Classical Quarterly **54.1** 185–197 (2004) *Printed in Great Britain*

MASCULINITY AND FEMININITY IN THE *LAUDATIO TURIAE*

The unknown Roman woman, whose funerary inscription is known as the *Laudatio Turiae* (*LT*), lived a highly eventful life. As a young girl, she brought the murderers of her parents to justice (1.3–9) and successfully defended her father's will against greedy relatives who had an eye on his property (1.13–26). During the civil war between Caesar and Pompey she supported her fleeing husband by supplying him richly with slaves, money, and food, by pleading with the authorities for *clementia*, and by defending their house against the partisans of Milo, who hoped to profit from the turmoil to plunder it (2.2a–11a). During the proscriptions under the second triumvirate she saved her husband's life, among other things by giving him advice and by finding places for him to hide. When, in late 42 B.C., by an edict from Octavian his civil rights were reinstated, she pleaded with Lepidus, who was in sole charge of the city, for confirmation. In spite of the humiliation and the wounds she suffered during this encounter, she persisted. Thanks to her determination her husband was restored, whereas Lepidus' brutality was publicly exposed (2.1–24).[1]

In the long inscription he set up on her grave, her husband, whose name—like that of his wife—is lost,[2] pays much attention to her public deeds: though covering only a small part of the over forty years of their married life these actions occupy almost half the surviving inscription. This is the more remarkable since, at first sight, such public prominence contrasts with the domestic virtues and the retired life Roman women are usually praised for in funerary inscriptions. Moreover, not only the space he devotes to this, but also the way he presents his wife is unusual. In describing her public activities he uses words of action and virtue normally employed for men, even military metaphors. In view of Roman ideas of masculinity and femininity this is—to say the least—unexpected. Why would a husband emphasize the public prowess of his wife and use military and other 'male' words in praising her? In doing so, he even risked harming her reputation and throwing doubt on his own masculinity.

The *LT* has received much scholarly attention. Most of it deals with the establishment of the text, its place in the genre of the *laudatio funebris*, its rhetorical aspects, and juridical and historical intricacies.[3] When it comes to a discussion of the deceased,

[1] For this incident, see A. Gowing, 'Lepidus, the proscriptions and the *Laudatio Turiae*', *Historia* 41 (1992), 283–96.

[2] The identification of the unknown couple with Q. Lucretius Vespillo (consul in 19 B.C.) and Turia (App. *BCiv.* 4.44 and Val. Max. 6.7.2) is now mostly abandoned (but see A. E. Gordon, 'Who's who in the *Laudatio Turiae*?', *Epigraphica* 39 [1977], 7–12 and W. Kierdorf, *Laudatio Funebris. Interpretationen und Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung der römischen Leichenrede* [Meisenheim am Glan, 1980], 43). For the sake of convenience, however, the unknown wife will be called 'Turia'.

[3] For the text: *CIL* 6.1527, 31670, 37053 (= *ILS* 8393) and A. E. Gordon, 'A new fragment of the *Laudatio Turiae*', *AJA* 54 (1950), 223–6; for the complete text and translation (that of Flach) with photos and an up-to-date bibliography: *CIL* 6.41062. Editions, translations, and commentary by M. Durry, *Éloge funèbre d'une matrone romaine (Éloge dit de Turia)* (Paris, 1950)—and its recent update: M. Durry and S. Lancel, *Éloge funèbre d'une matrone romaine (Éloge dit de Turia)* (Paris, 1992)—E. Wistrand, *The So-called Laudatio Turiae. Introduction, Text, Translation, Commentary* (Lund, 1976), and D. Flach, *Die sogenannte Laudatio Turiae. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (Darmstadt, 1991). The last-mentioned edition is followed here. For the text, see further: N. Horsfall, 'Some problems in the "Laudatio Turiae" ',

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

however, the acumen that characterizes so much of the work on other aspects of the *LT* seems lacking, and the text is usually taken for a direct reflection of her life and personality. Attention is mainly directed to her self-sacrificing devotion to her husband, the mutual love and fidelity of the couple, their long and harmonious marriage, and their sad childlessness.[4] In accordance with the words of her husband (e.g. 1.34–6), her public activities are regarded as exceptional. Thus, in both the private and the public aspects of her life modern authors follow the views of the *laudator*.

In this paper, I propose to regard the *LT* not as a disinterested description of a woman's life, but rather as a subjective narrative written by her husband with an eye to eliciting a positive response from his audience. Therefore, I will not focus on the 'facts' of her life (which I do not question), but on the way in which the author of the *LT* presents his wife—and himself—in the inscription. I shall look especially at the separation of the public and private spheres and at the attribution of 'male' and 'female' virtues to husband and wife. To answer the question whether 'Turia' was as exceptional as her husband suggests, her public activities and the virtues attributed to her will be compared to those of other women living in the same period and circumstances. My aim is twofold: to investigate the attribution of masculinity and femininity in the *LT*, and to have a closer look at the relation between norms and daily practice in the Augustan period.

GENDER AND GENRE

Despite its unusual form—the inscription addresses the deceased wife in the second person (as far as it is preserved)—the *LT* is generally regarded as a *laudatio funebris*.[5] This has a bearing on the purpose of the author of the *LT* and on the composition of his audience. Throughout his *oratio* (2.22 and 67) the bereaved husband pretends to address only his wife. This was, obviously, not in agreement with the presence of an actual audience at a *laudatio funebris*. When the deceased was a distinguished man (usually a member of the nobility) the *laudatio funebris* was delivered in the forum, from the rostra.[6] The speaker, preferably a son of the deceased, praised him for his career and value to the state, his virtues, and his distinguished family. Apart from relatives and friends, the audience consisted of the aristocratic peers of the deceased

BICS 30 (1983), 85–98 and P. Kruschwitz, 'Zu "Laudatio Turiae" 2, 6A', *ZPE* 126 (1999), 88–92. For the *LT* as a *laudatio funebris*: Kierdorf (n. 2), 33–48, 113–16, 139–45, see also O. C. Crawford, 'Laudatio funebris', *CJ* 37 (1941), 17–27. For rhetorical, juridical, and historical aspects, see respectively E. S. Ramage, 'The so-called *Laudatio Turiae* as panegyric', *Athenaeum* 82 (1994), 341–70; L. de Ligt, 'De significatione verborum: Romeins erfrecht in de "Laudatio Turiae" ', *Lampas* 34 (2001), 45–61; and Gowing (n. 1) with additional bibliography. An earlier sketch of the topic appeared in Dutch: E. A. Hemelrijk, 'De *Laudatio Turiae*. Grafschrift voor een uitzonderlijke vrouw?', *Lampas* 34 (2001), 62–80.

[4] See, for instance, J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *Roman Women. Their History and Habits* (London, 1977[5]), 194 on the childlessness of the couple. See also M. R. Lefkowitz, 'Wives and husbands' in I. McAuslan and P. Walcot (edd.), *Women in Antiquity* (Oxford, 1996), 67–82 at 77–79 and, for their mutual *fides*, S. Treggiari, *Roman Marriage. Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian* (Oxford, 1991), 237.

[5] Kierdorf (n. 2), 33–48 and 113–16, and Durry (n. 3), xiv–xxii; for a different opinion, P. Schrijvers, 'Waarom prijzen wij onze doden? Retorische aspecten van de "Laudatio Turiae" ', *Lampas* 34 (2001), 33–44. For a comparable address to the deceased, see the funeral eulogy held by Augustus for Agrippa in 12 B.C., L. Koenen, 'Die "Laudatio funebris" des Augustus für Agrippa auf einem neuen Papyrus (P. Colon. inv. nr. 4701)', *ZPE* 5 (1970), 217–83, at 248ff.

[6] See, for instance, Polyb. 6.53.1–54.3. For lists of funeral eulogies known from the literary and epigraphical sources, see Durry (n. 3), 65–6 and Kierdorf (n. 2), 137–49.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and the assembled people. Persons of less lofty status were probably eulogized at the graveside before an audience of relatives and friends.

Originally, the *laudatio funebris* was an all-male affair, both speaker and deceased being men.[7] Women come in at the very end of the second century B.C., but only as the deceased, never as the speaker. The *laudatio* that Q. Lutatius Catulus, consul in 102 B.C., held at the funeral of his mother Popilia was, according to Cicero, the first one ever held for a woman.[8] Since public attention was considered inappropriate for women, especially for young ones, at first only elderly women were publicly praised at their funerals. However, the political profit to be gained from public funeral laudations—also those for women—was such that this initial reserve was soon laid aside: from the late first century B.C. onwards funeral eulogies for women, including young ones, of distinguished families are mentioned as a matter of course.[9] Throughout Roman history, however, funeral eulogies for women were fewer in number than those for men. Yet, by a whim of fate the only three *laudationes* of which substantial parts survive (in inscriptions) were held for women: the *LT* by her husband, the contemporary *Laudatio Murdiae* by her son from her first marriage, and that for Matidia the Elder by her son-in-law, the Emperor Hadrian.[10]

Whereas during the empire funeral speeches for women of the imperial family were delivered in the forum, those for women of the non-imperial élite were probably given at the graveside.[11] Thus, the original audience of the *LT* must have consisted of her relatives and friends assembled at her funeral. Yet, by having (a version of) his oration engraved in two enormous marble slabs on her tomb her husband clearly aimed at a wider public:[12] his intended audience comprised all passers-by, then and in the future. Although only a minority of the ancient public could actually read the inscription,[13] all must have been impressed by the sheer size of the monument and by the costs involved. At the end of his speech, dropping his pretence of addressing only his wife, the husband acknowledges that he aims at fame and immortality for her (*fama*, 2.58 and 65; *quod inmort[ali]tati ad memoriam consecrat[um est]*, 2.57; *cum laudi]bus crescere tui memoriam*, 2.59–60)—and, we may add, indirectly for himself. I assume that it was with this in mind that he presented his narrative of her life.

[7] Of course, women may have been present among the audience from the start.

[8] Cic. *De Or.* 2.44 (the speaker is M. Antonius, grandfather of the *triumvir*): *cui primum mulieri hunc honorem in nostra civitate tributum puto*. *Contra* Crawford (n. 3), 21 and, recently, T. W. Hillard, 'Popilia and *laudationes funebres* for women', *Antichthon* 35 (2001), 45–63. I take the stories by Liv. 5.50.7 and Plut. *Cam.* 8 that Roman women received the honour of a public funeral laudation as a reward for the donation of their golden ornaments to pay off the Gauls (Livy) or to fulfil Camillus's vow to Apollo (Plutarch) to be aetiological myths explaining the funeral eulogies for women in the authors' own days, rather than correct historical accounts of the origins of female *laudationes*. For funeral eulogies for Roman women, see also Plut. *De mul. vir.* 1 (*Mor.* 242f).

[9] According to Plutarch (*Caes.* 5), Caesar broke the taboo in 68 B.C. when holding a funeral *laudatio* from the *rostra* for his young wife Cornelia; see also Suet. *Caes.* 6.

[10] Murdia: *ILS* 8394, see below n. 50; Matidia: *CIL* 14.3579.

[11] Flach (n. 3), 34, 37; Kierdorf (n. 2), 35; and Durry (n. 3), xxii, lxxviii-ix believe that the funeral eulogy for 'Turia' was held at her grave. *Contra* Gordon (n. 2), 7: 'presumably in the Roman Forum'.

[12] For a reconstruction of the marble plaques, see Horsfall (n. 3); originally, they must have been each 2.65 m high and, together, 1.70 m wide. A portrait statue of the deceased may have crowned the monument, see also Gordon (n. 2), 8. With Kierdorf (n. 2), 35 I assume that the inscribed text was roughly the same as the spoken oration.

[13] For ancient literacy, see W. V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, MA, 1989) and M. Beard et al. (edd.), *Literacy in the Roman World* (Ann Arbor, 1991).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

MALE VIRTUES AND FEMALE WEAKNESSES

In Roman opinion the qualities attributed to men and women were sharply distinguished. In contrast with the domestic virtues women were commonly praised for, such as chastity, modesty, obedience to the husband, and woolwork (*pudicitia*, *modestia*, *obsequium*, *lanificium*),[14] men were valued for qualities that made them excel in war and politics, such as courage, fortitude, and self-control. These 'male' and 'female' virtues were bound up with the separation of spheres: the 'male' public sphere of military, political, and juridical activities, and the private 'female' sphere of the home and family.[15] Despite changes in Roman society, which brought women more into the public eye, this notion of separate spheres was maintained and the conventional domestic virtues remained the standard for female behaviour, also in the imperial period. For example, Seneca praises his aunt Helvia as follows:

> throughout the sixteen years during which her husband was governor of Egypt she was never seen in public, never admitted a native to her house, sought no favour from her husband, nor suffered any to be sought from herself. And so a province that was gossipy and ingenious in devising insults for its rulers, . . . respected her as a singular example of blamelessness. . . . It would be much to her credit if she had won the approval of the province for sixteen years; that she had escaped its notice is still more.[16]

In contrast with the domestic virtues typical of women, *virtus*—a concept that apart from its original meaning of 'courage' also had a moral connotation—was regarded as the male quality *par excellence*.[17] This was explained by the etymological connection between *virtus* and *vir*:

> For the word *virtus* (courage, manliness) is derived from *vir* (man); indeed, the typical quality of men is fortitude, to which belong the two main duties: contempt of death and of physical pain. These therefore we must display, if we wish to be thought to possess *virtus,* or rather, since the word *virtus* is borrowed from *vir*, if we wish to be men.[18]

Virtus, *fortitudo*, and self-control were the quintessential male qualities. By displaying these, a freeborn man distinguished himself from inferior groups, such as women

[14] For women's domestic virtues, see, for instance, *ILS* 8402 and 8444, *CIL* 6.12853 and 10.1909 and the expression *volgei nescia* on *CIL* 6.9499 = *ILS* 7472. Their domesticity was symbolized by their woolwork: we find woolbaskets depicted on grave monuments for women (e.g. E. D'Ambra, 'The cult of virtues and the funerary relief of Ulpia Epigone', *Latomus* 48 [1989], 392–400) and working in wool served as a symbol of chastity and domestic virtue for women in Roman legends (e.g. that of Lucretia, Liv. 1.57–60).

[15] For public and private as separate but complementary spheres divided over the sexes (the man outside, the woman inside), see e.g. Columella *RR* 12 *praef*. 1–8.

[16] Sen. *Cons.Helv*. 19.6: 'per sedecim annos, quibus Aegyptum maritus eius optinuit, numquam in publico conspecta est, neminem provincialem domum suam admisit, nihil a viro petit, nihil a se peti passa est. Itaque loquax et in contumelias praefectorum ingeniosa provincia, . . . velut unicum sanctitatis exemplum suspexit. . . . Multum erat, si per XVI annos illam provincia probasset; plus est, quod ignoravit.'

[17] For a full and nuanced exposition of the traditional meaning of *virtus* (courage or martial prowess) and the subsequent broadening of the concept, under the influence of Greek ἀρετή, to include moral ideals, see M. McDonnell, 'Roman men and Greek virtue', in R. M. Rosen and I. Sluiter (edd.), *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity* (Leiden, 2002), 235–61.

[18] Cic. *Tusc.* 2.43: 'Appellata est enim ex viro virtus; viri autem propria maxime est fortitudo, cuius munera duo sunt maxima mortis dolorisque contemptio. Utendum est igitur his, si virtutis compotes vel potius si viri volumus esse, quoniam a viris virtus nomen est mutuata.'

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and slaves.[19] Without self-control a man was thought to be incapable of controlling others and, therefore, unfit for the occupations of the male élite: politics and the military. Moreover, his superior capacity for self-control justified his control over others.[20]

Thus, 'male' and 'female' qualities were not only sharply distinguished, they also differed in value: 'male' qualities were regarded as superior, in the same way as 'man' was superior to 'woman'.[21] In masculine self-definition, negative qualities such as weakness and lack of self-control were attributed to women, thus leading to the common stereotypes of female *infirmitas animi* and *impotentia muliebris*.[22] By contrasting 'male' virtues with these supposedly 'female' weaknesses, the superiority of men over women was made clear. To a man there was no greater affront than to be compared to a woman. *Mollitia*, when applied to men denoting effeminacy, has a wide range of meanings connected with the lack of force and self-control generally attributed to women: effeminate men were accused of weakness, cowardice, and a variety of other vices, such as sexual licentiousness and luxuriousness.[23]

Against the background of this hierarchy of 'male' and 'female' virtues the attitude of the writer of the *LT* is remarkable. In describing her public deeds, he attributes to his wife the 'male' qualities of courage, firmness of mind, steadfastness, and endurance: *virtus* (2.6a and 19), *firmitas animi* (2.8a and 15), *constantia* (1.25), and *patientia* (2.21). Moreover, the text bristles with words that present his wife in the active public role normally reserved for men.[24] In this she proved to be second to no man.[25] Words derived from military action abound in his description: she provided him with 'reinforcements' ([*subsi*]*dia* 2.2a), during the civil wars, deceived the 'guards of the enemies' (*a*]*dversariorum custodibus* 2.5a), 'protected' him (*m*]*unibat* 2.7a), 'prepared against' their opponents (*contra quos ea parabas* 2.7a), and chose 'allies' for her 'stratagems' (*sociosque consilioru*[*m t*]*uorum* 2.8). Her encounter with Lepidus even resulted in 'cruel wounds' (*cr*[*ud*]*elibus exceptis volneribus* 2.17). Her husband summarizes her merits by calling her, with a military metaphor only here applied to a woman, his *speculatrix* and *propugnatrix* (military spy and defender, 2.61).[26] In short, her death deprived him of 'so great and effective a stronghold of defence' (*tantis talibusque pr*[*aesi*]*diis*, 2.65).[27]

Throughout his *laudatio* the husband describes his wife as an exceptional woman. Yet, 'Turia's' story is not unique, as can be learned from numerous anecdotes about women who, like 'Turia', loyally supported their husbands in periods of crisis: they

[19] S. R. Joshel and S. Murnaghan (edd.), *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture: Differential Equations* (London, 1998).

[20] C. Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge, 1993), 1–33.

[21] The notion of male superiority was so widely accepted that Seneca (*Constant.* 2.1.1) could use it to 'prove' by analogy the superiority of the Stoa over other philosophical schools.

[22] For examples of *infirmitas animi*, E. A. Hemelrijk, *Matrona docta. Educated Women in the Roman Élite from Cornelia to Julia Domna* (London, 1999), 284, n.148; for *muliebris impotentia* and other female vices, see G. Vidén, *Women in Roman Literature. Attitudes of Authors under the Early Empire* (Göteborg, 1993), 110–29.

[23] Edwards (n. 20), 63–97.

[24] For examples, see Ramage (n. 3), 350ff., who compares her public actions with the *res gestae* of male panegyric.

[25] See, for instance, 1.8 (about her successful revenge of the murder of her parents): *si praes<t>*[*o fu*]*iss<e>mus*, *non ampliu*[*s potuissemus*] ('had we been present, we could not have done better').

[26] The feminine form of *propugnator* (*propugnatrix*) is found only in the *LT*.

[27] For more examples, see Ramage (n. 3), 352–3.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

liberally donated their jewellery, money, and possessions, they plotted escapes, found hiding-places, activated political friends, and pleaded their husbands' causes with the authorities.[28] In doing all this they entered male domains—such as the forum during political meetings—travelled in uncomfortable ways (for example, disguised as a slave), and took part in nightly deliberations. Like 'Turia' they ran personal risks. Although their activities on behalf of their husbands brought them into situations regarded as improper for women, they were praised for them because they were inspired by approved 'feminine' motives: loyalty and devotion to their husbands. Such stories, in which women are presented as stereotypes of good, or evil, wives, are not to be taken for reliable historical accounts. Yet, neither should they be dismissed as entirely fictitious. The norms and values that speak from them—and the active public role temporarily accorded to the wives—resemble those of the *LT*.

In the introduction to their volume *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture*, Joshel and Murnaghan comment: 'under the pressures of political crises . . . the loyal wife enacts the role of a husband so that the husband will not be reduced to the role of a wife'.[29] In the *LT*, however, the inversion concerns both roles: not only does 'Turia' take over the 'male' role, but her husband presents himself in the role traditionally reserved for the wife: overcome by sorrow at her death he lacks 'male' constancy (*constantia* 2.63–65). He is 'crushed' (*frangor* 2.62) by his misfortune, 'drowned' (*mersor* 2.63) by his grief, his pain 'tears away' (*extorquet*) the 'strength to control himself'(*const*[*an*]*tiae vires* 2.63), he 'cannot find a foothold' in either of the things that used to strengthen him (*in necutro mihi consto* 2.64), and when thinking of the uncertainties of the future he 'collapses' (*con*]*cido* 2.65). Thus, in a detailed reversal of the conventional gender-roles the wife displays the 'male' virtues of courage, firmness of mind, constancy, and endurance while acting in public, whereas the husband, hiding at home during the civil wars under the protection of his wife, is overpowered by sorrow at her death and unable to control himself. Inverting the conventional conjugal roles, she takes the lead and, also after her death, acts as his tutor: her fame and deeds teach him how to withstand the blows of fortune (*occurrente fama tua firma*[*tus animo atque*] *doctus actis tuis resistam fo*[*rt*]*unae* 2.58–9).[30] This inversion of gender-roles is not only openly displayed, but even stressed by her husband. How exceptional was the attitude of both 'Turia' and her husband in this respect? To judge this I shall briefly compare them to three Roman couples of roughly the same period and circumstances: Cicero and his wife Terentia, Ovid and his anonymous wife, and Fulvia and Mark Antony.

HONORARY MEN AND VIRAGOS

In his letters to Terentia written during his exile in 59–58 B.C. and during the civil wars Cicero repeatedly thanks his wife for her efforts on his behalf. Not only did Terentia support him emotionally, she also gave him notable financial backing, advised him as to his security, devised plans, exhorted his political friends to work for

[28] App. *BCiv.* 4.39–40, Val. Max. 6.7.2–3, Cass. Dio 47.7.4–5, and Vell. Pat. 2.67.1; for the psycho- logical function of such *exempla*, see H. Parker, 'Loyal slaves and loyal wives. The crisis of the outsider-within and Roman *exemplum* literature', in Joshel and Murnaghan (n. 19), 152–73 at 164–9. For examples of treachery by wives, see App. *BCiv.* 4.23–4.

[29] Joshel and Murnaghan (n. 19), 15.

[30] For the conventional ideal of the husband as a teacher of his wife, see Hemelrijk (n. 22), 31–6.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

his recall, and painstakingly kept him abreast of what happened in Rome, often writing to him more than once a day. In doing so she suffered hardships and humiliation.[31] Cicero describes himself as completely dependent on her support, judgement, and information, and he urges her to stay in Rome so as to further his cause.[32] A similar dependence is found in Ovid's *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* addressed to his wife, in which Ovid repeatedly begs her to conquer her fear and to plead for him with the authorities.[33] The help and support of their wives, their pleading with the authorities, and their information about the situation in Rome were essential to them. Just like 'Turia's' husband, Cicero and Ovid laid great stress on the *fides* and *pietas* of their wives,[34] which formed the reason—and the excuse—for their public activity.

Not only did Cicero and Ovid encourage their wives to act on their behalf, but—like 'Turia's' husband—they also attributed to them the 'male' quality of *virtus*. Moreover, Cicero speaks of the *fortitudo* of his wife and praises her and his daughter Tullia as 'more courageous than any man'.[35] He himself, however, as he grudgingly admits, fell short in *virtus* in these difficult times.[36] Here, we see the same inversion of gender roles as we have met in 'Turia' and her husband: a woman praised for her *virtus* in a traditionally male field and a husband failing in *virtus*.

Since the influential study by Gleason,[37] it is a received opinion that in Roman thought 'masculinity' was no innate quality but one that had to be acquired, also by men. Less attention has been paid to the fact that, in some cases, it could be acquired also by women. Apparently, this was no reason to change the notion that *virtus*—or, for that matter, *fortitudo* and *firmitas animi*—were typically male virtues. On the contrary, by displaying such virtues in 'male' fields, such as war and politics, women transcended their sex and became, so to speak, 'honorary men'.[38]

However, for women 'masculinity' was a risky notion: it could damage their

[31] For his letters to Terentia from exile, see Cic. *Fam.* 14.1–4. Cicero mentions Terentia's *labor(es)* on his behalf (*Fam.* 14.1.2 and 14.2.3) and worries about her poor health. For her difficulties, see e.g. *Fam.* 14.2.2.

[32] Cic. *Fam.* 14.2.3–4, 14.3.5, and 14.4.3. Terentia was less successful than 'Turia' in defending their house, which was burnt down on the day of his exile.

[33] Ov. *Tr*. 1.3.79–102, 1.6.5ff., 4.3.71ff., 5.2.37ff., 5.14.15ff.; *Pont*. 3.1.31ff. For her fear: *Tr*. 5.2.37; *Pont*. 3.1.119: *quid trepidas et adire times?* and 154: *voce tremente* (cf. 'Turia's' courage: *v]ox tua est firmitate animi emissa* 2.8a). Even if Ovid's exile is taken for a poetic fiction—which I do not believe—these poems demonstrate the importance that was attached to the wife's support.

[34] For Terentia's *pietas* and *fides*, see e.g. Cic. *Fam*. 14.1.1 and 3; those of Ovid's wife: *Tr*. 1.3.86, 1.6.23, 4.3.82, 5.5.45, 5.14.20, 28, and 41. 'Turia's' *pietas*: 1.7, 26, 32, 42, 50; 2.[7a], 2, 39; her *fides*: 1.26 and 2.43. *Pietas* and *fides* were important male virtues as well, *pietas* being one of the four virtues on the golden shield of Augustus, see K. Galinsky, *Augustan Culture. An Interpretative Introduction* (Princeton, 1996), 80–90; when used for women, these terms mostly denote their loyalty and devotion to their husbands and families.

[35] Cic. *Fam.* 14.1.1: Terentia's *virtus* and *fortitudo*; 14.2.2: Terentia is behaving *fortissime*; *Fam.* 14.7.2 (about Terentia and Tullia): *fortiores . . . quam quemquam virum* (for Tullia's *virtus*, see also Cic. *Att.* 10.8.9). For the *virtus* of Ovid's wife, see *Tr*. 1.6.15, 5.14.24, and *Pont*. 3.1.94; *Tr*. 4.3.76 clearly shows the public character of her *virtus*.

[36] Cic. *Fam.* 14.3.2: *pudet enim me . . . virtutem . . . non praestitisse*. In *Fam*. 14.2.1 he speaks disparagingly of his own timidity.

[37] M. W. Gleason, *Making Men. Sophists and Self-presentation in Ancient Rome* (Princeton, 1995).

[38] Hemelrijk (n. 22), 89–92. For some examples: because of her *novam in femina virtutem* (Liv. 2.13.11) the legendary heroine Cloelia was honoured with an equestrian statue, a typically male honour; Seneca set his mother Helvia as the example of women 'who because of their conspicuous courage were counted among the great men' (*quas conspecta virtus inter magnos viros posuit*, *Cons.Helv*. 16.5) and praises both Helvia and Marcia for their *virtus* (*Cons.Marc.* 1.1. and

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reputation. For example, Fulvia, the wife of Mark Antony, acted in all respects as might be expected from a loyal wife: she supported her husband for better and for worse, promoted his interests during his absences, endured his numerous infidelities, and remained constant to him until her death.[39] Nevertheless, most ancient sources are censorious. Fulvia's fierce desire to promote Antony's interests brought her into conflict with Octavian, and it was she, not Antony's brother (the consul L. Antonius), who was held responsible for the disastrous Perusine War. She is depicted as a virago and reviled because of her ambition, her supposed cruelty, and her interference in military affairs.[40] Her capacities in the male fields of politics and war were not in doubt; criticism was levelled against her inadequate performance of the female role. According to Plutarch, she 'had no interest in spinning or housekeeping', and Velleius Paterculus believed that 'except for her body, she had nothing that could be called feminine'.[41] Instead of the highly estimated obedience to a husband, she desired—so Plutarch claimed—to dominate him and thus 'to rule a ruler and command a commander'.[42] Even her chastity was called into question by the crude sexual allusions written on sling-stones found in Perugia (scratched by the soldiers of Octavian's army), and by the scurrilous poem ascribed by Martial to Octavian who, faced with the choice between war and sex with Fulvia, replies: 'Let the war-trumpets sound'.[43]

What is the reason for this unfavourable picture of Fulvia? In the first place, it should be noted that the authors writing about her differ from those writing about the other three women: we see 'Turia', Terentia, and Ovid's wife through the eyes of their loving husbands, but Fulvia through the eyes of her husband's enemies Cicero and Octavian, and of later authors who, at least partially, depend on them.[44] The Roman habit of attacking political opponents by blackening their female relatives has devastated Fulvia's reputation. Consequently, when reading about Fulvia we do not find the *fides* and *pietas* for which 'Turia', Terentia, and Ovid's wife were so highly praised. Yet, in view of her constant support of her husband she had a claim to these virtues: had we possessed sources more friendly towards Antony, *fides* and *pietas* might well have figured in their descriptions of Fulvia.[45] Perhaps, by her fierce support of

5 and *Cons. Helv.* 16.2 and 5); Ovid uses military metaphors to encourage his wife to display *virtus* (*Pont*. 3.1.91–4).

[39] App. *BCiv.* 3.51 describes how in 43 B.C., together with Antony's mother, his young son, and other relatives and friends, Fulvia 'went around the whole night visiting the houses of influential men and beseeching them' not to declare Antony a public enemy. Even Plutarch, who has a poor opinion of Fulvia, observes that she did everything, even waging a disastrous war against Octavian, for Antony's sake (Plut. *Ant*. 28.1). Cic. *Phil.* 2.77 unwittingly testifies to her love for Antony. For her tragic death, see App. *BCiv.* 5.59 and 62: discouraged by Antony's reproaches about the Perusine War, she fell ill and, according to Appian, died from grief.

[40] For her power and imperiousness, Cass. Dio 48.4.1–5; Cass. Dio 48.10.2–4 describes her behaving as a general (see also Plut. *Ant.* 33 and Florus 2.16.2); and 47.8.2–4 her cruelty (see also Cic. *Phil.* 3.4 and 13.18; App. *BCiv.* 4.29). For her meddlesomeness: Plut. *Ant*. 30.2; for her overbearing character and her dominance over Antony, Cic. *Phil*. 6.4 and Plut. *Ant.* 10.5–6. For other vices attributed to her, such as avarice and rapacity, see Cass. Dio 47.8.2; Cic. *Phil.* 2.95, 2.113, 3.16, 5.11, 5.22, 6.4; *Att*. 14.12.1; see also S. Treggiari, '*Leges sine moribus*', *AHB* 8.3 (1994), 86–98 at 94–5.

[41] Plut. *Ant.* 10.3: *οὐ ταλασίαν οὐδὲ οἰκουρίαν φρονοῦν γύναιον*. Vell. Pat. 2.74.2: *nihil muliebre praeter corpus gerens*.

[42] Plut. *Ant.* 10.3: *ἄρχοντος ἄρχειν καὶ στρατηγοῦντος στρατηγεῖν*.

[43] Mart. *Ep*. 11.20. For the poem and the sling-stones from Perugia, J. P. Hallett, '*Perusinae glandes* and the changing image of Augustus', *AJAH* 2 (1977), 151–71.

[44] C. B. R. Pelling, 'Plutarch's method of work in the Roman lives', *JHS* 99 (1979), 74–96 at 89–90 and id. 'Plutarch's adaptation of his source-material', *JHS* 100 (1980), 127–40 at 129–30.

[45] Antony's brother Lucius adopted the *cognomen* 'Pietas' because of his promotion of his

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Antony—especially over the Perusine war—she had become a nuisance, not least to Antony himself. Surely, her sudden death in 40 B.C. was a relief, because it opened the way to reconciliation between Octavian and Antony and a marriage of the latter with Octavia. Plutarch relates that Octavian and Antony used her death to blame Fulvia for their mutual estrangement.[46] After Octavian's rise to sole power the cruelties committed during the triumviral period were, for obvious reasons, attributed to Lepidus, Antony, and Fulvia.[47]

Thus, as a 'loser' in history, Fulvia's reputation was damaged more seriously than it would otherwise have been. The part she actually took in the civil wars was probably rather restricted, but her story shows that the reputation of a woman who entered a male field was at risk. In this respect the traditional female virtues played a major role. According to the biased sources, these virtues were wholly lacking in Fulvia: the ancient portrait of Fulvia is in all respects the opposite of 'female' *pudicitia*, *modestia*, *obsequium*, and *lanificium*. Instead, we meet a dangerous mixture of 'male' capacities and 'female' weaknesses, such as her typically 'female' lack of self-control. Even her supposed instigation of the Perusine War is ascribed to a feminine motive: jealousy of Cleopatra (by starting a war she expected to lure Antony away from Cleopatra), and Velleius Paterculus calls her flight after the fall of Perusia contemptuously *muliebris*.[48] Uninhibited by the traditional virtues, such typically 'female' weaknesses made her generally recognized 'male' capacities the more dangerous.

EXEMPLUM BONAE CONIUGIS

These three examples show that praise of traditional virtues was essential to upholding the reputation of a woman. 'Turia's' husband was well aware of this. In his *Laudatio*, female virtues abound, implicitly and explicitly. About halfway down the first marble slab, possibly at eye level,[49] her domestic virtues are enumerated: chastity, obedience, friendliness, affability, industry at woolwork, piety without superstition, modesty in clothing and finery, love and devotion to her family and to her mother-in-law (1.30–4). Her husband lists them in a *praeteritio* ('why should I speak of . . . ?'), only to sum them up more fully. A similar (feigned) ambiguity as regards the traditional female virtues is apparent in the *laudatio funebris* for Murdia. In what must have been his funeral speech, her son from her first marriage praises her for the prudent way she administered her possessions and for the fairness of her will. He himself had been made heir to an equal part with his half-brothers from her second marriage and had received a legacy from the patrimony of his deceased father besides. After this business-like exposition he continues as follows:

brother's interests (Cass. Dio 48.5.5). For the writings of Antony, see E. Huzar, 'The literary efforts of Mark Antony', *ANRW* II 30.1 (1982), 639–57. His letters circulated (cf. Ov. *Pont*. 1.1.23; Suet. *Aug.* 7.1; Tac. *Ann.* 4.34) but were not used by Plutarch, see Pelling, (n. 44, 1979), 89.

[46] Plut. *Ant*. 30.3–4; see also App. *BCiv.* 5.59 and 66, Cass. Dio 48.28.3. Cf. Cass. Dio 48.5.3 and 5 for an earlier attempt to blame Fulvia.

[47] R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939), 191, see also Gowing (n. 1); for a demythologization of Fulvia, see D. Delia, 'Fulvia reconsidered', in S. B. Pomeroy (ed.), *Women's History and Ancient History* (Chapel Hill, 1991), 197–217.

[48] Vell. Pat. 2.76.2. For her responsibility for the Perusine war because of her jealousy as regards Cleopatra: App. *BCiv.* 5.19, 59, 62.

[49] The original grave-monument is lost; for a reconstruction of the marble slabs, see Horsfall (n. 3), 86 and *CIL* 6.41062.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For these reasons, since the eulogy of all good women is by custom simple and similar, because their natural qualities over which they keep guard themselves, do not require a variegated language, and since it is enough that all of them have done the same to gain a good reputation and since it is hard for a woman to earn new forms of praise, as her life undergoes a smaller variety of fortunes, we inevitably honour the virtues they hold in common in order not to lose anything from fair precepts and thereby debase what remains. Therefore, my dearest mother earned the greatest praise of all, because in modesty, decency, chastity, obedience, woolworking, diligence and loyalty she was equal and similar to other good women and she was second to none . . . of courage, energy and prudence in the face of dangers. . . .[50]

In this somewhat tortuous wording Murdia's son excuses himself for mentioning the traditional virtues of his mother, only to enumerate them none the less. Obviously, these virtues were so much of a stereotype that he felt obliged to apologize for enumerating them, but, like 'Turia's' husband, he did not think that he could pass them over. Note his argument: 'since it is hard for a woman to earn new forms of praise, as her life undergoes a smaller variety of fortunes'. This, however, does not hold for women like Murdia and 'Turia', who had led highly eventful lives. The *laudator* could not omit the traditional virtues for a totally different reason: they were essential to the reputation of any woman, and perhaps even more so to those who lived an unconventional life.

This is confirmed by the example of the three women discussed above: Terentia, Ovid's anonymous wife, and Fulvia. Apart from their *pietas* and *fides*, the first two were praised for their decency, their chastity, and their kind behaviour. This combination of 'male' *virtus* and traditional 'female' qualities made each of them, in the words of Ovid, into an *exemplum bonae coniugis*,[51] the model of a good wife. Fulvia's reputation, on the other hand, was damaged by her alleged deficiency in the 'female' virtues. Whereas the first two women, in overcoming the proverbial weakness of their sex, raised themselves to the level of men, the unhappy combination of 'female' weaknesses and 'male' capacities turned Fulvia into a virago. The ancient sources present her as an androgynous monster.

'Turia's' husband leaves no doubt about it that his wife belongs to the first type. She is praised for her *domestica bona* (1.30) and her *probitas* (1.1), and her *pietas* and *fides* are repeatedly stressed (see n. 34). *Pietas* towards her husband and family brought her on to the public stage: the absence of her prospective husband and her brother-in-law (1.4–7) forced her to revenge the death of her parents herself, with the help of only her sister.[52] *Pietas* and *fides* towards her father, her sister, and her husband-to-be drove her to defend her father's will (1.25–6). Since she was the only daughter under the authority of her father, her own inheritance was secure, even if her father's will would

[50] *CIL* 6.10230 (= *ILS* 8394): 'Quibus de causeis quom omnium bonarum feminarum simplex similisque esse laudatio soleat, quod naturalia bona propria custodia servata varietates verborum non desiderent, satisque sit eadem omnes bona fama digna fecisse, et quia adquirere novas laudes mulieri sit arduom, quom minoribus varietatibus vita iactetur, necessario communia esse colenda, ne quod amissum ex iustis praecepteis cetera turpet. Eo maiorem laudem omnium carissima mihi mater meruit, quod modestia probitate pudicitia opsequio lanificio diligentia fide par similisque cetereis probeis feminis fuit, neque ulli cessit virtutis laboris sapientiae periculorum praecipuam aut certe. . . .'. Here the text breaks off.

[51] Ov. *Tr*. 1.6.26 and 4.3.72; for her *probitas* and *pudicitia* see *Tr*. 1.6.19; 4.3.57; 5.5.45, 5.14.22 and *Pont*. 3.1.93. Terentia's *probitas* and *humanitas* are praised in *Fam*. 14.1.1; Cicero addresses her as *fidissima atque optima uxor*, *Fam*. 14.4.6.

[52] Women could be accusers in cases concerning their direct relatives, see J. F. Gardner, *Women in Roman Law and Society* (London, 1990[3]), 262–3 and ead., *Being a Roman Citizen* (London, 1993), 86 and 100.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

be void. In that case, she would even inherit all.[53] But, in agreement with the wish of her father, she preferred to share her inheritance with her sister and her future husband.

Furthermore, traditional virtues implicitly play a significant role. For instance, it is a sure sign of *pudicitia* that after the death of her parents she remained in the house no longer than was strictly necessary: to live alone amidst (male) slaves was inappropriate for an unmarried girl.[54] As soon as circumstances allowed, she moved into the house of her prospective mother-in-law in order to wait there for her fiancé (1.10–12). It was also noted that in her *liberalitas* (1.42–50) she kept within traditional limits: together with her sister she brought up girls from poor branches of the family and provided them with a dowry that suited their rank. This kind of generosity was much valued in women, and one that had an imperial model: Livia too provided orphaned girls of impoverished upper-class families with a dowry.[55] In short, 'Turia' was the perfect Augustan *matrona*, as appears also from the lengths she was prepared to go to remedy the infertility of their marriage (2.25–39). Her husband makes it clear that throughout her life 'Turia' acted entirely in accordance with traditional values, as propagated by Augustus, whom he greatly revered;[56] to her contemporaries her virtuous style of living may even have seemed a little old-fashioned.

The same holds for the way in which she managed her property: in contrast to the legal separation of property between husband and wife in marriages without *manus*, 'Turia' and her husband administered their possessions together and in good harmony (1.37–41). Although, in their case, this was partly based in law—'Turia's' husband was also her guardian[57]—the stress her husband lays on their mutual harmony is influenced by the norms and values of the time. Community of property was an ideal of marriage which, due to the changes in the laws of marriage, was ascribed to the 'good old days'.[58] Indirectly, 'Turia's' husband compliments himself when emphasizing the *concordia* (2.34) of their marriage, which lasted over forty years *sine offensa* (1.28).[59] Moreover, rivalling his wife in generosity he, and the husband of her sister, bore the costs of the dowries that 'Turia' and her sister assigned to poor girls of their family

[53] De Ligt (n. 3).

[54] Cf. Antonia minor who, when widowed at the age of twenty-seven, went to live with her mother-in-law Livia, which according to Valerius Maximus 4.3.3 was a sign of her *egregia fides*. I know of no other example of an unmarried girl moving in with her prospective mother-in-law, but, of course, 'Turia's' circumstances were quite unusual.

[55] Cass. Dio 58.2.3. This kind of generosity had also been typical for Hellenistic queens, see S. B. Pomeroy, 'Charities for Greek women', *Mnemos.* 35 (1982), 115–35 at 120–3 and ead., *Women in Hellenistic Egypt from Alexander to Cleopatra* (New York, 1984), 15–16.

[56] For the *laudator* as a staunch adherent of Augustan policy and ideals, see e.g. Gowing (n. 1), 293 and 296.

[57] De Ligt (n. 3). For the separation of property between husband and wife in marriages *sine manu*, see e.g. Gardner (n. 52, 1990), 71–2; J. A. Crook, '"His and hers": what degree of financial responsibility did husband and wife have for the matrimonial home and their life in common in a Roman marriage?', in J. Andreau and H. Bruhns (edd.), *Parenté et Stratégies Familiales dans l'Antiquité Romaine* (Rome, 1990), 153–72; and Treggiari (n. 4), 365–96.

[58] Columella 12 *praef*. 7–8; Treggiari (n. 4), 10, 249–51.

[59] For marital *concordia,* see Treggiari (n. 4), 251–3; S. Dixon, 'The sentimental ideal of the Roman family', in B. Rawson (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome* (Oxford, 1991), 99–113 at 107–8; and Hemelrijk (n. 22), 33–4. Marital harmony was considered primarily the wife's achievement, but the husband too received part of the credit, cf. Tacitus about the harmonious marriage of his parents-in-law Agricola and Domitia Decidiana (*Agr.* 6). In Roman society, marriages as long as theirs were rare—as 'Turia's' husband proudly remarks (1.27)—but not unheard-of: for instance, Livia and Augustus were married more than fifty years; cf. also Plin. *Ep.* 8.5: a couple married for thirty-nine years *sine iurgio sine offensa.*

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(1.46–51). Lastly, he must have been aware that his indignant refusal of her proposal to divorce her because of her supposed barrenness (2.31–39) did him credit in the eyes of his public (2.40–7).[60]

We may therefore conclude that by elaborating on these points the *laudator* did not only aim at fame for his wife, but also wanted to leave a good impression of himself. Perhaps we may go a step further and assume, with Parker, that the virtue of a loyal wife reflected on her husband, increasing his honour and authority.[61] By presenting his wife as an exceptional woman, superior to other women of her day,[62] the *laudator* therefore both added to her honour and to that of his own. As we have seen, the reversal of gender-roles did not de-feminize her (because of her adherence to the traditional virtues) nor did it threaten his masculinity. Since she did all in the service of her husband, he remained the superior partner. It was this unquestionable superiority that allowed him to risk a possible loss of honour when adopting the feminine role.

NORMS AND DAILY PRACTICE

What does the inscription for 'Turia' tell us about the distinction between public life as the typical male domain and the private sphere as that of women, and about the attribution of 'male' and 'female' virtues? In the first place the *LT* shows that in daily life the separation of spheres was not as strictly observed as the moralistic sources want us to believe. Women could enter the public sphere and adopt male roles without incurring censure—though only under certain circumstances. Men professed their dependence on the support of their wives and set greater store on their private life and on the expression of their emotions than was traditionally approved of. The emotional outbursts and the departure from the traditional norm of male courage and self-control, displayed by Cicero and by 'Turia's' husband, are closely related to the emotions expressed in contemporary love-poetry, and the same holds for the dominant role of the female. Perhaps this poetry was not so subversive, nor so far from contemporary reality, as is usually assumed.

Was this a new development or does it reveal a contradiction between norms and daily practice? To my mind, the answer is: both. On the one hand, women (and children) are more in evidence in the early empire than they were before.[63] Also the fact

[60] For Roman attitudes towards divorce, see S. Treggiari, 'Divorce Roman style: how easy and how frequent was it?', in Rawson (n. 59), 31–46. Though infertility was an accepted reason for divorce, divorcing a good wife was not approved of, see Treggiari (n. 4), 237. Horsfall (n. 3), 93 wrongly considers his refusal to divorce as an expression of 'anti-Augustan' sentiment: the Augustan marital laws indeed stimulated marriage and the procreation of children among the élite, but they did not force childless couples to separate. In the long passage devoted to their childlessness (2.26–50) her husband describes how they had hoped for children and how hard she had tried to cure the barrenness of their marriage (which, in accordance with the ideas of the time, she assumed to be her fault). When all had failed, she had offered him the opportunity to divorce her and have children with another woman. The grief that speaks from this passage—and from 2.53, in which he likens his bereavement to the loss of a child—seems sincere, not just tailored to the Augustan marital laws, cf. Pliny's disappointment, and that of his father-in-law, when his young wife miscarried, Plin. *Ep*. 8.10.

[61] Parker (n. 28), 163–9. As one of his examples he mentions the *LT*, misspelled as 'Laudatio Thuriae'. However, 'Turia' differs from his other examples of Loyal Wives, in that, though doing all on behalf of her husband, 'Turia' shows much less dependence on him (as appears, for instance, from her proposal for divorce) than vice versa.

[62] Ramage (n. 3), 356–7.

[63] See, for instance, B. Rawson, 'The iconography of Roman childhood', in B. Rawson and P. Weaver (edd.), *The Roman Family in Italy. Status, Sentiment, Space* (Oxford, 1997), 205–32. By

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.185 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that, from the first century B.C. onwards, public *laudationes* were held at the funerals of distinguished women may be taken as a sign of the greater accessibility of the public sphere. If so, the stress in contemporary sources on the domestic virtues of women should perhaps not be explained as reflecting the actual restrictions of their lives but rather as a conservative reaction against their increasing presence in public life.

On the other hand, the traditional norms remained in force. They are even expressly confirmed in the *LT*. The public deeds of 'Turia' and Cicero's rather weak behaviour during his exile may at first sight seem incompatible with the norms of 'male' and 'female' behaviour, but Cicero's shame of his lack of *virtus* and the fact that 'Turia's' traditional virtues were elaborated on, show that both judged their behaviour by the traditional norms. In confirming the norms they violated, they illustrate in a fascinating way what Cohen has called 'simultaneous norm-validation and norm-non-adherence'.[64] As we have seen, 'Turia's' *fides* and *pietas*, and her other traditional female virtues, were stressed to justify her public actions. The impression is conveyed that her unusual public activities were the result of exceptional circumstances and, therefore, did not affect the norm of female domesticity. At the same time, the separation between public and private is subtly put in a different light: because 'Turia's' public actions were in the interest of her husband and family they could be presented as an acceptable extension of her domestic tasks and, therefore, as part of her private life. Thus, public and private become relative notions, which can be adjusted to circumstances or, in the words of John Ruskin: 'wherever a true wife comes . . . home is always around her'.[65]

University of Utrecht EMILY A. HEMELRIJK
Emily.Hemelrijk@let.uu.nl

contrast, public statues and honorary inscriptions for women are rare—even virtually non-existent—in Rome before the imperial period, see M. Sehlmeyer, *Stadtrömische Ehrenstatuen der republikanischen Zeit. Historizität und Kontext von Symbolen nobilitären Standesbewusstseins* (Stuttgart, 1999) and Hemelrijk (n. 22), 66–7.

[64] D. Cohen, *Law, Sexuality, and Society. The Enforcement of Morals in Classical Athens* (Cambridge, 1991), 238.

[65] J. Ruskin, 'Of queens' gardens', in id., *Sesame and Lilies. Two Lectures by John Ruskin* (London, 1907[2]), 68, quoted by A. Vickery, 'Golden age to separate spheres? Review of the categories and chronology of English women's history', *Historical Journal* 36.2 (1993), 383–414 at 400.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.185 Published online by Cambridge University Press