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Abstract. This final project’s purpose is to analyse, from a philological perspective, the differences between Roman men and women regarding sex. I will concentrate on the role women had, which is thought to be passive, and will propose ways in which they challenged said role. I will talk about some of the most notorious women who went against the norm and the way they were represented by their male peers. Moreover, I will discuss the role of prostitutes in society, given that there is more information about their status in sexual activities, since they were public sex workers. I will focus especially on Pompeii’s prostitutes, because many graffiti of sexual connotations have been found on the brothels’ walls, as well as on the streets’. Finally, I will argue that part of these graffiti could have been written by female prostitutes as a way of asserting their sexual agency.
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Introduction

The rise of feminism in the last decades has sparked the study of many aspects of the ancient world. I, as a feminist, have always had an interest in gender studies, hence why I did not hesitate to aim my final project down that line of study. During the composition of this work I have turned in many occasions to renowned scholars who have revisited the role of women in ancient Rome throughout the last decades—namely Cantarella\(^1\), Hallett and Skinner\(^2\), to name only a few. Regarding Pompeii, an undoubted specialist is Beard\(^3\) and, in relation to the city's graffiti, Levin-Richardson is a great scholar to turn to. In fact, it was one of her articles\(^4\) which inspired the original idea for this final project.

My main purpose is to analyse how sexism was expressed in ancient Rome, specifically in the sexual setting. As a consequence, the methodology of this final project will be based on the study and the philological commentary of Latin texts, as well as on a thorough research and reading of several academic works. I would like to emphasize, though, that I do not intend to show the deeply-rooted misogyny embedded in Roman society, which I believe is rather obvious. It is widely known that Rome was a patriarchal society, with men at its core, in which women were perpetually subjected to a male figure. My intention is to simply break down the different processes by which women were oppressed within the sexual context.

Concerning the structure of this composition, I will first lay out the Roman mental scheme regarding sex, without focusing on a specific timeframe. Next, I will talk about some of the most notable women who dared defy the gender roles imposed. In this section, though, I will focus on women who lived between the 1\(^{st}\) century BC and the 1\(^{st}\) century AD. Lastly, I will talk about prostitution, focusing on the prostitutes of Pompeii and especially on some graffiti of sexual connotation, all the while considering how they may have been a way for prostitutes to assert their sexual identity.

---


Sex in Ancient Rome

The Roman people have always been considered a rather open society when it comes to sex. In fact, many sexual references are found in their art, literature and inscriptions. As a result, many are the scholars who have dwelled in the study of this topic, namely the mid-20th-century sexuality theorist Michel Foucault, who published a three-volume series called *Histoire de la Sexualité*, of which the last two focus on the Greco-Roman world. More recently, and amongst others, Parker\(^5\) provided a detailed account of how Romans schematized sexuality, and both Langlands\(^6\) and Skinner\(^7\) published educational books all about sexuality in Greco-Roman society.

To begin with, I would like to point out that sex was part of the everyday lives of Roman people, since it was an important aspect of their religion. In fact, they had many deities concerned with different aspects of sex: Cupid sparked sexual desire, Priapus’ big penis represented humorous lust, Mutunus Tutunos (sometimes identified with the latter\(^8\)) was a Roman-Etruscan god of fertility\(^9\), the god Liber was in charge of relieving men during intercourse\(^10\), etcetera.

In this section, I aspire to provide an explanation of the Roman sexual scheme, not focusing on a certain period in time, but in a more general manner. The basic principle of Roman sexuality is that it was not divided into heterosexual and homosexual, as it is nowadays. Instead, it was built around a male/not male dichotomy. This dichotomy, as simple as it may seem, had many connotations. Being a male meant being both active and a citizen, while those “not male” were passive and non-citizens. Each individual had an established role in this paradigm—hence, for a man, to be passive was equivalent to playing the role of the woman. Actually, men who took the passive role during intercourse were immediately feminized and thus referred to as “pati muliebria”, that is, to suffer or be passive in the woman’s role\(^11\). I find it worth noting that “mulier” does not

---


\(^8\) PALMER (1974) p. 189

\(^9\) PALMER (1974) p. 205


\(^11\) PARKER (1997) p. 50
designate all types of women, but only low-class and disreputable women\textsuperscript{12}, which emphasizes even more the deprecatory character of such expression.

Bearing in mind such focus on men, it comes as no surprise that Roman society was purely phallocentric—the phallus was even considered a “fascinum”, an amulet. Therefore, sex was framed around penetration, the man being the penetrator, while women and slaves were the ones being penetrated. In this way, the man played an active role and the woman a passive one. To be penetrated meant a loss of control over one’s body, it implied subordination. Thus, for a man, being penetrated threatened both his status as a free citizen and his sexual integrity. Roman men, in order to uphold their dominant role, had to be the active ones during intercourse.

Moreover, sex is closely linked to the pleasure of the man. As a result of this, the act of “cunnum lingere”, aimed towards female pleasure, was seen as completely degrading for a man, since he was seen as being penetrated by the woman’s clitoris. As a matter of fact, any kind of oral sex was considered defaming in itself, to anyone who practiced it.

The Latin language is rich on sexual vocabulary and euphemisms. Nevertheless, for the purpose of this project, I will only concern myself with the most important ones. The normative male was called “\textit{vir}” and the woman, “\textit{femina}” or “\textit{puella}”. It is, however, important to note that “\textit{vir}” is only to be applied to “adult freeborn citizen males in good standing and positioned at the top of the hierarchy\textsuperscript{13}”. Each of these terms has its direct opposite—the passive man was scornfully called “\textit{cinaedus}” and women who took an active role were known as “\textit{tribas}”. These women were considered penetrators, as they were “endowed with a clitoris large enough to serve as a penis\textsuperscript{14}”, with which they would penetrate men.

Concerning libido, it was expected and even encouraged for a \textit{vir} to want sex with both female and male partners, so long as he took the active role\textsuperscript{15}. However, an excessive sex drive in a woman could really damage her reputation. Women’s main trait was “\textit{pudicitia}” —that is, chastity or modesty\textsuperscript{16}— although it was not

\textsuperscript{12}\textsc{Walters} (1997) p. 34
\textsuperscript{13}\textsc{Skinner} (2005) p. 195
\textsuperscript{14}\textsc{Skinner} (2005) p. 252
\textsuperscript{15}\textsc{Skinner} (2005) p. 199
\textsuperscript{16}\textsc{Langlands} (2006) p. 37
exclusive to the female gender\textsuperscript{17}. Female sexuality, then, was only encouraged as long as it was within a reproductive context.

Having said this, in this final project I will attempt to study the women who went against the established patriarchal norm. It will be divided in two: firstly, a series of notable women will be analysed from the perspective of their male peers, who belonged to an educated, high-class environment. Secondly, I will address a more popular, low-class case, that of prostitutes, through sexual graffiti found in the city of Pompeii.

\textsuperscript{17} \textsc{Langlands} (2006) p. 30
Abnormal women

Throughout the history of Rome, several female figures stand out from the rest because of their actions. I have selected a few, whom I have decided to call “abnormal women”, since they did not conform to the norm. Before getting into each of them, it is important to establish the model of an ideal Roman woman.

For a Roman woman, her purpose in life was to become a *matrona*, always subordinated to men—she would be under the *potestas* of either her father or her husband perpetually. Respectable women had to tie their hair up in a knot and wear the *stola*, typical of matrons. Moreover, they were strictly restricted to the private sphere, not being able to “hold a magistracy or public office, be judges, bring lawsuits, act as procurators, or speak in court as advocates".

Another aspect, apart from politics, in which Roman women had many restrictions was sex. A woman’s defining trait was *pudicitia*, i.e. chastity; thus, respectable women had to be *univirae* and loyal to their husbands. As a matter of fact, if a man found her wife committing adultery, he had the right to kill her with no legal consequences. However, if it was the wife who surprised her husband with a lover, she could not take any legal action, not even file for divorce. Moreover, Roman sexuality was closely linked to procreation, and women engaging in any sexual activities without reproduction as its goal were harshly criticised.

The women I have selected stand out either because of the way in which they chose to live their sexuality, or because of their willingness to assert themselves. Some of these women were courtesans who often visited elite members of society, such as Propertius’ Cynthia or Catullus’ Lesbia. I find it necessary to discern them from prostitutes. A courtesan either lived with her mother and sisters, who encouraged her in her licentious activities and took share in her profits, or under the custody of a “*lena*”. She could also live on her own, in a house provided by her lover, with all sorts of luxury and staff of her own. These women were, generally,
Roman and of respectable origins. Most importantly, they were "doctae puellae"; that is, they were sophisticated, musically gifted and educated.

It is for this type of women that Ovid wrote the third book of his *Ars Amatoria*. Ovid himself warns us that this is no book fit for respectable women\(^{23}\). In it, Ovid gives advice on many matters regarding love—or should I say, lust—such as how to do their hair according to the shape of their faces\(^{24}\), what colours their clothes should be\(^{25}\), or how to do their makeup\(^{26}\). Later in the book, he tackles aspects regarding behaviour: he teaches them how to flirt, how to make a man fall madly in love, how to make men jealous, how to conduct themselves at parties, etc.

Below, I have studied a total of nine women, from different periods and backgrounds. For each of them, I first provide a succinct biography; next, I analyse how they were represented by their male peers in writing and, finally, I provide a brief critical commentary, taking into the account the opinion of renowned scholars.

\(^{23}\) Ov., *AA* 1.31
\(^{24}\) Ov., *AA* 3.137-148
\(^{25}\) Ov., *AA* 3.169-192
\(^{26}\) Ov., *AA* 3.199-208
Clodia

Clodia Pulchra, originally Claudia, was born between 95 and 94 BC. She was the daughter of Appius Claudius Pulcher, a Roman patrician, and married Quintus Caecilius Metellus Celer, her cousin. It was an unhappy marriage—Clodia took several lovers and she was even suspected of poisoning her husband.

After her husband’s death in 59 BC, she had an affair with Marcus Caelius Rufus, who later left her. Upon their breakup in 56 BC, she sued him for attempting to poison her and for failing to return a sum of money she had lent him. Caelio was defended by the orator Cicero, who attacked Clodia and portrayed her as a prostitute.

It is important to note that Clodia was acquainted with Catullus, who dedicated poems to her under the name Lesbia. I will dedicate another section entirely to her identification with Lesbia and Catullus portrayal of her. For this section, however, I will focus on Cicero’s depiction of Clodia in his speech Pro Caelio.

Before getting into the speech, a little context is required. As mentioned above, Clodia married Marcus Caelius Rufus, who was friends with Cicero. When Caelius was sued by Clodia for attempted murder, he was defended by the Roman orator, a political enemy of Clodia’s brother, Clodius. Cicero’s defence is built on a series of attacks towards Clodia, arguing that her accusations came from the bitterness that Caelius’s breakup had caused her (“voces sunt contumeliosae temere ab irato accusatore nullo auctore emissae”).

Moreover, he accused her of being a seductress and a drunkard, and even of committing incest with her own brother (“nisi intercederent mihi inimicitiae cum istius mulieris viro—fratre volui dicere; semper hic erro”). He had already made several claims of their incestuous relationship before the trial, in his speeches De Haruspicum responsis (“cum uxorem sororemque non discernis27”) and Pro Sestio (“cum sororis adultero28”), among others.

Cicero also refers to her as “mulier quadrantaria”, that is to say, a quarter-of-an-as woman, which was the price of prostitutes at the time. He even went as far as

---

27 Cic. Har., 39
28 Cic. Sest., 39
to dub her the Medea of the Palatine hill\textsuperscript{29} and, through the use of prosopopeia, he impersonated Appius Claudius Caecus, one of Clodia’s most famous ancestors, to show how she had brought disgrace to the Claudian lineage. Appius wonders why Clodia does not behave like some of her female ancestors, such as Claudia Quinta, Appius’ granddaughter and a pious vestal. He regrets her walking along the Appian road in company of her lovers, a road whose construction he ordered ("ideo viam munivi, ut eam tu alienis viris comitata celebrares?").

Clodia was a sexually freed woman, and a politically powerful one, and for that she was highly criticised. Cicero focuses his attacks on her sexual life in order to undermine her as a political figure. She did not remain a "univira" after her husband’s death and took several lovers; therefore Clodia’s accusations against Caelius had to be false, since a woman who conducted herself in such a manner could not be trusted.

Cicero’s scornful portrayal of Clodia being fuelled primarily by his enmity with Clodius, it is very likely that he exaggerated Clodia’s lifestyle in order to discredit and humiliate her. Skinner believes that we can get a more truthful picture of Clodia through Cicero’s private correspondence\textsuperscript{30}, prior to his falling out with her brother. All in all, it is safe to say that Clodia certainly was not a traditional woman; instead, she chose to reject the role that Roman society imposed on her\textsuperscript{31} and live her life on her own terms.

\textsuperscript{29} \textsc{Cic.} (1958) 18
\textsuperscript{30} \textsc{Skinner} (1983) p. 277
\textsuperscript{31} \textsc{Serrato Garrido} (1985) p. 132
Lesbia

Lesbia is known to us through the poems of Catullus. As it has been previously mentioned, it is believed that the real woman behind the name Lesbia was actually Clodia Pulchra. It is Apuleius who tells us about her identification with Lesbia: “eadem igitur opera accusent C. Catullum, quod Lesbiam pro Clodia nominari”.

Additionally, one of Catullus’ own poems, number 79, supports this claim:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lesbius est pulcer: quid ni? quem Lesbia malit} \\
\text{quam te cum tota gente, Catulle, tua.} \\
\text{sed tamen hic pulcer uendat cum gente Catullum,} \\
\text{si tria notorum sauia reppererit.}
\end{align*}
\]

Pulcher, which means “beautiful”, could be a reference to Clodia’s brother, Publius Clodius Pulcher. Here, we find it close to the name Lesbius, the masculine form of Lesbia, which we find a bit later in the verse. In this poem, Catullus, while connecting the name Lesbia to Clodia’s family, also lets on a sly accusation of incest between the siblings, which often appears in Cicero as well.

Catullus met Clodia, henceforth called Lesbia, in 61 BC. She was thirty-three, six years older than the poet. He fell in love with her and dedicated himself to her, and while there are many poems in which he professes his love for her, Lesbia was a woman who took many lovers and could not be held down, which sparked Catullus’ jealousy. In his distress, he wrote some critical poems about Lesbia, which are going to be analysed presently.

The first one we find is poem 11. It is not particularly harsh—the poet just mentions that she has several lovers, for whom she does not feel true love, only lust (“cum suis vivat valeatque moechis, quos simul complexa tenet trecentos, nullum amans vere, sed identidem omnium ilia rumpens”).

As we continue reading his work, the poems become increasingly more insulting towards Lesbia. For example, in poem 37, we find an angry Catullus. Lesbia has left him, and now she attends a tavern regularly and makes love to the men she finds there. Catullus threatens to rape all of them. Through these threats, Catullus attempts to assert his masculinity, weakened by Lesbia’s abandonment.

---

32 Apul (1932) 10
Moreover, he wants to draw dirty graffiti on the tavern’s façade, thus making it look like a brothel and suggesting that Lesbia is a prostitute.

Finally, in poem 58, Catullus explicitly depicts Lesbia as a prostitute. She has now left the tavern and searches potential clients in cross-roads and alleyways. There, she “glubit”. In his book, Henderson states that “glubo” is Latin for λέπω. This verb means to “get the penis ready for fellatio” or to “peel back the foreskin” to stimulate erection\(^{33}\). This act, Henderson says, was performed by prostitutes as a preliminary to fellatio. Therefore, Lesbia’s identification as a prostitute becomes clear.

Should we then take Catullus at his word and believe Lesbia was an insatiable woman who behaved like a prostitute? Cantarella argues that Catullus is not a reliable source, since he was clearly biased by his infatuation with her. Catullus expected true love, one that would last forever. Instead, Lesbia was not so committed and loved other people at the same time\(^{34}\), which deeply frustrated him. Moreover, as Skinner poignantly notes, Catullus —like any other artist— was free to modify his experiences with Lesbia in order to write his poetry\(^ {35}\). In conclusion, the real Lesbia probably did not have much to do with the Lesbia that Catullus immortalised.

\(^{33}\) Henderson (1975) pp. 167-168
\(^{34}\) Cantarella (1997) p. 168
\(^{35}\) Skinner (1983) p. 275
Sempronia

Sempronia was the wife of Decimus Junius Brutus, a consul in 77 BC, and mother to Decimus Junius Brutus Albinus, who conspired among others against Julius Caesar in 44 BC. Sempronia was one of the “new women” in the late republic who rejected traditional gender roles and sought sexual freedom. She contrasts with the values from the earlier Roman Republic.

In 63 BC, after losing the elections for consulship twice, Catiline conspired to conduct a coup d'état. Sempronia was one of the conspirators, without the knowledge or consent of her husband.

The main source of information about Sempronia is Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*, in which he describes her as an educated woman and skilled in music—characteristics typical of a Roman matron. However, he continues by saying that she carried out her talents “with greater elegance than became a woman of virtue”. She had no interest in honour or chastity; for her, they are to be avoided. Therefore, instead of being chaste—as would correspond to a woman of her status—she actively sought lovers, being her the first one to make a move.

In her article, Weiden Boyd affirms that “in participating in the Catilinarian conspiracy, Sempronia and women like her overstep the bounds of behaviour appropriate to females”. Therefore, they acquire masculine features. She also believes that there is a correlation between *luxuria* and feminity. In the late Republic, Rome was growing more infected by *luxuria* and, thus, was becoming more and more degenerated, since “*luxuria* is a characteristic of women and women-like men*. This just goes to show the deeply-rooted misogynistic values enclosed in Roman society.

As to recent studies on Sempronia, I find it appropriate to mention Hemelrijk's book. She feels a certain scepticism towards Sallust's portrayal of Sempronia, arguing that Roman authors often combined a noble origin, beauty and education with immoral sexual behaviour, namely Clodia and Julia—the former we have already discussed, the latter will be analysed eventually. Hemelrijk observes that women taking part in activities belonging to the public sphere

---

36 Sal (1921)
37 Boyd (1987) p. 185
38 Boyd (1987) p. 190
threatened the established order, and for this reason they were criticised in sexual terms\textsuperscript{40}. As Hillard cunningly puts it: "a woman who ‘went public’ risked being branded a ‘public woman’\textsuperscript{41}".

\textsuperscript{40} HEMELRIJK (2004) p. 86
Fulvia

Fulvia Flaccia Bambula’s date of birth is not known for certain. She was born sometime between 80-85 BC, daughter of Marcus Fulvius Flaccus Bambulus and Sempronia. There is speculation about whether this Sempronia was the same that conspired with Catiline or a sister of hers. Fulvia married thrice: first Clodius Pulcher, the brother of Clodia; then Scribonius Curio; and lastly, her most famous husband, Mark Antony.

With the second triumvirate of 44 BC, the triumvirs divided the Roman provinces among them. Antony got assigned Egypt, where he met the queen Cleopatra VII and began an affair with her. During Antony's absence, Fulvia took care of his political interests in Rome. Eventually, a disagreement between her and Octavian finally led her to start a war between the two triumvirs. Octavian laid siege to Fulvia and her troops, which led her to surrendered and seek exile in Sicyon. There, she fell ill and died before being reunited with Antony. Appian, apart from qualifying her as “turbulent”, implies that people were actually pleased that she died.

Plutarch defines her as a woman who did not care about spinning or housekeeping, activities assigned to Roman matrons. He continues by saying that “she wished to rule a ruler and command a commander”. He believes Cleopatra should be thankful to Fulvia—it is because of her that Cleopatra managed to have such an influence over Antony, since Fulvia tamed and taught him to obey women. Later on, he describes her as “πολυπράγμονα καὶ θρασεῖαν”.

Fulvia certainly had a great political influence, as Cassius Dio narrates. He says that, when Publius Servilius and Lucius Antonius became consuls, it was really Antony and Fulvia who ruled. She managed affairs herself to make sure everything was as she wanted it. She certainly behaved like a man, carrying a sword around her waist, bossing around the soldiers and even lecturing them. In fact, Velleius Paterculus affirms that she was only a woman in regards to her body. Lastly,

---

42 APP. (1913) 5.6.59
43 PLUT. (1920) 10.3
44 PLUT. (1920) 30
45 CASS. Dio (1996) 48.4
46 CASS. Dio (1996) 48.10.4
47 VELL. PAT. (1924) 2.74
Cassius Dio tells a gruesome anecdote about Fulvia: upon Cicero’s beheading, she would have spat on his head and pierced his tongue with her hair pins⁴⁸.

Although many of the criticism Fulvia received had to do with her meddling in politics, two authors talk about her sexual behaviour. For example, Martial mentions her in his epigram 11.20. In it, Octavian talks about Fulvia wanting revenge on Antony, who was having an affair with the Anatolian princess Glaphyra, by having sex herself with Octavian. However, he refuses and, at the ultimatum given by her, “aut futue, aut pugnemus⁴⁹”, he chooses the latter. Moreover, in Sallust’s Bellum Catilinae, the author tells us of Fulvia having an affair with Quintus Curius ("stupri vetus consuetude⁵⁰"). Quintus took part in Catiline’s conspiracy and, when he eventually got tired of her, Fulvia told everything she knew about the plot.

Overall, Fulvia is not considered a historically important figure, a fact not at all surprising, given the overwhelming focus of earlier scholarship on politics and warfare, and other activities generally reserved for elite Roman men⁵¹. Nonetheless, there are divided opinions among those who have studied her. Münzer, in the entry on Fulvia in volume seven of Real Encyclopaëdie, defines her as “the first princess of Rome⁵²”.

The Lightmans, for example, state that: “Fulvia was indomitable and fearless. She had an implacable determination and possessed a spirit and strength of character unmatched by any of her three husbands. Among the many strong and independent women of the late republic, Fulvia holds a unique position. She alone among these Roman women crossed the gender boundary and stepped into the male preserve of military action during civil war⁵³”. However, Cenerini finds this depiction of Fulvia a bit excessive⁵⁴.

Lastly, Stegmann is of the opinion that the critical depiction of Fulvia given by ancient sources is due to Fulvia’s interfering in the public sphere, exclusive to

---

⁴⁸CASS. DIO (1917) 47.8
⁴⁹MART. (1920) 11.20
⁵⁰SAL. (1921) 23.3
⁵¹WEIR (2007) p. 13
⁵⁴CENERINI (2012) p. 109
men\textsuperscript{55}. Personally, I agree with Moriarity, who believes that: “history considers her a traitor only because she happened to be on the losing side. If Antony and his supporters had carried the day, Fulvia may well have been honored as a heroine by the Romans\textsuperscript{56}.”


\textsuperscript{56} Moriarity (2017)
Cynthia

Cynthia is the poet Propertius’ beloved. His poetry talks mostly about love and, therefore, is dominated by the figure of Cynthia. There is an ongoing discussion about whether Cynthia was a real woman or not. Alison Keith tells us in her article that “Cynthia ranges from a real woman whose name is Hostia, to an embodiment of Callimachean poetics, to a commentary on social politics in Rome, to a generic representation of the women of comedy, elegy, and epigrams\(^{57}\).” It is, again, the 2\(^{nd}\)-century writer Apuleius who tells us that Cynthia’s real name may have been Hostia. In his *Apologia*, he says: “*et Propertium, qui Cunthiam dicat, Hostiam dissimulet*\(^{58}\).”

I am not interested, however, in the realness of Cynthia. Whether she existed or not, Propertius often offers us a very derogative image of her. His defamations originate from Cynthia’s sexual liberty. The poems I will concentrate on are the ones which, I think, show her most shameful side.

**ELEGY 1.2**

In this elegy, Propertius insinuates that Cynthia is behaving like a prostitute. She wears clothes made in Kos (“*et tenuis Coa veste movere sinus*”), made with a very fine and almost transparent silk. These types of clothes were usually worn by prostitutes, without anything underneath them\(^{59}\). Cynthia would also be wearing her hair down, instead of wearing it on a bun, as was typical of matrons\(^{60}\) (“*aut quid Orontea crines perfundere murra*”). Additionally, Cynthia sells herself to lovers, covered in exotic ornaments (“*teque peregrinis vendere muneribus*”). These “foreign enticements” would have been gifted to her by her lovers, in exchange for her favours\(^{61}\).

Propertius then goes on by listing a series of women who remained faithful to their lovers, and ends by saying that “none of them conquered their lovers commonly” (“*non illis studium vulgo conquirere amantes*”). Here, “*vulgo*” could also be understood as “frequently” or “openly”. The women Propertius mentioned were

\(^{57}\) **KEITH** (2008) p. 98-104
\(^{58}\) **APUL.** (1912) 10
\(^{59}\) **PROP.** (2001) p. 154
\(^{60}\) **PROP.** (2001) p. 155
\(^{61}\) **PROP.** (2001) p. 155
honest and did not look for a lover in such an open manner as Cynthia is doing by dressing and wearing her hair in such ways\textsuperscript{62}.

**Elegy 1.11**

Propertius begins his eleventh elegy by telling us that Cynthia is in Baiae, an ancient Roman town situated on the west coast of the Gulf of Puteoli. Baiae was known for its hedonistic lifestyle and is mentioned by many classic authors. As we have seen in Cicero’s speech against Clodia, Baiae was known as a place where people went to party, drink and have sex.

Also, in the 1\textsuperscript{st} century, Seneca the Younger wrote his epistle 51, titled “On Baiae and Morals”. In it, he describes Baiae in the following way: “locum ob hoc devitandum, cum habeat quasdam naturales dotes, quia illum sibi celebrandum luxuria desumpsit” (“Baiae is a place to be avoided, because, though it has certain natural advantages, luxury has claimed it for her own exclusive resort\textsuperscript{63}”). And he continues: “ne Baias quidem; deversorium vitiorum esse coeperunt” (“nor Baiae either; for both places have begun to be resorts of vice\textsuperscript{64}”). Moreover, Marcus Terentius Varro defines the town as a place “quod non solum innubae fiunt communis, sed etiam ueteres repuerascunt et multi pueri puellascunt\textsuperscript{65}”.

Returning to the elegy, Propertius too highly criticises Baiae, describing it as “corrupt” and a “crime against love” (“tu modo quam primum corruptas desere Baias; ah pereant Baiae, crimen amoris, aquae!”). In such a place, it is difficult to remain loyal to your lover, and this worries our poet. He thinks that Cynthia is going to forget about him during her sojourn in Baiae and is going to fall into the arms of another man (“quam vacet alterius blandos audire susurros molliter in tacito litore compositam!”).

**Elegy 2.6**

In elegy 2.6, Propertius enumerates the most famous courtesans of antiquity to show that even they were not as promiscuous as Cynthia is. The first one, Lais, was a famous prostitute from Corinth, whose old name was Ephyra. Thaïs was

\textsuperscript{62} Prop. (2001) p. 157  
\textsuperscript{63} Sen. (1917) 51.1  
\textsuperscript{64} Sen. (1917) 51.3  
\textsuperscript{65} Var. (1971) p. 105
another famous courtesan from a comedy of the dramatist Menandre. Furthermore, Thaïs was also the name of a lover of Alexander the Great, who Ptolemy I Soter wed after the king’s death. Phryne was another courtesan, lover to Praxiteles. She promised to pay for the restoration of the Theban walls, destroyed by Alexander the Great, on the condition that the Thebans put up an inscription which said: “Alexander demolished them, the courtesan Phryne rebuilt them”.

In conclusion, her potential lovers are infinite (“oscula nec desunt qui tibi iure ferant”). Then, Propertius talks about disgraces that came upon men due to infidelity, such as the war of Troy or the rape of the Sabine women. From this point on, the poet gives us examples of faithful lovers, such as Alcestis, Admetu’s wife, who was willing to die for her husband; or Penelope, who waited twenty years for the return of her beloved Ulysses.

In short, this poem is a fierce critique against infidelity —specifically, against Cynthia’s infidelity— and a defence of loyalty to one’s lover.

**ELEGY 2.16**

Propertius’ elegy 2.16 is an attack towards those who sell their favours in exchange for money, or gifts. Apparently, Cynthia has left Propertius for a while to be with a foreign praetor. The poet, in his jealousy, names different women who gladly accepted gifts they were given and had a tragic end.

The first one, Eriphyle, was persuaded by Polynices, who gave her a necklace, to convince her husband Amphiarau to take part in the raid previous to the Seven against Thebes. She was finally murdered by her own son Alcmaeon. The second one, Creusa, before her wedding with Jason, received as a wedding gift from Medea, Jason’s ex-wife, a cursed tunic which killed her when she put it on.

At the end, Propertius threatens Cynthia by telling her that if she keeps on being unfaithful to him, her lover, Jupiter is going to cast a lightning bolt upon her as punishment (“quare ne tibi sit tanti Sidonia vestis, ut timeas, quotiens nubilus Auster erit”).

---
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**Elegy 3.13**

This elegy does not really talk about Cynthia, but I found it relevant to include it since it talks about prostitution. The poem is constructed around the idea that greed dominated the society of Propertius’ Rome. During this time, Propertius says, many young women turn to prostitution in order to be able to afford their caprices, such as jewellery, dresses and perfumes. No woman is immune to this kind of luxury—even those who profess themselves chaste want money (“haec etiam clausas expugnant arma pudicas”).

There are no faithful women left, such as Evadne or Penelope (“hoc genus infidum nuptarum, hic nulla puella nec fida Euadne nec pia Penelope”). The former committed suicide by throwing herself into her dead husband’s pyre; the latter was faithful to her husband while he was away for twenty years.

Propertius’ society is deeply corrupted and greedy, and so he praises the past, when the youth did not care about money, but about grain and trees (“felix agrestum quondam pacata iuventus, divitiae quorum messis et arbor erant!”) and when women were satisfied by fruit and flowers.

**Elegy 3.19**

Again, this elegy does not concentrate around the figure of Cynthia, but I decided to include it since, in it, Propertius affirms that women are more lustful than men. In order to illustrate such a statement, he turns to mythology. The first woman he mentions is Pasiphae, Minos’ wife, who entered a wooden cow in order to have sex with a bull. He also talks about Tyro, king Salmoneus’ daughter. She was married to Cretheus but loved the river Enipheus. The river god, however, rejected her and Neptune, filled with desire for Tyro, disguised himself as Enipheus in order to have sex with her.

Afterwards, he moves on to Myrrha, who was in love with her father Cinyras and tricked him into having sex with her. The next one is Medea, whose love for Jason was so strong that she killed her own children. Then, he refers to:
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Clytemnestra, who murdered her own husband Agamemnon upon his return from the Trojan War. Some authors maintain that she was seduced into it by her cousin Aegisthus, with whom she had started a love affair during his husband’s absence 77.

Lastly, Propertius mentions Scylla, a princess, daughter of Nisus, the king of Megara. She was, however, in love with Minos, her father’s enemy. Nisus had a lock of purple hair which made him and the city invincible. Out of love, Scylla decided to betray his father—she cut his purple hair and gave it to Minos 78.

Overall, these examples show that women’s libido is unstoppable and that they will go to great lengths to relieve it. To Propertius, Minos serves to exemplify how men are better than women, since he did not succumb to Scylla’s love 79.

**Conclusion**

In my opinion, in the same manner that Catullus could not be considered reliable in terms of his depiction of Lesbia, here we cannot completely trust Propertius’ characterisation of Cynthia. Propertius most likely took the elements that interested him, in terms of artistic creation, and adapted them to the message he was trying to convey in his poems. Therefore, a line has to be drawn between the Cynthia of the elegies and the real-life Cynthia.
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Livia

Livia was born in 58 BC, daughter of Alfidia and Marcus Livius Drusus, who had been born into the Claudian family and adopted into the family of the Livii Drusi. Therefore, through her father, Livia belonged to two of the most prestigious and oldest of Roman families. She was educated as corresponded to an upper-class girl—she learned how to read, write, mathematics, the management of a household, and maybe rhetoric. At around fifteen years old, she married Tiberius Claudius Nero, who was much older than her.

Her early life was undoubtedly not a regular one. After the civil war between Julius Caesar and Pompey had broken out, her family was forced to side with one of them and Livia’s father chose to favour Pompey. Afterwards, once Julius Caesar had been murdered, her husband allied himself with the losing side. Thus, she was constantly forced to flee from their enemies. Velleius Paterculus, for example, narrates one occasion in which she had to run away with her son Tiberius’ in her arms and board a ship that would take them to Sicily80. It was not until 40-39 BC that Octavius created a general amnesty and she was allowed to return to Rome.

Shortly after their coming back, Octavius met Livia and apparently fell desperately in love with her. Of course, this may not have been the only motive—she did belong to a great and prestigious family after all. In order to marry Octavius, Livia had to divorce Tiberius, who took it rather well and even gave her away. It was during this marriage that Octavius would become Emperor and would be named Augustus. Her role during her husband’s rule was a bit contradictory since, as a woman, she was supposed to stay in the private sphere but, as the wife of the princeps, she was unquestionably a very public figure. She embodied the values typical of a Roman matron and thus became the impersonation of Augustus’ emphasis on traditional values.

When Augustus died in 14 BC, not only did he leave her a large portion of his wealth, but also adopted her in his will, hence integrating her into the Julian family, and granted her the title of Augusta, which almost put her on the same level as the emperor himself. Certainly, such were the senate’s feelings, who was willing to give
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her the title of “mater patriae” or “parens patriae”. After her death in 29 AD, she was deified by her grandson Claudius.

Livia is one of the most famous personalities of ancient Rome mainly because of stories about her murdering several people in order to favour her son Tiberius. Tacitus is without a doubt the most abusive of the ancient authors. According to his Annals, Livia was behind the death of Julia the Elder’s sons Lucius and Gaius, although the former died of an illness and the latter from a battle wound. Moreover, he accuses her of manipulating poor old Augustus into exiling his grandson Postumus Agrippa to the island of Planasia and, after the emperor’s death, of plotting with Tiberius to have him killed. She would also have been the reason behind Tiberius’ decision to leave Rome. He even goes as far as calling her “gravis in rem publicam mater, gravis domui Caesarum noverca”. Yet, when talking about Livia’s death, he gives a more favourable depiction of her, calling her a gracious woman, an imperious mother and an amiable wife.

Tacitus seems to be based solely on rumours, as are Suetonius and Cassius Dio, but these last two certainly give a more neutral vision of Livia. From Cassius Dio we learn rumours that Livia was suspected of having killed Marcellus, Julia’s husband, and also Augustus by poisoning figs. It is on this last point where the three sources differ. While Cassius Dio and Tacitus agree on the presence of rumours linking Livia to the death of the emperor, on the grounds that she feared that Augustus might bring back Agrippa and thus displace her son Tiberius; Suetonius affirms that Augustus’ death was caused by intestinal issues.

Nevertheless, there are two authors which stand out in their kinder treatment towards Livia. The first one is Velleius Paterculus, who calls her an eminent woman, more similar to the gods than to humans. The second one is
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Ovid, who repeatedly identifies her with the goddess Juno and, at one instance, praises her by comparing her beauty to Venus’ and her character to Juno’s.

As one of the most controversial figures of ancient Rome, Livia has been the inspiration behind several works of fiction, one of them being the 20th-century novelist Robert Graves’ *I, Claudius*, which was later turned into a television show by the BBC. In both of them, following Tacitus’ tradition, Livia is presented as a cold, scheming, murderous woman.

Nonetheless, recent studies have attempted to deconstruct this fictional Livia and tried to bring to the surface the real one. For example, Balsdon is very critical of Tacitus, branding him irresponsible and claiming that he did not distinguish between facts and gossip. Furthermore, Kearsley believes that Livia was so harshly treated inasmuch as she was stepmother to Augustus’ children. She emphasizes the fact that there was a big prejudice against stepmothers in antiquity due to which they were considered evil. Additionally, Watson, in her *Ancient Stepmothers*, talks about the stereotype that stepmothers did not hesitate to murder anyone who stood in the way of their biological children and could be a threat to their power.

In my opinion, the Roman authors’ narratives seem to rely heavily on gossip, which most likely was sparked by the discomfort of the male elite towards a powerful woman. As previously stated, Livia’s gender confined her to the private sphere and there is no doubt that men felt threatened by a female figure as powerful as her. We have already taken a look at one way of discrediting women, which is accusing them of adultery and licentious behaviour. Through Livia’s case we discover another one: spreading rumours about a woman being an evil stepmother and killing off her husband’s offspring. As Dennison states, “Livia’s true ‘crime’ was not murder but the exercise of power” in a male-dominated society.

---

94 Ov. (1924) *Pont.* 3.1.113-118
95 Balsdon (1975) p. 90
96 Kearsley (2017) p. 104
98 Dennison (2011) p. 2
Sulpicia

Sulpicia is the only Roman poetess whose work has survived. She lived during the first half of the 1st century and belonged to one of Rome’s most aristocratic families—her dad was Servius Sulpicius Rufus, the son of a distinguished jurist of the same name. Said jurist, Sulpicia’s grandfather, was friends with Cicero, who proposed that Servius (the son) become the third husband of Cicero’s daughter Valeria. Sulpicia was the result of this union. Since she was an upper-class girl growing up in the first century BC, Sulpicia’s education would not have differed much from that of a boy.

Sulpicia’s mother, Valeria, had a brother named Marcus Valerius Messalla Corvinus, one of Rome’s most important literary patrons. He took her into his “circle”, among other renowned writers such as Ovid and Tibullus. It is, in fact, in the collection titled Corpus Tibullianum that we find Sulpicia’s poetry. In it, there are six elegies which are undeniably Sulpicia’s, of approximately 40 lines.

The first poem is dominated by joy. Sulpicia is happy because she is in love, a love which not only has been reciprocated, but also consummated—the verb "peccasse" would make reference to a sin of sexual nature. Sulpicia wants her relationship to be known, and she does not care about what people might think of her.

It is in the second elegy that we discover the name of Sulpicia’s lover, Cerinthus. However, this poem is of much sombre tone. The poetess regrets that she will not be able to spend Cerinthus’ birthday with him, since her uncle Messalla plans to send her to the countryside. We can clearly see that, even though Sulpicia a priori seems to benefit from a certain liberty, she is still a woman in 1st-century Rome and, as such, she finds herself in a subordinated position, having to obey a man’s orders. The verb “abducto”, in the participle form, such as is the case here (“abducta”) strengthens the feeling of obligation. Sulpicia’s submission is once again made clear in the third elegy, where she proudly announces that she has been allowed to stay. Through the use of the verb “licet” we can see that the decision of staying in Rome is not hers, but her uncle’s99.
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The fourth elegy reveals an angry Sulpicia. She believes that Cerinthus is being unfaithful, as he prefers a woman who wears a toga, that is, a prostitute or an adulteress. Moreover, his new lover carries a “quasillum” a basket of wool typical of slaves and low-class women\textsuperscript{100}.

In the fifth elegy we learn that Sulpicia is ill and that she only cares about recovery if Cerinthus also wants her to get well. By referring about her illness with the word “calor”, Sulpicia leaves room for interpretation. While “calor” could perfectly mean sickness, it could also be read figuratively, as making allusion to the romantic passion that overwhelms her.

This ambiguous meaning of “calor” is reinforced in the sixth and final elegy, in which Sulpicia regrets having left her lover so that he would not notice her illness. She suffers from a “fervida cura” and she tries to conceal her “ardorem”. Again, we find ourselves questioning whether she was actually feverish, or if she just wanted to repress the sexual passion that overcame her.

As to the real identity of the man behind the pseudonym Cerinthus, it has sometimes thought to be Marcus Caecilius Cornutus, a friend of Tibullus, addressed by him in two of his elegies\textsuperscript{101}.

In the \textit{Corpus Tibullianum}, there are five poems of uncertain authorship. Some say\textsuperscript{102} that the author may have been Tibullus himself. If this were the case, the poems certainly show a close relationship between the two. I have, however, decided not to include them, since I do not find them relevant, having been written by someone other than Sulpicia.

Apart from Sulpicia’s own poems and the ones composed by a mysterious author, the other main source of information about her is Martial. She is also mentioned by Ausonius\textsuperscript{103}, Sidonius Apollinaris\textsuperscript{104} and Fulgentius\textsuperscript{105}, but through them we do not learn much other than her name. Martial, however, dedicated two of his epigrams to Sulpicia.

In his epigram 10.35, Martial depicts Sulpicia as a role model. He resorts to mythology to give examples of human cruelty, such as Medea (“\textit{Colchidos furorem}”)
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and Atreus (though he seems to confuse him with his twin brother Thyestes). He compares Sulpicia and Caleno to Egeria and Num. Egeria, eternally faithful to her beloved Numa, upon his death, retired to the woods in Ariccia. Martial even compares Sulpicia to Sappho, and says that Sulpicia is more admirable than the latter: Phaon would have preferred her to Sappho, who was in love with him. Lastly, it is through Martial that we learn about Sulpicia’s long-lasting marriage to Caleno. In fact, in 10.38, he celebrates the fifteenth anniversary of the couple’s marriage.

It is no secret that, in the past, women more often than not have not been allowed to partake in literacy, and those who did get an education and dared to write have been left aside to prioritize their male peers. In Sulpicia’s case, scholars have tended not to take her work seriously. Since she was a woman, she has been branded an amateur and has been treated as sensitive and emotional. Namely, Davies defines her elegies as “personal and non-universalised” and “in no way academic”; in addition, J. R. Bradley states that her poems lack “any display of erudition”.

All in all, I think it is safe to say that Sulpicia definitely stands out from the other women in this project, since we get to know her through texts that she wrote herself. As Reisman states, Sulpicia, “by taking an active part in the love affair she described and by making it clear that her primary allegiance was not to any man but to her muse, Sulpicia brought a voice to Roman poetry that had not previously been heard: that of a strong, independent woman.”
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Julia

Julia the Elder, known in Latin as *Iulia Maior* or *Iulia Augusti*, was born in 39 BC and was the daughter of Gaius Octavius — later known as Augustus — and his second wife Scribonia. In 25 BC, when Julia was only fourteen years old, his father married her to her cousin Marcus Claudius Marcellus, son of her aunt Octavia. Marcellus died two years later, and Julia remarried in 21 BC, this time to Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa, with whom she had five children. According to Tacitus\(^{111}\), during this marriage Julia had an affair with Sempronius Gracchus, among others. After all, Agrippa was forty-two years old — twenty-four years older than her — and this was an arranged marriage, stripped from any kind of love or affection between the two. In fact, Pliny the Elder, in his *Naturalis Historia*, states: “quinquagensimo uno raptus anno in tormentis adulterorun coniugis\(^{112}\).”

As mentioned, Agrippa died in 11 BC and Julia took his third and final husband: Tiberius, Augustus’ stepson and the heir to the Empire. Different authors had divergent opinions about this marriage. Tacitus is of the opinion that Julia disdained her husband (“odiis in maritum accendebat\(^{113}\)”), while Suetonius tells us that it was Tiberius who “had a low opinion of Julia’s character” (“Iulies mores improbaret\(^{114}\”). Apparently, he was disgusted by her because she had made “indecent advances to him during the lifetime of her former husband; and that she was a woman of loose character\(^{115}\).” The fact that he had to divorce his previous wife Vipsania, his one true love, contributed to the conflict between the couple. In 6 BC, Tiberius retired to Rhodes, but sources are not certain as to why.

Even though many knew of Julia’s liaisons, Augustus initially refused to believe that his daughter could be capable of such lascivious activities. Four years later, he finally accused her of adultery and treason. Following this scandal, she was forced to go into exile in the island of Pandateria, accompanied by her mother Sempronia, who went voluntarily. He forbade her of any contact with male servants without his permission: he had to be previously given an account of this
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person’s age, stature, complexion, and of any marks or scars he had. She was also not allowed to drink wine or have any luxurious dresses\textsuperscript{116}.

In 4 AD, Augustus allowed Julia’s return to the continent, though she still lived secluded in Rhegium. After Augustus’ death, Tiberius returned from Rhodes to rule as emperor, and had no mercy on his ex-wife Julia. He stripped her of her pension and confined her to a room, without any company\textsuperscript{117}. Julia finally died in 14 AD, as a result of the harsh treatment she received from Tiberius.

In relation to her sex life and according to Dio and Seneca, despite her marriage to Tiberius, she revelled in drinking parties, many love affairs, and even prostitution. What made her licentious behaviour even more scandalous was the fact that her father Augustus had promoted the \textit{Lex Iulia de Adulteriis}, a law whose purpose was to punish, and thus, eradicate adultery.

According to Cassius Dio, she went to parties and got drunk at night in the Forum and on the \textit{rostra}\textsuperscript{118}. Seneca tells us that the \textit{rostra} were the tribunes from which her father Augustus had established the law against adultery\textsuperscript{119}, and she used this same place to carry out her sexual indulgences.

Finally, I find it appropriate to talk about Macrobius’ \textit{Saturnalia}, in which the account he gives of Julia is rather positive, portraying her as witty and funny. For example, one day, Julia wore a very provocative dress which did not please Augustus. The next day, however, he found Julia’s outfit much more appropriate, and when he congratuled her on her choice of dress, she answered: \textit{“hodie enim me patris oculis ornavi, heri viri”} (today I have dressed up for my father’s eyes, yesterday, for my husband’s).

On another occasion, upon being asked to follow her father’s example and behave more frugally, she said: \textit{“ille obliviscitur Caesarem se esse, ego memini me Caesaris filiam”} (he forgets he is the Caesar, but I remember that I am the Caesar’s daughter). Lastly, to those who knew about her several love affairs and were surprised that her children actually looked like Agrippa, her response was:
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“numquam enim nisi navi plena tollo vectorem” (I never take anyone on board if the ship is not full).

From my point of view, these sources are of doubtful veracity. Accusing women of high rank of adultery was common practice in order to discredit them—we have already seen it happen to Clodia, and we will shortly delve into Messalina’s similar case. Additionally, throughout history, it has always been men who studied Latin literature and history, and thus, the scandalous stories told by ancient Roman women have rarely been called into question.

There are, however, some exceptions. Firstly, the 18th-century German poet C. M. Wieland wrote an essay titled “Zur Ehrenrettung drei berühmter Damen des Altertums” (“Towards Rescuing the Honour of Three Famous Women of Antiquity”), in which he sees Julia as a victim, who was probably encouraged in his sinful activities by Livia, whose ultimate purpose was to secure the position of her children123.

Secondly, French historian Gaston Boissier defends her in his book L’Opposition sous les Césars. He is of the same opinion as Wieland: Livia encouraged Julia’s sinful behaviour because she wanted Augustus all to herself. Boissier also believes that because Julia was forced into loveless marriages, she was forced to find love elsewhere124.

Lastly, both Balsdon125 and Ronald Syme agree that ancient historians tended to exaggerate his tales. As the latter puts it: “Julia may have been immodest, but she was hardly a monster”126.

All in all, I believe ancient sources should be read with scepticism. “Or are we to believe that Julia would hold a drunken party in the Forum, when she had a choice of houses in which to be debauched in comfort?”127, as Elaine Fantham wonders. She surely indulged in some vices, but she was probably not as degenerate as we have been led to believe.
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Messalina

Valeria Messalina was born around 20-22 AD. She was the daughter of Domitia Lepida Minor, the granddaughter of Mark Anthony, and of Valerius Messalla Barbatus, a consul trusted by the Emperor Caligula. She married her second cousin, Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus, known as Claudius, in 38 AD. Suetonius tells us that Claudius married four times, and Messalina was his third wife. She bore him two children: Claudia Octavia and Tiberius Claudius Germanicus, better known as Britannicus.

Messalina became primarily notorious for her promiscuity and the consequences it carried. She had great control over her husband and managed to manipulate him in order to satisfy her desires. Juvenal, in his most misogynistic satire, narrates how Messalina used to sneak out of palace at night to work at a brothel. By hiding her hair under a blonde wig and going by the name of Lycisca, she received many clients until the brothel closed at dawn. What’s more, Pliny tells us about one occasion when Messalina challenged the most famous prostitute of Rome to see who could sleep with the most men in one day. Needless to say Messalina won, after having taken twenty-five lovers.

Gradually, her lust started getting out of control and she resorted to dubious strategies to get what she wanted. After her husband’s death, Messalina’s mother married Gaius Appius Silanus, governor of eastern Spain. Messalina tried to seduce him and, upon his refusal, tricked Claudius into killing him with the help of Narcissus, the emperor’s freedman. Narcissus told the emperor that he had had a dream in which Claudius was murdered by Silanus. When the emperor told the news to his wife, she told him that she had had the same dream several times, thus persuading him to kill Silanus. Other times, she decided to take matters into her own hands and killed her enemies herself, as happened with Vinicius, who refused to lie with her.

Manipulating her husband was second nature to Messalina. Once, she became enamoured of Mnester, a renowned actor who, despite her showering him with gifts, refused to lie with her. Therefore, she told Claudius to compel him to obey
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her. Mnester, thinking that the emperor was aware of Messalina’s lust, consented to being her lover. This was not, however, an isolated event. Messalina often pretended that Claudius knew what was going on and that he allowed her lust\textsuperscript{132}.

Moreover, she spread her promiscuous lifestyle among other women—she made them commit adultery in her own palace. If these women’s husbands agreed to their wives infidelities, she rewarded them. Those who opposed her, though, she destroyed. Messalina kept the emperor busy by bringing him courtesans, so he would not find out about her activities. Anyone who tried to inform the emperor suffered her rage, such as Catonius Justus, commander of the praetorian guard. If she was jealous of any women, she had them slain too\textsuperscript{133}.

Finally, Messalina wanted to become bigamous. She succeeded in marrying Gaius Silius while Claudius was away in Ostia\textsuperscript{134}. This wedding was the end of her. Narcissus, who had previously helped Messalina in her licentiousness, informed her husband of Messalina’s wedding. Claudius, finally realizing what had been happening under his own roof for years, executed Silius, along with many others, and Messalina\textsuperscript{135}.

The image of Messalina that we are given by these ancient authors is clearly defamatory. I wonder how trustful these testimonies are, and how much the real Messalina must have resembled the Messalina that history has passed along. The fact that Claudius was allegedly unaware of her wife’s illicit behaviour seems a bit suspicious. Furthermore, if Messalina had truly taken so many lovers, the couple’s children should have been removed from the imperial family in the basis of doubtful paternity, which never happened.

I am not alone in my scepticism, though, for many scholars have doubted the reliability of the ancient historians. For example, Hidalgo de la Vega points out that the works of Tacitus, Suetonius, Cassius Dio, Juvenal, Seneca and Pliny the Elder are contaminated by a tradition of hostility towards Claudius\textsuperscript{136}. Additionally, Balsdon\textsuperscript{137} hesitates to believe the scandalous tales of sexual misbehaviour provided by Pliny the Elder or Juvenal. The fact that they do not appear in Tacitus’
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Annals would be motive enough to distrust them. Lastly, as Fagan\textsuperscript{138} fittingly points out, modern scholarship has often been inclined to blame Messalina’s controversial sexual life on her young age—she could not have been older than eighteen when she married Claudius, already a middle-aged man. Perhaps Messalina did live a lustful life, which certainly must not have been approved by the Roman society of her time, but I wonder if she went as far as these sources want us to believe.

\textsuperscript{138} Fagan (2002) p. 571
Conclusions

As all of these testimonies show, women—especially powerful women—have been looked down upon since early antiquity. Roman society, as a patriarchal one, sought to control and keep women oppressed, which is clearly reflected in the works of the authors studied above. In order to do so, they used multiple resources: juxtaposing a woman’s virtues and her sins, making use of topics such as the *perfida noverca*, or humiliating her by depicting her as a prostitute.

Livy voiced men’s anxieties when he said: “Review all the laws with which your forefathers restrained their licence and made them subject to their husbands; even with all these bonds you can scarcely control them. What of this? If you suffer them to seize these bonds one by one and wrench themselves free and finally to be placed on a parity with their husbands, do you think that you will be able to endure them? The moment they begin to be your equals, they will be your superiors139”. The women I have talked about were powerful, each in their own way, and men wished to dominate them. Educated writers did so through calumny.

Only relatively recently have women been allowed to access scholarship, which, along with the rise of feminism and gender studies, has entailed the revisiting of women throughout history. As a result, many a book has been published discussing the veracity and reliability of the writers previously referred to.

The conclusion I draw from the study of both the primary sources and the subsequent research is that these women as the male Roman writers portrayed them are probably largely fictional. Indeed, they may have led unconventional lives and challenged the gender roles imposed on them. Nevertheless, such harsh treatment, in my honest opinion, may have been the result of men’s uneasiness, brought forward by the opposite sex gaining confidence and authority.

---

139 Liv. (1935) 34.3
Prostitution

Our knowledge of prostitution in Roman society comes mainly from the tales of Roman authors—especially Juvenal and Martial—and from archaeology—particularly from Pompeii. Prostitution, although it constituted a primary necessity of Roman society, was considered extremely shameful for women. In fact, when it comes to prostitution, we find a double standard, because even though sex-workers were looked down upon, they still were considered crucial “to ensure social and familial stability.” It was accepted for men to pay visits to prostitutes on the regular, as long as they were not excessive, while sex-workers were treated with nothing else than contempt.

It is no surprise, then, that prostitutes, along with other people who were thought to sell their bodies due to their profession—such as gladiators and actors—constituted a marginalized sector of society. Their occupations brought them “infamia”, thus diminishing their social status and their legal rights. As a matter of fact, Ulpian states that harassing women became “venial, even more so if the women be in prostitute’s dress and not that of a matron.” Therefore, a prostitute was not considered a person, but a mere “object with a market value”.

Women who found themselves taking part in prostitution would most likely have come to that position through slavery. Many of them were not Roman, but from Syria or Egypt. Another frequent situation was the woman’s family selling her due to economic reasons. As a matter of fact, in his comedies, Plautus presents money troubles as the main motivation for prostitution. These women would then be under the supervision of a “leno”, the procurer. There were also prostitutes who worked independently and paid a rent to the owner of the brothel in order to be able to use a room.

140 BALSDON (1975) p. 224
141 ÅSHEDE (2016) p. 938
142 ÅSHEDE (2016) p. 938
144 The Digest of Justinian (1985) Translated by WATSON, A. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, p. 777a (47.10.15.15)
146 PROP., 2.23.21
147 BALSDON (1975) p. 224
149 ÅSHEDE (2016) p. 934-935
150 BALSDON (1975) p. 224
Prostitution was widely spread among Roman cities. Although it is hard to establish facts about prostitution since “bodies temporally engaging in sexual activities involving payment require no purpose-built structures and leave no unique material remains,” we can say that, in the late Empire there were in Rome forty-five brothels and, in Pompeii, at least seven. However, as Beard states, a man in search of fun need not go specifically to the *lupanar*, since the majority of Pompeii’s prostitutes would have been waiters or inn-keepers.

Prostitutes either walked the streets in search of customers or sat or stood outside brothels. In fact, the term “prostitute” would come from the Latin “prostare”, which means “to stand in a public space.” Although Adams provides over 50 terms to refer to a prostitute, the most common ones were “meretrix” (literally, she who earns money) and “scortum” (leather skin). Others include “lupa” (a she-wolf) or “publica” (public). They could also be referred to depending on their activities: “proseda” (sitting), “circulatrix” (walking around) and “nonaria” (at night). They are also called “prostitulum” (one in front of the inn) by Plautus and “bustuarias moechias” (she who prostitutes herself among tombs) by Martial.

Prostitutes were easily distinguishable due to her appearance, since they were forced to use the toga—as were women who had committed adultery—, typical of male Roman citizens, in order to differentiate them from the respectable members of society. They also wore their hair down and excessive make up.

Legislation regarding prostitution varied throughout time. We do know, however, that at one point prostitutes were forced to register as such in front of the *aediles*. In fact, after Augustus’ reign, some matrons registered themselves as prostitutes in hopes of taking several lovers without facing legal consequences.
From the Empire of Gaius Caligula onwards the prostitute had to pay a tax, which was “as much as each received for one embrace”\textsuperscript{162}.

It also should be noted that a remarkable fraction of prostitutes were male. As Servius says in his commentary on Vergil’s \textit{Eclogues}: “the Romans of old freely enjoyed the services of prostituted boys”\textsuperscript{163}. Of course, they were supposed to take the passive part in the intercourse, according to the Roman sexual conventions previously seen.

\textsuperscript{162} \textit{Suet.} (1913) \textit{Cal.}, 40
\textsuperscript{163} Åshede (2016) p. 933
Pompeian graffiti

The eruption of the Vesuvius in 79 AD coated the Campanian city of Pompeii with a thick layer of ash, thus preserving it in an impeccable state for thousands of years. In Pompeii we find a great number of graffiti, which have sparked great interest in scholarship. In this section, I focus on a corpus of inscriptions of sexual nature, many of which are found on the walls of what were brothels, taverns, inns and lunch counters. In order to do so, I leave to one side the studies provided by great academics, such as Varone\textsuperscript{164} and Hightower\textsuperscript{165}, and follow Levin-Richardson's\textsuperscript{166} line of thought. Therefore, instead of taking these graffiti as advertisements or boasts from clients, I suggest that, for Pompeian prostitutes, writing these graffiti was a way of claiming themselves as sexual subjects and agents.

There are, however, a few issues to be dealt with before analysing the graffiti. One main difficulty when approaching graffiti is the uncertainty of the writer's gender. Therefore, for the purpose of this final project, I assume that a graffito with a third-person or a first-person verb combined with a female subject was written by a woman, as I would do for the male equivalent. Additionally, there is the question of literacy. Even though we have the testimonies of writers such as Catullus\textsuperscript{167} and Martial\textsuperscript{168}, which talk of female readers, it is important to note that these women were all of noble origin and had nothing to do with prostitutes. The names and professions of the brothel’s clients found in graffiti indicate lower status (slaves, freedmen, and the free poor)\textsuperscript{169}. So, if lower-class men could read and write, who is to say that lower-class women could not? Furthermore, many of these graffiti contain spelling mistakes, hence suggesting a low level of literacy\textsuperscript{170}.

Usually, in a sexual graffito, men would be the grammatical subjects of an active verb denoting penetration, while women would be the grammatical objects.

\textsuperscript{166} My claims are based on the following article: LEVIN-RICHARDSON, S. (2013) “Fututa Sum Hic: Female Subjectivity and Agency in Pompeian Sexual Graffiti”, \textit{The Classical Journal}: 108.3, pp. 319-345
\textsuperscript{167} CAT., 35
\textsuperscript{168} MART., 3.68, 3.86, 4.17, 4.81
\textsuperscript{169} LEVIN-RICHARDSON (2011) p. 61
\textsuperscript{170} LEVIN-RICHARDSON (2013) p. 329
of said active verbs, or the grammatical subjects of passive verbs or participles. The graffiti I have chosen to analyse actually invert that order—it is the women who become the subjects, and if the men appear it is only as mere adjuncts.

Female-authored graffiti could take many forms, one of them being verbs such as “fellare” in active forms, which we find in Fortunata fellat (Fortunata sucks\(^{171}\)), Methe fela\(<t>\) (Methe sucks\(^{172}\)), Ionis fellat (Ionis sucks\(^{173}\)), Ianuaria fe\(<lat>\) (Ianuaria sucks\(^{174}\)) and Nice fellat (Nice sucks\(^{175}\)). The choice of using the verb “fellare”, when the act of fellatio could also be described with passive forms of the verb “irrumare”, is key to understanding these graffiti as a way for prostitutes to stress their agency.

Female subjectivity and agency could also be expressed in other sexual acts, as “fututrix” demonstrates, for example, in the graffiti Μόλα φουτούτρις (Mola the fucktress\(^{176}\)) and Miduse fututrix (Miduse the fucktress\(^{177}\)). The endings -τρις/-trix convey an active role. If the idea the writer wanted to express was “Mola was fucked”, they could have easily written “Mola fututa”. I believe, therefore, that the use of “fututrix” here is significant. We also find this active ending for the act of fellatio, such as in <Am>arillis fellatri\(<x>\) (<Am>arilis the blow-job babe\(^{178}\)) and Murtis fellatrix (Murtis the blow-job babe\(^{179}\)).

Graffiti written in first-person with a female subject are fewer, but should also be considered a claim to subjectivity. One example would be the graffiti “fututa sum hic” (I was fucked here\(^{180}\)). As a last remark, I would like to point out the fact that these graffiti are missing sexual partners, which could also be an indication of assertion of the prostitute’s sexual agency.

Finally, I would like to emphasize the fact that all of this is, of course, merely hypothetical. There is no possible way for us to know who wrote these graffiti, or their gender, or why. The supposition that they were written by prostitutes is as good as any other. However, I would like to think that they were authored by the

\(^{171}\) CIL IV 2259 & CIL IV 2275
\(^{172}\) CIL IV 4434
\(^{173}\) CIL IV 2403
\(^{174}\) CIL IV 8465b
\(^{175}\) CIL IV 2278
\(^{176}\) CIL IV 2204
\(^{177}\) CIL IV 4196 (I use Levin-Richardson’s translation for φουτούτρις/”fututrix”)
\(^{178}\) CIL IV 1510 Add. 208 (I use Levin-Richardson’s translation for ”fellatrix”)
\(^{179}\) CIL IV 2292
\(^{180}\) CIL IV 2217
Pompeian prostitutes. The history of the female gender has for many years been unknown, mainly due to the silencing to which women have been subjected throughout the centuries. Hence why I am so eager to defend the prostitutes’ authorship and to believe that these graffiti may provide a glimpse into these women's consciousness.
Conclusions

Throughout this final project we have seen the different ways in which misogyny expressed itself in Roman culture, specifically in the sexual context. We have analysed the sexual practices and vocabulary which perpetrated women’s oppression, how some women reacted to this situation and the consequences their “rebellious acts” had. In order to do so, I have both analysed the texts from several Roman authors and referred to the books of many notable scholars when convenient.

Firstly, I have given an account of the sexual Roman scheme, which was built not around sexual orientation but around a dichotomy differentiating the active from the passive. I have also considered how the Roman vocabulary could be violent and express contempt towards women.

Secondly, I have presented a few profiles of some Roman women who did not meet the expectations that society had of them. They decided to live their lives in their own terms, loving whomever they wanted and refusing to conform to the established gender roles. Consequently, I have also analysed the perception their male educated peers had of them and how some Roman authors aggravated the “scandalous” acts carried out by these women by creating literary personas which may have not corresponded with the real women.

Finally, I have briefly introduced the topic of prostitution in Rome, along with the concept of infamia, since prostitution was conceived as fundamental for Roman society and yet it also brought shame upon those who practiced it. Lastly, I have given a non-exhaustive list of Roman terminology to refer to prostitutes as well as a corpus of graffiti of female authorship.
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Cic., Cael.

7.18
Reprehendistis a patre quod semigrarit. Quod quidem in hac aetate minime reprehendendum est. Qui cum et ex publica causa iam esset mihi quidem molestam, sibi tamen gloriosam victoriam consecutus et per aetatem magistratus petere posset, non modo permittente patre, sed etiam suadente ab eo semigravit et, cum domus patris a foro longe abesset, quo facilius et nostras domus obire et ipse a suis coli posset, conduxit in Palatio non magno domum.

8.18
Quo loco possum dicere id, quod vir clarissimus, M. Crassus, cum de adventu regis Ptolemaei quereretur, paulo ante dixit:

Utinam ne in nemore Pelio—
Ac longius mihi quidem contexere hoc carmen liceret:

Nam numquam era errans

hanc molestiam nobis exhiberet

Medea animo aegro, amore saevo saucia.

Sic enim, iudices, reperietis quod, cum ad id loci venero, ostendam, hanc Palatinam Medeam migrationemque hanc adulescenti causam sive malorum omnium sive potius sermonum fuisse.

12.30-16.38
Itaque severitati tuae, ut oportet, ita respondere non audeo; erat enim meum deprecari vacationem adulescentiae veniamque petere; non, inquam, audeo; perfugiis nihil utor aetatis, concessa omnibus iura dimitto; tantum peto ut, si qua est invidia communis hoc tempore aeris alieni, petulantiae, libidinum iuventutis, quam video esse magnam, tamen ne huic aliena peccata, ne aetatis ac temporum vitia noceant. Atque ego idem, qui haec postulo, quin criminibus, quae in hunc proprie conferuntur, diligentissime respondeam, non recuso.
Sunt autem duo crimina, auri et veneni; in quibus una atque eadem persona versatur. 
Aurum sumptum a Clodia, venenum quaesitum, quod Clodiae daretur, ut dicitur. 
Omnia sunt alia non crimina sed maledicta, iurgi petulantis magis quam publicae quaestionis. “Adulter, impudicus, sequester” convicium est, non accusatio; nullum est enim fundamentum horum criminum, nullae sedes; voces sunt contumeliosae temere ab irato accusatore nullo auctore emissae. 
Horum duorum criminum video auctorem, video fontem, video certum nomen et caput. Auro opus fuit; sumpsit a Clodia, sumpsit sine teste, habuit quamdiu voluit. 
Maximum video signum cuiusdam egregiae familiaritatis. Necare eandem voluit; quaesivit venenum, sollicitavit quos potuit, paravit, locum constituit, clam attulit. 
Magnum rursus odium video cum crudelissimo discidio exstitisse. Res est omnis in hac causa nobis, iudices, cum Clodia, muliere non solum nobili, sed etiam nota; de qua ego nihil dicam nisi depellendi criminis causa.

Sed intellegis pro tua praestanti prudentia, Cn. Domiti, cum hac sola rem esse nobis. Quae si se aurum Caelio commodasse non dicit, si venenum ab hoc sibi paratum esse non arguit, petulanter facimus, si matrem familias secus, quam matronarum sanctitas postulat, nominamus. Sin ista muliere remota nec crimen ullum nec opes ad oppugnandum Caelium illis relinquuntur, quid est aliud quod nos patroni facere debeat, nisi ut eos, qui insectantur repellamus? Quod quidem facerem vehementius, nisi intercederent mihi inimicitiae cum istius mulieris viro—fratrem volui dicere; semper hic erro. Nunc agam modice nec longius progrediar quam mea fides et causa ipsa coget. Neque enim muliebris umquam inimicitias mihi gerendas putavi, praesertim cum ea quam omnes semper amicam omnium potius quamquisquam inimicam putaverunt.

Sed tamen ex ipsa queraem prius utrum me secum severe et graviter et prisce agere malit, an remisse et leniter et urbane. Si illo austeri more ac modo, aliquis mihi ab inferis excitandus est ex barbatis illis non hac barbula, qua ista delectatur, sed illa horrida, quam in statuis antiquis atque imaginibus videmus, qui obiurget mulierem et qui pro me loquatur, ne mihi ista forte suscenseat. Exsistat igitur ex hac ipsa familia aliquis ac potissimum Caecus ille; minimum enim dolorem capiet, qui istam non videbit.

Qui profecto, si exstiterit, sic agat ac sic loquetur: “Mulier, quid tibi cum Caelio, quid cum homineualescentulo, quid cum alieno? Cur aut tam familiaris fuisti ut aurum
commodares, aut tam inimica, ut venenum timeres? Non patrem tuum videras, non patruum, non avum, non proavum, non abavum, non atavum audieras consules fuisse; non denique modo te Q. Metelli matrimonium tenuisse sciebas, clarissimi ac fortissimi viri patriaæque amantissimi, qui simul ac pedem limine extulerat, omnis prope civis virtute, gloria, dignitate superabat? Cum ex amplissimo genere in familiam clarissimam nupsisses, cur tibi Cælius tam coniunctus fuit? Cognatus, adfinis, viri tui familiaris? Nihil eorum. Quid igitur fuit nisi quaedam temeritas ac libido? Nonne te, si nostræ imaginis viriles non commovebant, ne progenies quidem mea, Q. illæ Claudia, aemulam domesticæ laudæ in gloria muliebri esse admonebat, non virgo illæ Vestalæ Claudia, quæ patrem complexa triumphantem ab inimico tribuno plebei de curru detrahæ passa non est? Cur te fraterna vitia potius quam bona paterna et avita et usque a nobis cum in viris tum etiam in feminis repetita moverunt? Ideone ego pacem Pyrrhi diremi, ut tu amorum turpissimorum cotidie foedera ferires, ideo aquam adduxi, ut ea tu inceste uterere, ideo viam munivi, ut eam tu alienis viris comitata celebræs?“

Sed quid ego, iudices, ita gravem personam induxi, ut Verear, ne se idem Appius repente convertat et Cælius incipiæt accusare illæ suæ gravitatem censoria? Sed videro hoc posterius atque ita, iudices, ut vel severissimis disceptatoribus M. Cæli vitam me probaturæ esse confidam. Tu vero, mulier, (iam enim ipse tecum nulla persona introductæ loquor) si ea, quæ facis, quæ dicis, quæ insimulas, quæ moliris, quæ arguis, probare cogitas, rationem tantæ familiaritatis, tantæ consuetudinis, tantæ coniunctionis reddas atque exponas necesse est. Accusatores quidem libidines, amores, adulteria, Baias, actas, convivia, comissationes, cantus, symphonias, navigia iactant, idemque significant nihil se te invita dicere. Quæ tu quoniam mente nescio qua effrenata atque praecipiæ in forum deferi iudiciumque voluisti, aut diluas oportet ac falsa esse doceas aut nihil neque crimini tuo neque testimonio credendum esse fateare.

Sin autem urbaniæ me agere mavis, sic agam tecum; removebo illum senem durum ac paene agrestem; ex his igitur sumam aliquem ac potissimum minimum fratrem qui est in isto genere urbanissimus; qui te amat plurimum, qui propter nescio quam, credo, timiditatem et nocturnos quosdam inanes metus tecum semper pusio cum maiore sorore cubitavit. Eum putato tecum loqui: “Quid tumultuaris, soror? quid insanis?"
Quid clamorem exorsa verbis parvam rem magnam facis? Vicinum adolescetulum aspexisti; candor huius te et proceritas, vultus oculique pepulerunt; saepius videre voluisisti; fuisti non numquam in isdem hortis; vis nobilis mulier illum filium familias patre parco ac tenaci habere tuis copiis devinctum; non potes; calcitrat, respuit, repellit, non putat tua dona esse tanti; confer te alio. Habes hortos ad Tiberim ac diligenter eo loco paratos, quo omnis iuventus natandi causa venit; hinc licet condiciones cotidie legas; cur huic, qui te spernit, molesta es?"

Redeo nunc ad te, Caeli, vicissim ac mihi auctoritatem patriam severitatemque suscipio. Sed dubito, quem patrem potissimum sumam, Caecilianumne aliquem vehementem atque durum:

Nunc enim demum mi animus ardet, nunc meum cor cumulatur ira aut illum:

O infelix, o sceleste!

Ferrei sunt isti patres:

Egon quid dicam, quid velim? quae tu omnia
Tuis foedis factis facis ut nequiquam velim,
vix ferendi. Diceret talis pater: "Cur te in istam vicinitatem meretriciam contulisti? cur inleccebris cognitis non refugisti?

Cur alienam ullam mulierem nosti? Dide ac dissicce;
Per me tibi licet. Si egebis, tibi dolebit, non mihi.
Mihi sat est qui aetatis quod reliquum est oblectem meae."

Huic tristi ac directo seni responderet Caelius se nulla cupiditate inductum de via decessisse. Quid signi? Nulli sumptus, nulla iactura, nulla versura. At fuit fama. Quotos quisque istam effugere potest, in tam maledica civitate? Vicinum eius mulieris miraris male audisse, cuius frater germanus sermones iniquorum effugere non potuit? Leni vero et clementi patre, cuius modi ille est:

Fores ecfregit, restituentur; discidit
Vestem, resarcietur,

Caeli causa est expeditissima. Quid enim esset, in quo se non facile defenderet? Nihil iam in istam mulierem dico; sed, si esset aliqua dissimilis istius, quae se omnibus pervolgaret, quae haberet palam decretum semper aliquem, cuius in hortos, domum, Baias iure suo libidines omnium commearent, quae etiam aleret adolescentes et parsimoniam patrum suis sumptibus sustentaret; si vidua libere, proterva petulanter,
dives effuse, libidinosa meretricio more viveret, adulterum ego putarem, si quis hanc paulo liberius salutasset?

26.62
Quae quidem omnia, iudices, perfacilem rationem habent reprendendi. Cur enim potissimum balneas publicas constituerat? In quibus non invenio quae latebra togatis hominibus esse posset. Nam si essent in vestibulo balnearum, non laterent; sin se in intimum conicere vellent, nec satis commode calceati et vestiti id facere possent et fortasse non recipierentur, nisi forte mulier potens quadrantaria illa permutatione familiaris facta erat balneatori.

LESBIA
Catul.

11
Furi et Aureli, comites Catulli,
sive in extremos penetrabit Indos,
litus ut longe resonante Eoa
tunditur unda,
sive in Hyrcanos Arabasve molles,
seu Sacas sagittiferosque Parthos,
sive quae septemgeminus colorat
aequora Nilus,
sive trans altas gradetur Alpes
Caesaris visens monimenta magni,
Gallicum Rhenum, † horribilesque † ultimosque Britannos,
omnia haec, quaecumque feret voluntas
caelitum, temptare simul parati,
pauca nuntiate meae puellae
non bona dicta.
cum suis vivat valeatque moechis,
quos simul complexa tenet trecentos,
nullum amans vere, sed identidem omnium
ilia rumpens:
nec meum respectet, ut ante, amorem,
qui illius culpa cecidit velut prati
ultimi flos, praetereunte postquam
tactus aratrost.

37
Salax taberna vosque contubernales,
a pilleatis nona fratribus pila,
solis putatis esse mentulas vobis,
solis licere, quidquid est puellarum,
confutuere et putare ceteros hircos?
an, continenter quod sedetis insulsi
centum an ducenti, non putatis ausurum
me una ducentos irrumare sessores?
atqui putate: namque totius vobis
frontem tabernae scorpionibus scribam.
puella nam mi, quae meo sinu fugit,
amata tantum quantum amabitur nulla,
pro qua mihi sunt magna bella pugnata,
consedit istic. hanc boni beatique
omnes amatis, et quidem, quod indignumst,
omnes pusilli et semitarii moechi;
tu praeter omnes une de capillatis,
cuniculosae Celtiberiae fili
Egnati, opaca quem bonum facit barba
et dens Hibera defricatus urina.

58
Caeli, Lesbia nostra, Lesbia illa,
illa Lesbia, quam Catullus unam
plus quam se atque suos amavit omnes,
nunc in quadriviis et angiportis
SEMPONIA
Sall., Cat., 25
Sed in eis erat Sempronia, quae multa saepe virilis audaciae facinora commiserat. Haec mulier genere atque forma, praeterea viro atque liberis satis fortunata fuit; litteris Graecis et Latinis docta, psallere et saltare elegantius, quam necesse est probae, multa alia, quae instrumenta luxuriae sunt. Sed ei cariora semper omnia quam decus atque pudicitia fuit; pecuniae an famae minus parceret, haud facile discerneres; lubido sic accensa ut saepius peteret viros quam pateretur. Sed ea saepe antehac fidem prodiderat, creditum abiuraverat, caedis conscia fuerat, luxuria atque inopia praeceps abierat. Verum ingenium eius haud absurdum; posse versus facere, iocum movere, sermone uti vel modesto, vel molli, vel procaci; prorsus multae facetiae multusque lepos inerat.

FULVIA
Sall., Cat., 23.3
Sed in eaconiuratione fuit Q. Curius, natus haud obscuro loco, flagitiis atque facinoribus coopertus, quem censores senatu probri gratia moverant. Huic homini non minor vanitas inerat quam audacia; neque reticere, quae audierat, neque suamet ipse scelerar occultare; prorsus neque dicere neque facere quicquam pensi habebat. Erat ei cum Fulvia, muliere nobili, stupri vetus consuetudo; cui cum minus gratus esset, quia inopia minus largiri poterat, repente glorians maria montisque polliceri coepit et minari interdum ferro, ni sibi obnoxia foret; postremo ferocius agitare, quam solitus erat. At Fulvia insolentiae Curi causa cognita tale periculum re publicae haud occultum habuit, sed sublato auctore de Catilinae coniuratione, quae quoque modo audierat, compluribus narravit.
10.3
ἀπαλλαγεὶς γάρ ἐκείνου τοῦ βίου γάμῳ προσέσχε, Φουλβίαν ἀγαγόμενος τὴν Κλωδίαν τῷ δημαγωγῷ συνουκήσασαν, οὐ ταλασίαν οὐδὲ οἰκουρίαν φρονοῦν γύναιν, οὐδὲ ἀνδρὸς ἰδιωτὸν κρατεῖν ἄξιον, ἀλλὰ ἄρχοντος ἄρχειν καὶ στρατηγοῦντος στρατηγεῖν βουλόμενον, ὡστε Κλεοπάτραν διδασκάλως Φουλβία τῆς Αντωνίου γυναικοκρατίας ὀφείλειν, πάνω χειροήθη καὶ πεπαιδαγωγημένον ἀπὸ ἄρχης ἀκροάσθαι γυναικῶν παραλαβοῦσαν αὐτὸν.
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Τοιαῦτα ληροῦντα καὶ μειρακειομένον τὸν Αντώνιον ἀγγελία δύο καταλαμβάνουσιν, ἢ μὲν ἀπὸ Ρώμης, Δεύκιον τὸν ἀδέλφον αὐτοῦ καὶ Φουλβίαν τὴν γυναίκα πρῶτον ἄλληλοις στασιάσαντας, εἶτα Καίσαρι πολεμίζοντας, ἀποβεβληκέναι τὰ πράγματα καὶ φεύγειν ἐξ Ἰταλίας, ἐτέρα δὲ ταύτης οὐδὲν ἐπικεστέρα, Λαβιῆν ἐπάγοντα Πάρθους τὴν ἄπ᾽ Εὐφράτου καὶ Συρίας ἀχρι Λυδίας καὶ Ἰωνίας Ἀσίαν καταστρέφεσθαι. μόλις οὖν ἡταν καὶ ἐπίστρατος, ἔλπιζον δὲ τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ πολέμοις ἐπέστρεψαν, Φουλβίας δὲ γράμματα θρήνων μεστὰ πεποίησαν εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν, ἄγων ναῖς διακοσίας. ἀναλαβὼν δὲ κατὰ πλοῦν τῶν φίλων τοὺς πεθανοῦσας ἐπυνθάνετο τοῦ πολέμου τὴν Φουλβίαν αἰτίαν γεγονέναι, φύσει μὲν οὖν πολυπράγμονα καὶ θρασεῖαν, ἐλπίζοντας δὲ τῇ Κλεοπάτρᾳ ἀπάξειν τὸν Αντώνιον εἰ τι γένοιτο κύνημα περὶ τὴν Ἰταλίαν. συμβαίνει δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς καὶ Φουλβίαν πλέουσαν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν Σικυώνι νόσῳ τελευτήσαι: διὸ καὶ μᾶλλον αἱ πρὸς Καίσαρα διαλαγάς καὶ ἐπιτελοῦσιν, ἐξαιρεῖτος καὶ ἴσης Ἰταλίας καὶ Καίσαρ ἠν ἐνεκαλεῖτο δὲ αὐτὸς τῷ παραδόν τῇ Φουλβίᾳ προστριβόμενος, οὐκ εἰὼν ἐξελέγχειν ὅτι πρόφασιν, ἀλλὰ διέλυον ἀμφιτέρους καὶ διηρύνειν τὴν ἔγκρησιν, ὅρον ποιούμενοι τὸν Ἰόνιον, καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐξαναλήμενος Αντωνίως, τὰ δὲ ἐσπέρια Καίσαρι, Λέπιδον δὲ Λιβύην ἔχειν
ἐὼντες, ὑπατεύειν δὲ τάξαντες, ὅτε μὴ δόξειν αὐτοῖς, φίλους ἑκατέρων παρὰ μέρος.

Mart., 11.20
Caesaris Augusti lascivos, livide, versus
sex lege, qui tristis verba Latina legis:
“Quod futuit Glaphyran Antonius, hanc mihi poenam
Fulvia constituit, se quoque uti futuam.
Fulviam ego ut futuam? quod si me Manius oret pedicem, faciam? non puto, si sapiam.
‘Aut futue, aut pugnemus’ ait. quid, quod mihi vita carior est ipsa mentula? signa canant!”
absolvis lepidos nimirum, Auguste, libellos, qui scis Romana simplicitate loqui.

Cass. Dio
47.8
Ἐκεῖνος μὲν οὖν πολλοὺς, ὅσους γε καὶ ἡδυνήθη, διεσώσατο· ὁ τε Λέπιδος τῷ τε ἀδελφῷ τῷ Παύλῳ ἔς Μήλην ἐκδράναι ἐπέτρεψε, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους οὐκ ἀπαραίτητος ἦν· ὁ δὲ Αντώνιος ὁμίως καὶ ἀνηλεώς οὐχ ὅτι τοὺς ἑκτεθέντας ἄλλα καὶ τοὺς ἑπικουρήσατο τινι αὐτῶν ἑπιχείρήσαντας ἐκτείνε. τάς τε κεφαλὰς σφων, εἰ καὶ σιτούμενος ἑπεσκόπει, καὶ ἐπὶ πλείστον τίς τε ἀνοσιώτάτης καὶ τῆς οἰκτροτάτης αὐτῶν ὦψεως ἑνεπίμπλατο. καὶ ἡ γε Φουλουία πολλοὺς καὶ αὐτὴ καὶ κατ᾽ ἐχθραν καὶ διὰ χρήματα, καὶ ἐστιν οὖς οὐδὲ γιγνωσκομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρός, ἑθανάτωσεν· ἐνὸς γοῦν τινως κεφαλὴν ἰδὼν εἶπεν ὅτι “τούτων οὐκ ἡπιστάμην.” ὥς δ᾽ οὖν καὶ ἡ τοῦ Κικέρωνος ποτε ἐκομίσθη σφίσι (φεύγων γὰρ καὶ καταληφθεὶς ἑσφάγη), ὁ μὲν Ἀντώνιος πολλὰ αὐτῷ καὶ δυσχερῇ ἐξονειδίσας ἐπειτ᾽ ἐκέλευσεν αὐτίνῃ ἐκφανέστερον τῶν ἄλλων ἐν τῷ βήματι προτεθῆναι, ἤν᾽ ὅθεν κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ δημηγορῶν ἤκουσετο, ἐνταῦθα μετὰ τῆς χειρὸς τῆς δεξιᾶς, ὡςπερ ἀπετέμητο, ὡρῶτο· ἢ δὲ δὴ Φουλουία ἐς τε τὰς χεῖρας αὐτίνη πρὶν ἀποκομισθῆναι ἐδέξατο, καὶ ἐμπικραναμένη οἱ καὶ ἐμπτύσασα ἐπὶ τε τὰ γόνατα
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ἐπέθηκε, καί τὸ στόμα αὐτῆς διανοίξασα τὴν τε γλώσσαν ἐξείλκυσε καὶ ταῖς βελόναις αῖς ἐς τὴν κεφαλὴν ἔχρητο κατεκέντησε, πολλὰ ἁμα καὶ μιαρὰ προσπεισκῶπτουσα. καὶ οὐτοὶ δʼ οὖν όμως ἔσωσάν τινας, παρ᾽ ὄν γε καὶ πλεῖω χρήματα ἔλαβον ἢ τελευτησάντων εὕρησεν ἠλπισαν· καὶ ἵνα γε μὴ κεναί αἰ ἐν τοῖς λευκώμασι χώρα τῶν ὁνομάτων αὐτῶν ὡσι, ἐτέρους ἀντενέγραφαν. πλὴν γε ὁτι τὸν θείον ὁ Ἀντώνιος, πολλὰ τῆς μητρός τῆς ἑαυτοῦ τῆς Ἰουλίας ἰκετευσάσης, ἀφήκεν, οὐδὲν ἀλλο χρηστὸν εἰργάσατο.

48.4
Τότε μὲν δὴ ταῦτ᾽ ἐγένετο, τῷ δὲ ἐχομένῳ ἔτει ὀνόματι μὲν ὁ τε Σερούλιος ὁ Πούπλιος καὶ ὁ Ἀντώνιος ὁ Λούκιος, ἔργῳ δὲ οὕτῳ τε καὶ ἡ Φουλουία ὑπάτευσαν· τοῦ τε γάρ Καίσαρος πενθερά καὶ τοῦ Ἀντωνίου γυνῆ ὀνύσα τὸν τε Λέπιδον ὑπὸ νωθείας παρ᾽ οὐδὲν ἤγε καὶ αὐτὴ τὰ πράγματα διεχείριζεν, ὥστε μήτε τὴν βουλὴν μήτε τὸν δῆμον ἀλλο τι παρὰ τὸ ἐκεῖνη δοκοῦν χρηματίζεν. τοῦ γοὺν Λούκιον αὐτοῦ σπουδάζοντος ἐπινίκα πινὺν ἐν ταῖς Ἀλπεσιν οἰκούντων, ὡς καὶ νικήσαντός σφας, πέμψαι, τέως μὲν ἡ Φουλουία ἀντέλεγεν, οὐδείς οἱ συνεχώρησεν, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐκεῖνη θεραπευθεῖσα ἐπέτρεψε, πάντες ἐψηφίσαντο, ὡστε τῷ μὲν λόγῳ τὸν Ἀντώνιον καθ᾽ ἁνπερ κεκρατηκέναι ἐλεγεν (οὕτε γὰρ ἐπραξὲ τι νικητηρίων ἄξιον, οὐθ᾽ ἄλος ἤγεμονιαν ἐν τοῖς χωρίοις ἑκεῖνας ἔσχε), τῇ δ᾽ ἀληθείᾳ τὴν Φουλουίαν ... καὶ πομπεύσα. πολὺ γοὺν πλεῖον ἐκεῖνον, ἄτε καὶ ἀληθέστερον, ἐσεμύνετο· τὸ γάρ δούναι τινὶ ἐξουσίαν τῆς τῶν νικητηρίων πέμψεως μείζον τοῦ διεορτάσα αὐτὰ παρ᾽ ἐτέρου λαβόντα ἦν. πλὴν γε ὅτι τὴν τε σκευὴν τὴν ἐπινίκιον ὁ Λούκιος ἐνεδύσατο καὶ τοῦ ἀρματος ἐπέβη, τά τε ἅλλα τὰ καθῆκοντα ἐπὶ τῶν τοιοῦτος ἐπραξεν, αὐτῇ ἦ Φουλουία τὴν πανήγυριν, ὑπηρέτη ἐκεῖνῳ χρωμένη, ποιεῖν ἐδοξε. ἥχηθε δὲ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τοῦ ἐτους ἡμέρᾳ. καὶ ἐπὶ τε τοῦτῳ ὁ Λούκιος ἐξ ἵσου | τῷ Μαρίῳ ἐσεμύνετο, ὅτι ἐν τῇ νουμηνίᾳ αὐτήν, ἐν ἡ ὑπαιτεύειν ἦρξετο, ἐπετέλεσε· καὶ προσέτε καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐκείνων ἡγάλλετο, λέγων αὐτὸς μὲν ἠθελοντῆς τά τε τῆς πομπῆς κοσμημάτα ἀποτεθείσθαι καὶ τὴν βουλῆν ἐν τῇ ἀγοράιῳ στολῇ ἡθρουκέναι, τὸν δὴ δὴ Ἁδριανὸν ἀκοντα αὐτὰ πεποιηκέναι.
προσετίθει τε ὑπὸ ἑκείνῳ μὲν ἢ τις ἡ οὐδεὶς στέφανος ἐδόθη, αὐτὸς δὲ ἄλλους τε καὶ παρὰ τοῦ δήμου κατὰ φυλῆν, ὁ μηδενὶ τῶν προτέρων ἐγεγόνει, διά τε τὴν Φουλουίαν καὶ διὰ τὰ χρῆματα ἀλάθρα τισὶν ἀνάλωσεν, ἔλαβεν.

48.10.3-4
 Ἑκείνῳ δὲ τούτοις ἐπαρόμενοι καὶ τοὺς στερομένους τῆς χώρας προσποιούμενοι, Λούκιος μὲν πανταχόσε συνιστά τε αὐτοὺς καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Καίσαρος ἀποσπᾶν περιήγη, Φουλουία δὲ τὸ τε Πραινέστε κατέλαβε καὶ προσεταιριστούς βουλευτάς τε καὶ ἵππας ἔχουσα τά τε ἅλλα πάντα μετ' αὐτῶν ἐβουλεύετο, καὶ τὰς παραγγέλσεις ὡς ἐκασταχόσε ἐχρη ἐπεμπε. καὶ τί ταῦτα θαυμάσειν ἂν τις, ὅποτε καὶ ξίφος παρεζώννυτο καὶ συνθῆμα τοῖς στρατιώταις ἐδίδου, ἐδημηγόρει τε ἐν αὐτοῖς πολλάκις; ὡστε καὶ ἑκείνα τῷ Καίσαρι προσίστασθαι.

App., BC, 5.6.59
 Αἱ τε στρατηγίδες αὐτοῦ τάξεις, ὡπο τής τῆς δόξης ἐπαρόμενας, προσπελάζον τῷ χάρακα τῷ Καίσαρος κατὰ μέρη καὶ τοὺς συνεστρατευμένους σφίσιν ἀνεκάλυπτον, οἱ μὲν τὴν ἀπόκλεισιν τοῦ Βρεντεσίου καὶ τὴν ἀφαίρεσιν τοῦ Καληνοῦ στρατοῦ, οἱ δὲ τὴν ἀποτέχισιν τοῦ Βρεντεσίου καὶ πολιορκίας καὶ τὴν τῆς Αὐσονίδος καταδρομῆν καὶ τὸ συνθέσθαι μὲν Ἀηνοβάρβῳ σφαγεῖ Γαῖοι Καίσαρος, συνθέσθαι δὲ Πομπηῖῳ κοινῷ πολεμιῷ καὶ τέλος οἱ τοῦ Καίσαρος τὴν γνώμην σφύν τοῖς ἐτέρως ἀνεκάλυπτον, ὁτι Καίσαρι συνέλθοιν οὐκ ἀμηνημονοῦντες Αντωνίου τῆς ἀρετῆς, ἀλλὰ διαλαγάς ἐπινοοῦντες ἀμφοτέρως ἢ Αντώνιον ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ πολεμοῦντα ἀμυνοῦμενοι. καὶ τάδε καὶ αὐτοὶ προσπελάζοντες τοῖς Αντωνίῳ χαρακώμασι προύλεγον.
 Βενομένων δὲ τούτων ἀγγέλλεται Φουλβία τεθνεῶσα, λεγομένη μὲν ἐπὶ ταῖς Αντωνίου μέμψειν ἀθυμήσαι καὶ ἓς τὴν νόσον ἐμπεσεῖν, νομίζομεν δὲ καὶ τὴν
νόσον ἐκούσα ἐπιτρίψαι διὰ τὴν ὀργὴν Ἀντωνίου· νοσοῦσάν τε γὰρ αὐτὴν ἀπολελοίπει καὶ οὐδὲ ἀπολείπων ἐωράκει. ἐδόκει δ᾽ ἀμφοτέροις ἐς πολλὰ συνοίσειν ὁ θάνατος, γυναῖοι φιλοπράγμονος ἀπηλλαγμένοις, ἢ διὰ τὸν Κλεοπάτρας ἵλιον ἐξερρίπτει τοσόνδε πόλεμον. τὸ γε μὴν πάθος ἀσθενῶς ἠνεγκεν ὁ Ἀντώνιος, ἱγούμενὸς τι καὶ αίτιος γεγονέναι.

**Vell. Pat., 2.74**


**CYNTHIA**

*Prop.*

1.2

*Quid iuvat ornato procedere, vita, capillo
   et tenuis Coa veste movere sinus,*

*aut quid Orontea crines perfundere murra,*

*teque peregrinis vendere muneribus,*

*naturaeque decus mercato perdere cultu,*

*nec sinere in propriis membra nitere bonis?*

*crede mihi, non ulla tuaest medicina figurae:
   nudus Amor formam non amat artificem.*
aspice quos summittat humus non fossa colores,
    ut veniant hederae sponte sua melius,
surgat et in solis formosior arbutus antris,
    et sciat indocilis currere lympha vias.
litora nativis praefulgent picta lapillis,
    et volucres nulla dulcius arte canunt.

non sic Leucippis succendit Castora Phoebe,
    Pollucem cultu non Haelia soror;
non, Idae et cupido quondam discordia Phoebo,
    Eueni patriis filia litoribus;
nec Phrygium falso traxit candore maritum
    aucta externis Hippodamia rotis:
sed facies aderat nullis obnoxia gemmis,
    qualis Apelleis est color in tabulis.
non illis studium vulgo conquirere amantes:
    illis ampla satis forma pudicitia.

non ego nunc vereor ne sis tibi vilior istis:
    uni si qua placet, culta puella sat est;
cum tibi praesertim Phoebus sua carmina donet
    Aoniamque libens Calliopea lyram,
    unica nec desit iucundis gratia verbis,
    omnia quaeque Venus, quaeque Minerva probat.
his tu semper eris nostrae gratissima vitae,
    taedia dum miserae sint tibi luxuriae.

1.11
Ecquid te mediis cessantem, Cynthia, Baiis,
    qua iacet Herculeis semita litoribus,
et modo Thesproti mirantem subdita regno
    proxima Misenis aequora nobilibus,
nostri cura subit memores adducere noctes?
ecquis in extremo restat amore locus?
an te nescio quis simulatis ignibus hostis
sustulit e nostris, Cynthia, carminibus,
ut solet amoto labi custode puella,
perfida communis nec meminisse deos?

atque utinam mage te remis confisa minutis
parvula Lucrina cumba moretur aqua,
aut teneat clausam tenui Teuthrantis in unda
alternae facilis cedere lympha manu,
quam vacet alterius blandos audire susurros
molliter in tacito litore compositam!
non quia perspecta non es mihi cognita fama,
sed quod in hac omnis parte timetur amor.
ignosces igitur, si quid tibi triste libelli
attulerint nostri: culpa timoris erit.

ah mihi non maior carae custodia matris
aut sine te vitae cura sit uilla meae!
tu mihi sola domus, tu, Cynthia, sola parentes,
omnia tu nostrae tempora laetitiae.
seu tristis veniam seu contra laetus amicis,
quicquid ero, dicam ’Cynthia causa fuit.’
tu modo quam primum corruptas desere Biaias:
multis ista dabunt litora discidium,
litora quae fuerunt castis inimica puellis:
ah pereant Biae, crimen amoris, aquae!

2.6
Non ita complebant Ephyraeae Laidos aedes,
ad cuius iacuit Graecia toea fores;
turba Menandreae fuerat nec Thaidos olim
tanta, in qua populus lusit Erichthonius;
nec quae deletas potuit cormponere Thebas,
Phryne tam multis facta beata viris.
quid etiam falsos fingis tibi saepe propinquos,
oscula nec desunt qui tibi iure ferant.

me iuvenum pictae facies, me nomina laedunt,
me tener in cunis et sine voce puer;
me laedet, si multa tibi dabat oscula mater,
me soror et cum quae dormit amica simul:
omnia me laedent: timidus sum (ignosce timori)
et miser in tunica suspicor esse virum.

his olim, ut famast, vitii ad proelia ventumst,
his Troiana vides funera principis;
hinc olim ignaros luctus populavit Achivos,
Atridae magno cum stetit alter amor;
aspera Centauros eadem dementia iussit
frangere in adversum pcula Pirithoum.

cur exempla petam Graïûm? tu criminis auctor,
nutritus duro, Romule, lacte lupae:
tu rapere intactas docuisti impune Sabinas:
per te nunc Romae quidlibet audet Amor.

felix Admeti coniunx et lectus Ulixis,
et quaecumque viri femina limen amat!
templa Pudicitiae quid opus statuisse puellis,
si cuivis nuptae quidlibet esse licet?

quae manus obscenas depinxit prima tabellas
et posuit casta turpia visa domo,
illa puellarum ingenuos corrupt ocellos
nequitiaeque suae noluit esse rudis.
a gemat in tenebris, ista qui protulit arte
turpia sub tacita condita laetitia!
non istis olim variabant tecta figuris:
tum paries nullo crimine pictus erat.

sed nunc immitterum velavit aranea fanum
et mala desertos occupat herba deos.
quos igitur tibi custodes, quae limina ponam,
quae numquam supra pes inimicus eat?
nam nihil invitae tristis custodia prodest:
quam peccare pudet, Cynthia, tuta sat est.

2.16
Praetor ab Illyricis venit modo, Cynthia, terris,
maxima praeda tibi, maxima cura mihi.
non potuit saxo vitam posuisse Cerauno?
a, Neptune, tibi qualia dona darem!
nunc sine me plena fiunt convivia mensa,
nunc sine me tota ianua nocte patet.
quare, si sapis, oblatas ne desere messes
et stolidum pleno vellere carpe pecus;
deinde, ubi consumpto restabit munere pauper,
dic alias iterum naviget Illyrias!
Cynthia non sequitur fascis nec curat honores,
semper amatorum ponderat una sinus;
semper in Oceanum mittit me quaerere gemmas,
et iubet ex ipsa tollere dona Tyro.

at tu nunc nostro, Venus, o succurre dolori,
rumpat ut assiduis membra libidinis!
ergo muneribus quivis mercatur amorem?
Iuppiter, indigna merce puella perit.
atque utinam Romae nemo esset dives, et ipse
straminea posset dux habitare casa!
numquam Venales essent ad munus amicae,
    atque una fieret cana puella domo;
numquam septenas noctes seiuncta cubares,
candida tam foedo brachchia fusa viro,
    non quia peccarim (testor te), sed quia vulgo
    formosis levitas semper amica fuit.

barbarus exutis agitat vestigia limbis
    et subito felix nunc mea regna tenet!
Nullane sedabit nostros iniuria fletus?
    an dolor hic vitiis nescit abesse tuis?
tot iam abiere dies, cum me nec cura theatri
    nec tetigit Campi, nec mea mensa iuvat.
at pudeat! certe pudeat, nisi forte, quod aiunt,
    turpis amor surdis auribus esse solet.
cerne ducem, modo qui fremitu complevit inani
    Actia damnatis aequora militibus:
hunc infamis arnor versis dare terga carinis
    iussit et extremo quae rere in orbe fugam.
Caesaris haec virtus et gloria Caesaris haec est:
    illa, qua vicit, condidit arma manu.

sed quascumque tibi vestis, quoscumque smaragdos,
    quasve dedit flavo lumine chrysolithos,
haec videam rapidas in vanum ferre procellas:
    quae tibi terra, velim, quae tibi fiat aqua.
aspice quid donis Eriphyla invenit amari,
    arserit et quantis nupta Creusa malis.
non semper placidus periuros ridet amantes
    Iuppiter et surda neglegit aure preces.
vidisti toto sonitus percurrere caelo,
    fulminaque aetheria desiluisse domo:
non haec Pleiades faciunt neque aquosus Orion,
    nec sic de nihilo fulminis ira cadit;
periurias tunc ille solet punire puellas,
    deceptus quoniam flevit et ipse deus.

quare ne tibi sit tanti Sidonia vestis,
    ut timeas, quotiens nubilus Auster erit.

3.13
Quaeritis, unde avidis nox sit pretiosa puellis,
    et Venere exhaustae damna querantur opes.
certa quidem tantis causa et manifesta ruinis:
    luxuriae nimium libera facta viast.
Inda cavis aurum mittit formica metallis,
    et venit e Rubro concha Erycina salo,
et Tyros ostrinos praebet Cadmea colores,
    cinnamon et multi pistor odoris Arabs.

haec etiam clausas expugnant arma pudicas
    quaeque gerunt fastus, Icarioti, tuos.
matrona incedit census induta nepotum
    et spolia opprobrii nostra per ora trahit.
nullast poscendi, nullast reverentia dandi,
    aut si quast, pretio tollitur ipsa mora.

felix Eois lex funeris una maritis,
    quos Aurora suis rubra colorat equis!
namque ubi mortifero iactast fax ultima lecto,
    uxorum fuis stat pia turba comis,
et certamen habent leti, quae viva sequatur
    coniugium: pudor est non licuisse mori.
ardent victrices et flammae pectora praebent,
    imponuntque suis ora perusta viris.
hoc genus invidum nuptarum, hic nulla puella
   nec fida Euadne nec pia Penelope.

felix agrestum quondam pacata iuventus,
   divitiae quorum messis et arbor erant!
illis munus erat decussa Cydonia ramo,
   et dare puniceis plena canistra rubis,
nunc violas tondere manu, nunc mixta referre
   lilia vimineos lucida per calathos,
et portare suis vestitas frondibus uvas
   aut variam plumae versicoloris avem.

his tum blanditiis furtiva per antra puellae
   oscula silvicolis empta dedere viris.
hinnulei pellis stratos operibat amantes,
   altaque nativo creverat herba toro,
pinus et incumbens laetas circumdabat umbras;
   nec fuerat nudas poena videre deas.

corniger Arcadii vacuam pastoris in aulam
   dux aries saturas ipse reduxit oves;
dique deaeque omnes, quibus est tutela per agros,
   praebebant vestri verba benigna foci:
‘et leporem, quicumque venis, venaberis, hospes,
   et si forte meo tramite quaeris avem:
et me Pana tibi comitem de rupe vocato,
   sive petes calamo praemia, sive cane.’

at nunc desertis cessant sacraria lucis:
   aurum omnes victa iam pietate colunt.
auro pulsa fides, auro venalia iura,
   aurum lex sequitur, mox sine lege pudor.
torrida sacrilegum testantur limina Brennum,

dum petit intonsi Pythia regna dei:
at mox laurigero concussus vertice diras
    Gallica Parnasus sparsit in arma nives.
te scelus accepto Thracis Polymestoris auro
    nutrit in hospitio non, Polydore, pio.
tu quoque ut auratos gereres, Eriphyla, lacertos,
    delapsis nusquamst Amphiaraüs equis.

proloquar (atque utinam patriae sim verus haruspex!):
    frangitur ipsa suis Roma superba bonis.
certa loquor, sed nulla fides; neque vilia quondam
    verax Pergameis maenas habenda mali:
sola Parim Phrygiae fatum componere, sola
    fallacem Troiae serpere dixit equum.
ille furor patriae fuit utilis, ille parenti:
    expertast veros irrita lingua deos.

3.19
Obicitur totiens a te mihi nostra libido:
    crede mihi, vobis imperat ista magis.
vos, ubi contempti rupistis frena pudoris,
    nescitis captae mentis habere modum.

flamma per incensas citius sedetur aristas,
    fluminaque ad fontis sint reditura caput,
et placidum Syrtes portum et bona litora nautis
    praebat hospitio saeva Malea suo,
quam possit vestros quisquam reprehendere cursus
    et rabidae stimulos frangere nequitiae.

testis, Cretaei fastus quae passa iuvenci
    induit abiegnae cornua falsa bovis;
testis Thessalico flagrans Salmonis Enipeo, 
quae voluit liquido tota subire deo. 
crimen et illa fuit, patria succensa senecta 
    arboris in frondes condita Myrrha novae.

nam quid Medeae referam, quo tempore matris 
    iram natorum caede piavit amor? 
quidve Clytaemestrae, propter quam tota Mycenis 
    infamis stupro stat Pelopea domus? 
toque, o, Minoa venumdata, Scylla, figura 
    tondes purpurea regna paterna coma.

hanc igitur dotem virgo desponderat hosti! 
    Nise, tuas portas fraude reclusit amor. 
at vos, innuptae, felicius urite taedas: 
    pendet Cretaea tracta puella rate. 
non tamen immerito Minos sedet arbiter Orci: 
    victor erat quamvis, aequus in hoste fuit.

LIVIA

Vell. Pat.

2.75

Per eadem tempora exarserat in Campania bellum, quod professus eorum, qui 
    perdiderant agros, patrocinium ciebat T. Claudius Nero praetorius et pontifex, Ti. 
    Caesaris pater, magni vir animi doctissimique et ingenii. Id quoque adventu Caesaris 
    sepultum atque discussum est. Quis fortunae mutationes, quis dubios rerum 
    humanarum casus satis mirari queat? Quis non diversa praesentibus contrariaque 
    expectatis aut speret aut timeat? Livia, nobilissimi et fortissimi viri Drusi Claudiani 
    filia, genere, probitate, forma Romanarum eminentissima, quam postea coniugem 
    Augusti vidimus, quam transgressi ad deos sacerdotem ac filiam, tum fugiens mox 
    futuri sui Caesaris arma ac manus bimum hunc Tiberium Caesarem, vindicem 
    Romani imperii futurumque eiusdem Caesaris filium, gestans sinu, per avia itinerum
vitatis militum gladiis uno comitante, quo facilius occultaretur fuga, pervenit ad mare et cum viro Nerone pervecta in Siciliam est.

2.130.5
Cuius temporis aegritudinem auxit amissa mater, eminentissima et per omnia dei quam hominibus similior femina, cuius potentiam nemo sensit nisi aut levatione periculi aut accessione dignitatis.

Tac., Ann.

1.3
Ceterum Augustus subsidia dominationi Claudium Marcellum sororis filium admodum adultscentem pontificatu et curuli aedilitate, M. Agrippam, ignobilem loco, bonum militia et victoriae socium, geminatis consulatibus extulit, mox defuncto Marcello generum sumpsit; Tiberium Neronem et Claudium Drusum privignos imperatoriiis nominibus auxit, integra etiam tum domo sua. Nam genitos Agrippa Gaium ac Lucium in familiam Caesarum induxerat, necdum posita puerili praetexta principes iuventutis appellari, destinari consules specie recusantis flagrantissime cupiverat. Ut Agrippa vita concessit, Lucium Caesarem euntem ad Hispaniensis exercitus, Gaium remeantem Armenia et vulnere invalidum mors fato propera vel novercae Liviae dolus abstulit, Drusoque pridem extincto Nero solus e privignis erat, illuc cuncta vergere: filius, collega imperii, consors tribuniciae potestatis adsumitur omnisque per exercitus ostentatur, non obscuris, ut antea, matris artibus, sed palam hortatu. Nam senem Augustum devinxerat adeo, uti nepotem unicum, Agrippam Postumum, in insulam Planasiam proiecerit, rudem sane bonarum artium et robore corporis stolide ferocem, nullius tamen flagitii conpertum. At hercule Germanicum Druso ortum octo apud Rhenum legionibus ipsos adscirique per adoptionem a Tiberio iussit, quamquam esset in domo Tiberii filius iuvenis, sed quo pluribus munimentis insisteret. Bellum ea tempestate nullum nisi adversus Germanos supererat, abolendae magis infamiae ob amissum cum Quintilio Varo exercitum quam cupidine proferendi imperii aut dignum ob praemium. Domi res tranquillae, eadem magistratuum vocabula; iuniores post Actiacam victoriam, etiam senes plerique inter bella civium nati: quotus quisque reliquis qui rem publicam vidisset?
1.5

Haec atque talia agitantibus gravescere valetudo Augusti, et quidam scelus uxoris suspectabant. Quippe rumor incesserat paucos ante mensis Augustum, electis consciis et comite uno Fabio Maximo, Planasiam vectum ad visendum Agrippam; multas illic utrimque lacrimas et signa caritatis spemque ex eo fore ut iuvenis penatibus avi redderetur: quod Maximum uxori Marciae aperuisse, illam Liviae. Gnarum id Caesari; neque multo post extincto Maximo, dubium an quaesita morte, auditos in funere eius Marciae gemitus semet incusantis quod causa exitii marito fuisset. Utcumque se eae res habuit, vixdum ingressus Illyricum Tiberius properis matris litteris accitur; neque satis conpertum est spirantem adhuc Augustum apud urbem Nolam an examinem reppererit. Acribus namque custodis domum et vias saepserat Livia, laetique interdum nuntii vulgabantur, donec provisis quae tempus monebat simul excessisse Augustum et rerum potiri Neronem fama eadem tulit.

1.6

Primum facinus novi principatus fuit Postumi Agrippae caedes, quem ignorant inermumque quamvis firmatus animo centurio aegre confecit. Nihil de ea re Tiberius apud senatum disseruit: patris iussa simulabat, quibus praescripsisset tribuno custodiae adposito ne cunctaretur Agrippam morte adficere quandoque ipse supremum diem explevisset. Multa sine dubio saevaque Augustus de moribus adulescentis questus, ut exilium eius senatus consulto sanciretur perfecerat; ceterum in nullius umquam suorum necem duravit, neque mortem nepoti pro securitate privigni inlatam credibile erat. Propius vero Tiberium ac Liviam, illum metu, hanc novercalibus odiis, suspecti et invisi iuvenis caedem festinavisse. Nuntianti centurioni, ut mos militiae, factum esse quod imperasset, neque imperasse sese et rationem facti reddendam apud senatum respondit. Quod postquam Sallustius Crispus particeps secretorum (is ad tribunum miserat codicillos) comperit, metuens ne reus subderetur, iuxta periculooso ficit suo vera promeret monuit Liviam ne arcana domus, ne consilia amicorum, ministeria militum vulgarentur, neve Tiberius vim principatus resolveret cuncta ad senatum vocando: eam condicionem esse imperandi ut non aliter ratio constet quam si uni reddatur.
1.10

Dicebatur contra: pietatem erga parentem et tempora rei publicae obtentui sumpta; ceterum cupidine dominandi concitos per largitionem veteranos, paratum ab adulescente privato exercitum, corruptas consulis legiones, simulatam Pompeianarum gratiam partium; mox ubi decreto patrum fascis et ius praetoris invaserit, caesis Hirtio et Pansa, sive hostis illos, seu Pansam venenum vulneri adfusum, sui milites Hirtium et machinator doli Caesar abstu- lerat, utriusque copias occupavisse; extortum invito senatu consulatum, armaque quae in Antonium acceperit contra rem publicam versa; proscriptionem civium, divisiones agrorum ne ipsis quidem qui fecere laudatas. Sane Cassii et Brutorum exitus paternis inimicitiis datos, quamquam fas sit privata odia publicis utilitatis remittere: sed Pompeium imagine pacis, sed Lepidum specie amicitiae deceptos; post Antonium, Tarentino Brundisinoque foedere et nuptii sororis inlectum, subdolae adfinitatis poenas morte exsolvisse. Pacem sine dubio post haec, verum cruentam: Lollianas Varianasque cladis, interfectos Romae Varrones, Egnatios, Iullos. Nec domesticis abstinebatur: abducta Neroni uxor et consulti per ludibrium pontifices an concepto necdum edito partu rite nuberet; Vedii Pollionis luxus; postremo Livia gravis in rem publicam mater, gravis domui Caesarum noverca. Nihil deorum honoribus relictum cum se templis et effigie numinum per flamines et sacerdotes coli vellet. Ne Tiberium quidem caritate aut rei publicae cura successorem adscitum, sed, quoniam adrogantiam saevitiamque eius introspexerit, comparatione deterrima sibi gloriam quaesivisse. Etenim Augustus paucis ante annis, cum Tiberio tribuniciam potestatem a patribus rursum postularet, quamquam honora oratione, quaedam de habitu cultuque et institutis eius iecerat quae velut excusando exprobraret. Ceterum sepultura more perfecta templum et caelestes religiones dcernuntur.

1.14

Multa patrum et in Augustam adulation: alii parentem, alii matrem patriae appellandam, plerique ut nomini Caesaris adscriberetur “Iuliae filius” censebant. Ille moderandos feminarum honores dictitans eademque se temperantia usurum in iis quae sibi tribuerentur, ceterum anxius invidia et muliebre fastigium in deminutionem sui accipiens ne lictorem quidem ei decerni passus est, aramque adoptionis et alia huiusce modi prohibuit. At Germanico Caesari proconsulare imperium petivit,
missique legati qui deferrent, simul maestitiam eius ob excessum Augusti solarentur. Quo minus idem pro Druso postularetur, ea causa quod designatus consul Drusus praesensque erat. Candidatos praeturae duodecim nominavit, numerum ab Augusto traditum; et hortante senatu ut augeret, iure iurando obstrinxit se non excessurum.

4.57
Inter quae diu meditato prolatoque saepius consilio tandem Caesar in Campaniam specie dedicandi templae apud Capuam Iovi, apud Nolam Augusto, sed certus procul urbe degere. Causam abscessus quamquam secutus plurimos auctorum ad Seiani artes rettuli, quia tamen caede eius patrata sex postea annos pari secreto coniunxit, plerumque permoveor num ad ipsum referri verius sit, saevitiam ac libidinem cum factis promeret, locis occultantem. Erant qui crederent in senectute corporis quoque habitum pudori fuisse: quippe illi praegracilis et incurva proceritas, nudus capillo vertex, ulcerosa facies ac plerumque medicaminibus interstincta; et Rhodi secreto vitare coetus, recondere voluptates insuerat. Traditur etiam matris impotentia extrusum quam dominationis sociam aspernabatur neque depellere poterat, cum dominationem ipsam donum eius accepisset. Nam dubitaverat Augustus Germanicum, sororis nepotem et cunctis laudatum, rei Romanae imponere, sed precibus uxoris evictus Tiberio Germanicum, sibi Tiberium adscivit. Idque Augusta exprobrabat, reposcebat.

5.1
Rubellio et Fufio consulibus, quorum utrique Geminus cognomentum erat, Iulia Augusta mortem obiit, aetate extrema, nobilitatis per Claudiam familiam et adoptione Liviorum Iuliorumque clarissimae. Primum ei matrimonium et liberi fuere cum Tiberio Nerone, qui bello Perusino profugus pace inter Sex. Pompeium ac triumviros pacta in urbem reedit. Exim Caesar cupidine formae aufert marito, incertum an invitam, adeo properus ut ne spatio quidem ad enitendum dato penatibus suis gravidam induxerit. Nullam posthac subolem edidit sed sanguini Augusti per coniunctionem Agrippinae et Germanici adnexa communis pronepotes habuit. Sanctitate domus priscum ad morem, comis ultra quam antiquis feminis probatum, mater impotens, uxor facilis et cum artibus mariti, simulatione filii bene
composita. Funus eius modicum, testamentum diu inritum fuit. Laudata est pro rostris a G. Caesare pronepote qui mox rerum potitus est.

Cass. Dio

53.33.4

αιτίαν μὲν οὖν ἡ Λιούια τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ Μαρκέλλου ἔσχεν, ὅτι τῶν υἱῶν αὐτῆς προετετήμητο: ἐς ἀμφίβολον δ` οὖν ἡ υποψία αὐτή καὶ ὑπ` ἐκεῖνου τοῦ ἔτους καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἑπείτα, οὕτω νοσωδῶν γενομένων 3 ὡστε πάνυ πολλοὺς ἐν αὐτοῖς

56.30

ὁ δ` οὖν Ἀὔγουστος νοσήσας μετῆλλαξε: καὶ τινα υποψίαν τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ η Λιούια ἔλαβεν, ἐπειδή πρὸς τὸν Ἀγρίππαν κρύφα ἐς τὴν νήσου διέπλευσε καὶ ἐδάκνει οἱ καὶ παντάπασι καταλαγήσεθαι. δείσασα γάρ, ὡς φασί, μὴ καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ μοναρχίᾳ αὐτὸν καταγάγῃ, σφηκά τινα ἐπὶ δένδροις ἐτ` ἐπόντα, ἄφον ὁ Άὔγουστος αὐτοχειρί συκάζει οὐκ ἐποίησε, διὰ τῶν Λιουίᾳ θανάτου ἐσχεν, ὃτι τῶν Αὐτοχειρίς συκάζειν ἐἰ οὐκ ἐποίησε, καὶ ἀλλὸς ἀρρωστήσας τοὺς τε ἐταίρους συνεκάλεσε, καὶ εἰπὼν αὐτοῖς ὡς ἐχρῆσθε, τέλος ἔφη ὅτι ἡ τοῦ Ῥώμης γηίνην παραλάβων λιθίνην ὑμῖν καταλείψω. τούτῳ μὲν οὖν ὑπὸ τοῦ οἰκοδομημάτων αὐτῆς ἀκριβές ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ τῆς ἀρχής ἱσχυρὸν ἐνεδείξατο· κρότον δὲ δὴ τίνα παρ` αὐτῶν ὁμοίως τοῖς γελωτοποιοῖς, ὡς καὶ ἐπὶ μίμου τινὸς τελευτή, αἰτήσας καὶ πάμπαν πάντα τὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίον διέσκωψε. καὶ ό μὲν οὖν τῇ ἐννεακαίδεκάτῃ τοῦ Αὔγουστου, ἐν η` ποτὲ τὸ πρῶτον ὑπάτευσε, μετῆλλαξε, ἱσχας μὲν πέντε καὶ ἐβδομάκοντα ἐτῆ καὶ μήνας δέκα καὶ ἡμέρας ἐξ καὶ εἰκοσι´ τῇ γάρ τρίτῃ καὶ εἰκοστῇ τοῦ Σεπτεμβρίου ἐγεγέννητο, μοναρχίας δὲ, ἄφο` οὐ πρὸς τῷ Ἀκτίῳ ἐνίκησε, τέσσαρα καὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἐτῆ, δεκατριῶν ἡμερῶν.

57.12.4

ὀθεν ἀλλα τε ἐξω τοῦ νεομισμένου ἐσεφέρετο, καὶ πολλοὶ μὲν μητέρα αὐτήν τῆς πατρίδος πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ γονέα προσαγορεύεσθαι γνώμην ἐδωκαν. ἀλλοί καὶ τὸν
Τιβέριον ἀπ’ αὐτῆς ἐπικαλεῖσθαι ἐσηγήσαντο, ὡσεὶ ἄσπερ οἱ Ἑλληνες πατρόθεν, οὕτω καὶ ἐκείνος μητρόθεν ὀνομάζηται.

Suet., Aug., 97.3

*Tiberium igitur in Illyricum dimissurus et Beneventum usque prosecuturus, cum interpellatores alii atque aliis causis in iure dicendo detinerent, exclamavit, quod et ipsum mox inter omina relatum est: non, si omnia morarentur, amplius se posthac Romae futurum; atque itinere incohato Asturam perrexit et inde praeter consuetudinem de nocte ad occasionem auroae evectus causam valitudinis contraxit ex profuvio alvi.*

Suet., Tib., 50.3

*quare non “parentem patriae” appellari, non ullum insignem honorem recipere publice passus est; sed et frequenter admonuit, maioribus nec feminae convenientibus negotiis abstineret, praecipue ut animadvertit incendio iuxta aedem Vestae et ipsam intervenisse populumque et milites, quo enixius opem ferrent, adhortatam, sicut sub marito solita esset.*

Ov., Pont., 3.1.113-118

*morte nihil opus est, nihil Icariotide tela.*

*Caesaris est coniunx ore precanda tuo,*

*quaes praestat virtute sua, ne prisca vetustas laude pudicitiae saecula nostra premat:* 

*quaes Veneris formam, mores Iunonis habendo sola est caelesti digna reperta toro.*

Sulpicia

*Sulpicia*  

3.13

*Tandem venit amor, qualem texisse pudori quam nudasse alicui sit mihi, Fama, magis.*

*exorata meis illum Cytherea Camenis*
attulit in nostrum deposuitque sinum.
exsoluit promissa Venus: mea gaudia narret,
dicetur si quis non habuisse sua.
non ego signatis quicquam mandare tabellis,
me legat ut nemo quam meus ante, velim,
sed peccasse iuvat, vultus componere famae
taedet: cum digno digna fuisse ferar.

3.14
Invisus natalis adest, qui rure molesto
et sine Cerintho tristis agendus erit.
dulciur urbe quid est? an villa sit apta puellae
atque Arretino frigidus amnis agro?
iam nimium Messalla mei studiose, quiescas:
non tempestivae saepe, propinque, viae.
hic animum sensusque meos abducta relinquo,
arbitrio quam vis non sinis esse meo.

3.15
Scis iter ex animo sublatum triste puellae?
natali Romae iam licet esse suo.
omnibus ille dies nobis natalis agatur,
qui nec opinanti nunc tibi forte venit.

3.16
Gratum est, securus multum quod iam tibi de me
permittis, subito ne male inepta cadam.
sit tibi cura togae potior pressumque quasillo
scortum quam Servi filia Sulpicia:
solliciti sunt pro nobis, quibus illa doloris
ne cedam ignoto maxima causa toro.
3.17
Estne tibi, Cerinthe, tuae pia cura puellae,
quod mea nunc vexat corpora fessa calor?
a ego non aliter tristes evincere morbos
optarim, quam te si quoque velle putem.
at mihi quid prosit morbos evincere, si tu
nostra potes lento pectore ferre mala?

3.18
Ne tibi sim, mea lux, aeque iam fervida cura
ac videor paucos ante fuisse dies,
si quicquam tota commisi stulta iuventa
   cuius me fatear paenituisse magis,
hesterna quam te solum quod nocte reliqui,
   ardorem cupiens dissimulare meum.

Mart.
10.35
Omnes Sulpiciam legant puellae
uni quae cupiunt viro placere;
omnes Sulpiciam legant mariti,
uni qui cupiunt placere nuptae.
non haec Colchidos adserit furorem,
diri prandia nec refert Thyestae;
Scyllam, Byblida nec fuisset credit:
sed castos docet et probos amores,
lusus, delicias facetiasque.
cuius carmina qui bene aestimarit,
nullam dixerit esse nequiorum,
nullam dixerit esse sanctiorem.
tales Egeriae iocos fuisset
udo crediderim Numae sub antro.
hac condiscipula vel hac magistra
esses doctior et pudica, Sappho:
sed tecum pariter simulque visam
durus Sulpiciam Phaon amaret.
frustra: namque ea nec Tonantis uxor
nec Bacchi nec Apollinis puella
erepto sibi viveret Caleno.

10.38
O molles tibi quindecim, Calene,
quos cum Sulpicia tua iugales
indulsit deus et peregit annos!
o nox omnis et hora, quae notata est
caris litoris Indici lapillis!
o quae proelia, quas utrimque pugnas
felix lectulus et lucerna vidit
nimbis ebra Nicerotianis!
vixisti tribus, o Calene, lustris:
aetas haec tibi tota conputatur
et solos numeras dies mariti.
ex illis tibi si diu rogatam
lucem redderet Atropos vel unam,
malles, quam Pyliam quater senectam.

JULIA
Sen., Ben., 6.32.1
Divus Augustus filiam ultra impudicitiae maledictum inpudicam relegavit et flagitia
principalis domus in publicum emisit: admissos gregatum adulteros, pererratam
nocturnis comissionibus civitatem, forum ipsum ac rostra, ex quibus pater legem de
adulteris tulerat, filiae in stupra placuisse, cottidianum ad Marsyam concursum, cum
ex adultera in quaestuariam versa ius omnis licentiae sub ignoto adultero peteret.
Suet., Aug., 65

Sed laetum eum atque fidentem et subole et disciplina domus Fortuna destituit. Iulias, filiam et neptem, omnibus probris contaminatas relegavit; C. et L. in duodeviginti mensium spatio amitis ambos, Gaio in Lycia, Lucio Massiliae defunctis. Tertium nepotem Agrippam simulque privignum Tiberium adoptavit in foro lege curiata; ex quibus Agrippam brevi ob ingenium sordidum ac ferox abdicavit seposuitque Surrentum.

Aliquanto autem patientius mortem quam dedecora suorum tuit. Nam C. Lucique casu non adeo fractus, de filia absens ac libello per quaestorem recitato notum senatui fecit abstainitque congressu hominin diu prae pudore, etiam de necanda deliberavit. Certe cum sub idem tempus una ex consciis liberta Phoebe suspendio vitam finisset, maluisse se ait Phoebes patrem fuisse. Relegatae usum vini omnemque delicatiorem cultum ademit neque adiri a quoquam libero servoque nisi se consulto permisit, et ita ut certior fieret, qua is aetate, qua statura, quo colore esset, etiam quibus corporis notis vel cicatricibus. Post quinquennium demum ex insula in continentem lenioribusque paulo condicionibus transtulit eam. Nam ut omnino revocaret, exorari nullo modo potuit, deprecanti saepe p. R. et pertinacius instanti tales filias talesque coniuges pro contione inprecatus. Ex nepte Iulia post damnationem editum infantem adgnosci alique vetuit. Agrippam nihilo tractabiliorem, immo in dies amentiorem, in insulam transportavit saepsitque insuper custodia militum. Cavit etiam s.c. ut eodem loci in perpetuum contineretur. Atque ad omnem et eius et Iuliarum mentionem ingemiscens proclamare etiam solebat:

Αἱθ᾽ ὀφελον ἄγαμος τ᾽ ἔμεναι ἄγονος τ᾽ ἀπολέσθαι.

nec aliter eos appellare quam tris vomicas ac tria carcinomata sua.

Suet., Tib.

7

Virili toga sumpta adulescentiam omnem spatiumque incessentis aetatis usque ad principatus initia per haec fere transegit. Munus gladiatorium in memoriam patris et alterum in avi Drusi dedit, diversis temporibus ac locis, primum in foro, secundum in amphitheatro, rudiaris quoque quibusdam revocatis auctoramento centenum milium; dedit et ludos, sed absens; cuncta magnifice, inpensa matris ac uitrici.
Agrippinam, Marco Agrippa genitam, neptem Caecili Attici equitis R., ad quem sunt Ciceronis epistulae, duxit uxorem; sublatoque ex ea filio Druso, quamquam bene convenientem rursusque gravidam dimittere ac Iuliam Augusti filiam confessim coactus est ducere non sine magno angore animi, cum et Agrippinae consuetudine teneretur et Iuliae mores improbabat, ut quam sensisset sui quoque sub priore marito appetentem, quod sane etiam vulgo existimabatur. Sed Agrippinam et abegisse post divorcium doluit et semel omnino ex occurrere visam adeo contentis et tamentibus oculis prosecutus est, ut custoditum sit ne unquam in conspectum ei posthac veniret. Cum Iulia primo concorditer et amore mutuo vixit, mox dissidit et aliquanto gravius, ut etiam perpetuo secubaret, intercepto communis fili pignore, qui Aquileiae natus infans extinctus est. Drusum fratrem in Germania amisit, cuius corpus pedibus toto itinere praegrediens Romam usque pervexit.

50.1
Odium adversus necessitudines in Druso primum fratre detexit, prodita eius epistula, qua secum de cogendo ad restituendam libertatem Augusto agebat, deinde et in reliquis. Iuliae uxori tantum afuit ut relegatae, quod minimum est, offici aut humanitatis alicui impertiret, ut ex constitutione patris uno oppido clausam domo quoque egredi et commercio hominum frui veteret; sed et peculio concesso a patre praebitisque annuis fraudavit, per speciem publici iuris, quod nihil de his Augustus testamento cavisset.

Tac., Ann., 1.53
Eodem anno Iulia supremum diem obiit, ob impudicitiam olim a patre Augusto Pandateria insula, mox oppido Reginorum, qui Siculum fretum accolunt, clausa. Fuerat in matrimonio Tiberii florentibus Gaio et Lucio Caesaribus spreveratque ut inparem; nec alia tam intima Tiberio causa cur Rhodum abscederet. Imperium adeptus exortrem, infamem et post interfecit Postumum Agrippam omnis spei egenam inopia ac tabe longa peremit, obscuram fore necem longinquitate exilii ratus. Par causa saevitiae in Sempronium Gracchum, qui, familia nobili, sollers ingenio et prave facundus, eandem Iuliam in matrimonio Marci Agrippae temeraverat. Nec is libidini finis: traditam Tiberio pervicax adulter contumacia et odiis in maritum accendebat; litteraeque quas Iulia patri Augusto cum insetatione
Tiberii scrisit, a Graccho compositae credebantur. Igitur amotus Cercinam, Africi maris insulam, quattuordecim annis exilium toleravit. Tunc milites ad caudem missi invenere in prominenti litoris nihil laetum opperientem. Quorum adventu breve tempus petivit, ut suprema mandata uxori Alliiariae per litteras daret, cervicemque percussoribus obtulit; constantia mortis haud indignus Sempronio nomine: vita degeneraverat. Quidam non Roma eos milites, sed ab L. Asprenate pro consule Africae, missos tradidere, auctore Tiberio, qui famam caedis posse in Asprenatem verti frustra speraverat.

Cass. Dio
55.10.9-16

Τῷ μὲν οὖν Αρεί ταύτ’ ἐγένετο, αὐτῷ δὲ δὴ τῷ Ἀὐγοῦστῳ ἄγῳ τε ἱερὸς ἐν Νέᾳ πόλει τῇ Καμπανίδι, λόγῳ μὲν ὅτι κακωθείσαν αὐτὴν καὶ ὑπὸ σεισμοῦ καὶ ὑπὸ πυρὸς ἀνέλαβεν, τὸ δ᾽ ἀληθὲς ἐπειδὴ τὰ τῶν Ἐλλήνων μόνοι τῶν προσχώρων τρόπον τινὰ ἐξήλουν, ἐψηφίσθη, καὶ ἡ ἐπωνυμία ἢ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀκριβῶς ἐδόθη· πρῶτερον γὰρ ἄλλως ἄνευ ψηφίσματος ἐπερημίζετο, καὶ μέντοι καὶ ἐπάρχουσα τῶν δορυφόρων τότε πρῶτον Κύιντον τε Ὑστώριον Σκαπούλαν καὶ Πούπλιου Σάλουιον Ἀπρον ἀπέδειξεν· οὕτω γάρ τοι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐγὼ μόνους τῶν ἐπαρχόντων τινὸς, ἐπειδήπερ ἐκκεννίσχθηκεν, ὀνομάζει. ἐποίησε μὲν οὖν καὶ ὁ Πυλάδης ὁ ῥηχητὴς πανηγυριῶν τινα, οὐκ αὐτὸς χειρουργήσας ἀτε καὶ ύπέργηρως ὃν, ἀλλὰ τῇ τε σκευῇ τῇ ἁρχικῇ καὶ τοῖς ἀναλώμασιν, ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ Κύιντος Κρισπίνος στρατηγός. λέγω δὲ οὐ τούτο ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι ἄνδρες τε ἅπτες καὶ γυναῖκες οὐκ ἀρανείς εἰς τὴν ὀρχήστραν ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐςχῆθησαν, ἀλλὰ ταύτα μὲν ἐν οὕδενι λόγῳ ὁ Ἀὐγοῦστος ἐτίθετο, τὴν δὲ Ἰουλίαν τὴν θυγατέρα ἀσελγαίνουσαν οὕτως ὡστε καὶ ἐν τῇ ἁγορᾷ καὶ ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῦ γε τοῦ βήματος καὶ κωμάζειν νύκτωρ καὶ συμπίνειν ὑπὲρ φωράσας ὑπερωργίσθη. κατείκαζε μὲν γὰρ καὶ πρῶτερον οὐκ ὀρθῶς αὐτὴν βιοῦν, οὐ μέντοι καὶ ἐπίστευεν· οὶ γὰρ τοι ἐς ἢγεμονίας ἐχοντες πάντα μᾶλλον ἢ τα σφέτερα γιγνόσκουσι, καὶ οὖτ᾽ αὐτοὶ τι τοὺς συνόντας ὡν ποιοῦσι λανθάνουσιν οὕτε τὰ ἐκείνων ἀκριβοῦσι. τότε δ᾽ οὖν μαθὼν τὰ πραττόμενα τοσοῦτῳ θυμῷ ἔχρησατο ὡστε μηδ᾽ οίκοι αὐτὰ κατασχεῖν ἀλλὰ
καὶ τῇ γερουσίᾳ κοινώσα, κάκ τοῦτο ἑκείνη μὲν ἐς Πανδατερίαν τὴν πρὸς
Καμπανία νήσον ὑπερωρίσθη, καὶ αὐτῇ καὶ ἡ Σκριβωνία ἡ μήτηρ ἐκόυσα
συνεξέπλευσε· τῶν δὲ δὴ χρησαμένων αὐτῆ ὁ μὲν Ἰουλλος ὁ Ἄντώνιος, ὡς καὶ ἐπὶ
tῇ μοναρχίᾳ τούτῳ πράξας, ἀπέθανε μετ᾽ ἄλλων τυχῶν ἐπιφανῶν ἄνδρῶν, οἱ δὲ
λοιποὶ ἐς νήσους ὑπερωρίσθησαν. καὶ ἐπειδὴ καὶ δήμαρχος τις ἐν αὐτοῖς ἦν, οὐ
πρότερον πρὶν διάρκει ἐκρίθη, πολλῶν δὲ ἐκ τοῦτο καὶ ἄλλων γυναικῶν ἐφ᾽
όμοιος τισιν αἰτίαν λαβοῦσών οὐ πάσας τὰς δίκας ἐδέχατο, ἄλλα καὶ χρόνον τινὰ
ἀφώρισεν ὡστε τὰ πρὸ ἑκείνου πραχθέντα μὴ πολυπραγμονεῖσθαι. ἐπὶ γὰρ τῆς
θυγατρὸς μηδὲν μετριᾶσα, ἄλλα καὶ φήσας ὅτι Φοίβης πατὴρ μᾶλλον ἢ ἑκείνης
gεγονέναι ἥθελε, τῶν ἄλλων ἐφείδετο. ἡ δὲ Φοίβη ἐξελεύθερα τε τῆς Ἰουλίας
καὶ συνεργὸς οὖσα προαπέθανεν ἐκουσία, διόπερ καὶ ὁ Αὐγοῦστος αὐτὴν
ἐπίρησε.

57.18.1a
Τὴν δὲ γυναῖκα Ἰουλίαν οὔτε ἐπανήγαγεν ἐκ τῆς ὑπερονίας ἢν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς
αὐτῆς τοῦ Αὐγοῦστον κατεδικάσθη δι᾽ ἀσέλγειαν, ἄλλα καὶ κατέκλεισεν αὐτὴν,
ὡς τε κακουχίας καὶ λιμοῦ φθαρῆναι.

Macr., Sat., 2.5.1-9
Vultis aliqua et filiae eius luliae dicta referamus? sed si garrulus non putabor, volo de
moribus feminae paуча praemittere, ni quisquam vestrum habeat serie et discenda
quaet proferat: hortantibusque omnibus ut coepto insisteret, ita de luliae orsus est:
‘annum agebat tricesimum et octavum, tempus aetatis, si mens sana superesset,
patrís abutebatur, cum alioquin litterarum amor multaque eruditio, quod in illa
domo facile era, praeterea mitis humanitas minimeque saevus anumus ingentem
feminae gratiam conciliarent, mirantibus qui vitia noscebant tantam pariter
diversitatem. non semel praecesperat pater, temperato tamen inter indulgentiam
gravitatemque sermone, moderaretur profusos cultus perspicuosque comitatus. idem
cum ad nepotum turbam simulitudinemque respererat qua repraesentabatur
Agrippa, dubitare de pudicitia filiae erubescebat. inde blandiebatur sibi Augustus
laetum in filia animum usque ad speciem procacitatis sed reatu liberum, et talem
fuisse apud maiores Claudiam credera audebat. itaque inter amicos dixit duas habere se filias delicatas, quas necesse haberet ferre, rem publicam et Iuliam.

Venerat ad eum licentiore vestitu, et oculos offenderat et laetum patrem affectata severitate complexa est. at ille qui pridie dolorem suum continuerat, gaudium continere non potuit et, quantum hic, ait, in filia Augusti probabilior est cultus? non defuit patrocinio suo Iulia his verbis: hodie enim me patris oculis ornavi, heri viri.

Notum et illud. averterant in se populum in spectaculo gladiatorum Livia et Iulia comitatus dissimilitudine: quippe cingentibus Liviam gravibus viris, hac iuventutis et quidem luxuriosae grege circumsedebatur. admonuit pater scripto, videret quantum inter duas principes feminas interesse. eleganter illa rescrispsit: et hi mecum senes fient.

Eadem Iulia mature habere coeperat canos, quos legere secrete solebat. subitus interventus patris alicuaquando oppressit ornatrixe. dissimulavit Augustus deprehensis super vestem earum canis, et aliis sermonibus tempore extracto, induxit aetatis mentionem interrogavitque et cum illa respondisset, ego, pater, cana esse malo, sic illi mendacium obiecit: quid ergo istae te calvam tam cito faciunt?

Item cum gravem amicum audisset Iulia suadentem melius facturam si se composuisse ad exemplar paternar frugalitatis, ait: ille obliviscitus Caesarem se esse, ego memini me Caesaris filiam.

Cumque conscii flagitiorum mirarents quo modo similes Agrippae filios pareret, quae tam vulgo potestatem corporis sui faceret, ait: numquam enim nisi navi plena tollo vectorem.

MESSALINA

Juv. 6.115-132

respice rivales divorum, Claudius audi
quae tulerit. dormire virum cum sensorat uxor,
ausa Palatino et tegetem praeferre cubili
sumere nocturnos meretrix Augusta cuculos
linquebat comite ancilla non amplius una.
sed nigrum flavo crinem abscondente galero
intravit calidum veteri centone lupanar
et cellam vacuam atque suam; tunc nuda papillis
prostitit auratis titulum mentita Lyciscae
ostenditque tuum, generose Britannice, ventrem.
exceptit blanda intrantis atque aera poposcit;
mox lenone suas iam dimittente puellas
tristis abit, et quod potuit tamen ultima cellam
clausit, adhuc ardens rigidae tentigine volvae,
et lassata viris necdum satiat
obscurisque genis turpis fumoque lucernae
foeda lupanaris tulit ad pulvinar odorem.

Cass. Dio
60.14
Ἐθισθεὶς δ᾽ οὖν αἵματος καὶ φόνων ἀναπίπλασθαι προπετέστερον καὶ ταῖς ἀλλαὶς σφαγαῖς ἔχρηστο. αἴτιοι δὲ τοῦτον οぃ τε Καίσαρειοι καὶ ἡ Μεσσαλίνα ἐγένοντο: ὅπότε γὰρ ἀποκτεῖναι τινα ἐθελήσειαν, ἐξεφόβουν αὐτόν, καὶ τοῦτον πάνθ᾽ ὁσα ἐβούλοντο ποιεῖν ἐπετρέποντο. καὶ πολλάκις γε ἐξανιναῖος ἐκπλαγεὶς καὶ κελεύσας τινὰ ἐκ τοῦ παραχρήμα περιδεοῦς ἀπολέσθαι, ἔπειτα ἀνενεγκὼν καὶ ἀναφρονήσας ἐπεζήτει τε αὐτόν, καὶ μαθὼν τὸ γεγονός ἐλυπεῖτό τε καὶ μετεγίγνωσεν. ἥρξατο δὲ τῶν φόνων τοῦτων ἀπὸ Γαΐου Ἀππίου Σιλανοῦ. τοῦτον γὰρ εὐγενεστάτον τε ὅντα καὶ τῆς Ἰβηρίας τότε ἄρχοντα μεταπεμψάμενος ὡς τι αὐτοῦ δεόμενος, καὶ τὴν τε μητέρα οὶ τὴν τῆς Μεσσαλίνης συνοικίσας, καὶ αὐτὸν ἐν τε τοῖς φιλτάτοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενεστάτοις χρόνον τινὰ τιμῆσας, ἔπειτ᾽ ἐξαίφνης ἔσφαξεν, ὅτι τῇ τε Μεσσαλίνη προσέκρουσεν οὐκ ἔθελήσας αὐτῇ συγγενέσθαι πορνικωτάτοις χρόνον τινὰ τιμῆσας, ἔπειτ᾽ ἐξαίφνης ἔσφαξεν, ὅτι τῇ τε Μεσσαλίνῃ προσέκρουσεν οὐκ ἔθελήσας αὐτῇ συγγενέσθαι πορνικωτάτῃ τε καὶ ἀσελγεστάτη οὖσῃ, καὶ τῷ Ναρκίσσῳ τῷ ἀπελευθέρω αὐτοῦ δι᾽ ἐκείνην. καὶ οὐ γὰρ εἶχον οὖτ᾽ ἀληθὲς οὔτε πιθανὸν τι κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ εἰπεῖν, συνέπλασεν ὀναρ ὁ Νάρκασσος ὡς σφατόμενον τὸν Κλαύδιον ὑπὸ τοῦ Σιλανοῦ αὐτοχειρία ἰδών, καὶ αὐτὸς τε εὐθὺς ὑπὸ τὴν ἔω ἐν τῇ εὐνῇ οἶ ἐτ᾽ ὄντι ύπότρομος διηγήσατο, καὶ ἡ Μεσσαλίνῃ παραλαβοῦσα ἐδείνωσε.
60.18.1-4
Μεσσαλίνα δὲ ἐν τούτω αὐτή τε ἦσέλγανε καὶ τὰς ἄλλας γυναίκας ἀκολοσταίνειν ὁμοίως ἡνάγκαζε, καὶ πολλάς γε καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ παλατίῳ, τῶν ἀνδρῶν παρόντων καὶ ὀράντων, μισχεύεσθαι ἐποίει. καὶ τούτως μὲν καὶ ἐφίλει καὶ ἤγαπα, τιμαίς τε καὶ ἀρχαῖς ἠγαλλε, τοὺς δ’ ἄλλους τοὺς μὴ συγκαθίζετας σφαξ ἐς τούτο καὶ ἐμίσει καὶ πάντα τρόπον ἀπώλευε. καὶ ταῦτα μέντοι τοιαύτα τε ὄντα καὶ ἀναφανδὸν οὕτω γιγνόμενα τὸν Κλαύδιον ἐπὶ πλείστον ἠλαθεν: ἔκεινῳ τε γὰρ θεραπαινίδια τινα συμπαρακατέκλινε, καὶ τοὺς τι δυναμένους οἱ μηνύσαι τοὺς μὲν εὐεργεσίας τοὺς δὲ καὶ τιμωρίας προκατελάμβανεν ὡσπερ καὶ τότε καὶ Κατώνιον Ἰουστόν τοῦ τε δορυφορικοῦ ἄρχοντα καὶ δηλωσαί τι αὐτῷ περὶ τούτων ἐθελήσαντα προδιέφθειρε. τὴν τε Ἰουλίαν τὴν τοῦ Δρούσου μὲν τοῦ Τιβέριου παιδὸς θυγατέρα, τοῦ δὲ δὴ Νέρωνος τοῦ Γερμανίκου γυναίκα γενομένην, ἡλιοτυπήσασα ὡσπερ καὶ τὴν ἔτεραν, ἀπέσφαξε. καὶ τις ἐν τούτῳ τῶν ἰππέων, ὡς καὶ ἐπιβουλεύσας τῷ Κλαύδιῳ, κατὰ τοῦ Καπτωλίου ὑπὸ τε τῶν δημάρχων καὶ τῶν ὑπάτων κατεκρημνίσθη.

60.22.3-5
Ἐκείνους μὲν δὴ τούτοις ἐτίμησαν, τῇ δὲ δὴ τοῦ Γαίου μνήμη ἀχθόμενοι τὸ νόμισμα τὸ χαλκοῦν πᾶν, ὡςόν τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ ἐντετυπωμένην εἴχε, συγχωνευθῆναι ἐγνωσαν, καὶ ἐπράξθη μὲν τούτο, οὐ μέντοι καὶ ἐς βέλτιον τι ὁ χαλκὸς ἐχώρησεν, ἀλλ’ ἀνδρίαντας ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἡ Μεσσαλίνα τοῦ μνηστήρου τοῦ ὀρχηστοῦ ἐπούσατο. ἐπεὶ γὰρ τῷ Γαίῳ ποτὲ ἐκείνος ἐκέχρητο, χάριν τινὰ αὐτῷ ταύτην τῆς πρὸς ἕαυτήν συνουσίας κατέθετο. σφόδρα γὰρ ἦρα, καὶ ἐπεὶ γε μηδένα τρόπον μὴν ὑπαχνουμένη τι μήτε ἐκροβοῦσα αὐτὸν συγγενέσθαι αὐτῇ ἀναπείσα ἐδύνατο, διελέξη τῷ ἀνδρί, ἀξιόσα αὐτὸν πειθαρχεῖν οἱ ἀναγκασθῆναι ὡς καὶ ἐπ’ ἄλλο τι αὐτοῦ δεομένη: καὶ ὀὕτως εἰπόντος αὐτῷ τοῦ Κλαύδιου πάνθε, ὥσα ἐν προστάττεται ὑπὸ τῆς Μεσσαλίνης ποιεῖν, συνὴν αὐτῇ ἡς καὶ τοῦθεν ὑπ’ ἐκείνου κεκελευσμένου, τὸ δ’ αὐτὸ τοῦτο καὶ πρὸς ἄλλους συχνοὺς
ἐπραττεν: ὡς γὰρ εἰδότος τε τοῦ Κλαυδίου τὰ γιγνόμενα καὶ συγχωροῦντός οἱ ἀκολασταίνειν ἐμοιχεύετο.

60.27.4
Καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐξηπατήθη, ὃ δὲ Οὐνίκιος ὑπὸ μὲν τοῦ Κλαυδίου οὐδὲν ἐπαθεν ἢν μὲν γὰρ διαπρεπῆς ἀνήρ, τὴν δὲ ἡσυχίαν ἄγων καὶ τὰ ἐαυτοῦ πράττων ἐσώζετο, ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς Μεσσαλίνης, ὑποψίᾳ τε ὅτι τὴν γυναίκα αὐτοῦ τὴν Ἰουλίαν ἀπεκτόνει, καὶ ὁργῇ ὅτι οὐκ ἠθέλησέν οἱ συγγενέσθαι, φαρμάκῳ διεφθάρη.

60.31.1-5
Ὡς τῇ Μεσσαλίνα ῥήσατο οὖν ἔξαρκοι οἱ ὅτι καὶ ἐμοιχεύετο καὶ ἐπορνεύετο τὰ τε γὰρ ἄλλα αἰσχρῶς ἐπραττε, καὶ ἐπὶ οἰκήματος ἐστίν ὅτε ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ αὐτὴ τε ἐκαθέζετο καὶ τὰς ἄλλας τὰς πρῶτας ἐκάθιζε, καὶ ἐπεθύμησε καὶ ἀνάρας, τούτῳ δὴ τὸ τοῦ λόγου, πολλοὺς ἔχειν, καὶ σύμπασιν ἃ τοῖς χρωμένοις αὐτῇ κατὰ συμβόλαια συνώσκησαν, εἰ μὴπερ εὐθὺς ἐν τῷ πρῶτῳ φωραθείσα ἀπώλετο. τέως μὲν γὰρ οἱ Κασάρειοι πάντες ὑμιλόγουν αὐτή, καὶ οὐδέν ὃ τι οὐκ ἀπὸ κοινῆς γνώμης ἐποίουν. ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸν Πολύβιον, καίτοι καὶ ἐκείνῳ πλησιάζοσα, καὶ διέβαλε καὶ ἀπέκτεινεν, οὐκέτι αὐτῇ ἐπίστευον, κακὸ τοῦτο ἐρημωθείσα τῆς παρ᾽ αὐτῶν εὐνοίας ἐφθάρη. τὸν τε γὰρ Σίλιον τὸν Γάιον, τὸν τὸν Σίλιον τοῦ ὑπὸ Τιβερίου σφαγέντος υἱὸν, ἀνάρα ἐπεγράψατο, καὶ τούς τε γάμους πολυτελῶς εἰστάσασε καὶ οἰδάν αὐτῷ βασιλικὴν ἔχαρισα, πάντα τὰ τιμώτατα τῶν τοῦ Κλαυδίου κεμηλίων συμφορῆσασα ἐς αὐτὴν, καὶ τέλος ὑπατον αὐτὸν ἀπέφηνεν. ταῦτ᾽ οὖν πρότερον μὲν καὶ ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἄλλων ἀκουόμενα καὶ ὀρώμενα τὸν γοῦν Κλαυδίου ἐλάνθανεν: ὡς δ᾽ υπότος τε τέ τὰ Ἡστια πρὸς ἐπίσκεψιν σίτου κατέβη, καὶ ἐκείνῃ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ, πρόφασιν ὡς καὶ νοσοῦσα, ὑπελεύφη, συμπόσιον τέ τι περιβόητον συνεκρότησε καὶ κύμον ἀσελγεστατὸν ἐκώμασεν, ἐνταύθα ὁ Νάρκισσος μονοθέντι τῷ Κλαυδίῳ μηνύει διὰ τῶν παλλακῶν αὐτοῦ πάντα τὰ γιγνόμενα, καὶ ἐκφοβήσας αὐτὸν ὡς καὶ τῆς Μεσσαλίνης ἐκείνον τε ἀποκτενεῖν καὶ τὸν Σίλιον ἐς τὴν ἄρχην ἀντικαθιστάναι μελλούσης, ἀνέπεισε συλλαβεῖν τινας.
καὶ βασανίσαι. ἄμα τε τοῦτ ἐγίνετο καὶ αὐτὸς ἐς τὴν πόλιν ἤπείχθη, καὶ ὡσπερ εἶχεν ἐσελθὼν ἄλλους τε πολλοὺς καὶ τὸν Μνηστήρα ἐθανάτωσε, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν Μεσσαλίναν ἐς τούς τοῦ Ἀσιατικοῦ κήπους, δι᾽ οὐσπερ οὐχ ἦκαστα ἀπωλῶλει, ἀναχωρήσασαν ἀπέσφαξεν.

Tac., Ann., 11.26


Plin., Nat., 10.83

Bipedum solus homo animal gignit. homini tantum prīmi coitūs paenitentia, augurium scilicet vitae a paenitenda origine. ceteris animalibus stati per tempora anni concubitus, homini, ut dictum est, omnibus horum dierum noctiumque. ceteris satias in coitu, homini prope nulla; Messalina Claudii Caesāris coniunx regalem hanc existimans palmam elegit in id certamen nobilissimam e prostitutis ancillam mercenariae stipis, eamque nocte ac die superavit quinto atque vicemisto concubitu. in hominum genere maribus deverticula veneris, excogitata omnia, scelera naturae, feminis vero abortus. quantum in hac parte multō nocentiōres quam ferae sumus! viros avidiores veneris hieme, feminas aestate Hesiodus prodidit.
Suet., Cl., 37

Nulla adeo suspicio, nullus auctor tam levis exstitit, a quo non mediocri scrupulo injecto ad cavendum ulciscendumque compelleretur. Unus ex litigatoribus seducto in salutatione affirmavit, vidisse se per quietem occidi eum a quodam; dein paulo post, quasi percussorem agnosceret, libellum tradentem adversarium suum demonstravit; confestimque is pro deprenso ad poenam raptus est. Pari modo oppressum ferunt Appium Silanum; quem cum Messalina et Narcissus conspirassent perdere, divis partibus alter ante lucem similis attonito patroni cubiculum inruptit, affirmans somniasse se vim ei ab Appio inlatam; altera in admirationem formata sibi quoque eandem speciem aliquot iam noctibus obversari rettulit; nec multo post ex composito inrumpere Appius nuntiatus, cui pridie ad id temporis ut adesset praeceptum erat, quasi plane repraesentaretur somnii fides, arcessi statim ac mori iussus est. Nec dubitavit postero die Claudius ordinem rei gestae perferre ad senatum ac liberto gratias agere, quod pro salute sua etiam dormiens exsurbaret.