

FEMALE DRESS IN THE AGUSTEAN AGE

*Manel García Sánchez**

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 deviances, 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.

Keywords: dress, mode, *mos maiorum*, *mundus muliebris*, woman.

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 molición (*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 Augustean 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 high-

lighted by Ronald Syme, not a code of constitutional law, but a vague and emotional concept–.¹ 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*

* manelgarciasanchez@ub.edu (CEIPAC: Centro para el Estudio de la Interdependencia Provincial en la Antigüedad Clásica. Departament de Prehistòria, Història antiga i Arqueologia, Universitat de Barcelona). This paper has benefited from the resources provided by the HAR2011-24593 projects funded by the Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness of the Government of Spain, and the ERC 340 828 IDEAS Programme, funded by the European Research Council.

¹ Syme 2002, 153.

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 Augustean 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 Zanker³ 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 (*ἀκοσμία*) 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 (*γυμνός/nudus*) and the dressed Roman body (*romano 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 Augustean 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 *Graecia capta ferum uictorem 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 ceperint 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 confectae vestes 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, confronted 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 genre¹⁰ that ethics (*mos*) were defended and exalted, ethics which would try to eradicate the excesses and deviations of a plutocratic society¹¹ 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.

¹¹ Syme 2002, 50.

uria) and comforts (*mollitia*)¹² 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 depraved the habits and turned the virile toga into womanly clothing (Cic., *Phil.* 2. 44: *Sumpsisti virilem, quam statim muliebrem togam reddidisti*) and of showing their preference for those traditionally non-Roman clothes (D.C. 50.5.3).¹³ However, as the majority of the population, of the *plebs* or the *humiliores* could not read, visual arts, statues, busts, relieves and the glyptic 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.¹⁴

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 Livius¹⁵ 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 time¹⁶ would become an important focus of the moral censorship of Augustus's 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 elegiacs 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 *muliebris impotentia* related to the *gaudia Veneris*, *libido*, *mollitia* and women's *fides* was a topic or *lieu commun*.¹⁷ This moral ideal was also ubiquitous in the iconographic

and epigraphic sources as well as in the Augustan 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 *società galante* who had made of luxury an inalienable habit¹⁸ 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 high society¹⁹ and the *humiliores*, the slaves²⁰ or women who had a dishonest and immoral behaviour such as courtesans (*paelex*) (Dig. 47.10.15.15), prostitutes (*meretrix/scortum*) and adulteress (*moecha*), to whom wearing the *stola* was completely forbidden (Hor., *S.* 1.2.63).²¹

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,²² to refer to either adulteresses' or prostitutes' dissolute sexual behaviour and *toga* as ornamental synecdoche to refer to prostitute, harlot or a brothel.²³ We can certainly count on the mention of M. Antistius Labeo, a lawyer from the Augustan 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 Heskell 2001, 136-139.

¹⁴ Syme 2002, 251; Zanker 2002, 20.

¹⁵ *munditiae et ornatus et cultus, haec feminarum insignia sunt, his gaudent et gloriantur, hunc mundum muliebrem appellarunt maiores nostri* (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 temporarily 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 secundum condicionem mariti 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 invaded 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 pallio* 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.* 57-8).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 Empire²⁹ and always using an uniform archetype, 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 adulteriis 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-*

²⁴ Sebesta 2001a, 65-71; Olson 2002, 398.

²⁵ Veyne 1993, 127. The information that this French wise author offers when he reminds us that in Afranius' time, the author of *fabulae togatae* in the last third of the II B.C century, there were honest courtesans who wore the long-length clothing (*uestis longa*) as the matrons (fr. 153 Daviault, 133 Ribbeck: *meretrix cum ueste longa*; *ibidem*, fn. 32; Scholz 1992, 13).

²⁶ Gagé 1963, 118.

²⁷ Albaladejo and García 2014, 62 f.

²⁸ Syme 2002, 440-458, 468.

²⁹ Dress was also a symbol of Romanisation, but without renouncing their own identity by wearing the native clothing (Marcks 2008, 151 s.).

³⁰ López López 1998, 7, 65-89, 131-143.

³¹ Treggiari 2005, 142.

³² Treggiari 2005, 131.

³³ It was known with several names: *Ad legem Iuliam de adulteriis* (C. *Theodosianum* and *Digest*, D. 48.5, 48.20, 48.26), *Lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis* (D. 48.5; *Inst.* 4.18.4), *Lex Iulia de adulteriis et stupro* (Val. Prob. 3.99; D. 48.5, C. 9.9), *Lex Iulia de pudicitia* (C. 9.9, 8) and *De adulteriis et pudicitia* (Suet., *Aug.* 34). *Vid.* for a more detailed version Csillag 1976.

³⁴ Csillag 1968; 1976; Mette-Dittmann 1991, 33-90, 131-186; Treggiari 1991, 37-80; McGinn 1998, 70-104; Hallett 2012, 373-375. Texts collected in Evans Grubbs 2002, 83-88.

³⁵ Dio Cassius highlights that Augustus was poor in his private affairs but rich in the public sphere (D.C. 56.41.5) and P. Zanker reminds us about the new program for the State ostentation or *publica magnificentia* (Cic., *Mur.* 76) which was launched against the rage aroused by private luxury (*privata luxuria*) (Zanker 1992, 19 and 187).

tuaria (18 BC),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.³⁶ Other authors, more appropriately, believe that the law could have had merciless real effects on adulteresses.³⁷ We shall take Augustus's daughter, Julia, as an example (Vell. 2.100, 3-5), and beyond possible crime of lese majesty.³⁸ We could add to this that the creation of the *delatores* and the establishment of the *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 *ius stolatae*,³⁹ and the same laws would try to restore the old fashion style (Suet. *Aug.* 40.5: *Etiam habitum vestitumque pristinum reducere studuit*; Suet., *Aug.* 44.2; D.C. 54.16.5). Dressing might have been linked to the *exemplum* set by those matrons who had fulfilled their duty to the State by procreating the necessary number of children (*ius trium liberorum*; D.C. 55.2.6). The *stola* was then considered a *robe of state*⁴⁰ which also meant an *ius-tum 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 *ius trium liberorum* concession and being *feminae stolatae* devoted to *lanificium* and as *castae piae suis*,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.⁴²

Those women who were single or married citizens were entitled, therefore, to wear the *stola*, a usage legally regulated in Augustean time when the following novelty was introduced: that is, if the *stola* had traditionally been considered the symbol of a matron's decorum (Cic., *Phil.* 2.18. 44-45), not wearing it in that moment was considered to be a sin of adultery

(*stupro*), 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 *stolatae feminae*,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–⁴⁴ with ribbons (*vittae tenues*), which was a distinction of decency and a religious symbol present in animals of sacrifice, priests and temples,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 (*institae longae*) –a reminiscence of another old taboo which forbid to show the feet as the moral obligation was to cover them with the *institae*–,⁴⁶ the same women excluded by Ovid of his *Ars Amandi* (Ov., *Ars* 1.31-34;⁴⁷ 2.599-600; 3.23-27; 613-614; cf. *Rem.* 385-386), but whom he eloquently defined as *uos quis vittae longaue uestis abest* (Ov., *Fast.* 4.134). Married women, widows or divorced women were bound to wear long clothing or *stola*, the sign of full-length clothing and sashes which marked them as taboo women, as untouchable.⁴⁸ The use of the *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 (*pudicitia*), although, as it usually happens within the hypocrisy immanent to all moral regulations, along with the stole, silk dresses coming from Cos or *Coae uestes*, dyed in purple (*purpurea amethystus*; Ov., *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,⁴⁹ and the preference of some Roman ladies who were quite reluctant to change them for the simple *stola*, even though it was considered to be the symbol of chastity and patriotic pride of anyone who belonged to the *populus Romanus*.⁵⁰

³⁶ Veyne 1978, 35-63; Veyne 1983, *passim*.

³⁷ Rousselle 2005, 164.

³⁸ Braccisi 2012.

³⁹ Csillag 1976, 173.

⁴⁰ Olson 2002, 391.

⁴¹ Csillag 1976, 173.

⁴² Evans Grubbs 2002, 85.

⁴³ Kolb 1977, esp. 239 and 242 f.; Scholz 1992, 13 ff., 82; Sebesta 2001b, 49).

⁴⁴ Frazer 1929, I, 302 ff. and II, 385 ff. provides some examples; Boëls-Janssen 1993, 7; Gross 1962, 85-105; Kockel 1993, 35-49.

⁴⁵ Gagé 1963, 166 ff.; Boëls-Janssen 1993, 10.

⁴⁶ Reinach 1903, 733-736; Boëls-Janssen 1993, 7-8.

⁴⁷ *Este procul, vittae tenues, insigne pudoris, quaeque tegis medios, instita longa, pedes* (Ov., *Ars* 1. 31-34).

⁴⁸ Veyne 1983, 121-130.

⁴⁹ Sebesta 2001b, 65-71; Olson 2002, 398.

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 *lanificium*, the work of wool (Suet., *Aug.* 64.2: *filiam et neptes ita instituit, ut etiam lanificio assuefaceret*), 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 considered a new Lucretia 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 granddaughter, both called Julia, chose not to adopt the strict way of life imposed by the patriarch and his daughter could not stand Livia’s hypocrisy, who had abnegated to the image set by the father: the matron diligently devoted to her husband’s togas weaving.⁵³ They paid the offence with the *relegatio*, first Augustus forbid his daughter Julia to wear inappropriate or loud clothes (Macr. 2.5.3: *profusos cultus perspicuosque comitatus*) and in her exile she was not allowed to wear refined dresses (Suet., *Aug.* 65.3: *delicatiores cultum*), a quite revealing fact for the current topic. The *relegatio in insula* was the punishment stipulated by the *lex Iulia de adulteriis* for adultery (*stuprum*) along with the confiscation of half of the dowry and a third of any other property and in the Republican era it was a matter which was settled within a family counsel headed by the *paterfamilias*. Due to either the genre differences or because men were required for the Empire, the fact was that for the woman’s lover, normally as guilty as her of committing adultery, the sentence consisted in the confiscation of half of his properties.⁵⁴ Ulpian (*D.* 23.3.10 pr.; *D.* 23.3.10.1) indicates that clothes (*uestes*) were a part of the goods included in the dowry paid by the woman’s family and that it was convenient for the husband that those were not valued (*res non esse aestimatas*) so he did not have to take responsibility for them in case they were damaged or worn out by the woman. So if the woman enlarged her wardrobe, it would be in her own profit always, therefore, if that law was already applied under Augustus, we could deduce that the accusation of adultery would result in the loss of half of the clothes included in her dowry and a third part of those dresses bought as a married woman, a punishment that could be related to the

aforementioned prohibition mentioned by Suetonius (Suet., *Aug.* 65.3) about using luxurious or refined clothing in exile, surely because if the law was applied, those dresses would have been confiscated.

Macrobius writes about an anecdote related to Julia which proves to be quite eloquent in relation to the moral regulations imposed on dressing by Augustus and the reality of Roman aristocratic women who were fond of luxurious materials. One day Julia came before her father wearing a *licentiore vestitu*, having checked that she had offended him by doing so, she came before him the following day wearing what a woman of irreproachable moral was expected to wear –as it is shown in the *Ara pacis* next to Agrippa– in view of this Augustus exclaimed *quantum hic, ait, in filia Augusti probabilior est cultus?* Even though it aroused his father’s anger again, Julia answered that those were the clothes to wear for a father’s eyes whereas she would wear a loud and licentious dress for a man’s eyes (Macr. 2.5.5; Sen., *Ben.* 6.32).⁵⁵ 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*, *palla* 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 Augustan statutory it was probably much more persuasive and shocking on popular mentality than the crimes and punishments stipulated by the *leges Iuliae*.⁵⁷ Women belonging to the Imperial family are also 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*, *uestiarius*, *uestiplicus* and *uestris* (Bianchini 1727, s.v.; Gorio 1727, s.v.).

⁵² Syme 2002, 385.

⁵³ Syme 2002, 426; Braccesi 2012, 61.

⁵⁴ Treggiari 1991, 454-457; McGinn 1998, 140-247; Evans Grubbs 2002, 84.

⁵⁵ Fantham 2006, 81 f.; Robert 2011, 77.

⁵⁶ Braccesi 2012, 20.

⁵⁷ Evans Grubbs 2002, 87; Robert 2011, 77.

⁵⁸ Bartman 1999, 41 f., 88; cat. 18.

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 Augustan 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 Augustan 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 uestis 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.* 1.294: *coniunx percurrit pectine telas*) and the slaves card balls of wool (Verg., *G.* 1.390: *carpentem pensa puellae*). The figure of Dido in the *Aeneid* (19 BC) dressed, as it could not be otherwise, *sidoniam picto chlamydem circumdata limbo, (...) aurea purpuream subnectit 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 Dido –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 Maecenas' 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

⁵⁹ Bartman 1999, 42 and 44.

⁶⁰ Zanker 2002a.

⁶¹ Della Corte 1982, 552.

⁶² Zanker 2002b, 85.

⁶³ Conte 2011, 231, 236.

⁶⁴ Grimal 1966, 43.

⁶⁵ Bender 2001.

⁶⁶ Conte 2011, 265.

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.⁶⁷ 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: *uittae tenues, insigne pudoris, quaeque tegis medios, instita 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 uterentur*; *CIL* 1.1570: *ita leibertate ille me hic me decorat stola*)⁶⁸. 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: *cunnum uelatumque stola*)⁶⁹ 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 cocco 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*).⁷⁰ 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 embroidered 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: *uerum 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 grege porcum* (Hor., *Ep.* 1.4.15), also turned to the references to both footwear⁷¹ 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: *duplici 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 in a more diaphanous way the contradictions of the times are made evident, is the erotic elegy, the one of Tibulle 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 (*seruitium 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, uittae tenues, insigne pudoris, / quaeque tegis medios, instita longa, pedes* (Ov. *Ars.* 1. 31-32).⁷²

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 praised⁷³ by the Augustean ideology. Tibullus recom-

⁶⁷ Cordier 2005, 240 f.

⁶⁸ Veyne 1983, 129.

⁶⁹ *Cunnum*=*mulier* was used to create a strong impact related to his taboo character, like the basic obscenity for the women *genitalia* and *pudenda*, particularly offensive when used *pars pro toto* and unusual in satire (Adams 1982, 80 f.; Montero Cartelle 1991, 19, 32).

⁷⁰ An extravagant use of a taffeta weaved with a type of furry wool normally used to make blankets and coats, especially travelling cloaks which was expensive and which, dyed in purple, turned out to be unappropriated as a cleaning cloth. Horace uses the term borrowed from the Greek language (*gausápes*), a thick and furry cloth new in Rome in Augustus's time but which was not originally Greek (Ernout and Meillet 2001, s.v. *gausapa*; Chantraine 1999, s.v. *gaúsapos*).

⁷¹ Although it is posterior to our research period, it is dated between 62 and 79 AD, and it belongs to the IV Pompeian style, one recalls the life in the forum in the Julia Felix villa where women buy clothes and there is a shoemaker who wears a colourful red cloak and shows his goods to four women who are seated in the benches placed there for the costumers (Naples Archaeological Museum, inventory number 9063 and 9069; *Le Antichità di Ercolano Esposte*, Naples, 1762, vol. 3, pl. p. 221).

⁷² Lilja 1965.

⁷³ Conte 2011, 280 f.

mends his Delia to stay pure (*casta*), to devote herself to distaff labour (Tib. 1.3.83-6: *deducat plena stamina longa colu*), the natural place for women to be (Tib. 2.1.61-6),⁷⁴ 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, quamuis non uitta ligatos impediatur crines nec stola longa pedes*). Goddesses are only pleased by chastity (*castitas*) 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... Tyriae uestes*; 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 censorship: 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 had kept as concubines were allowed to wear it (*D.* 18.5.13 pr.; 1.16.46.1).⁷⁵

Propertius' *Elegies* (28-16 BC), also dealt with that ancestral morality. The *docat puella* Cintia (whose real name was Hostia according to *Apul. Apol.* 10) was his lover, an educated, refined and elegant woman who wore seducing clothes (Prop. 3.10.15), but who was also used by the poet as an example of the social degradation, the lack of moderation of Rome, a city which taught young people to embrace luxury (Prop. 3.12.17-8: *luxuriae Roma magistra*) and allowed the matron's ethical code based on *pudor*, *castitas* and *fides*⁷⁶ to be consigned to oblivion. The main culprits for all that: the despicable luxuries and wealth increased in the conquests (Prop. 2.2.32; 2.16.43; 2.23.21; 2.24a.10-14; 3.7.1-3), Attalus' clothes (Prop. 2.13.22; 3.18.19: *in Attalico mors; Attalicas supera uestes*), who was accused by tradition of being the creator of the sumptuous fabrics embroidered in gold accused by the poet of teaching virtuous girls to hate (Prop. 1.1.5: *castas puellas odisse*), to refuse marriage, a habit which Augustus tried to tackle in the year 27 BC (Prop. 2.7.1-10). Cynthia is portrayed moving the soft pleats of her dress from Cos (Prop. 1.2.2: *tenuis Coa ueste movere sinus*; 2.1.5-6; 4.2.23; 4.5.56-7), purples on Phoenician cloaks (Prop. 4.3.33 and 51: *Poenis purpura ostris*; 4.5.22-3), unaware of the fact that for a true Ro-

man woman modestly was the real beauty (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 uestis*; 2.29a.15), the colourful fabrics (Prop. 1.14.22: *uariis serica textilibus*) and, following the Augustean restoration 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 nimum 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 austere 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 nimum libera facta uia est*), in which, obviously, clothing plays an important role and in which *et Tyros ostrinos praebet Cadmea colores*, where matrons have abandoned their labours for Icarus' daughter (*haec etiam clausas expugnant arma pudicas quaeque gerunt fastus, Icarionoti, tuos*), and have succumbed to luxury (*luxuriae nimum libera facta uia est*), and in which we find nor faithful Evadne or pious Penelope (*hic nulla puella 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*). 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).⁷⁷

However, it was probably Ovid's work the one which better illustrates the vital tone and the contradictions of a generation who was torn between the fidelity to the moral restoration and volubility and the luxury and a soft, bourgeois lifestyle, it definitely evidences 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 consequence of a poem and a mistake (*carmen et error*; *Ov. Tr.* 2.207) but it also clearly showed Augustus's

⁷⁴ *Rure etiam teneris curam exhibitura puellis/ Molle gerit tergo lucida uellus ouis./ Hinc et femineus labor est, hinc pensa colusque, / Fusus et adposito pollice uersat opus./ Atque aliqua adsidue textrix operata Mineruam/ Cantat, et adplauso tela sonat latere* (Tib. 2.1.61-6).

⁷⁵ Veyne 1983, 129.

⁷⁶ Conte 2011, 287.

⁷⁷ Sebesta 2005, 113-120.

implacable determination to restore the ancient and encratic 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.⁷⁸ 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, uittae tenues, insigne pudoris, / quaeque tegis medios, 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).⁷⁹ 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 Tyriis, Tyrios laudabis amictus; / siue erit in Cois, Coa decere puta*), who would not fake when giving themselves up in bed while they would frigidly be thinking about her wools (Ov., *Ars*. 2.685-686: *Odi quae praebet quia sit praebere necesse / siccaque de lana cogitat ipsa sua*). 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 uelata* (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),⁸⁰ 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* (Livy., *Praef*. 11-12). The books related to the Augustean 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*, as in the case of Lucretia (Liv. 1.57), whose story became a symbol of the pure wife in Augustus's times,⁸¹ or in an endless number of funerary inscriptions⁸² where the *lanam fecit* became the second nature of the *mundus muliebris* of matrons *domisedae* or *lanificae*, who in the first century BC still had as a model the *summa lanifica* Tanaquil,⁸³ 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.⁸⁴ 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 voluble and fond of luxury (*luxuriallicentia*) 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-

⁷⁸ Fantham 2006, 111-116.

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 figuratively 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: *Pellibus et laxis arcant mala frigora braxis*; Ov., *Tr*. 5.10.31-34: *cultu Persica braca*; Ov., *Pont*. 4.10.2).

⁸¹ Sebesta 1997, 529.

⁸² Cenerini, 2002, 11-28; Carroll 2011, 196-201.

⁸³ Larsson 1998; Cottica 2008, 220; Larsson 2008, 230-1, 233-4.

⁸⁴ D'Ambra 1993, 84.

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 gloriantur, hunc mundum muliebrem appellarunt maiores nostri*), that is, of being full citizens.⁸⁵

The same moralizing and apologist 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 feminine chastity for the Roman population, 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 –*abscisa sententia, 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 reformist program of Augustus. That was the first time women were registered in the census either as full citizens, married or single⁸⁶ –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 Lolita Paulina whose attire was worth forty millions sesterces (Plin., *Nat.* 9. 117) and we might also remember Hortentia's persuasive speech (Plin., *Nat.* 9. 117). However, according to Valerius Maximus, in his enraged praise of *Pudicitia*, 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 divinized virtue: *Pudicitia* (V. Max. 6.1. *praef.*: *te custode, matronalis stola censetur*). Eloquent and warning 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 liberorum*, as a legislative action to increase the birth rate.

Roman antiquarians offered their erudition and knowledge in technical disciplines to the Augustean power and his restoration program and also as an an-

swer 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 grammarian 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, especially 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 girl would confine her hair in a yellow hairnet (*reticulum*) 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 nuptial belt (*cingulum*) tied to the *nodus Herculeus* (Fest. 55L) and which symbolized the acceptance of her new role as *custos domi* and the wish of becoming a fertile wife whose desire for fertility was symbolized by the sheep wool, also a symbol of her role as *lanifica*.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 *uenenatum*, or the Vestals with their white *suffibulum* (Fest. 475L)⁹⁴ –as it is shown in the bride of Aldobrandini's wedding, dated in Augustean 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 monopoly, symbolized 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

⁸⁵ Cf. *mulieres opertae auro purpuraque; arsinea, rete, diadema, coronas aureas, rusceas fascias, galbeos, lineas, pelles, redimicul* (Cato, *Orig.* 9); *Cato ait deposita ueste purpurea feminas usas caerulea, cum lugerent* (Cato, *Orig.* 11); Wyke 1994, 139; Dubourdieu 2011, 52-55.

⁸⁶ Veyne 1983, 129.

⁸⁷ Sebesta 1997, 534.

⁸⁸ Boëls-Janssen 1993, 71.

⁸⁹ Wild 1970, 63.

⁹⁰ Sebesta 1997, 533.

⁹¹ Gagé 1963, 118 f.; Sebesta 2005, 117 f.

⁹² Gagé 1963, 29 f.

⁹³ Sebesta 2001b; Sebesta 1997, 535; La Follette 2001. The sources denounce too the excessive elegance, coquetry and *luxuria* of the Vestals, appearing in the *Ara pacis* (La Follette 2011, 155 f.).

⁹⁴ Boëls-Janssen 1993, 12.

⁹⁵ La Follette 2011, 56.

a distinction of her *castitas* and her *pudicitia*, as they were portrayed in the funerary iconography,⁹⁶ 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 uelatos*, the *tutulus*, shapes which, according to Varro were also a symbol of both matron's fertility and her protectiveness of the Estate (Var., *L.* 7.44). The hairstyle, due to its magical and sensual characteristic was scrupulously stated and many references show how magical and apotropaic loose hair was to prevent plagues, to beg deities in critical situations or, to illustrate an example related to clothing, we can remember the story narrated by 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).⁹⁷ 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*).⁹⁸

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,⁹⁹ 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.¹⁰⁰

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,¹⁰¹ 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.¹⁰²

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.¹⁰³ 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 *stola* as a symbol of feminine virtue and decency.¹⁰⁴ 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.*

⁹⁶ La Follette 2001, 55.

⁹⁷ Gagé 1963, 168, fn. 2; Boëls-Janssen 1993, 9.

⁹⁸ Sebesta 2001b, 48-50.

⁹⁹ Durry 1950, LIV.

¹⁰⁰ Durry 1950, 40.

¹⁰¹ Olson 2002, 391. They can also see the type Fundilia or Eumachia sculptures, with tunic and cloak wrapped with double curve collected in front of the torso; the Great Herculanense and the Small Herculanense or the seated sculptures of deities and some women of the imperial house (Poulsen 1973, 114, n° 78; Bieber 1977, 200 ff.; La Rocca 1983, 27 f.; Mikocki 1995, 121-123).

¹⁰² Kampen 1991, 454; Sebesta 1997, 530; D'Ambra 1993, 12 and 88 f.

¹⁰³ Sebesta 1997, 531.

¹⁰⁴ Zanker 1992, 199.

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: *iniquis 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 neoathic scene of the gynaeceum 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-Leucotea and Dionysius as a child, in the villa Farnesiana, considered to be an authentic catwalk or catalogue of clothing and of Augustean 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 Herculaneum'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 anguished bride on her wedding 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 to 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 imperial 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, Athene's wife, Appollieia'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,

¹⁰⁵ It is thanks to an Arnobius' unique reference, surely extracted from an antiquarian lost piece of news like the Varro *De Vita Populi Romani*, that we also know that virgins consecrated their small togas (*puellarum togulae*) to a fertility deity known as *Fortuna Virginalis* (Arn., *Adu. Nat.* 2.67: *puellarum togulas Fortunam defertis ad Virginalem?*), for Gag , a *rite vestimentaire* of transition from being a *puella* to *virgo*, similar to the adolescents' ritual when they took the virile toga to embrace adulthood, a nuptial ritual, for Champeaux (Champeaux 1982, 288 ff.), who, however, criticizes that there was no difference between *virgines* and the *puellae* (Gag  1963, 37-39). The enigmatic deity, who was probably *Fortuna Virgo*, put us back on Varro's track, a piece of news from Nonius (Non. 278, 18: *et a quibusdam dicitur esse Virginis Fortunae ab eo, quod duabus undulatis togis est opertum*) and the story of the covered statue with two waved togas (*undulatae*, in Varro and Plinius: *Nat.* 8.194), one on top of the other (*togae super iniectae*, according to Ovid), that might be the image *Fortuna Virgo* in the *Forum Boarium*, connected to the temple located in the same forum dedicated to the *uniuirae* –whose privileges and admiration also increased at the end of the Republic and in Augustus's period (Gag  1963, 6)– and to *Pudicitia*. Ovid consecrated a passage of the *Fasts* (6.569-624) to speculate about the prohibition of uncovering the statue and about which character –maybe the King Servius Tullius– or deity –*Fortuna Virgo*– was hiding under the togas, even though most of the researchers tend to believe that the virgins would probably consecrate their *togulae* to the aforementioned statue as well as to *Fortuna Virgo* and, especially due to the fact Ovid makes a veiled reference to the women when he indicates (Ov., *Fast.* 6.619-620) that if she is uncovered it will mean the end of all decency (Champeaux 1982, 274-281; Bo ls-Janssen 1993, 49 ss.). For the antique dealers of Augustus's times, like Varro, those two togas would have been weaved with the same wool than Tanaquil, also known with the matronly name of Gaia Caecilia, knitted the *regia undulata* toga of Servius Tullius and whose spindle, distaff and a bit of wool were kept in the temple of Sancus (Plin., *Nat.* 8.194), and from the same *toga undulata* might have derived, according to Plinius, the *sororiculata*, in the shape of a breast (Gag  1963, 29-31; Champeaux 1982, 290 ff.).

¹⁰⁶ Schefold 1972, 141, 143 and 150 s.; Zanker 2002a, 112-132.

¹⁰⁷ Baldassarre et al. 2002, 130; Carandini 2010, 151-225.

¹⁰⁸ Bastet and de Vos 1979.

¹⁰⁹ Baldassarre et al. 2002, 132.

¹¹⁰ Baldassarre et al. 2002, 140.

¹¹¹ Veyne 2003, 38-45.

¹¹² Baldassarre et al. 2002, 146.

¹¹³ Baldassarre et al. 2002, 170, 172.

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 peplum 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.¹¹⁴

The regulations on clothing in Augustus's times were, as they had been in other periods of Roman history,¹¹⁵ 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 Augustean 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.

Bibliography

- ADAMS (1982): J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, London.
- ALBALADEJO and GARCÍA (2014): M. Albaladejo Vivero and M. García Sánchez, "Luxuria et mollitia: Rome's textile raw material trade with the East", in *PV IV*, 57-65.
- BALDASSARRE *et al.* (2002): I. Baldassarre, A. Pontrandolfo, A. Rouvert and M. Salvadori, *Pittura romana. Dall'ellenismo al tardo-antico*, Milan.
- BARTMAN (1999): E. Bartman, *Portraits of Livia. Imaging the Imperial Women in Augustan Rome*, Cambridge.
- BASTET and DE VOS (1979): F. L. Bastet and M. de Vos, *Il terzo stile pompeiano*, The Hague.
- BENDER (2001): H. Bender, "De *Habitu Vestis*: Clothing in the *Aeneid*", in J. L. Sebesta and L. Bonfante (eds.), *The World of Roman Costume*, Madison, 146-152.
- BIANCHINI (1727): F. Bianchini, *Camera ed iscrizioni sepolcrali de' liberti, servi, ed ufficiali della casa di Augusto scoperte nella via Appia*, Roma.
- BIEBER (1977): M. Bieber, *Ancient Copies. Contributions to the history of Greek and Roman Art*, New York.
- BOËLS-JANSSEN (1993): N. Boëls-Janssen, *La vie religieuse des matrones dans la Rome archaïque*, Rome.
- BRACCESI (2012): L. Braccesi, *Guilia, la figlia di Augusto*, Rome and Bari.
- CARANDINI (2010): A. Carandini, *Le case del potere nell'antica Roma*, Rome and Bari.
- CARROLL (2011): M. Carroll, *Spirits of the Dead. Roman Funerary Commemoration in Western Europe*, Oxford.
- CENERINI (2002): F. Cenerini, *La donna romana*, Bologna.
- CHAMPEAUX (1982): J. Champeaux, *Fortuna. Recherches sur le culte de la Fortune à Rome et dans le monde romain, des origines à la mort de César. I. Fortuna dans la religion archaïque*, Rome.
- CHANTRAINE (1999): P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, Paris.
- CONTE (2011): G. B. Conte, *Letteratura latina. Manuale storico dalle origini alla fine dell'impero romano*, Milan.
- CORDIER (2005): P. Cordier, *Nudités romaines. Un problème d'histoire et d'anthropologie*, Paris.
- COTTICA (2008): D. Cottica, "Spinning in the Roman World: from Everyday Craft to Metaphor of Destiny", in C. Gillis and M. L. Nosch (eds.), *Ancient Textiles. Production, Craft and Society*, Oxford, 220-228.
- CSILLAG (1968): P. Csillag, «Das Eherecht des augusteischen Zeitalters», *Klio* 50, 111-138.
- CSILLAG (1976): P. Csillag, *The Augustean Laws on Family Relations*, Budapest.
- D'AMBRA (1993): E. D'Ambra, *Private Lives, Imperial Virtues. The Frieze of the Forum Transitorium in Rome*, Princeton.
- DELLA CORTE (1982): F. Della Corte, "Le Lege Iuliae e l'elegia romana", in *ANRW II.30.1*, 539-558.
- DIXON (1988): S. Dixon, *The Roman Mother*, London.
- DUBOURDIEU (2011): A. Dubourdieu, "Regards romains sur la parure du corps: maquillage, coiffure, bijoux, vêtements, parfums", in L. Bodiou, F. Gherchanoc, V. Huet and V. Mehl (eds.), *Parures et artifices: le corps exposé dans l'Antiquité*, Paris, 45-55.
- DURRY (1950): M. Durry, *Éloge funèbre d'une matrone romaine (Éloge dit de Turia)*, Paris.
- ERNOUT and MEILLET (2001): A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, Paris.
- EVANS GRUBBS (2002): J. Evans Grubbs, *Women and the Law in the Roman Empire. A sourcebook on marriage, divorce and widowhood*, London and New York.
- FANTHAM (2006): E. Fantham, *Julia Augusta. The Emperor's Daughter*, London and New York.
- FIERZ-DAVID (2007): L. Fierz-David, *La Villa de los Misterios de Pompeya*, Vilaür.
- FRAZER (1929): G. Frazer, *The Fasti of Ovid*, London.
- GAGÉ (1963): J. Gagé, *Matronalia. Essai sur les dévotions et les organisations cultuelles des femmes dans l'ancienne Rome*, Brussels.
- GALINSKY (1996): K. Galinsky, *Augustean Culture*, Princeton.
- GIROD (2013): V. Girod, *Les femmes et le sexe dans la Rome antique*, Paris.
- GORIO (1727): A. F. Gorio, *Monumentum sive Columbarium Libertorum et Servorum Liviae Augustae*, Florence.
- GRIMAL (1966): P. Grimal, *El siglo de Augusto*, Madrid.
- GROSS (1962): W. H. Gross, *Iulia Augusta. Untersuchungen zur Grundlegung einer Livia-Ikonographie*, Göttingen.
- HALLETT (2012): J. P. Hallett, "Women in augustan Rome", in S. L. James and S. Dillon, *The Women in the Ancient World*, Oxford, 375-384.

¹¹⁴ Veyne 2003, 10 f., 16 and 20. A Jungian interpretation can be seen in the posthumous work of Fierz-David 2007.

¹¹⁵ Olson 2002, 402.

- HESKEL (2001): J. Heskkel, "Cicero as Evidence for Attitudes to Dress in the Late Republic", in J. L. Sebesta and L. Bonfante (eds.), *The World of Roman Costume*, Madison, 133-145.
- KAMPEN (1991): N. Kampen, "Reliefs of the Basilica Aemilia", *Klio* 73, 448-458.
- KEITH (2012): A. Keith, "Women in Augustean Literature", in S. L. James and S. Dillon, *The Women in the Ancient World*, Oxford, 385-399.
- KOCKEL (1993): V. Kockel, *Porträtreiefs stadtrömischer Grabbauten. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und zum Verständnis des spätrepublikanisch-frühkaiserzeitlichen Privatporträts*, Mainz am Rhein.
- KOLB (1977): F. Kolb, "Zur Statussymbolik des antiken Rom", *Chiron* 7, 239-259.
- LA FOLLETTE (2001): L. La Follette, "The Costume of the Roman Bride", in J. L. Sebesta and L. Bonfante (eds.), *The World of Roman Costume*, Madison, 54-64.
- LA FOLLETTE (2011): L. La Follette, "Se parer en Vestale : un travail de funambule?", in L. Bodiou, F. Gherchanoc, V. Huet and V. Mehl (eds.), *Parures et artifices: le corps exposé dans l'Antiquité*, Paris, 155-170.
- LA ROCCA (1983): P. La Rocca, *Ara Pacis Augustae. In occasione del restauro della Fronte originale*, Rome.
- LARSSON (1998): L. Larsson Löven, "Lanam fecit. Woolworking and Female Virtue", in L. Larsson Lovén and A. Strömberg (eds.), *Aspects of Women in Antiquity*, Jönsered, 85-95.
- LARSSON (2008): L. Larsson Löven, "Wool Work as a Gender Symbol in Ancient Rome. Roman Textiles and Ancient Sources", in C. Gillis and M. L. Nosch (eds.), *Ancient Textiles. Production, Craft and Society*, Oxford, 229-236.
- LILJA (1965): S. Lilja, *The Roman Elegists' Attitude to Women*, Helsinki, 196-201.
- LÓPEZ LÓPEZ (1998): M. López López, *Estatuas masculinas togadas y estatuas femeninas vestidas de colecciones cordobesas*, Córdoba.
- MARCKS (2008): C. Marcks, "Las estatuas femeninas en Hispania: consideraciones acerca del concepto de ciudadanía visto a través de los signos externos", in J. M. Noguera Celdrán and E. Conde Guerri (eds.), *Escultura romana en Hispania V*, Murcia, 149-161.
- MCGINN (1998): Th. McGinn, *Prostitution, Sexuality, and the Law in Ancient Rome*, New York.
- METTE-DITTMANN (1991): A. Mette-Dittmann, *Die Ehegesetze des Augustus. Eine Untersuchung im Rahmen der Gesellschaftspolitik des Princeps*, Stuttgart.
- MIKOCKI (1995): T. Mikocki, *Sub Specie Deae. Les impératrices et princesses romaines assimilées à des déesses. Étude iconologique*, Rome.
- MONTERO CARTELE (1991): E. Montero Cartelle, *El latín erótico. Aspectos léxicos y literarios*, Sevilla.
- ROBERT (2011): J.-N. Robert, *Les romains et la mode*, Paris.
- OLSON (2002): K. Olson, "Matrona and Whore: The Clothing of Women in Roman Antiquity", *Fashion Theory* 6, 387-420.
- POULSEN (1973): V. Poulsen, *Les portraits romains*, Copenhagen.
- PUCCINI (2007): G. Puccini, *La vie sexuelle à Rome*, Paris.
- REINACH (1903): S. Reinach, "Les pieds pudiques", *L'Anthropologie* 14, 733-736.
- ROUSSELLE (2005): A. Rousselle, "Gestes et signes de la famille dans l'empire romain", in A. Rousselle, G. Sissa and Y. Thomas (eds.), *La Famille dans la Grèce antique et à Rome*, Paris.
- SCHFOLD (1972): K. Schefold, *La peinture pompéienne. Essai sur l'évolution de sa signification*, Brussels.
- SCHOLZ (1992): B. I. Scholz, *Untersuchungen zur Tracht der römischen matrona*, Cologne and Weimar.
- SEBESTA (1997): J. L. Sebesta, "Women's Costume and Feminine Civic Morality in Augustean Rome", *Gender and History* 9.3, 529-541.
- SEBESTA (2001a): J. L. Sebesta, "Tunica Ralla, Tunica Spissa: The Colors and Textiles of Roman Costume", in J. L. Sebesta and L. Bonfante (eds.), *The World of Roman Costume*, Madison, 65-76.
- SEBESTA (2001b): J. L. Sebesta, "Symbolism in the Costume of the Roman Woman", in J. L. Sebesta and L. Bonfante (eds.), *The World of Roman Costume*, Madison, 46-53.
- SEBESTA (2005): J. L. Sebesta, "The toga praetexta of Roman Children and Praetextate Garments", in L. Cleland, M. Harlow and Ll. Llewellyn-Jones (eds.), *The Clothed Body in the Ancient World*, Oxford, 113-120.
- SYME (2002): R. Syme, *The Roman revolution*, Oxford.
- TREGGIARI (1991): S. Treggiari, *Roman marriage: iusti coniuges from the time of Cicero to the time of Ulpian*, New York.
- TREGGIARI (2005): S. Treggiari, "Women in the Time of August", in K. Galinsky (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of August*, Cambridge, 130-147.
- VEYNE (1978): P. Veyne, "La famille et l'amour sous le Haut-Empire romain", *Annales ESC* 33, 35-63.
- VEYNE (1983): P. Veyne, *L'élegie érotique romaine. L'amour, la poésie et l'Occident*, Paris.
- VEYNE (2003): P. Veyne, *I misteri del gineceo*, Rome and Bari.
- WILD (1970): J. P. Wild, *Textile Manufacture in the Northern Roman Provinces*, Cambridge.
- WYKE (1994): M. Wyke, "Woman in the Mirror: The Rhetoric of Adornment in the Roman World", in: L. Archer, S. Fischler and M. Wyke (eds.), *Women in Ancient Societies. An Illusion of the Night*, Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and London, 134-151.
- ZANKER (1992): P. Zanker, *Augusto y el poder de las imágenes*, Madrid.
- ZANKER (2002a): P. Zanker "Immagini mitologiche nelle case pompeiane", in P. Zanker (ed.), *Un'arte per l'impero. Funzione e intenzione delle immagini nel mondo romano*, Milan, 112-132.
- ZANKER (2002b): "Immagini come vincolo: il simbolismo politico augusteo nella sfera privata", in P. Zanker (ed.), *Un'arte per l'impero. Funzione e intenzione delle immagini nel mondo romano*, Milan, 79-91.