman society, which, with the exception of its deities, made of those wearing the ordinary toga a symbol of its citizens’ equality and moderation. The opposition between naked Greek bodies (γυμνὸς/nudus) and the dressed Roman body (*romanò habitu uestiri/honeste uestiri*), the gens togata, was a familiar topic in Roman identity and the nakedness was the opposite of urbanitas, civitas Romana and pudor, a serious consequence of *otium.*\(^5\) The sense of identity was transmitted to the Roman people by an unequivocal and patriotic message, Romanos rerum dominos gentemque togatam (Verg., A. 1.282; Suet., Aug. 40.5), and to hid the unavailable women’s bodies under his long clothes was the evidence of an honour, virtue and shame society.\(^6\)

Augustus’ reaction was not the first one from a chronological point of view—neither would be the last—as Julius Caesar had already enacted a law against the extravagant lifestyle of clothing and the jewellery ostentation of Roman women, a measure which was still praised by Tertullian when he claimed: *illae leges abierunt... quae dignitatum et honestorum natalium insignis non tenere nec impune usurpari senebant* (Tert., Apol. 6).\(^7\) Augustan reforms conceived clothing as an efficient method of social regulation,\(^8\) although the truth is that Rome succumbed hardly with any resistance to Greek and Eastern luxury and we could oppose Horace’s *Græcia capta ferum victorem cepit* to the fears of Cato the Elder in 195 BC when he claimed as Livius reminded the Romans: *eo plus horreo, ne illae magis res nos cepert quam nos illas* (Liv. 34.4.3). Roman men and women equally succumbed to luxury, clothing excesses and Greek fashion; the linen, silk, Tyre’s purple, perfumes and jewellery imported from the East triggered the eternal return of the rhetoric speech about the corruption of traditions both in the old days and after embodied in *Orientalism.*\(^9\) It was with much dismay, and using an eloquent and warning image of the deep crisis of values of the times that Columella complained about that atmosphere always strained by the suspicion of a fictitious moral decadence of an indolent society: *nunc vero, cum pleraeque sic luxu et inertia diffluant, ut ne lanificii quidem curam suscipere dignentur, sed domi confeciant veteres fastidio sint, perversaque cupidine maxime placeant, quae grandi pecunia et paene totis censibus redimuntur* (Col. 12 praef. 9). Once again we can find the conservative reaction against the new habits, values and tastes, confronting feelings about what should be the appropriate definition of vice and virtue.

As a cornerstone to restore the *mos maiorum* and to encourage family ethics, the complicity of those intellectuals close to the *princeps* and the new order was sought. It was through all and every single literary genre\(^10\) that ethics (*mos*) were defended and exalted, ethics which would try to eradicate the excesses and deviations of a plutocratic society\(^11\) and put end to the habits which the dangerous love to luxury (*lux-\)

\(^2\) Conte 2011, 215-226.
\(^3\) Zanker 1992, 17-19, 23.
\(^4\) Galinsky 1996, 132.
\(^5\) Cordier 2005, 8 f., 20.
\(^6\) Girod 2013, 157.
\(^7\) Csillag 1976, 173.
\(^8\) Kelly Olson has perspicuously highlighted the role of clothing as *an important tool of social regulation* and also the power clothes to reflect values, exemplify anxieties (Olson 2002, 387 f.).
\(^9\) Wyke 1994, 140 f.
\(^10\) Hallett 2012; Keith 2012.
uriae) and comforts (mollitia) had corrupted. For many, those habits were responsible for undermining the fundamental values of the Republic, the honourable traditions and institutions of the ancestors, the mos maiorum. Cicero, by using a revealing and eloquent metaphor about clothing, accused Mark Antony and his companions of becoming effeminate, of having deprived the habits and turned the virile toga into womanly clothing (Cic., Phil. 2. 44: Sumpsi stiti virilem, quam statim muliebrem togam reddidisti) and of showing their preference for those traditionally non-Roman clothes (D.C. 50.5.3). However, as the majority of the population, of the plebs or the humiliores could not read, visual ars, statues, busts, relieves and the gptic or the numismatic iconography, in short, the power of images, would also be put at the service of the aforementioned moral reform and would also show the scale of values and prejudices of Roman society.

Clothing and feminine ornaments (also masculine), fashion accessories (cultus; ornatus) and elegance (munditia) obviously reflected the social order and the mos maiorum, and were the centre of attraction, the one coming from the mundus muliebris recalled by Livius as the natural place for women, according to what had presumably been determined, wisely and prudently, by the maiores when they assigned her to be the costus domi. The spreading of luxury in women’s attire in Augustus’s time would become an important focus of the moral censorship of Augustus’ time writers, who thought of clothing as an effective method at the service of the new— or old—morality. From Livius’ historiography to Virgil, Horace and Ovid’s poetry or the elegies of servitium amoris as Tibullus or Propertius going through any other literary genre, no author can be found who would not take up his pen to recall the appropriate and virtuous ways of dressing and the muliebri impotentia related to the gaudia Veneris, libido, mollitia and women’s fides was a topic or lieu commun. This moral ideal was also ubiquitous in the iconographic and epigraphic sources as well as in the Agustean age ideology, even though it cannot be considered such a tangible success in the daily reality of a gentrified aristocracy. Drawing on Paul Veyne’s words, a societë galante who had made of luxury an inalienable habit used to distinguish the social stratum and status between full-length clothing and plebeians clothes (Plin., Nat. 33.12.2), between the beautiful and distinguished ladies who would wear the stola as a distinction of their social superiority, becoming the expression stolata matrona, as it has been previously mentioned, a honorific title (CIL 5.5892; 10.5918 and 6009; Petr. 44.18: mulieres stolatae) of the feminae honestae and a title which will set the differences between the matrons who belonged to a hight society and the humiliores, the slaves or women who had a dishonest and immoral behaviour such as courtesans (paelex) (Dig. 47.10.15.15), prostitutes (meretrix/ scortum) and adulteress (moechu), to whom wearing the stola was completely forbidden (Hor., S. 1.2.63).

Let us reconsider this previous revelation: prostitutes and adulteresses wearing the toga. This certainly is a common place in historiography even though we can only rely on Horace’s documental evidence of it (Hor., S. 1.2.63; cf. Juv. 2.68-70), a fact which, we believe, Kelly Olson appropriately claims might indicate, in opposition to Thomas McGinn’s arguments, that the toga was not normally worn by prostitutes, from whose clothing we have no visual evidence, and in the same way the stolata or the uittae were a synecdoche used to refer to matrons, maybe the word togata was only a metonymy, for some people less common than what it is believed, to refer to either adulteresses’ or prostitutes’ dissolute sexual behaviour and toga as ornamental synecdoche to refer to prostitute, harlot or a brothel. We can certainly count on the mention of M. Antistius Labeo, a lawyer from the Agustean era, who warned matrons about the dangers of dressing like prostitutes (Dig. 47.10.15.15: meretricia ueste), although no mention is to be found about the toga and the passage might

---

12 Albaladejo and García 2014.
13 Heskel 2001, 136-139.
15 mulitiae et ornatus et cultus, haec feminarum insignia sunt, his gaudent et gloriantur, hunc mundum muliebrem appellarunt maiores (Liv., 34.7.8-9).
16 Sebesta 2001a, 68.
17 Puccini 2007, 38 f., 61.
18 It was wonderfully described in Veyne 1983.
19 About the role and prestige of Roman mothers Dixon 1988. It has been suggested, maybe exaggeratedly, that they were even considered to be an ordo (Treggiari 1991, 35).
20 J. Gagé reminds us, however, that in the Nonas Caprotinas celebration, on the 7th of July, the slaves were allowed to temporary wear the stola, maybe as part of a ritual in which the world might have been temporary put up-side down (Gagé 1963, 17 f.).
21 In a letter written by Plinius the Younger to Quintilian, who is supposed to dowry his daughter for marriage, he reminds him of the fact that clothing should suit the status of her future husband (Plin., Ep. 6.32: debet secundam condicionem maritii uti veste comitatu).
22 As an example McGinn 1998, 155, 158, 163 and 211, and questioning the popularity of that usage in real life Olson 2002, 397.
23 Olson 2002, 394-396.
be simply and implicitly revealing two facts: on the one side, that honourable women might not have always dressed as *stolatae matronae*; on the other side, that an honourable Roman matron should not succumb to erotic temptation and seduction by wearing dresses made of Coan silk or *uestes Coae*, which had been either dyed in purple (*purpurae amethysti*; Ov., *Ars*. 3.169-92) or in other colours, transparent, and which were the symbol of women of bad reputation or reprehensible moral.\(^{24}\) Those *stolatae matronae* otherwise, certainly undid the Agustean literature but they were undoubtedly the same women who exhibited their wealth in their dresses and wore what they pleased and showed themselves in public with no *stola* (*Tert.*, *De palio* 4.9)\(^{25}\) a much more scandalous action, as Gagé reminds us. It was never totally accepted in Rome nor in any other ancient society, that women could feel completely free to wear fashionable clothes due to the fact that archaic societies would usually ascribe a particular dress to a person’s rank and age and because dress was connected to rites of passage and magical powers.\(^{26}\)

However, the fact that reality and moral followed different paths is not significant, as it has repeatedly happened throughout history. Agustean propaganda thought of the regulation on feminine dressing as an effective method at the service of the old morality to be restored. Such an attempt is, for us, a treasure of information about both the clothing at that time and the immanent contradictions of a society who was facing the unstoppable irruption of fashion, *otium*, pleasure and *luxuria* (*Vell*. 2.1.1-2) which undermined the moral ideas that the *princeps* was attempting to restore.\(^{27}\) The national ideological program went for the return of that old strict morality praised by Horace in his *Carmen Saeculare*: *iam Fides et Pax et Honos Pudorque / priscus et neglecta redire Virtus / audet* (Hor., *Saec*. 5.7).\(^{28}\)

Along with the power of persuasive speeches, the statues, both standing and seated, were used to send the new moral message and feminine clothing, characterized by a great diversity of clothes, of ways of wearing them and of either hiding or covering women’s bodies, which beyond elegance or distinction, should subordinate comfort to morality, and they were constant reminders, in Rome and in other provinces of the Empire\(^{29}\) and always using an uniform archetypal, that chastity, decency (*pudicitia*) and decorum were Roman genuinely feminine virtues.\(^{30}\) Statues of women belonging to the Imperial family were first displayed in public places with Augustus, they would be the model and example to follow of what it was expected from women. In the portico of Octavia, for example, a gallery of these exemplary women might have been displayed.\(^{31}\) Both pictorial and also numismatic iconography deserve now our attention. They emphasized the role of the family with Octavia, as it is shown in an aureus issued by Mark Antony and Augustus, but surprisingly Livia never appeared. Currency proved to be a very effective and ubiquitous propaganda. Agustean ideology demanded, therefore, the return to those traditions of the old Republic of farmers based on the family and the land, and he also fought against Eastern influences, luxury and dissolution (*Gel*. 2.24.14. 15; *Gel*. 10.2.2), also by using a program which would portray women anchored in the *mos maiorum* tradition.\(^{32}\)

Marital ethics were especially relevant and that ideological program of moral restoration was stated through three laws (*Suet.*, *Aug*. 34.1; *D.C*. 54.16): the *lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* (18 BC), the *lex Iulia de adulterii coercendis* (18 BC) (*Ov.*, *Pont*. 2.3.57-58),\(^{33}\) and the *lex Papia Poppaea nuptialis* (9 AD). These were later combined in a unique text: the *lex Iulia et Papia Poppaea* (*D.C*. 56. 1-10),\(^{34}\) maybe complemented by the *lex Iulia sump-
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\textit{tuaria} (18 BC),\textsuperscript{35} which for some authors, such as Veyne, was hardly ever applied on adulteresses who belonged to high society, simply due to the fact that the woman was considered to be an inferior member, an eternal minor whose actions could not jeopardise men.\textsuperscript{36} Other authors, more appropriately, believe that the law could have had merciless real effects on adulteresses.\textsuperscript{37} We shall take Augustus’s daughter, Julia, as an example (Vell. 2.100, 3-5), and beyond possible crime of lese majesty.\textsuperscript{38} We could add to this that the creation of the \textit{delatores} and the establishment of the \textit{praemia delatorum} doubtlessly brought multiple complaints and a majority zeal for the law compliance. Those laws would surely regulate clothing as well, and we surely make no mistake when we affirm the existence of an \textit{ius stolatae},\textsuperscript{39} and the same laws would try to restore the old fashion style (Suet. Aug. 40.5: \textit{Etiam habitum vestitumque pristinum reducere studuit}; Suet., Aug. 44.2; D.C. 54.16.5). Dressing might have been linked to the \textit{exemplum} set by those matrons who had fulfilled their duty to the State by procreating the necessary number of children (\textit{ius trium liberorum}; D.C. 55.2.6). The \textit{stola} was then considered a \textit{robe of state}\textsuperscript{40} which also meant an \textit{iustum matrimonium}, something which would be a distinction of rank but also of their sexual behaviour. It would be ubiquitous in the funerary inscriptions where we find women who, by leaving a record for posterity of having enjoyed the \textit{ius trium liberorum} concession and being \textit{feminae stolatae} devoted to \textit{lanificium} and as \textit{castae piae suis},\textsuperscript{41} show how proud they were of their virtue. Those laws, obviously, did not trigger a favourable reaction among the elite who would conceive them as an interference in their private affairs.\textsuperscript{42}

Those women who were single or married citizens were entitled, therefore, to wear the \textit{stola}, a usage legally regulated in Augusteian time when the following novelty was introduced: that is, if the \textit{stola} had traditionally been considered the symbol of a matron’s decorum (Cic., \textit{Phil.} 2.18. 44-45), not wearing it in that moment was considered to be a sin of adultery (\textit{stuprum}), excluded of this were those women of questionable past or reputation as they could, by no means, be part of the unsullied circle of the \textit{stolatae feminae},\textsuperscript{43} those free and virtuous women by definition, of those virtuous maidens who would tie their hair—one of the major magic elements and both a symbol of women’s sex charms and a latent threat to men—\textsuperscript{44} with ribbons (\textit{vittae tenues}), which was a distinction of decency and a religious symbol present in animals of sacrifice, priests and temples,\textsuperscript{45} and also in those Roman matrons of proven virtue whom should be preserved of all excesses, of those women who would cover their chaste feet with the flounces of their dresses (\textit{institae longae}) –a reminiscence of another old taboo which forbid to show the feet as the moral obligation was to cover them with the \textit{institae}–\textsuperscript{46} the same women excluded by Ovid of his \textit{Ars Amanti} (Ov., \textit{Ars} 1.31-34; 47 2.599-600; 3.23-27; 613-614; cf. Rem. 385-386), but whom he eloquently defined as \textit{uos quis uittae longaque vestis abest} (Ov., \textit{Fast.} 4.134).

Married women, widows or divorced women were bond to wear long clothing or \textit{stola}, the sign of full-length clothing and sashes which marked them as taboo women, as untouchable.\textsuperscript{48} The use of the \textit{stola} was spread by women of the Imperial family, and its value raised new awareness in the sculptural iconography of Rome, it also had an effect on the representation of women in Augustus’s times as a symbol of feminine virtue, chastity and decency (\textit{pudicitia}), although, as it usually happens within the hypocrisy immanent to all moral regulations, along with the stole, silk dresses coming from Cos or \textit{Coae vestes}, dyed in purple (\textit{purpurea amethystus}; Ov., \textit{Ars} 3.169-92) and other colours and sensually transparent were worn, those were the symbol of those women of questionable reputation or censurable morality.\textsuperscript{49} and the preference of some Roman ladies who were quite reluctant to change them for the simple \textit{stola}, even though it was considered to be the symbol of chastity and patriotic pride of anyone who belonged to the \textit{populus Romanus}.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{35} Veyne 1978, 35-63; Veyne 1983, passim.
\textsuperscript{36} Rousselle 2005, 164.
\textsuperscript{37} Braccesi 2012.
\textsuperscript{38} Csillag 1976, 173.
\textsuperscript{39} Olson 2002, 391.
\textsuperscript{40} Csillag 1976, 173.
\textsuperscript{41} Evans Grubbs 2002, 85.
\textsuperscript{42} Kolb 1977, esp. 239 and 242 f.; Scholz 1992, 13 ff., 82; Sebesta 2001b, 49).
\textsuperscript{43} Frazier 1929, I, 302 ff. and II, 385 ff. provides some examples; Boëls-Janssen 1993, 7; Gross 1962, 85-105; Kockel 1993, 35-49.
\textsuperscript{44} Gagé 1963, 166 ff.; Boëls-Janssen 1993, 10.
\textsuperscript{45} Reinhart 1903, 733-736; Boëls-Janssen 1993, 7-8.
\textsuperscript{46} Este procul, vittae tenues, insigne pudoris, quaeque tegis medios, instita longa, pedes.
\textsuperscript{47} Kolb 1977, esp. 239 and 242 f.; Scholz 1992, 13 ff., 82; Sebesta 2001b, 49).
\textsuperscript{48} Veyne 1983, 121-130.
\textsuperscript{49} Sebesta 2001b, 65-71; Olson 2002, 398.
\textsuperscript{50} Zanker 1992, 198 s.; Scholz 1992, 82; Kockel 1993, 51; Marcks 2008, 149 f.
Augustus had to set an example and, therefore, he educated his daughters and granddaughters in the lan-
ificium, the work of wool (Suet., Aug. 64.2: filiam et
neptes ita instituit, ut etiam lanificio assuefareret),
following the example of the old matrons; he would
actually hardly ever wear any clothing which had not
been knitted by his sister, daughter or granddaughters
(Suet., Aug. 73) or his wife Livia –shall she be con-
sidered a new Lucrecia and a model for Roman
wives51 or, quoting Caligula’s sarcastic irony
(Suet., Cal. 23), as an Ulixem stolatum?52 However,
by a strange twist of fate, his daughter and grand-
daughter, both called Julia, chose not to adopt the
strict way of life imposed by the patriarch and his
clothing in exile, surely because if the law was ap-
plied, those dresses would have been confiscated.

Macrobius writes about an anecdote related to Ju-
lia which proves to be quite eloquent in relation to
the moral rules of Augustus and the reality of Roman aristocratic women who
were fond of luxurious materials. One day Julia came
before him wearing what a man’s eyes (Macr. 2.5.5; Sen.,
Ben. 6.32).53 Macrobius writes that Augustus dubitare de pudicitia
filiae erubescerat; however, it was surely not easy for
young girls to be devoted to weaving and to fulfil
their parents’ expectations of becoming a dressing
exemplum by wearing the matrons’ old-fashioned style,
even less so in a time when people had surrendered
to fashion and to the carpe diem philosophy.56

Horace might have been right when claiming that the
leges sine moribus were quite useless (Hor.,
Carm. 3.24.35), even when Livia was portrayed in the
statues wearing the traditional tunica, pallia and
stola, as it is shown in the statue Falerone in Munich
or in the southern frieze of the Ara Pacis Augustae,
which undeniably reflected Augustus’s ideological
and moral code of the exemplary family and in
Agustean statutory it was probably much more per-
suasive and shocking on popular mentality than the
crimes and punishments stipulated by the leges Iuli-
ae.57 Women belonging to the Imperial family are al-
so portrayed wearing the Greek equivalent chiton and
himation, even though they did not renounce to the
luxury of silk or linen which was so popular among
the wealthy Roman aristocratic women.58 It was also
very significant the fact that it was obligatory for
women to wear the stola and it reached its highest
popularity as the symbol of obedience, chastity and
modesty (stola uerecundiae, we read in Val. Max.

51 Sebesta 1997, 530. In Monumentum libertorum et servorum Liviae Augustae we find a purpura, a ueste, lanipendius, uestiarus, uest-
plicus and uestrus (Bianchini 1727, s.v.; Gorio 1727, s.v.).
52 Syme 2002, 385.
58 Bartman 1999, 41 f., 88; cat. 18.
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2.1.5; 6.1.6-7), or not to mention its use as a mechanism to control women’s sexuality.59 Pompeii’s paintings, which were edifying and somehow old-fashioned and in which characters and moralizing mythological stories were a novelty, showed a more severe control on women’s nude and they superimposed the ideal of moderation on eroticism. We find an illuminating example of this in the differences between the way the love encounter between Ares and Aphrodite, or Mars and Venus, of the Casa dell’Amore punito (VII, 2, 23), and the paintings of the same mythological scene in the times of Nero or Flavian dynasty, when she is painted completely dressed, in the first case, wearing transparencies and semi naked in the paintings of the Casa di Meleagro (VI, 9, 2.13) or of the Casa delle nozze di Ercole (VII, 9, 47), in the second case.60 It might then be sensible to see Augustus, in the leges Iuliae in 18 BC, as Della Corte claims, as the restauratore del mos maiorum, a carattere androcratico,61 although the laws were not actually very successful in their aim of changing the fashion and dressing taste of Roman women and in submitting them to a rigid and severe moral code in which the pietas became the leitmotif of the Agustean program.62

Even though the references to clothing are a moralizing topic in the Latin literature of the late Republican period (Lucr. 4.1125-1130; 5.1350-1360), we can start our analysis through the Latin sources which were used to restore the mos maiorum in Virgil, his Eclogues (42-39 BC) and Georgics (38-26 BC) about shepherding lifestyle are a reflection of both the sufferings which came after the confiscations in the years 42-41 BC and the renewed hopes in Agustean era (Verg., G. 1.500 ff.). It was a way to interpret with a bucolic language the dramatic situation of the Civil Wars and to make of the colonus lifestyle a moral archetype63 as well as to highlight the moral pre-eminence, the greatness and the nobility of the life of those men who worked the land in the Italic peninsula.64 It is in the fourth Eclogue, where the beginning of a renewed Golden Age is announced and the luxury of clothing embroidered in gold or the abuses of dyeing wool in purple or in other colours is denounced (Verg., Ecl. 4.42: nec uarios discet mentiri lana colores. That was a literary topos at the time, also used in the Georgics (Verg., G. 1.125 ff.; 2.464-5: auro neitis Ephyreiaque aera, alba neque Assyrio

fucatur lana ueneno; 2.525-540; 3.285-314; 3.384-394)—although it was already present during the late Republic in Lucretius (Lucr. 5.1350-1360)—through whom it was highlighted the idea that happiness goes alongside with austerity and simple life, a life in which the good farmer or shepherd’s wife would sing by the fireplace at night, while she works on the fabrics with a sharpened comb (Verg., G. 1.390: carpentes pensa puellae). The figure of Dido in the Aeneid (19 BC) dressed, as it could not be otherwise, sidoniam picto chlamydem circumdatae limbo, (...) aurea purpurea subnexit fibula uestem (Verg., A. 4.137-139) could be also used to denounce the fatal effects of royal luxury on the moral of people. This is a peculiar fact because the chlamys is a man’s dress which evidences that Diō –from the Roman point of view—held the power contra natura, something that was against woman’s duties.65

Horace’s literary production quickly joined Mæcenas’ circle which served the ideological and moral program of national restoration. The Epodes (41-30 BC), the Satires (35-30 BC), the Odes (23 BC), the Epistles (20 BC) or the Carmen Saeculare (17 BC) sometimes combine the Epicurean apology of the carpe diem with the ubiquitous and omnipresent defence of autarchy as the only possible and propitious atmosphere for happiness. In the civil poetry of Horace it is recurrently stated the idea that the crisis at the end of the Republic was a consequence of the decadence in habits and the spread of the most extravagant luxury,66 again it was rural lifestyle, the one of the locus amoenus, the ideal and appropriate scenery for the reestablishment of the mos maiorum, the old lifestyle and the virtues restored by Augustus (Hor., Carm. 4.15.11-2: ueteres reuocauit artis; Hor., Saec. 57-8), that primitive rural lifestyle in which wool would not be dyed but preserved its original colour (Hor., Carm. 3.5.27-8). His critical spirit keeps appearing in his Satires or Sermones when he criticizes the evil of the times: the tyranny of fashion (Hor., S. 2.7.10), which would ridicule the modest citizen who wears a rough toga to protect himself from the cold (Hor., S. 1.3. 14-15: toga crassa), the seduction of luxury and greed (Hor., S. 1.2.80; 2.3.94-96), an excess that has no middle term and that is shown in men and women’s clothes when they boast around
walking in their sumptuous tunics (nil medium est, Hor., S. 1.2.28), and women wear well sewn skirts ornamented with flounces extended to their heels (Hor., S. 1.2.29: subsuta talos tegit insita ueste).

A veiled reference to the matronae can be obviously found here and it was better not to show any interest in them because seducing them was prohibited (Hor., S. 2.7.46), and those flounces sewn to their full-length demure dresses, the stola, would hide their feet and protect them with the cover of decency. It was with another sign of the pudicitia, the palla, that another source of desire was covered, also with the ribbons of the virgins, a symbol of their chastity, all of this irritated men as Ovid reveals in his Ars amatoria (Ov., Ars. 1.31-32: uitiae tenues, insigne pudoris, quaque tegis medios, insitia longa, pedes).

In Horace’s literary works matrons are confused with slave women who wear a toga (ancilla togata), that is, slave women who, having obtained their freedom, changed their tunics for the toga which marked prostitutes (Hor., S. 1.2.63). We actually have information about freedwomen who wore the tunic to show their civil status (Macr. 1.6.13: libertinae quae longa ueste uerentur; CIL 1.1570: ita leibertate illei me hic me decorat stola). The dress is used as a synecdoche in the Satires when women are described, very near to an oxymoron, as vulvas wearing the stola (Hor., S. 1.2.70-71: cunnun uelatumque stola) also the comparison between a vulgar matron, whose stole would hide her feet and who wears a cloak (Hor., S. 1.2.99: ad talos stola demissa et circumdata palla), contrasts with the immodest woman who wears Coan silk which transparency allows people to see her half naked (Hor., S. 1.101-2: Cois tibi paene uidere est ut nudam), a woman who lives in luxurious mansions where they show up in the best possible light on their ivory beds made of purple tainted carpets (Hor., S. 2.6.102-3: domo uestigia, rubro ubi cococto tincta super lectos canderet uestis eburnos) and whose slaves, on top of it, clean their tables with purple cloths (Hor., S. 2.8.11: gausape purpureo).

That term was also used by Ovid to refer to the cloak a woman is wearing with Tyre’s purple, silk from Cos or dresses emboiled in gold (Ov., Ars. 2.297-300; cf. Petr. 21.2). Horace, who was simply interested in knowing what truth and moral are (Hor. Ep. 1.1.11: ierum atque decens curo et rogo), in the sapere aude (Hor., Ep. 1.2.40), who repeatedly used the topic of the greedy merchant who seeks for luxurious goods in India (Hor., Ep. 1.1.45), but who was at the same time Epicure de gerege porcum (Hor., Ep. 1.4.15), also turned to the references to both footwear and clothing (Hor., Ep. 1.1.94-6), included in the Epistles, also to attire, as a moral metaphor (Hor., Ep. 1.14.32; 1.18.30-3), to the censorship of Sidon’s purple (Hor., Ep. 1.10.26-27) and the delicate wool of Miletus (cf. Theoc. Idyl. 15.126) and he praises those who, like the cynics (cf. Diog. Laert. 6.22), wear the double cloak of austerity and virtue (Hor., Ep. 1.17.25-31: duplìci panno patientia uelat). The remedy is straightforward and the command, clear cut: may all the matrons not wear round pearls, may them re-read the stoic books which they place on silky cushions (Hor., Epod. 8.13-5) and may they not be so eager to dye the fleece twice with purple from Tyre (Hor., Epod. 12.20-1).

Another truly fruitful field for our aim and in which a more diaphanous way the contradictions of the times are made evident, is the erotic elegy, the one of Tibule and Propertius, the one of Ovid, which powerfully shows the debate between the defence of the mos maiorum, the pudicitia, and the spread of luxuria and mollitia among the citizen aristocracy and, especially, among the capricious and educated women who supposedly enslaved our poets (servitium amoris) and succumbed to luxury and worldly pleasures. It is also highly probable that the public who was the keenest on the aforementioned genre was to be found among those women, especially if we take into consideration the verses which open the Ars amatoria: Este procul, uitiae tenues, insigne pudoris, / quaque tegis medios, insitia longa, pedes (Ov. Ars. 1.31-32).

Tibullus’ Elegies (32-25 BC) are also considered to be an apology of a rural and frugal lifestyle (Tib. 1.1.5; 1.1.43), of the old rural values celebrated and praised by the Agusten ideology. Tibullus recom-

---
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mends his Delia to stay pure (casta), to devote herself to distaff labour (Tib. 1.3.83-6: deducat plena stamin-
na longa colu), the natural place for women to be (Tib. 2.1.61-6), to be cautious even though she
would not tie her hair with a ribbon nor the long stole extended to her feet (Tib. 1.6.67-8: sit modo casta, 
doce, quanamis non uita ligatos imperdat crines nec stola longa pedes). Goddesses are only pleased by
chastity (castiæs) which is proved by wearing a pure garment (Tib. 2.1.13: pura ueste) as the stole. Women
wearing saffron cloaks (Tib. 1.7.46-7: lutea palla... Tyriæ ueste; Tib. 1.9.70), or pearls from the happy
Indies (Tib. 2.2.15) or the dresses of transparent fabrics sewn by women of Cos and embroidered with
golden thread stripes (Tib. 2.3.49-58) were censured again. There is an unequivocal reason for such cen-
sorption: the silk of Cos and the shining sea shell of the Red Sea corrupted the honest Roman girls (Tib.
2.4.26-31; 3.3.17-20; [Tib.] 8.11-20). However, Delia, presumably, would not have the right to wear
the tunic (Tib. 1.6.67), because only the married freedwomen or those women whose owner would
have kept as concubines were allowed to wear it (Prop. 1.2.24: illis ampla satis forma pudicitia). The cliché
for the love militia’s in Propertius’ erotic elegy is used to criticize the taste for silks –also the Arabic
one (Prop. 2.3.14: Arabio lucet bombyce puella–, the dresses from Sidon (Prop. 2.16.55: Sidonia uesitis;
2.29a.15), the colourful fabrics (Prop. 1.14.22: uarissi serica textilibus) and, following the Augustan restora-
tion line, as a reminder that Rome could not be a happy place until no woman would attempt against
morality, (Prop. 2.32.43-4: o nimium nostro felicem tempore Romam, / si contra mores una puella facit!),
until no young girl would be tempted to sin (Prop. 2.32.51: / si contra mores una puella facit!). Here the
poet appeals again to cultural primitivism, to the memory of an old time in which the frugal and aus-
tere peasant’s wife would wear a simple dress and would devote herself to wool spinning (Prop. 3.6.13-
7). Some verses in the third book (Prop. 3.13.1-60) epitomized that atmosphere of moral degradation, the
freeway opened by luxury (luxuriae nimium libera facta uia est), in which, obviously, clothing plays an
important role and in which et Tyros oestrinos praebet Cadmea colores, where matrons have abandoned
their labours for Icarus’ daughter (haec etiam clausas expugnant arma pudicas quaequae gerunt fastus, Icar-
itio, tuos), and have succumbed to luxury (luxuriae nimium libera facta uia est), and in which we find
nor faithful Evadne or pious Penelope (hic nulla puell-
a nec fida Euadne nec pia Penelope), in short, the
decadence of a city, Rome, which collapses due to its
wealth (fragitur ipsa suis Roma superba bonis)
(forma pudicitia). The poet would complain about the fact that Sparta was not a model to be followed by Rome, a place where
Lacedaemonian girls did not use perfume for their hair or wear dresses from Tyre (Prop. 3.14.27-8), and
he would also complain about young people having been deprived of decency after abandoning the
toga praetexta (Prop. 3.15.3).27
However, it was probably Ovid’s work the one which better illustrates the vital tone and the con-
tradictions of a generation who was torn between the fi-
delity to the moral restoration and volubility and the
luxury and a soft, bourgeois lifestyle, it definitely evi-
dences that Augustus’s laws failed in straightening
the boat’s helm of an aristocracy who had succumbed
to pleasures and luxury, to the tyranny of fashion. His
sentence to exile in the year 8 A.C. was both the con-
sequence of a poem and a mistake (carmen et error; 
Ov. Tr. 2.207) but it also clearly showed Augustus’s

26 Veyne 1983, 129.
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implacable determination to restore the ancient and enocratic moral code of his ancestors. The poem, the *Ars amatoria* (1 BC-1 AD); his mistake, his involvement in the scandal of Julia the Younger, Augustus’ granddaughter. In the initial verses of his *Ars*, as it has been said, the virtue symbolized in dress is used by the poet to keep virtuous matrons and free women away from the temptation of reading it: *Este procul, uitae tenues, insigne pudoris, / quaque tegis mediros, instita longa, pedes* (Ov., *Ars*. 1. 31-32); or using the synecdoche of flounces: *nihil hic, nisi lege remissum / luditur; in nostris instita nulla iocis* (Ov., *Ars*. 2.600-601). Modesty and decency in dressing were opposed to the sensuality of those women who seduced men by wearing the purple of Tyre and the silk of Cos, those who would daringly show up merely wearing a tunic—*tunicata*—(Ov., *Ars*. 2.297-301: *Siue erit Tyris, Tyrios laudabis amicitus; / siue erit in Cois, Coa decere puta*), who would not fake when giving themselves in bed while they would frigidly be thinking about her wools (Ov., *Ars*. 2.685-686: *Odi quae praebet quia sit praebere necesse / sicque tegis*). It was a world in which virtue was banned, a quality considered to be feminine due to both its attires and name (Ov., *Ars*. 3.23: *Ipsa quoque et cultu est et nomine femina Virtus*) the world where some women exhibited their liking for extravagance in their clothes, unaware of virtuous Andromache who used to wear rough tunics (Ov., *Ars*. 3.109: *tunicas induta ualentes;* Ov., *Rem*. 394-387; Ov., *Rem*. 707-709)—Varro would state that if fitted the established used (Var., *L*. 10.27: *ex instituto debet*), but it was also an old time for which Ovid explicitly and scandalously claims not to long (Ov., *Ars*. 3.121-122) and the poet rejoices in the fact that in his times women wear dresses embroidered with gold and they have made the wools *de Tyrio murice* and some other diverse dyes (Ov., *Ars*. 3.169-194: *lana tota ut plures sucos bibit*; Ov., *Med*. 9-10; Ov., *Med*. 18). Even though in his *Amores* (20 BC-1 AD) the beautiful Corinne wears a *tunica unelata* (Ov., *Am*. 1.5.9), in his *Tristia* (8-12 BC) and in his *Epistulae ex Ponto* (13 BC), Ovid, while intoning a *mea culpa* and recanting under the sun of those who have been exiled and set aside in the inhospitable Tomis, does not neglect the dressing topic by reminding us again that he always warned matrons and free women who wore delicate ribbons and long strips up to half of their feet length (Ov., *Tr*. 2.247-250), not to read his *Ars*, in the times when Augustus would condemn crimes (Ov., *Tr*. 2.541).

Leaving poetry behind to embrace historiography we should pay attention to Livy (9 BC-9 AD), as an example of a literary work which was at the service of the task of restoring religious values and an ancient moral code, of denouncing the uncontrolled luxury and ubiquitous abundance of corrupting pleasures, of the *mos maiorum* (Liv., *Praef*. 11-12). The books related to the Augustan age have been lost, but we can still see in the *exempla* included in the preserved books the use of the same *topos* at the service of the *princeps’* ideological program. Those events which had been memorable and dramatic since the foundation of Rome showed in Livy’s works virtuous women devoted to the loom labour, just like Horatia, who has made with her own hands her fiancé’s military cloak (Liv. 1.26.2), or Lucretia, who wove wool into the night surrounded by her slaves (Liv. 1.26.2), or the impositions of modesty and decency on the clothing of Postumia’s vestals (Liv. 4.44.11) and Minutia (Liv. 8.15.7-8). The moral of loom and the spinning wheel, textile and domestic work was repeatedly associated to matrons as a literary *topos*, in the case of Lucretia (Liv. 1.57), whose story became a symbol of the pure wife in Augustus’s times, or in an endless number of funerary inscriptions where the *lanam fecit* became the second nature of the *mundus multiebris* of matrons *domisetae* or *lanifici* who in the first century BC still had as a model the *summa lanifica* Tanaquil, and who would recall how close Rome was to be destroyed due to the *luxuria* of the anti-heroine Tarpeia, her liking for jewels and her mistaken idea of what a Vestal’s real sexuality should be, a very recurrent myth, by the way, in Augustus’s period.4 There was a demand for the appliance of rights on women’s garments and Livy, for 195 BC, used the debate around the abolition of the *Lex Oppia* (215 BC) to remind the way Cato and Lucius Valerius would argue about the safest way to tackle the untameable and undisciplined nature of women, too volatile and fond of luxury (*luxurialicentia*) and too persistent in repeatedly demanding a relaxation on the control over the colour of garments, a second nature, woman’s nature, whose world of ele-

79 Scholz 1992, 14 highlights, *instita*, although it is a part of the *stola*, it appears in Ovid as the *pars pro toto*. It is even sometimes figurally used to refer to matrons.
80 It is also censored, by the way, the fashion of the barbarian *Getae* dressed with leathers and *bracae* (Ov., *Tr*. 3.10.19; Ov., *Tr*. 5.7.49: *Pellibas et laxis arcent mala frigora bracis;* Ov., *Tr*. 5.10.31-34: *cultu Persica braca;* Ov., *Pon*. 4.10.2).
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gance, ornaments or attire were a sign of her rank but
would, at the same time, not allow her to partake of
magistracies, priesthoods, of triumphs or spoils of
war (Liv. 34.1-7; munditiae et ornatus et cultus, haec
feminarum insignia sunt, his gaudent et gloriatur,
hunc mundum muliebreum appellarnunt maiores nos-
tri), that is, of being full citizens.85

The same moralizing and apostolic tone used to
imperatively ask Roman women to be chaste can also
be found in Valerius Maximus, who provides many
and typified edifying stories about models of femi-
nine chastity for the Roman people, among them
there are Lucretia, Virginia (V. Max. 6.1), Cornelia,
the mother of Gracchus (V. Max. 4.4), or a story
which took place in 166 BC when the consul Caius
Sulpicius Galus who rejected his wife –absceda sen-
tentia, sed tamen aliqua ratione munita– because she
left home without covering her head (v. Max.
6.3.10), a story that provides a datum which confirms
that dress played an important role under the re-
formist program of Augustus. That was the first time
women were registered in the census either as full cit-
zizens, married or single 86 –actually, the triumvirs had
already introduced a tax on the properties of wealthy
women (App., BC 4.32.136 ss.), from which dresses
and jewels would surely be a substantial part, like the
one from the rich and beautiful Lolia Paulina whose
attire was worth forty millions sesterces (Plin.,
Nat. 9. 117) and we might also remember Hortentia’s persuas-
ive speech (Plin., Nat. 9. 117). However, according to
Valerius Maximus, in his enraged praise of Pudici-
tia, with that measure Augustus was trying to protect
the honour of the mothers and to distinguish them by
wearing the stola under the protection of that di-
vinized virtue: Pudicitia (V. Max. 6.1. præf.: te cus-
tode, matronalis stola censeitur). Eloquent and warn-
ing are also the stories of those women who, like
Cornelia, were conscious that the best ornament for a
married woman were her children, a fact also to be
connected with the approval of the ius trium libera-
rum, as a legislative action to increase the birth rate.

Roman antiquarians offered their erudition and
knowledge in technical disciplines to the Agustean
power and his restoration program and also as an
swver for the crisis at the end of the Republic. The
long-lived Varro (116-27 BC) would complain when
remembering how an excessive luxury (luxuria)
made a lot of Greek dresses fashionable (Var.,
L. 5.131). Verrius Flacus, an insigne grammatian and
the preceptor of Lucius and Gaius, also paid especial
attention to the symbolism of dress in the transition
of a woman from adolescence to becoming a wife, es-
specially to the wedding dress, doubtlessly parallel to
the ideological program of Augustus,87 to his marital
legislation, his ubiquitous apologias for fertility and
the Empire’s need of counting with the citizens of the
future– mothers of soldiers. In the transition towards
adulthood, symbolized in women by marriage, young
people from both genres wore the white– the colour
of pureness- tunica recta, created by Tanaquil (Plin.,
Nat. 8. 124; Fest. 364.21L),88 woven in a vertical
loom, the first one used by the Romans,89 a tunic
which might be ornamented with purpled sashes to
indicate sexual inviolability.90 The afternoon before
the wedding, after taking the child’s toga praetexta
off,91 according to the rite vestimentaire, the young
woman would confine her hair in a yellow hairnet (retic-
ulum) knitted by herself and, on the previous night of
the wedding, she would wear the tunica recta o
regilla to sleep,92 a tunic which was tight to the nup-
tial belt (cingulum) tied to the nodus Herculanus
(Fest. 55L) and which symbolized the acceptance of
her new role as custos domi and the wish of becom-
ing a fertile wife whose desire for fertility was sym-
bolized by the sheep wool, also a symbol of her role
as lunifica.93 The bride would cover her hair with the
saffron flammeum (Ov., Ep. 21.164-5), as Flaminica
Dialis (Fest. 82.6L; 369L; 342L) with her rica and
ueneratum, or the Vestals with their white suffibulum
(Fest. 475L)94 – as it is shown in the bride of Aldo-
brandini’s wedding, dated in Agustean times–95 and
her yellow slippers (luteum soccum; Catul. 61.8-10),
her head being uncovered by her husband on the
wedding ceremony, to him the wife’s custody was
given along with the woman’s sexual monoply, sym-
bolized by her hair. Her new status would also oblige
her to make new changes in dressing and as matron
and future materfamilias the stola and the palla were
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a distinction of her castitas and her pudicitia, as they were portrayed in the funerary iconography, a sign of her new place of natural subjugation next to her husband, and because, according to Athenaeus, education and morality were shown in the way a dress was worn (Ath. 1.21 b-c). If the wife combed her hair in the chaste and ancient seni crines hairstyle (Fest. 454L), the matron should comb her tower-shaped bun or in a citadel shape and uitta velatos, the tutulus, shapes which, according to Varro were also a symbol of both matron’s fertility and her protective character and sensual characteristic was scrupulously stated in the characterization of both matron’s fertility and her protective character, according to Livy of the time Sabine women stood between Roman and Sabine men to stop hostilities by uncovering their hair: tum Sabinae... crinibus passis scissaque ueste..., ausae se inter tela uolantia inferre (Liv. 1.13.1; cf. Ov., Fast.3.219). In the end, the widow should change the palla for the dark ricinium during the normative mourning year fixed by the maiores (Sen., Ep. 63.13). According to Festus it was a feminine ornament (Fest. 342.20L) or according to Varro the most ancient warm clothes appropriate to women (Var., L. 5.132-3; ut antiquissimum mulierum ricinium). Epigraphy can also proof the way the moral code applied to dressing, spindle and spinning influenced the general mentality, quoting Sanders’ words, described as an authentic littérature de rue, and to this we would add the adjective moral. In the Laudatio Turiae (ILS 8393), an epitaph written between the years 8 and 2 BC, among the virtues of the deceased Turia (Durry 1.30), and beyond the predictable pudicitia, lanifica (lanificis tuis adsiduitatis), religiosa or the devotion to her family, the discretion in her clothing (ornatus non conspiciendi) stands out along with the ornament’s austerity (cultus modici) as a proof that our matron lived a quiet life confident of never being penalized by Augustus’s sumptuary law of 18 BC.

Literature was put at the service of power and moral regeneration, however, the power of images could be even more effective and a new iconographic language showed the Romans the image they should have of themselves and of their traditions. The use of the image of women in sculpture as a moral signifier was a new phenomenon of this period. In fact, the first sculptures of women wearing the stola date mostly from Julio-Claudian times, as well as in paintings –we just need to remember Vitruvius and his admonitory apology against the corrupted decoration of the frescos in the rooms (Vitr. 1.7.1; 7.5.3: iniquis moribus) or in the numismatic or glyptic iconography, either as mortals symbolizing maternity or the exemplary wife, or as goddesses –Tellus in the Ara Pacis– symbolizing fertility, both sides of a coin sending the same message.

The Ara Pacis is an excellent window display for the new ideological language about the traditional family to be emulated in the use of dresses, a monument where women of the imperial family are portrayed as examples of pudicitia by exemplarily wearing the stola –as it was the statue of Livia located in the National Museum of Naples (Inv. 6041), portrayed wearing the stola, palla and vittae in her hair. Whereas in the Ara Pacis men wear the tunica as a symbol of their role as world rulers, women symbolized, by wearing the stola, the palla and the vittae, that their sexuality, due to their condition of being chaste and faithful wives, is protected along with both the family’s and the family men’s honour. All the women of the imperial family are idealized: Livia, Julia, Antonia the Elder and Antonia the Younger, who wore her palla and covered her body and head with it –even though it was common in sculptures that women’s hairstyle was highlighted and they did not cover their heads with the palla– a symbol of pudicitia’s virtue, of that decency which was presumably lacking in the most women who lived at the end of the Republic and in Augustus’s times and a virtue which, as Zanker has claimed, Caesar tried to empower with the use of the stole as a symbol of feminine virtue and decency. Even the girl at the altar wears the children’s normative toga praetexta, a dress with a purple sash (praetexta) which protects, as the sources remind us (Fest. 282, 283L; Quint., Decl.
340; Pers. 5.30-1), the inviolability of feminine sexuality from infancy.105

It has already been mentioned that also painting was edifying, old fashioned and moralizing and it showed the control over women’s nudity. It gave the ideal of moderation preference over eroticism and of victory over impiety,106 especially in the private parietal painting, it counted on Vitruvius to make an apologia for the imitation of luxury also in the domestic environment (Vitr. 1.7.1; 7.5.3: intuicis moribus).107 Even though it is impossible to exactly date the parietal painting which strictly belonged to Augustus’s times, we can find good examples of both the second and the beginning of the third Roman painting style in the house of Augustus and in that of Livia in the Palatino located in Rome, in the villa Farnesiana, in the villa of the Mysteries in Pompeii, in the villa Farnesiana, of Agrippa Postumus or in the neathic scene of the gymaeicum in Aldobrandini’s wedding.108 In house of Augustus, for example, especially in his private rooms, luxury was abolished or mitigated by the new message of pietas: Apollo was the main character, while in Livia’s house there was a similar ornamental language.109 The same moderation is to be found, even with references to motherhood or feminine piety in Ino-Lucotea and Dionysus as a child, in the villa Franesiana, considered to be an authentic catwalk or catalogue of clothing and of Augustan times morality, which has been connected to the wedding of Agrippa and Julia, Augustus’s daughter, a place where the feminine characters clearly wear decent dresses, even in the Venus’ toilette scene.110 Those mandatory virtues on women’s dressing are also shown in Herculeanum’s delicate work painted on marble of Astragal players (Niobe, her daughters and Leto) –let us remind that Niobe was the proud matron of her offspring– in the painting women cover their bodies from shoulders to feet, as Roman matrons were supposed to do. Aldobrandini’s wedding scene is also a reflection of the pietas, an anguish bride on her weeding night wears a veil and is advised or calmed down by Peitho and Aphrodite, who is naked waist up but covers her chest with her extended right arm and appears, as it is supposed to be, next to her attentive mother.111 Another demi naked figure also covers her chest and uses the same arm to pour the perfume of an unguent vase over a seashell and a veiled matron and also some young girls who are cautiously dressed and sing wedding chants while they celebrate the immanent happiness of conjugal life written reported in the Roman lyrics.112 The Imperial villa at Boscotrecase also holds some delicate examples of mythology; it shows Andromeda normatively dressed, whereas in the imperal villa of Pompeii, in the fresco of Dedalus and Icarus, a woman virtuously dressed observes compassionately Icarus’s death. To conclude, there are iconographic motives belonging to the new moral order, of the new pietas which came up with the pax Augusta, motives which also appear in the funerary painting, in the women bringing presents to rural sanctuaries, in the case of the columbarium of the Doria Pamphili villa or in the beautiful funeral procession for the doctor Patron, in Rome’s via Latina, where feminine images appear, Atheno’s wife, Appoliaca’s oldest daughter both veiled and dressed with a white tunic and the youngest, Antigone wears a white tunic but has her head uncovered.113 The impressive frescoes,
which are located in the villa of the Mysteries, take us to a moment prior to Augustus’s times and are an answer to the same moralizing momentum, especially if we assume Paul Veyne’s interpretation to be not an initiation to mysteries but a nuptial scene -obviously religious- of feminine toilette, common in the sarcophagi, and an apology for conjugal love where the mother, the domina, a figure wearing a pepulum and a veil to cover her head appears accompanied again by a bride, dressed in purple with a sash and a purple belt, in this rite of passage.\footnote{Veyne 2003, 10 f., 16 and 20. A Jungian interpretation can be seen in the posthumous work of Fierz-David 2007.}

The regulations on clothing in Augustus’s times were, as they had been in other periods of Roman history,\footnote{Olson 2002, 402.} more a moral imperative imposed by power and linked through literature and iconography, a desire or an ideal than a reality of the daily life, and we might as well refer to it as a failure. None of the analysed sources allow us to affirm that politics and Agustean legislation over marriage, moral, luxury or dress were a success. As it usually happens in any attempt of moral reform, there is a great distance between what is prescribed in the imaginary or in the moral code and what actually happens in real life.
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