A Proposed Framework for Roman "Chastity Crimes": *Pudicitia* in Early Imperial Roman Literature

Fatima Omar
University of Chicago
Classical Studies/Statistics

Two central narratives exist in Roman literature in which women die on the basis of their compromised sexual status: the stories of Lucretia and Verginia. The mythologizing narratives of these women exist within Livy's history of the founding of Rome (along with the history of Rome written by Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the moral writings of Valerius Maximus) as stories of victims of gendered violence who exemplify chastity and sexual purity. These qualities were of such importance that the deaths of Lucretia and Verginia catalyzed crucial political transitions in Roman history. That these women exemplify the quality of *pudicitia* connects *pudicitia* to the political stability of Rome. Therefore, the cultural debate on sexual morality can also be seen in a more applicable way through the moralized writings of Valerius Maximus, who dedicates an entire chapter of his work "Memorable Deeds and Sayings" to *pudicitia* and gives several examples of violence primarily towards women as a result of some type of sexual transgression. In this same chapter he also provides stories in which women – as agents of sexual immorality or as its victims – do not die, stories of women as murderers of their attackers, narratives of men who are killed by their fathers, and stories of men whose sexual morality is called into question, but do not die and are instead sent to court. These sources reveal an ongoing ethical debate about sexual morality and how one should think about a situation where, and indeed what one should do after, the sexual morality of a person has been compromised, either of their own own volition or non-consensually. The historical narratives of Lucretia and Verginia reveal high-stakes situations in which their chastity implicates all of Rome, but the information that we have surrounding sexual morality help inform that which stories of Lucretia and Verginia indicate: that sexual morality in Roman culture was inextricably tied to the success of the state, and that chastity, at least in these stories, was a code by which good Roman women, and men, must live for the sake of the stability of Rome.

In the stories of Lucretia and Verginia, three key "events" are present: rape (or threat of rape), death in the name of chastity, and some type of political change leading to an improved and more powerful Rome. However, these stories focus very little on the actual crime, the women, and their emotions. The narratives place emphasis on the men who attack Lucretia and Verginia and additionally on the men who, as a result of their deaths, are catalyzed to effect revolutionary political changes on Roman society. On first glance, stories of Lucretia and Verginia (as well as the stories presented by Valerius Maximus) seem to be written as "honor killings." I argue in this paper that one can deduce a different model, a Roman model, which focuses on another quality: *pudicitia*, or chastity. These "chastity killings" reflect a Roman preoccupation with the notion of chastity and its connection to the success of society and the city. The two main narratives point to an environment where, when there is inappropriate lust mingled with political tyranny, even the most chaste woman cannot be saved; and if she is the object of such inappropriate lust, drastic action must be taken. I also explore what the

implications of this environment are for situations where the stakes are not so high, asking if it is even a possibility for a low-stakes situation when Roman chastity is concerned.

In this paper I distinguish between the death of Roman women under circumstances of questionable sexual morality and honor killings as they occur in an anthropological framework. To do so, I provide background on honor killings and the cultural contexts in which they operate, along with a brief analysis of Roman society and the way in which familial structure shaped it. In addition, I examine Latin words relating to the topic of sexual morality to understand Roman conceptions of chastity, and to make a distinction between "honor" and the operative category in Roman literature. Finally, I visit the stories of Lucretia and Verginia as they appear in Livy; I examine the story of Verginia first, even though it occurs chronologically after the story of Lucretia, because her story maps onto paradigmatic honor killing in a more obvious way, which allows us to determine how the story of Lucretia deviates in key ways. Both narratives are considered in conjunction with stories about remedying or punishing transgressions of chastity found in Valerius Maximus that help to inform the cultural debate about sexual morality. Examining these alongside each other illustrates "chastity killings" existing as a mode of Roman gender-based violence in early Imperial literature, and is indicative of the extent to which chastity was important to Romans during this time.

Section I: Background on Honor Killings

Killing in the name of honor (or more broadly, honor-based violence) has often been attributed to specific societies and cultural traditions. However, honor-based violence is not confined to any particular religion, culture, society, or even social stratum: honor is a social code that stems from an aggregation of interpersonal exchanges, regardless of cultural particulars.[1] It is for this reason that cultural contexts should be evaluated on an individual basis to determine how honor and codes of honor might be driving forces behind certain instances of gender-based violence. The aim of this section is to explore honor killing from an anthropological and sociological view, in order to examine seemingly similar stories about such violence in Roman literature.

Purna Sen, the Director of Policy for UN Women, identifies six key features that determine whether the killing of a woman or girl may be classified as a honor killing. Honor killing operates within a system of gender relations that controls and problematizes women's behavior, particularly in the case of women's sexuality; it features collective decisions regarding punishment for transgressions of boundaries (implying that one individual's sexual transgression can affect multiple people); it leaves the potential for women not only to police and monitor the behavior of other women, but also to participate in the killing of other women; it implies the ability to reclaim family honor through killing or enforced compliance; and it usually occurs within a state that sanctions such killings by accepting "honor" as an excuse, and thus a mitigating circumstance.[2] The paired concepts, "honor" and "shame," and their use as justifications for violence and homicide have been found in many societies, but they tend to be

[1] Aisha K. Gill, Carolyn Strange & Karl Anton Roberts. *"Honour" Killing and Violence: Theory, Policy and Practice*. 4. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

[2] Lynn Welchman, & Sara Hossain. *"Honour": Crimes, Paradigms, and Violence against Women*. 50. London ; New York: Zed Books, 2005.

associated with cultures originating from nomadic peoples and herdsmen.[3] Often migrating, these groups of people carried their most valuable property with them, otherwise risking it being stolen and having no recourse to law enforcement or government. As a result, they likely had little allegiance to any form of national government. Once a culture of honor exists within a lawless society, transitioning from a culture of custom to a culture of law is difficult for its members, requiring that when faced with conflict, they willingly back down and refuse to retaliate immediately. These are actions that in an honor-based culture appear weak and unwise. Furthermore, in societies operating under codes of honor, there exists a strong inclination towards collective morality, behaviors, and values conforming to these prevailing codes. In this context, individuals who wish to challenge, contradict, or contest these collective codes may find it difficult to do so. Additionally, where women are the challengers or transgressors of "honor," these codes – intentionally or not – typically enable or at least accommodate men's actions in response. It is not merely acceptable for men to take such punitive actions; it is beneficial for them in wider society.[4] As a result, honor extends from the transgressor of honor to the person responsible for that transgressor, who feels compelled to punish her for it. When the honor of one person is questioned, particularly that of a woman, the pride, esteem, dignity, reputation, and virtue of many are at stake.[5]

What lies behind these collective morals and values that justify violence within the context of a culture of honor? Honor killing does not come from an intrinsic need to control women's sexual behavior in and of itself, but rather a potential consequence: reproduction. In cultures where reproduction is a particularly important familial power structure, its protection ensures the preservation of the family. It is the responsibility of a woman to bear and raise healthy, strong, and legitimate children, making her a commodity in the family, purchasable through dowry. In this way, women are an investment that men make towards their honor, standing, and indeed their actual existence in a community and thus, women are the repository for the honor of men. Specifically, this concerns the senior adult males of the family unit. For evidence, one can look to common cultural practices in early Middle Eastern and Mediterranean pastoral societies, but also many other cultures where complete power and authority to make political and economic decisions for the family existed in the hands of the most senior adult male in the family.[6] Preservation of this honor then becomes a case of the family, with a male at its head, protecting the virginity and purity of a woman, single or married. Externally, this manifests itself in the guarding of a woman's behavior and dress; internally, her hymen should be intact. Women, as the repository for family honor, have the responsibility to take care not to bring dishonor upon her family and specifically the individual at its head: a man. This cultural framework legitimizes a man's right to restore his and his family's honor, even via bloodshed. In addition, it is evolutionarily advantageous for a man to make investments in his offspring in order to ensure that his genes are passed on and continue in a population. Before the invention discovery of DNA testing, determining paternal relationships could prove impossible, and it would be inefficient to spend time and effort rearing a child that is not one's own. Paternal

---

[3] David Leverenz. *Honor Bound: Race and Shame in America*. 59-63. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2012.

[4] Welchman, Hossain. *"Honour": Crimes, Paradigms, and Violence.* 51.

[5] Gill, Carolyn, Karl. *"Honour" Killing and Violence.* 2.

[6] Amani Awwad. "Gossip, Scandal, Shame and Honor Killing: A Case for Social Constructionism and Hegemonic Discourse." *Social Thought & Research* 24, no. 1/2 (2001): 39-52. Web.

certainty is therefore of great importance and when it is threatened, resorting to aggression might be necessary. This manifests itself in the practice of social norms that protect male exclusivity in sexual relations and in patriarchal laws against adultery.[7]

Section II: Roman Culture

Some aspects of the cultural framework above that foster gender-based violence are found in Roman culture, particularly in the late Republic and early Empire. First, it is helpful to understand that Roman law and custom prioritized, with formal cultural emphasis, agnate bonds (kinship through the male line) over cognate bonds. The Twelve Tables, according to Ulpian, instituted agnate guardianship and succession, and the Romans used this paradigm of patrilineal descent as a fundamental guide that informed all areas of their social life.[8] One would therefore expect reproduction to be a crucial element of marriage and sexual relations; and indeed, for the Romans, the value of the family was its reproductive abilities in producing new citizens, and the ability to transfer intangibles such as reputation, name, and *penates* through these new citizens (along with tangible goods such as houses and slaves).[9] Marriage, as an institution that existed primarily for the production of legitimate children, was not based on attraction. Rather, marriage was centered on the recommendations and interests of the family: Roman marriages were often arranged by older generations and were used to forged political alliances.[10] Marriage was an affair arranged by the family and for the purpose of growing the family, so much so that Augustan legislation included inheritance restrictions on childless marriages. [11] And where preservation of family (which includes name, reputation, etc.) and land is prized, there is a general suspicion of women and a need to control their actions.[12]

The vertical nature of honor killings as described above also aligns with many aspects of Roman society, which can also be considered as vertical. In paradigmatic instances of honor crimes, violent acts against women for reasons related to honor are committed by fathers more often than they are committed by husbands. That is to say, the perpetrating of violence towards women based on honor mostly occurs vertically, or inter-generationally. This may be a result of societies that are based on family units, not individuals; there is a distinction between dishonor as a "collective" or familial injury versus dishonor as an "individual" injury. A wife's sexual transgressions might render a husband jealous, and might even cause him to feel that his individual pride and honor have been compromised. But this does not compare to the collective injury her transgressions could cause to her family of origin, the head of which was most often the father who also held responsibility for punishing her. This aspect of culture that fosters honor crimes relates to Roman society on many different levels. From a legal perspective, certain Augustan laws point to a difference between dishonor brought upon a husband and dishonor

---

[7] Matthew A. Goldstein. "The biological roots of heat-of-passion crimes and honour killings," *Politics and the Life Sciences* 21,2 (2002): 28-37.

[8] Judith P. Hallett. *Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society: Women and the Elite Family*. 23, 202. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984.

[9] Suzanne Dixon. *The Roman Family*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992. 111.

[10] Dixon, S. *The Roman Family*. 62-63.

[11] Judith E. Grubbs. *Women and the Law in the Roman Empire: A Sourcebook On Marriage, Divorce and Widowhood*. 84. London ; New York: Routledge, 2002.

[12] Dixon, S. *The Roman Family*. 42, 120.

brought upon a *paterfamilias* in Augustan law: the *lex Iulia* legally sanctioned a father to kill an adulterous daughter (and the man with whom she committed adultery), but a husband was forbidden to kill his adulterous wife.[13] In much of the Roman literature examined in this paper, this type of violence occurs within the context of a father's position holding more importance than that of a husband or fiancé.[14]

This paternal element of familial relations extends further than legal code: the unique relationship of a Roman father (particularly an elite Roman father) to his daughter indicates how Roman society, throughout its history, might have operated in this vertical, family-based manner. In general, the Roman elite family did not just possess political influence and social significance: the family was regarded as a significant and stable social, economic, and public institution.[15] Within that family was the head: the *paterfamilias.* In Hallett's examination of fathers and daughters in Roman society, she argues that a high valuation of fatherhood remained a constant throughout Roman history. The early Romans elaborated the familial paternal role into a social metaphor for supreme authority. This continued through to the Republic and early Empire, when Romans frequently looked to *mos maiorum*, or ancestral custom, to justify and sanctify their sentiments. It is not a coincidence that from *pater* comes the word for country or homeland, *patria.*

Just as the father role was culturally elaborated into a metaphor for power, the daughter role was transformed into a social metaphor for culturally valued female behavior. While the relationship between Roman fathers and daughters was a loving one, it did not come without strict expectations. These expectations were predicated on a Roman daughter being completely dependent on her father, or at least another close male in her life such as her husband. A daughter took her father's name as her own (for example, Marcus Tullius Cicero and his daughter, Tullia). While this can be viewed as indicative of a cultural desire to erase all individuality of daughters except that they were their father's children, this can also be interpreted as signifying a father's pledge to look after his daughter in every way possible.[16] Both in literary and historical sources it is clear that fathers with daughters, particularly elite fathers, assumed a special concern for them.[17]

As individuals carefully looked after by their fathers, daughters bore expectations to follow certain patterns of behavior relating to their loyalty and sexual virtue.[18] These patterns included deference and personal allegiance, which often had politically charged undertones, towards one's father. In the same way, stories about daughters who betrayed their fathers and other relatives by siding against them and remaining loyal to their husbands would have served as counter-examples that should not have been followed.[19] Deference and personal allegiance

---

[13] Hallett, J.P. *Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society.* 142. See also John Richardson. *Augustan Rome 44 BC to AD 14: The Restoration of the Republic and the Establishment of the Empire*. 120-122. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012, for more discussion on the *lex Iulia.*

[14] See below for a detailed discussion of the narratives of Lucretia and Verginia. For example, in the story of Verginia, her father takes it upon himself to kill her in order to prevent the ruin of her chastity.

[15] Hallett, J.P. *Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society.* 28.

[16] Hallett, J.P. *Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society.* 79-90.

[17] For a discussion on who constituted the "Roman elite," see Catherine Edwards. *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge 1993) 12-17. According to Edwards, social status depended on satisfying technical requirements but also on securing the recognition of the rest of society, and often definitions of the elite were objects of Roman moralizing writings.

[18] Hallett, J.P. *Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society.* 136.

[19] See Livy, 1.46-49 for the story of Tullia, the daughter of the Roman king Servius Tullius, who helps her

were not the only expectations that a father had of his daughter. Literary and anecdotal evidence regarding Roman daughters reveals the expectation of virginity before marriage and complete faithfulness to husbands after marriage. The Augustan law permitting a father to kill an adulterous daughter but not a son suggests that the expectation of sexual purity didn't exist in the same way for sons, and although this law contained obstacles to make it difficult for a father to actually do so, it demonstrates a difference between the implications of sexual transgression on a father and the implications on a husband. In general, as with many societies in which honor crimes have been or still are a component, a Roman woman's virginity and sexuality belongs to her family. For example, in Valerius Maximus' commentary on the punishments of severe fathers, a daughter's transgression evokes harsh punishment based on a father's unilateral choice, not consultation with anyone else.[20] The implication is that not only are differential responses of fathers to daughters and sons tolerated, but that they help the *paterfamilias* save face when his household is threatened.[21] These expectations of a daughter have an underlying theme, that is, a father's desire and expectation that his daughter be completely dependent and without agency. Self-assertiveness or a daughter's display of independence would have been undesirable to a Roman father.[22] Fathers did not consult their daughters regarding their own marriage, and because of the culturally prevalent relationship between father and daughter, a father could probably avoid most situations where a daughter might resist his decisions or question his judgment.

While vertical family structure and the importance of the father are similar between Roman culture and others that foster honor-based violence, an emphasis on the larger community in Roman culture moves us further from the cultures described above and closer to something unique. First, it is important to note that late Republican and early Imperial Roman society was far from being a society made up of tribes or of tribal culture. This is a key difference between Roman culture and the cultures described above, because if the state organized and functioned under a formal government, and formal laws govern citizens as well as more informal familial social control, then the reputation of individual families are necessarily less important in society. Rome, from early on in its founding, was an organized state with formalized law. By the late Republic and early Empire, laws were beginning to adjudicate certain things that used to be decided in a family "court" or *concilium*, which functioned as the organ of discipline.[23] One group of actions to which this applied were cases of sexual purity. Transferring some of the power over these cases from the family to the state tied moral issues to units larger than merely an individual family. In the Roman moral universe, certain societal elements were working to influence the moral outlook of a Roman: the moralizing gaze of community, the regulatory experience of *pudor* (shame), the laws, omnipresent gods, and exemplary tradition. One way in which we can see the influence of government on moral behaviors of individuals is through the *Censor*, who would compile the census, enroll men in the army, and supervise the lifestyle and morals of Romans. His role extended beyond this, in that it took on an internal regulatory force: Dionysius of Halicarnassus wrote that Romans behave in their own home as if the *Censor* were

husband Lucius Tarquinius rise to the thrown by being instrumental in the murder of her father.

[20] Lauren E. Caldwell. *Roman Girlhood and the Fashioning of Femininity*. 69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

[21] Caldwell, L. *Roman Girlhood.* 69.

[22] Hallett, J.P. *Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society.* 143.

[23] Dixon, S. *Roman Family*. 139

watching them there too.[24] These society-wide forms of sexual social control filtered their way through down to sexual social control at the level of the family, creating an environment in which vigilantism could be fostered. In this way, Rome, which was a growing empire and had a highly-developed political system, still retained aspects of tribal life on a certain constitutive ideological level.

Why, though, was this occurring at the end of the Republic and during the early Empire? The Augustan vision of a new Roman republic made family and domestic life a central space around which the rest of civic life might be built. One reason is that, at least for Augustus, both the space and the language of domestic relationships were included as part of the emperor's public persona.[25] This became a model for the rest of society, particularly the elite. Another reason came from the need to make the social and political institutions of a republic appear to support the idea of one-man rule, and also the need to find a way for post-civil war Rome to imagine herself as a community of shared values again. In this way the domestic sphere became an uncontroversial place to focus public attention where tradition, virtue, and the nostalgic comforts of home might be invoked as the basis of a renewed sense of national purpose.[26] At the center of this domestic sphere were women, whose role in this new vision of Roman society was to contribute to representing what the imperial regime had to offer: an imagined return to an unproblematic and virtuous past, and a fresh way of understanding Roman public participation.[27] However, women were often representatives of the benefits of empire through a focus on their morality, which is why laws and literature from this time feature women in the public view while simultaneously describing how little they belong here.

Control of sexual morality was in the interest of Rome as a state, and this intersected heavily with familial and community relations. This unique framework of Roman society underpins the particular cases in Roman literature, discussed in detail in this paper, when women die as a result of threats to their sexual purity, and suggests that such extreme cases were a manifestation of societal sexual control.

Section III: Pudicitia

While there are similarities between Roman society and others that foster honor-based violence, Roman "honor" and the family-based honor operating above are not equivalent. As the stories examined further on in this paper suggest, Roman sexual purity had a close connection to political stability, rather than familial stability, and the word most often used in this context is *pudicitia.* Kristina Milnor refers to elements of the transition from Republic to Empire as a "gendered Augustanism," or a set of ideals and ideologies that on the one hand considered themselves above the rise and fall of political systems, and on the other hand served as one of the

---

[24] Rebecca Langlands. *Sexual Morality in Ancient Rome*. 17-18. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 20.13.2-3. See also Michel Foucault. 1926-1984. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. 200-228. New York: Vintage Books, 1995., for a discussion on Panopticism and Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon, a structure in which an inhabitant can see the tower from which he is being watched but never knows from where he is being observed.

[25] Kristina Milnor. *Gender, Domesticity, and the Age of Augustus: Inventing Private Life*. 27. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

[26] Milnor, K. *Gender, Domesticity, and Augustus.* 27.

[27] Milnor, K. *Gender, Domesticity, and Augustus*. 4.

foundations of the new imperial state.[28] Women became, as mentioned in the previous section, the focal point of the domestic sphere, evoking an imagined return to a virtuous and uncontroversial past and a fresh way of understanding Roman public participation. As a result, a culture emerged that included an overwhelming concern with feminine virtue and its locations.[29]

Within this emerging culture, which tasked itself with upholding a virtuous past and ensuring a prosperous future, the operative category is *pudicitia,* not the root of the English word "honor" (*honos*). The word *pudicitia*, often and loosely translated as "modesty" or "chastity," arises frequently and more than other similar words (e.g. *castitas* or "chastity") in the texts discussed in this paper.[30] While it is difficult and often unhelpful to try to apply English words and concepts to Latin, it is necessary to further define this term. *Pudicitia* is a key ethical concept that can loosely translate to "sexual virtue," but it exists alongside other words that relate to sexual virtue as well, such as *castitas, modestia, sanctitas, verecundia, etc.*[31] What, then, distinguishes *pudicitia* from these words? Where similar words might relate to sex but can also relate to other modes of virtuousness, such as virtue regarding religious purity or food consumption, *pudicitia* refers only to sexual purity. It is also the only one from this group of qualities that has a place in political philosophy: it appears alongside justice (*aequitas*), liberty (*libertas*), peace (*pax*), dignity (*dignitas*), and temperance (*parsimonia*). As a result, it is a controversial and unsettled topic that provoked discussions about a wide range of moral issues. Finally, *pudicitia* is considered by some authors as paradigmatically Roman, as it is central to Roman ideas about the development of the city and culture.[32]

Because it is multidimensional, the word *pudicitia* should be defined in a systematic way. *Pudicitia* appears in the Roman sources as a deity, a core civic virtue, a psychological state, and a physical state; it is associated with shame and awareness of social boundaries, honor and bravery, reputation, vulnerability, and much more. To simply define it as "female chastity" is inaccurate for several reasons: if chastity is defined as the repression of desire through sexual abstinence, then this does not cover the range of meanings of *pudicitia,* and moreover it is not an exclusively female quality.[33] That it is applicable to both females and males is a similarity that *pudicitia* and "honor" (within the framework of honor killings) share. Rebecca Langlands asserts a more accurate way to describe *pudicitia,* as a moral virtue that pertains to the regulation of behavior (of oneself or of others) specifically associated with sex.[34] For women, maintaining *pudicitia* required maintaining virginity before marriage and remaining sexually faithful after marriage; and for men, maintaining pudicitia meant asserting masculinity in sexual relations: a

---

[28] Milnor, K. *Gender, Domesticity, and Augustus.* 3.

[29] Milnor, K. *Gender, Domesticity, and Augustus.* 4.

[30] Livy, 1.58.5, 1.58.7, 1.58.10, 3.44.4, 3.45.5, 3.45.9, 3.48.8. See Thomas A. McGinn. *Prostitution, Sexuality, and the Law in Ancient Rome*. 10. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998., who writes of an honor-shame syndrome in which the role of Man is to protect a family's honor and the role of Woman is to conserve her sexual purity, lest the collective reputation of the family be shamed. However, "honor" does not quite map onto Roman categories, because the Latin root *honos* refers mostly to distinctions received as a reward due to rank or another type of recognition.

[31] Langlands, R. *Sexual Morality in Rome.* 4. *Pudicitia* is also the name of the goddess of chastity, who is connected to Juno. See Section VII on Valerius Maximus and his treatment of both *puditicia* the quality and *Pudicitia* the deity.

[32] Langlands, R. *Sexual Morality in Rome.* 2, 3.

[33] Langlands, R. *Sexual Morality in Rome.* 30-33.

[34] Ibid., 35.

Roman man should always practice the active, not passive, sexual role.[35] For the purposes of this essay, I use the English word "chastity" to mean sexual behavior of men or women that is acceptable to the moral standards and guidelines of the culture in question when discussing sexual norms in general, and the Latin word *pudicitia* in the discussion of the specifics of Roman authors. The distinction between *pudicitia*-killings and honor killings lies in how *pudicitia* is required to be manifested and in its close connection with the politics of the city. It is for this reason that I use Livy as the primary source for the narratives of Lucretia and Verginia, and compare these to Dionysius of Halicarnassus when the narratives diverge in relevant ways.[36] Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* gestures strongly to a superior morality of earlier Romans, and this connects the work closely with Augustan legislation, which depended on and reinforced an idea of the necessity of looking backward into the past in order to move forward into the future.[37] When Livy writes about *pudicitia,* therefore, we can start from the basis that this quality is somehow connected to the body politic.

Section IV: Verginia

The story of Verginia as it appears in Livy parallels the paradigm above of honor-based violence more closely than that of Lucretia. Although Lucretia's story precedes Verginia's chronologically in the history of Rome, examining Verginia's narrative first helps to understand what it means for Lucretia's narrative to deviate in key ways. Verginia, a plebeian young woman, is killed by her father in order to prevent sexual assault by a corrupt official, Appius Claudius. The consequences of her death implicate more people than just herself or her immediate family. However, narratives of Verginia diverge from the anthropological framework through two key differences working in conjunction with each other: the framework above places importance on the reputation of the *family* when the *honor* of a woman is threatened or compromised, while this story places importance on the integrity of *Rome* and Roman values when Verginia's *chastity* is threatened. Several key aspects point to this distinction: Verginia's qualities that attract the lust of Appius; where the blame, and thus the center of her chastity, lies; and what is at stake when she is threatened, and subsequently, when she is killed. Verginia's existence as an emblem, or *exemplum,* of chastity, as opposed to an existence in which her moral subjectivity is emphasized, further separates this mode of gender-based violence from the anthropological paradigm: Verginia's personal traits, specifically chastity, are connected to the body politic, not just her family.[38]

In his characterization of the family of Verginia, Livy sets up a contrast between that which he aims for the reader to notice (the family's strong morals and principles) and that which Appius Claudius notices and becomes infatuated with (Verginia's physical beauty) in a way that

---

[35] Sara E. Phang. *Roman Military Service: Ideologies of Discipline in the Late Republic and Early Principate*. 93. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

[36] See Jane D. Chaplin. *Livy's Exemplary History*. 17. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000., for information regarding Dionysius of Halicarnassus' history of Rome as well as Livy's motive for writing his own. According to Jane Chaplin, Dionysius had an interest in historical *exempla*, but unlike Livy, whose writing is characteristic of featuring *exempla* that can be interpreted in multiple ways, Dionysius only saw purpose in highlighting *exempla* that were worth imitation.

[37] Milnor, K. *Gender, Domesticity, and Augustus*. 155.

[38] See Section V for more discussion on exemplarity in Roman literature and in the Roman mind.

displays the moral degeneracy of Appius. Both the family of Verginia and the man to whom she is betrothed, Icilius, are described as morally upright:

> *Pater virginis, L. Verginius, honestum ordinem in Algido ducebat, vir exempli recti domi militiaeque. Perinde uxor instituta fuerat liberique instituebantur. Desponderat filiam L. Icilio tribunicio, viro acri et pro causa plebis expertae virtutis.*
>
> The father of the girl, Lucius Verginius, a centurion of rank, was serving on Algidus, a man of exemplary life at home and in the army. His wife had been brought up in the same principles, and his children were being trained in them. He had betrothed his daughter to the tribune Lucius Icilius, a sharp man of proven virtue in the cause of the plebeians. (Livy, 3.44.1-4)

If Verginius' wife and children have been brought up with the same morals and principles as he himself had been, then one might assume that Verginia also bears these characteristics. But Livy makes more of an explicit reference to the morality of Verginia in his use of the word *virgo.*[39] While this word is often loosely translated as "virgin" or "maiden," the connotations go beyond reference only to age or sexual status: the word *virgo* also has strong moral undertones.[40]

Despite her family's strong sense of values and her own chastity, however, it seems to be Verginia's remarkable beauty that incites Appius's *libido* to want her:

> *Hanc virginem adultam forma excellentem Appius amore amens pretio ac spe perlicere adortus…*
>
> This grown girl, remarkably beautiful, Appius, out of his mind with love, attempted to entice with money and promises. (Livy, 3.44.4)

Early on, Livy connects unchecked lust with physical beauty, and eventually compromised chastity. Livy and Dionysius describe how when in the presence of Verginia, Appius is seized by an overwhelming desire for her because of her beautiful appearance (and both mention that she has reached the age of marriageability), but all three authors describe her and her family's strong moral standing *before* mentioning her beauty, and also, more extensively.[41] If Appius is drawn to her physical beauty, why do Livy and others seem to give precedence to descriptions of moral traits? Doing so highlights Appius' moral corruption: despite the many honorable traits that characterize Verginia and her family, he is superficially overcome by her physical beauty and thus his attraction represents moral corruption. Livy and others emphasize an uncontrollable lust, and a lust that doesn't seem to spare even those who are the most morally upright and chaste. Verginia, chaste as she is, is in danger. Perhaps this is why, according to Juvenal, no one should wish their daughters to be beautiful as Verginia or Lucretia were.[42] Early on in the story, then,

---

[39] Livy, 3.44.4.

[40] Caldwell, L. *Roman Girlhood.* 50-53. *Virgo* is used often among literary authors to label respectable girls.

[41] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 3.28.2.

[42] Langlands, R. *Sexual Morality in Rome.* 83; Juv.10.297-8

Livy presents a narrative that has less to do with Verginia and her individual characteristics themselves and more to do with the lustful degeneracy of Appius Claudius.

Dying as a consequence of threatened *stuprum*[43] might suggest that Verginia is to "blame"[44], but several aspects of the story point to the blame lying with the unchecked lust of Appius Claudius. Appius finds himself with a window of opportunity: Verginia, in addition to being an unmarried plebeian woman, is temporarily without her father. Appius has his client, Marcus Claudius, claim Verginia as if Appius' slave. One particular excerpt from this story shows the full extent of Appius Claudius' immorality:

> *postquam omnia pudore saepta animadverterat, ad crudelem superbamque vim animum convertit…sequique se iubebat: cunctantem vi abstracturum.*
>
> After finding that her modesty was proof against everything, he changed to a course of cruel and tyrannical violence…and he [Marcus] ordered her to follow him, and he would remove her forcibly if she delayed. (Livy, 3.44.4-6)

Appius is a *decemvir*, a government official but his behavior recalls that of a tyrant, and with the use of "superbamque," Livy is recalling a specific one: the king Tarquinius Superbus and his son Sextus, the Roman prince who rapes Lucretia. The connection that is maintained here and elsewhere between the two women solidifies the paradigm to follow. Moreover, Appius' quickness to use force, and his general subversion of the law, is evidence of his abuse of power over all Romans, as well as his general immorality.[45] Most importantly, however, Appius claiming Verginia as his slave has powerful implications within the context of citizenship status and within the historical context of corrupt officials. Slaves in Roman society were considered property: Roman men were not liable to be charged with adultery or rape if the person in question was a slave.[46] Verginia becomes a symbol of a public that is under the oppressive and corrupt power of the *decemvirs* by being reduced to slavery and victimized by a powerful man. That she, a young, unmarried, unprotected woman, is his victim and that her story becomes paradigmatic for all citizens, is indicative of the depravity in Rome at the time. Given the reduction in her status to slave, it would not make sense to focus blame on a powerless victim. Instead, the narrative shows that the untethered lust of Appius Claudius is a reflection of a fundamental abuse of power that is to blame for the treatment of all Roman citizens, not just Verginia.

By drawing attention to Verginia's chastity even though it does not withstand Appius' threats, Livy sets up contrasting morals that had a particular register in an Augustan context. The

---

[43] Jane Gardner. *Women in Roman Law & Society*. 121. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986. *Stuprum* can generally be referred to as any sort of sexual immorality, such as adultery for married women or married men raping a young girl.

[44] That is to say, a person who would be to "blame" for such an occurrence would be both involved in an incident and would have been able to stop it, but didn't. In the model of honor killing as described in Section I, Verginia being at fault for Appius' sexual assault would be presupposed.

[45] It is also important to note the placement of this story and these characters within a work in which Livy conspicuously antagonizes the Claudian Dynasty. See P. G. Walsh. *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods*. 89. Cambridge [Eng.]: University Press, 1961.

[46] Gardner, J. *Women in Roman Law*. 118-121. According to Gardner, even a virgin *dressed* as a slave would have incurred less punishment on the perpetrator of sexual assault.

early books of Livy's history were written during the beginning of Augustus's restoration; although several aspects were ineffective and unpopular, the aim was to return to ancestral Roman traditions, renew Rome's greatness, and reorganized the state. Augustan legislation sought to undo the supposed conditions of the late Republic: greed, license, wealth, and luxury.[47] It is in this context, in which Livy exists in a generation with a collapsed past and an uncertain future, that one can look to Livy's use of Verginia (and as we will see, Lucretia) as an *exemplum* of chastity.[48] For Sandra Joshel, Livy's account of Roman political transformation involves three "actors": villains whose lustful desires are ultimately self-destructive, innocent and chaste women who are raped and killed to preserve the virtue of the body female and the body politic, and Roman men who are inspired to act by other Roman men who take control of the situation.[49] Livy's narrative can be seen to reflect a society that was troubled by male excess and a lack of female chastity, and thus men who exercise self-discipline (men who perform their civic duties, and who do not give into wealth, avarice, and luxury) such as Icilius and Verginius, set an example of virtuous male bodies that are indifferent to greed and lust. By creating a scene where even Verginia's resolute modesty is out of her control, Livy keeps the narrative at a distance from Verginia's subjectivity. In Livy's narrative of political transformation, themes of avarice and luxury are consistently contrasted with male self-control and chastity, often leaving the object of these aspects – women – out of the picture.

If Verginia's chastity exists outside of her control and the control of her male relatives, then it becomes clear that as long as she is living, her removal from the episode is necessary in the pursuit of justice. One reason for this necessity is the questionable status of her chastity. Although it is clear that Verginia cannot be blamed for Appius' tyrannical actions, her sexual status is nevertheless an anomaly. Unchecked lust and a lack of chastity are two sides of the same coin: if Appius succeeds in claiming Verginia for himself out of his lustful desire, then Verginia no longer remains a chaste young woman.[50] Eliminating the source of the lust does not solve the problem, because Livy's narrative tends to a dichotomy of female sexuality: woman, as far as Rome is concerned (not as far as an individual like Verginia is concerned, because she is not in full control of her chastity), is either chaste or unchaste.[51] Verginia is already an anomaly in female sexuality because her chastity has been called into question. This poses Verginia as a threat to others, which is the second reason why her removal is necessary. In Livy's history, often the threatening element of a "good" woman is her attractiveness. Her existence is a threat to the discipline of men.[52] The unchecked desire of Appius is where blame lies, and in order to resolve the situation it is Verginia who must be eliminated.

During the scene of Verginia's death, the high political stakes of her compromised chastity become much clearer. Verginius arrives to help his daughter out of her plight, but upon

---

[47] Sandra Joshel. "The Body Female and the Body Politic: Livy's Lucretia and Verginia," 114., in *Sexuality and Gender in the Classical World: Readings and Sources* (ed L. K. McClure), Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Oxford, UK. 2002. doi: 10.1002/9780470756188.ch6

[48] Chaplin, J. *Livy's Exemplary History.* 31

[49] Joshel, S. "The Body Female and the Body Politic." 117.

[50] If this is the case, then the opposite applies too: male self-discipline and female chastity are also two sides of the same coin. If men can focus on moderation and his duties to his family and Rome, then women will not be able to seduce them.

[51] Joshel, S. "The Body Female and the Body Politic." 120.

[52] Joshel, S. "The Body Female and the Body Politic." 118-120.

realizing the difficulty of this task, he becomes desperate. He asks Appius to grant him a moment alone with Verginia and her nurse:

> *Data venia seducit filiam ac nutricem prope Cloacinae ad tabernas, quibus nunc Novis est nomen, atque ibi ab lanio cultro arrepto, 'hoc te uno quo possum' ait, 'modo, filia, in libertatem vindico.' Pectus deinde puellae transfigit, respectansque ad tribunal 'te' inquit, 'Appi, tuumque caput sanguine hoc consecro.' Clamore ad tam atrox facinus orto excitus Appius comprehendi Verginium iubet.*
>
> Permission being granted, he led his daughter and the nurse to the booths near the shrine of Cloacina,[53] are now called the "New Booths," and there, snatching a knife from a butcher, he said, "Thus, my daughter, in the only way I can, I claim your freedom!" He then stabbed the heart of the girl, and looking back to the tribunal, shouted, "'You, Appius, and your life I devote to destruction with this blood!" The shout which broke forth at the dreadful deed roused Appius, and he ordered Verginius to be seized. (Livy, 3.48.3-6)

One might imagine a group of three choices: *violated* or *unviolated* (that is, physically), *publicly adulterous* or *publicly innocent* (regardless of physical state), and *dead* or *alive*. Appius Claudius, as a lustful, tyrannical official, does not give a choice to Verginia, a young, unmarried girl without agency. In his hands, her fate is to be *violated-publicly adulterous-alive*. The public's shock and indignation towards the actions of Appius suggest that they want Verginia to be *unviolated-publicly innocent-alive*.[54] This, of course, would be ideal. However, when Verginius realizes that Appius is too powerful to challenge, he creates a new option for Verginia: *unviolated-publicly innocent-dead.* This action, and indeed his words, make it clear that the death of Verginia is a better option for both herself and all Romans than for a young, unmarried woman to be actually unchaste or even unchaste in the public's perception. If this circumstance only implicated Verginia, then to exclaim that this murder is for her freedom would be sufficient. However, immediately after stabbing her, Verginius calls revenge on Appius and his life, foreshadowing the overthrow of the *decemvirs,* an action that would benefit all Romans.

The nature of chastity in this particular story – as something that cannot be restored through Verginia's death but that can serve as a call to revolt – is revealed when Livy localizes the threat to Rome of desecrated chastity in the various ways that the characters grieve. Within the context of a society in which the relationship between fathers and daughters was a uniquely loving one,[55] one might expect Verginius to be upset over Verginia's death. Indeed, several actions show this to be true: when approached by an unaware crowd, he weeps silently before imploring them to understand the dire circumstances under which he killed his daughter, her life being dearer to him than his own, and he tells them his daughter died a miserable but honorable death (*miseram sed honestam mortem occubuisse*).[56] Verginia's death does not bring any direct benefit to Verginius, while the paradigmatic honor killing scheme necessarily involves the death

[53] Cloacina is the protector of sexual intercourse in marriage. That Verginia is being associated with such a goddess in her final moment adds to her exemplarity.

[54] Livy, 3.45-47.

[55] See Section II.

[56] Livy, 3.48.6-9.

of a sexually transgressing woman directly and positively affecting her family. In other words, the death of Verginia is a call to revolt, rather than an action that restores family reputation. The ways in which the other characters grieve also reflects the non-restorative nature of Verginia's death, and that chastity implicates a large group rather than an individual or a small unit such as the family:

> *Ille ferro quacumque ibat viam facere, donec multitudine etiam prosequentium tuente ad portam perrexit. Icilius Numitoriusque exsangve corpus sublatum ostentant populo; scelus Appi, puellae infelicem formam, necessitatem patris deplorant. Sequentes clamitant matronae, eamne liberorum procreandorum condicionem, ea pudicitiae praemia esse?— cetera, quae in tali re muliebris dolor, quo est maestior imbecillo animo, eo miserabilia magis querentibus subicit. Virorum et maxime Icili vox tota tribuniciae potestatis ac provocationis ad populum ereptae publicarumque indignationum erat.*
>
> But Verginius made a passage for himself with his knife wherever he went, until, protected by a crowd of men who attached themselves to him, and so reached the city gate. Icilius and Numitorius raised the lifeless body and showed it to the people, lamenting the crime of Appius, the unlucky beauty of the girl, and the necessity of her father. The matrons, following, exclaimed, "Was this the condition on which children were to be raised? Were these the rewards of chastity?" —with other such manifestations of womanly grief and are so much the more weak as their lack of self-control makes them the more give way to grief. The men, and especially Icilius, talked only of the tribunician power and the right of appeal to people, having been taken from them, and of indignation at the wrongs to the public. (Livy, 3.48.6-9)

The *matronae* who cry out loud and lament a seemingly-absent reward for chastity reveal how oppressive the political climate has become if chastity, a quality held so dear, is compromised. Verginia's chastity is the cause of concern for *all* Roman women, and where women, who symbolize the private sphere and hold the future of a society in their wombs, are in danger, men are in danger.

The other men, such as Icilius, grieve the death of Verginia and react to this danger in the way a Roman man and soldier should: they talk about their rights that they have been stripped of and think of the wrongs done to the nation, because after all, they have the self-control that the *matronae* lack. It is through Livy's use of spectacle that the actions of these men, as a result of Verginia's death, become a call to revolution.[57] The sight of Verginia's lifeless body, lifted up by Icilius and Numitorius to be seen by the crowd, neatly summarizes what has happened: *scelus Appi, puellae infelicem formam, necessitatem patris deplorant.* Male heroes and tyrants, therefore, not raped women, carry forward the main trajectory of Livy's work. According to Rebecca Klindeinst, the struggle to lay hands on Verginia's never-penetrated body represents the

[57] See Andrew Feldherr. *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History*. 3. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998. When Livy uses narrative strategies to engage the audience's gaze, his text reproduces political consequences of the events described, and these strategies encourage the audience to act upon his own society.

struggle to determine who will control the body politic.[58] Once it is in the hands of these male heroes, and also not representing an anomaly in chastity, revolutionary measures are able to begin. Verginia, then, catalyzes the political change that is to occur and she is remembered as an exemplary figure of chastity during its most trying time.

Section V: Lucretia

The other prominent narrative – the one which appears first, chronologically – of a Roman woman whose chastity is compromised, and who dies subsequently, is that of Lucretia.[59] Together with the story of Verginia, this story adheres to what can be called a Roman paradigm of gender-based violence, or "chastity killing": Lucretia becomes the victim of sexual assault that compromises her chastity, threatening her family and more importantly, the Roman polity. In Livy's extended account of the founding of the city, the story of Lucretia precedes that of Verginia, and Livy even draws an explicit parallel between the two.[60] During the reign of the king Tarquinius Superbus, his son Sextus becomes infatuated with the beautiful, chaste, and married Lucretia, and despite her attempts to guard her chastity, he succeeds in raping her. Of her own accord and volition, she then kills herself and her death catalyzes the exile of the Roman royal family and the beginning of the Republic. We can look to many of the same aspects that occur in the story of Verginia in this story of Lucretia to see that these two narratives constitute a particular mode of gender-based violence, one involving women whose existence as *exempla* of chastity is paired with the notion that they exist as individuals, but even more as representatives of a community oppressed by tyranny in the polity at large, and as catalysts of revolutionary actions. Unlike the anthropological paradigm, what is at stake in the sexual assault of these women is more than just their family's reputation.

Lucretia's entrance into the story is as an unknowing participant in a competition of whose wife is the most honorable. Livy immediately puts her chastity and femininity into focus against Sextus's fixation on her physical beauty. During an extended siege of the Rutulian capital of Ardea, young men, drunk and away from Rome and their wives, pass their time concocting a competition of whose wife is superior to the rest. They surprise Lucretia, whose actions compared to the other women explicitly reveal her *pudicitia*:

> *citatis equis avolant Romam. Quo cum primis se intendentibus tenebris pervenissent, pergunt inde Collatiam, ubi Lucretiam haudquaquam ut regias nurus, quas in convivio luxuque cum aequalibus viderant tempus terentes sed nocte sera deditam lanae inter lucubrantes ancillas in medio aedium sedentem inveniunt. Muliebris certaminis laus penes Lucretiam fuit.*

---

[58] Patricia Klindienst. "Ritual Work on Human Flesh': Livy's Lucretia and the Rape of the Body Politic" 51-70. *Helios.* 17:1 (Spring) 1990.

[59] See the beginning of Section III for an explanation of why I examine these two stories out of textual order.

[60] Livy, 3.44.1: *sequitur aliud in urbe nefas ab libidine ortum, haud minus foedo eventuquam quod per stuprum caedemque Lucretiae urbe regnoque Tarquinios expulerat, ut non finis solum idem decemviris qui regibus sed causa etiam eadem imperii amittendi esset.*

> They immediately galloped to Rome, where they arrived in the early evening. From there they proceeded to Collatia, where they saw Lucretia, not like the king's daughters-in-law, whom they had seen spending their time in luxurious entertainments with their equals, but though at an advanced time of night, employed at her wool, sitting in the middle of the house amid her maids working around her. The praise of the competition of the ladies was belonging to Lucretia. (Livy, 1.57.9-10)

While Livy uses the word *virgo* to identify Verginia's character traits, here Lucretia's actions identify her as a morally-upright Roman woman. Before emerging as an actor in the scene, the reader is told that she is unlike the other daughters-in-law of the king who have been spending their time at luxurious feasts. Livy's use of *luxus* starts to set up the contrast between discipline and luxuriousness that was present in the story of Verginia and that will continue to be developed in this narrative. The discipline and moral integrity that Lucretia does exhibit, in comparison to the other women, is made explicit in the image of Lucretia spinning wool late into the night. Aristocratic Roman women and matrons, such as Lucretia, were expected and highly praised for spinning wool as it was a part of general domestic administration. As a result, wool-spinning (*lanificium*), though a physical task, is often grouped in a set of moral characteristics such as modesty (*modestia*), upright character (*probitas*), a nature of compliance (*obsequium*), conscientiousness (*diligentia*), trustworthiness (*fides*), and chastity (*pudicitia*) in the Roman mind.[61] That Livy includes this particular action in his narrative and, for example, Dionysius of Halicarnassus does not, sets up Lucretia's exemplarity to Rome and Roman women that is to become fully actualized later in the story.[62] This powerful spectacle of Lucretia's chastity makes Sextus' preoccupation with her physical appearance all the more stark by contrast. For Sextus, it is her beauty, and then her chastity, that incites his evil passion.[63] Livy constructs a background that he also does with Appius Claudius: the juxtaposition of luxury and lust against discipline and chastity confirms and turns the focus of the narrative to Sextus's moral degeneracy even at the individual level.

As in the story of Verginia, the question of where the "blame" lies for what ensues leads the audience further away from Lucretia and closer to the unchecked lust of Sextus Tarquinius. After a few days, Sextus enters Collatinus' home under the pretense of a guest and is welcomed warmly by all, including Lucretia. Collatinus is both absent and unaware. In the middle of the night he invades Lucretia's room and eventually rapes her:

> *Cum pavida ex somno mulier nullam opem, prope mortem imminentem videret, tum Tarquinius fateri amorem, orare, miscere precibus minas, versare in omnes partes muliebrem animum. Ubi obstinatam videbat et ne mortis quidem metu inclinari, addit ad metum dedecus: cum mortua iugulatum servum nudum positurum ait, ut in sordido adulterio necata dicatur. Quo terrore cum vicisset obstinatam pudicitiam velut vi victrix libido, profectusque inde Tarquinius ferox expugnato decore muliebri esset…*

---

[61] Hallett, J.P. *Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society.* 19, 43.

[62] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 4.64.4. Dionysius simply refers to Lucretia as a matron who excelled all the Roman women in beauty as well as virtue.

[63] See Matthew Fox. *Roman Historical Myths: The Regal Period in Augustan Literature*. 212-213. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996., who writes that, if at all, Lucretia is only passively characterized before the reader meets her, and thus her effect on Sextus emerges as perversity on his part.

> After being awoken from her sleep, the fearful woman saw no help, only imminent death near; then Tarquin talked of his love, begged, mixed threats with entreaties, turned the female's mind in all ways. When he saw that she was inflexible, and that she was not moved even by fear of death, he added to terror the threat of dishonor; when she is dead he would place a murded naked slave next to her, he said, so that in sordid adultery she would be said to have been killed. When by the terror of this disgrace his lust, as it were victorious, had overcome her inflexible chastity, and from there Tarquin had departed, exulting in having triumphed over a lady's honor… (Livy, 1.58. 1-5)

At first, Lucretia's ability to exert her chastity extends further than Verginia's agency when she is attacked by the client of Appius. Verginia was speechless with fear,[64] but when Sextus threatens Lucretia, not even the fear of death moves her. This difference in agency between the two women exists for several reasons. On a practical level, the threat of *stuprum* is much more urgent here: Lucretia is asleep in her bed, and Sextus is threatening to rape her right away. More importantly, though, Lucretia's agency comes in part from her social status as a Roman woman. Lucretia is married and a *mulier*, not a *virgo* still under paternal authority. However, just like Verginia, Lucretia is eventually forced to submit to Sextus. One similarity in the circumstances that both the women find themselves in point to why this is the case: both women are unprotected by the men that would have any real power to protect them. For Verginia, this is her father Verginius, and for Lucretia, this is her husband Collatinus. When Collatinus is absent, Sextus overpowers Lucretia physically, and his uncontrollable lust prevails over her chastity. In this moment, Lucretia and her chastity are outmatched and ultimately powerless. The rape of Lucretia, and one might say rape in Roman literature in general, is about the exertion of force and male action in a female space.[65] Lucretia's powerlessness in overcoming danger points the blame, and therefore the focus of the narrative, towards Sextus and his untethered lust.

Another question of blame must be asked regarding Collatinus, who suggests the competition in the first place and through whom Livy also evokes contrasting images of frivolity and self-discipline. In Livy's narrative, Collatinus proposes a competition among the men with whom he is drinking to see whose wife (and therefore which of the men) is the most praiseworthy, setting off a chain of events that leads to the rape of Lucretia. Putting Lucretia on display in such a way that Sextus is able to become inflamed with passion places part of the blame for what transpires on Collatinus.[66] In the narrative of Lucretia written by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, however, this competition does not occur. Instead, while Collatinus is away Sextus stays at his home as a guest, and Lucretia simply entertains him as host.[67] What, then, does this element of the story that is missing in Dionysius' account do for Livy's account? First, a need to display morality despite the dangers of doing so is indicative of a time in which *pudicitia* is of great value. Livy also uses this as another avenue to construct a contrast between frivolity and self-discipline, exemplifying Lucretia from the beginning of the story. But part of

---

[64] Livy, 3.44.7: *pavida puella stupente…*

[65] Joshel, S. "The Body Female and the Body Politic." 122-128.

[66] One would not blame Collatinus for being away from home, because by performing his duties of being a soldier he is acting in the way that he should, just like Icilius and Verginius do. The question here is whether exposing Lucretia in the way that Collatinus does is blameworthy.

[67] Dionysius, 4.64.4-6.

Lucretia's exemplarity includes being emblematic of moral ideals such as *pudicitia*, and less of an individual with her own moral subjectivity. The particular addition of Collatinus as another individual into the story's mechanism focuses the narrative onto the men who drive the action forward.

The choice of Lucretia to kill herself after being raped by Sextus reveals the implications of compromised chastity and points to why her removal from the scene is necessary in the pursuit of stability for all of Rome. Lucretia calls for her father and Collatinus to come with other men, and when they ask if everything is alright, she replies, "Not at all…for what is to be salvaged when the *pudicitia* of a woman is lost?" (*Minime…quid enim salvi est mulieri amissa pudicitia?*) While Lucretia claims her *pudicitia* is lost, her father and friends console her, telling Lucretia that the mind sins but not the body. Livy creates confusion about where *pudicitia* is located, but, similarly to the story of Verginia, one can imagine the same group of three choices: *violated* or *unviolated*, *publicly adulterous* or *publicly innocent*, and *dead* or *alive*. Sextus gives Lucretia two choices: she can either choose to be *violated-publicly innocent-alive* or *violated-publicly adulterous-dead*, and she chooses the former in the moment, leading the reader to believe that the importance of chastity lies in the *perception* of others and not necessarily in actual physical purity. Then, despite being told by her father and husband that she is not at fault, she creates a new option: *violated-publicly victimized-dead*. According to Rebecca Langlands, Lucretia locates *pudicitia* in her body, thereby not considering it part of her moral subjectivity, when only a few lines before, she chose to accept bodily dishonor over perceived dishonor.[68] If chastity were solely a physical quality and something that only affected herself, she would have chosen the second option (*unviolated-publicly adulterous-dead*), and if chastity were solely a quality that concerned intention, then she would not have had to create the third option (*violated-publicly victimized-dead*). What does this complexity reveal? First, Lucretia's questionable status about her physical being and morality in and of itself is objectifying: the more one debates where chastity does or does not manifest itself in relation to her, the more the narrative becomes less about her and her moral subjectivity, and more about *pudicitia* as a public concern. Second, if she did not die as a result of this question, this perplexity would remain, potentially creating problems for herself, Collatinus, her family, and possibly others. However, the knife that she plunges into her heart seems to eradicate whatever lack of chastity was there and kills any anomaly in female sexuality, the most important one being this contradiction between Lucretia's innocent mind and desecrated body.[69]

Understanding the distance that Livy increasingly places between the reader and Lucretia's moral subjectivity puts into focus the implications of Lucretia's attack on a group much larger than herself and even her family: what is most at stake in this defilement of chastity is the future of Rome. In the ancient world there existed a wider cultural phenomenon (not just restricted to literature) in which rape affected those other than its actual, physical victims.[70] In the anthropological paradigm of an honor-based society above, the social group most affected by rape (and sexual transgression in general) is the immediate family. Sexual transgression done to or by a woman is a threat to family honor, and punishment in the form of violence or death mitigates such a threat, restoring a family's reputation. In the story of Lucretia, "family honor" or reputation does not seem to be the operative category in any sense. If it did, Lucretia could have

[68] Langlands, R. *Sexual Morality in Rome.* 93.
[69] Joshel, S. "The Body Female and the Body Politic." 124.
[70] Langlands, R. *Sexual Morality in Rome.* 87.

chosen to be *violated-publicly innocent-alive*. Just as the familial grief of Verginius and Icilius over the death of Verginia pushes along the narrative towards a political change, Lucretius and Collatinus, as well as the other men in the narrative, grieve in such a way that catalyzes the overthrow of the monarchy. While her father and her husband are, understandably, distraught over what has happened, Brutus pulls out the knife from Lucretia's body, vows to take vengeance on the Roman monarchy, and tells the others to do the same. Brutus' actions of bravery and level-headedness inspire the same in others:

> *totique ab luctu versi in iram, Brutum iam inde ad expugnandum regnum vocantem sequuntur ducem. Elatum domo Lucretiae corpus in forum deferunt, concientque miraculo, ut fit, rei novae atque indignitate homines. Pro se quisque scelus regium ac vim queruntur. Movet cum patris maestitia, tum Brutus castigator lacrimarum atque inertium querellarum auctorque quod viros, quod Romanos deceret, arma capiendi adversus hostilia ausos. Ferocissimus quisque iuvenum cum armis voluntarius adest; sequitur et cetera iuventus.*
>
> Grief was turned into anger; they followed Brutus's lead, calling them from there, now, to storm the kingdom. They carried out the body of Lucretia from the house and carried it into the form, where, men formed a crowd by the miracle and the indignity of the new crime, as they would be. Each had his own complaint to make of the crime and violence of the prince. The sorrow of the father not only moved them, but that Brutus neutralizes their tears and idle lamentations and urged them to be men and Romans by taking up arms against those who had dared to treat them as enemies. The boldest of the young men seized their weapons and offered themselves for service, and the rest followed. (Livy, 1.59.2-4)

A series of *exempla* and spectacles quickly takes the narrative from Lucretia and her private home to the public forum: Lucretia first assigns herself an exemplary role; Livy's use of spectacle through Lucretia's suicide evokes an image of bravery on her part; Brutus uses her knife and body to incite her family to fight against the monarchy; and the crowd is not only moved by the sight of Lucretia's body but also by Brutus's determination. After witnessing both, the grief of the men turns into anger. This story begins with a woman who is both powerless herself and a symbol for the powerless body politic against the monarchy, but as the narrative continues, men, as defenders of Lucretia's chastity and the public, take up focus. Taken with the story of Verginia, Lucretia's story fits into a pattern of "chastity killings," where the death of a woman after her chastity has been compromised is radical and revolutionary, and therefore affects the Roman state.

Section V: Verginia and Lucretia as a category in Livy

Both of these stories reveal a perplexing attitude towards *pudicitia*, both in that they do not provide a clear and definitive view of what it is, and also in the dramatic amount of importance they place on the trait itself. But when discussing the narratives of these women, and those of Livy in particular, it is important to keep in mind the mode of transmission in which they exist. In order to make thoughtful comparisons between the anthropological framework for

honor killing and these two narratives of Roman women, it is necessary to note here the difference in the nature of the two objects of study. The paradigm of honor killing as laid out earlier comes from anthropological and sociological studies observing culture in action, while these historical narratives of Lucretia and Verginia serve as literary artefacts representing the workings of the political imaginary. Action in the anthropological framework cannot therefore be equated with action occurring in such stories. However, looking at the two in conjunction is still helpful when analyzing how these narratives indicate cultural debate surrounding sexual morality. That Verginia and Lucretia are exemplary figures will particularly inform this discussion.

Livy himself, in his preface, states the utility of his Roman history, setting up a scheme in which he will display exemplary characters for the audience to connect with Rome's past:

> *Hoc illud est praecipue in cognitione rerum salubre ac frugiferum, omnis te exempli documenta in inlustri posita monumento intueri; inde tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde foedum inceptu foedum exitu quod vites.* (Livy, *praefatio,* 10.)

Exemplary Roman figures exist within a discourse that links actions, audience, values, and memories together in a particularly Roman context[71] and for Livy in particular, this discourse is applicable to his readers who are active participants in Roman society, reflecting consciously and following social norms willingly.[72] Furthermore, exemplary discourse may frequently focus on the elite (though not always), but it encompasses and enjoins all of Roman society: from the late Republic onward, exemplarity can be considered the normative mode of establishing and instilling social values through actions, evaluations of those actions, and then social reproduction.[73] Matthew Roller describes four elements characteristic of exemplarity. There must be an action regarded as consequential to the Roman community at large that embodies (or obviously fails to embody) critical social values; there must be an audience of witnesses who make ethical judgments, placing the observed action into categories such as "good" or "bad"; there must be a commemoration of the deed that occurs by means of a monument;[74] finally, there must be imitation or reference to imitation of the deed, because both primary and secondary spectators of the action are encouraged to replicate the deed and therefore win similar renown.[75] *Exempla* are not restricted to legendary figures that only embrace moral concepts: they can be unnamed or obscure individuals, battle tactics, constitutional precedents, or religious affairs that also exhibit practical matters.[76] This develops a self-generating cycle of social reproduction, creating more monuments and therefore more audiences. Briefly revisiting Livy's narratives illustrates how they map onto this exemplary scheme. Both the kidnapping of Verginia and the rape of Lucretia were held to be consequential for the larger Roman community, embodying the *pudicitia* of the women (and family) and the lust of their assailants; the spectatorship of the

---

[71] Matthew B. Roller. "Exemplarity in Roman Culture: The Cases of Horatius Cocles and Cloelia." 4. *Classical Philology* 99, no. 1 (2004): 1-56. doi:10.1086/423674.

[72] Michèle Lowrie & Susanne Lüdemann. *Exemplarity and Singularity: Thinking Through Particulars in Philosophy, Literature, and Law*. 8. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2015.

[73] Roller, M. "Exemplarity in Roman Culture," 6.

[74] Roller defines a monument as "An object or device that brings the action to memory: narratives, statues, scars or other bodily marks, toponyms, cognomina, even rituals." 6.

[75] Ibid., 4-6.

[76] Chaplin, J. *Livy's Exemplary History.* 3.

audiences in the two narratives, who comment on the morality in question, constitute the actions as consequential for their communities; the two women are commemorated in Livy's memory but also in the memory of what follows in Livy's work (Lucretia designates herself as an example for Roman women); Livy makes explicit references to Lucretia in the story of Verginia, alluding to the actions of Verginia's father as an imitation of Lucretia's *pudicitia* in action. Lucretia and Verginia, as they exist in Livy's historical narrative, fit right into a tradition that in the particular cases of these two women, works to exemplify their chastity.

What do the deaths of Lucretia and Verginia signify in a discussion of these women as *exempla*? Is there some aspect of their exemplarity that exists *because* of their death? Their existence after their chastity has been threatened creates an obstacle between the Roman public and their oppressors. After all, it isn't until both Lucretia and Verginia are dead (not after they have been raped or threatened with rape), that Brutus, Collatinus, Icilius, and the other men around them are provoked to challenge their oppressors. Sandra Joshel provides three reasons why Lucretia and Verginia have to die in order for the narrative to continue and for social and political change to occur: if they live, they stand as evidence of a living disorder or chaos among questions of whether they are chaste or unchaste; if they live, Lucretia and Verginia constitute another threat, that once the private sphere of the men close to them has been invaded, the buffer zone that the women represent is destroyed and becomes harmful to what it once protected (men);[77] finally, if they die, their bodies can be deployed and observed by all men in a way that would be less possible if they live.[78] They do not become exemplary figures of chastity until both of their deaths. Lucretia maintains her purity by resisting Sextus for as long as possible, but ultimately, she is powerless against him, and her chastity has not succeeded. This is even more the case for Verginia, who, as an unmarried, unprotected, younger woman tries to resist Appius Claudius but is even more quick than Lucretia to succumb. Until their deaths, they are simply symbolic of political oppression: the rape and threatened rape of women signify the victimization of a body politic that is similarly defenseless under the rule of tyrants or tyrannical political leaders.[79] But when Lucretia kills herself and Verginia is killed by her father, they take on a role as emblems of the true *preservation* of chastity. Livy connects the *pudicitia* of the women, and therefore Woman as a category, to the liberty of the people. This connection in and of itself makes the deaths of Lucretia and Verginia worthwhile and signifies the lengths a community has to go to to protect its values. Together, these stories provide a dramatized and mythologized view into the effects of compromised *pudiciti*a, the political oppression or general instability that it can be indicative of, and benefits to the community of mitigating all of its anomalies.

---

[77] This particular reason for the necessity of death can be seen when Lucretia asks her family and friends to avenge her death by targeting Sextus specifically, but Brutus and others end up exiling the entire royal family. Lucretia's oppressor is Sextus, but there is a larger threat to the Roman public: Sextus and the rest of the Roman monarchical family.

[78] Joshel, S. "The Body Female and the Body Politic." 120. Cf. Ann Vasaly. *Livy's Political Philosophy: Power and Personality in Early Rome*. 51. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2015., who writes that on a superficial level, Lucretia functions as a catalyst in that the *outrage* she suffers becomes the last of the insupportable cruelties that the Roman people are suffering under the Tarquins. However, Sandra Joshel's argument that their *deaths* necessitate men to be outraged enough to take on the political establishment aligns more with mine: the defense of *pudicitia* that these women exhibit through their death (whether by their own hand or, for example, their father's) incites the men around them to fight for a revolutionizing of Rome and Roman values.

[79] In the case of Verginia this is even more clear: Verginia and the people that are being oppressed under Appius Claudius and the decemvirs are innocent and guiltless plebeians.

Section VII: Sexual Morality in Other Sources: Valerius Maximus

The narratives of Lucretia and Verginia in Livy's history and, more generally, exemplarity in Livy, function in a way that is closely tied to the body politic. However, what do stories of Lucretia, Verginia, and other individuals experiencing gender-based violence elsewhere mean for a broader discussion of sexual morality in Rome, and are they also necessarily entangled in the politics of the city? Valerius Maximus, in his book *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia,* or "Memorable Deeds and Sayings," compiled a collection of historical anecdotes, utilizing exemplarity throughout. He was writing around the time of Livy's death but under a new emperor, Tiberius, and for generations, his book experienced significant popularity (there are more manuscripts of "Memorable Deeds and Sayings" that survive than any other book in Latin prose apart from the Bible) until the study of Livy began to take over. One can think of his work as what Martin Bloomer calls "neither 'real' political prose nor academic theorizing," but rather a view into declamation and a collection of stories that exhibit specific Roman values working as a moral code.[80] A common theme throughout the book is the contrast between ideas of *virtus* and *vitia*, or good and bad moral conduct.[81] Valerius communicates what were originally political and historical texts as a culture for a new political age under a changing empire that still honored virtues of the past but constituted a new society, through the lens of the codes of conduct that adhered to ideas of *virtus* and *vitia* in Roman noble families.[82] His organization of stories by categories rather than by chronology blurs the line between past and present and creates an impression of timeless and universal values.[83]

What is of particular interest in this paper is Valerius Maximus' section on *pudicitia*, and his treatment of this word as both a quality and as the deity *Pudicitia* herself. His stories (much like Livy's) emphasize that guarding the *pudicitia* of a woman is a form of protecting the state, but they provide a more practical conception than Livy's of its application to Roman society. Each chapter of the book contains a programmatic preface which is to be proven by the examples to follow, and the preface to the chapter on *pudicitia* connects the goddess *Pudicitia* to chastity and protection of the state:[84]

> *Vnde te uirorum pariter ac feminarum praecipuum firmamentum, Pudicitia, inuocem? tu enim prisca religione consecratos Vestae focos incolis, tu Capitolinae Iunonis puluinaribus incubas, tu Palatii columen augustos penates sanctissimumque Iuliae genialem torum adsidua statione celebras, tuo praesidio puerilis aetatis insignia munita sunt, tui numinis respectu sincerus iuuentae flos permanet, te custode matronalis stola censetur: ades igitur et recognosce quae fieri ipsa uoluisti.*

---

[80] Martin W. Bloomer. *Valerius Maximus & the Rhetoric of the New Nobility*. 2-8. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.

[81] Clive Skidmore. *Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen: The Work of Valerius Maximus*. 54. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1996

[82] Bloomer, M.W. *VM & the Rhetoric of the New Nobility.* 11-12. See also Hans-Friedrich Mueller. "Vita, Pudicitia, Libertas: Juno, Gender, and Religious Politics in Valerius Maximus." *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-)* 128 (1998): 221-63. 222.

[83] Hans-Friedrich Mueller. *Roman Religion in Valerius Maximus*. 22. London: Routledge, 2002.

[84] Skidmore, C. *Practical Ethics.* 57.

> From where should I invoke you, Chastity, chief support of men and women alike? For you inhabit the places consecrated to Vesta by ancient religion, you watch over the cushioned couch of Capitoline Juno, you glorify the summit of the Palatine, the sacred dwelling, and the most holy nuptial bed of Julia, with your protection the emblems of the youthful generation are safe, with respect for your divinity the flower of youth remains whole, with your guardianship a matron's dress is approved: Come, therefore, and know of things which have been as you yourself wish. (Val. Max. 6.1)

By connecting the goddess *Pudicitia* to both the gods and to the imperial household, Valerius implies that the virtue over which the goddess governs is essential to the overall stability of the state, and through divine sanction it is also an eternal quality.[85] In this way, he ties the actions of individuals to the success of the empire. He continues to do so, albeit in a similarly indirect way, in the body of the chapter. For ease of reference, below are summaries of the stories in the first chapter of Book VI entitled "*Pudicitia"*:

1. Lucretia kills herself after being raped by Sextus Tarquinius.
2. Verginius kills his daughter before she can be raped by Appius Claudius.
3. Pontius Aufidianus kills his daughter and a slave with whom she committed adultery and whom she was given access to by her tutor.
4. P. Maenius kills a freedman after he kisses her daughter in order to teach him a lesson.
5. Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus exacts punishment from a son for dubious chastity and goes into voluntary exile, after which it is eventually discovered that he has murdered this son.
6. P. Atilius Philiscus kills his daughter for illicit sexual intercourse, even though as a child he was forced into prostitution.
7. M Claudius Marcellus brings a tribune of the plebs to trial for having tried to seduce his son, and this tribune is eventually convicted.
8. Metellus Celer prosecutes a man for promising money to a married woman in exchange for sex, and successfully convicts him on the basis of his intentions alone.
9. T. Verturius brings a complaint before the consuls against Plotius, his former master who abused Verturius for not having sex with him. Plotius is sent to prison.
10. C. Pescennius has C. Cornelius put in prison for having sexual relations with a freeborn boy. Cornelius dies in prison.
11. Cominius, a tribune of the plebs, summons M. Laetorius Mergus, a military tribune, to trial for approaching his adjutant for sex. Mergus flees (and probably dies), but is still convicted.
12. C. Marius declares that C. Plotius justifiably killed C. Lusius for daring to approach Plotius for sexual favors, even though the status difference between the two men was in favor of C. Lusius.
13. Names of men who find other men engaging in adultery and exact private revenge.

1. (External example 1) Hippo, a Greek woman, is captured by an enemy fleet and throws herself into the sea to protect her chastity.
2. (Ext. 2) The wife of the Galatian chieftan Orgiago is forced to have sex with a centurion, but she orders him to be killed and brings his head to her husband.

[85] Mueller, M. *Roman Religion in VM.* 21-22.

3. (Ext. 3) Wives of Teutons are captured by Marius and ask to be sent as a gift to the vestal virgins so as to protect their chastity. When Marius refuses, they hang themselves.

Although these stories all contain instances of sexual misdemeanor, it is violence (and particularly, violent death) that occupies the main focus of and indeed constitutes the primary heroic action of the chapter.[86] The first two examples are familiar ones: Lucretia and Verginia:

> *Dux Romanae pudicitiae Lucretia, cuius uirilis animus maligno errore fortunae muliebre corpus sortitus est, a Sex. Tarquinio regis Superbi filio per uim stuprum pati coacta, cum grauissimis uerbis iniuriam suam in concilio necessariorum deplorasset, ferro se, quod ueste tectum adtulerat, interemit causamque tam animoso interitu imperium consulare pro regio permutandi populo Romano praebuit.*
>
> The leader of Roman chastity, Lucretia, whose manly spirit by a malignant error of Fortune was appointed a womanly body, was raped by force by Sex. Tarquinius, a son of the king Superbus. In a family council she had despaired over her fateful injury with the most grave words, and with a sword which she had brought, concealed in her garment, she killed herself, and through such a courageous death she provided a reason for the Roman people to change the authority of the kings to consuls. (Val. Max. 6.1.1)
>
> *Atque haec inlatam iniuriam non tulit: Verginius plebei generis, sed patricii uir spiritus, ne probro contaminaretur domus sua, proprio sanguini non pepercit: nam cum App. Claudius decemuir filiae eius uirginis stuprum potestatis uiribus fretus pertinacius expeteret, deductam in forum puellam occidit pudicaeque interemptor quam corruptae pater esse maluit.*
>
> And this woman [Lucretia] did not bear the injury done to her. Verginius, a man of a plebeian family but of patrician spirit, in order for his house not to be contaminated with disgrace, did not spare his own blood: for when Appius Claudius the decemvir, relying on his powerful resources, sought persistently to rape his daughter, leading the girl into the forum, he killed her, preferring to be the killer of a chaste daughter than the father of a corrupt one. (Val. Max. 6.1.2)

While these stories do not include the historical and political context that Livy's do, the minimalism provides a focused view into what is important to Valerius Maximus, and therefore what he wants his audience to absorb from the stories. First, there is a clear emphasis on the reactions to, and punishments of, *stuprum* rather than on the *stuprum* itself, which only takes up approximately one line. In addition, in Valerius we find much more of a focus on Lucretia than in Livy. After narrating her story, Valerius follows with a series of stories that all contain a male as the dominant actor (aside from the foreign examples),[87] and Valerius even gives Lucretia

---

[86] Langlands, R. *Sexual Morality in Rome.* 139-141.

[87] See Langlands, R. *Sexual Morality in Rome.* 140., and Bloomer, M.W. *VM & the Rhetoric of the New Nobility*. 4. Domestic examples are generally more striking and appropriate while the common practice of Roman rhetoric is to view foreign examples as lighter, less impactful, and morally inferior to Roman examples.

herself a set of masculine characteristics that facilitates her agency. By contrast, Valerius does not name Verginia her own story and Verginius is the sole actor and protector of chastity.

The wide range of examples in this chapter provides a view into cases of sexual transgression that have thus far not been encountered in this paper: instances of transgression instigated by women and instances of sexual transgression that don't involve women at all offer a greater applicability of *pudicitia* to all. This extended exemplarity on *pudicitia* exhibits the different ways in which *pudicitia* might operate. The Roman cases of women actively involved in sexual transgression (stories 3, 4, and 6) all end with punishment exacted in a vertical manner: fathers punish daughters, whether through violence towards their own daughters or towards the men involved in the sexual transgression. This vertical direction of punishment fits in with the anthropological framework of honor killing and also within the context of Roman society in general. Where Roman men punish other men for sexual transgressions against male victims (stories 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12), *pudicitia* is still at work, however it is operating differently because the victims are men. A hallmark of Roman masculinity is the practice of the active sexual role (that is, avoiding penetration), and therefore sexual morality, or chastity, for Roman men would be to avoid the passive sexual role.[88] For soldiers this was especially the case, as rape signified defeat, a fate worse than death.[89] The example of Cominius and M. Mergus in story 11 brings a new perspective on *pudicitia* and its connection to the stability of the city. Discipline of the army was an important part of Imperial Roman culture: *disciplina militaris* was emphasized to prevent civil war and address socio-political crises through routinization and also an imposition of austerity.[90] Lack of *pudicitia* among men would constitute an internal threat to the army, which would overtly affect the stability and progress of Rome.

Because the stories above focus on violent death or punishment more than they do the actual sexual transgression, they highlight the importance of the people who act towards a goal of promoting *pudicitia*, and these are, with the exception of Lucretia and the women in the foreign examples, men. Whether they are killing their children (stories 2-6), bringing sexual transgressors to trial (stories 7-11), or are doing some form of either without a trial (stories 12-13), fathers, officials, and generals are representing Roman power that is state-sanctioned, and they are small-scale models of the emperor's role in society.[91] While these stories are still sensational in the way that Livy's stories of compromised chastity are, they reveal a necessity to balance societal roles (e.g. father, magistrate, or emperor), with personal virtues of mercy and severity. The stories outlined above portray one type of reaction to certain circumstances, but throughout Valerius Maximus' book *severitas* and *crudelitas* are balanced by *humanitas* and *clementia* in fathers towards their children.[92] Both Rebecca Langlands and Hans-Friedrich Mueller therefore take Valerius Maximus' view of chastity in a positive, benevolent, and religiously-uplifting light, with a range of purposes from reinforcing the traditional conduct of women, to motivating men, to providing reasons for the defeat of an army or societal disruption, and also its role in various executions that might be related to all of these purposes.[93]

---

[88] Phang, S. *Roman Military Service.* 93.
[89] Phang, S. *Roman Military Service.* 94.
[90] Ibid., 1-6.
[91] Langlands, R. *Sexual Morality in Rome.*153.
[92] Val. Max. 5.8.
[93] Langlands, R. *Sexual Morality in Rome.* 153-154., and Skidmore, C. *Practical Ethics.* 54.

A key difference between *pudicitia* as it is operating in these stories and *pudicitia* as it operates in Livy's narratives above is that Valerius Maximus' stories tend to a restorative view of *pudicitia* as opposed to one that is revolutionary. Part of this is due to their brevity: three or four lines cannot encompass any type of social change that may have occurred as a result of the actions of the figures. Some of the stories, such as that of P. Maenius (story 3), contain punishments as deterrents, looking forward to an eventual restoration of *pudicitia* the next time one is tempted to transgress. Others, for example, the story of T. Verturius (story 9), contain punishments as retribution. One might view the stories of P. Aufidianus and P. Atilius Philiscus (stories 3 and 6) in the way that Jane Gardner does: as similar to paradigmatic honor violence, because in these examples the fathers may have thought that their daughters would not be able to get married after committing such sexual crimes.[94] Another way in which these punishments, particularly those of fathers, act restoratively is through the conception of *stuprum*. Rebecca Langlands suggests taking *stuprum* as a form of stealing (claiming possession of what is another man's) or at least of humiliating another citizen. If this is the case, then fathers who kill their daughters restore their children to themselves by demonstrating that they have the power to destroy their bodies entirely.[95]

Valerius Maximus wrote *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* during the reign of Tiberius who was particularly vigilant in the defense of *pudicitia.*[96] Although the restorative nature of *pudicitia* in these stories is different from the nature of *pudicitia* in Livy, this does not exclude Valerius' use of the moral concept from one that implicates more than just the family. Elsewhere in the book, Valerius states that *libido* harms both the *penates* and the state, and associates illicit sexual desire with *infamia*, suggesting it is threatening to an individual, as well as political oppression and war.[97] *Pudicitia* in Valerius Maximus exists as a quality that is to be upheld due to its benefit for individuals and for the state, and at the very least, examples of severe restorations of *pudicitia*, such as violence or murder, should be recalled in order to deter individuals from sexual transgression.

Conclusion

The stories of Lucretia and Verginia in Livy, as well as the additional examples presented by Valerius Maximus, highlight the importance of *pudicitia* in Roman society: specifically, they present Roman greatness as – in part – predicated upon how zealously Roman women guard their chastity and how zealously Roman men vindicate violated chastity. Defending *pudicitia* is indeed exemplified from every angle: Lucretia is a symbol of fortitude, bravery, and female heroism *through* her defense of chastity in both Livy and Valerius Maximus. Similarly, Verginius is commended for the difficult decision to kill his daughter rather than let her be victim to another man. The other men in these two narratives are praised for their vindication of the injustices done to these women (and, as mentioned above, to the body politic) by overthrowing or exiling not just the assailants themselves but the entire political establishments

[94] Gardner, J. *Women in Roman Law*. 121.

[95] Langlands, R. *Sexual Morality in Rome.* 150.

[96] Mueller, M. *Roman Religion in VM.* 53.

[97] Valerius Maximus, 4.3.init. (add the excerpt)? See also Paulus Dig. 47.11.1.pr.1, for a reflection on the connection between private lust and public health.

that they represent. While the anthropological framework of honor killing described in this essay involves individuals and families that would be relatively inconsequential to a national government or state, many of these examples feature groups of people on whom it would be especially incumbent to respect chastity (unmarried women, soldiers and high-ranking members of the Roman army, and the Roman elite in general) and are up against individuals who are especially destructive threats to chastity because of their position of power.

The differences between the way Livy describes the stories of Lucretia and Verginia and the way that Valerius Maximus writes about his cases are symptomatic of the literary genres that they each ascribe to, but through their stories the writers both put forward practical prescription to the modern Roman reader to keep *pudicitia* guarded. Valerius Maximus uses practical examples of punishing chastity but Livy's exist within a historical narrative of already-mythologized characters that Livy then mythologizes further, and as a result his examples are extreme. Lucretia and Verginia existed during times in Roman history when, according to Livy, immorality was at its height. The rape (and the threat of rape) of these women constituted the "last straw" of their society's oppressive political regime. These tales recall a foundational Roman past. Livy wrote these narratives in the context of a contemporary Roman agenda that called for a return to the moral codes and customs of the past. On the other hand, Valerius Maximus – apart from his own version of the stories of Lucretia and Verginia – uses slightly less extreme examples with a goal that fits in with the general purpose of *Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*: to serve as a reference for what it means to be a good Roman. P*udicitia* is undeniably important in both of these authors' works, and its presence creates a set of literary codes of chastity. These codes display "chastity killing" as a last resort option for the crucial protection of *pudicitia* and encompass chastity as a question of not just family or community, but of the fabric of the state. Viewing the *exempla* in this way offers a greater understanding of the necessity to control *pudicitia* in Rome and the ways in which early Imperial Roman literature offers suggestions on how to do so.

Works Cited:

Awwad, Amani M. "Gossip, Scandal, Shame and Honor Killing: A Case for Social Constructionism and Hegemonic Discourse." *Social Thought & Research* 24, no. 1/2 (2001). Web.

Bloomer, W. Martin. *Valerius Maximus & the Rhetoric of the New Nobility*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.

Caldwell, Lauren E. *Roman Girlhood and the Fashioning of Femininity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Chaplin, Jane D. *Livy's Exemplary History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000

Dixon, Suzanne. *The Roman Family*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.

Edwards, Catherine. *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome.* Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Feldherr, Andrew. *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Foucault, Michel. 1926-1984. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.

Fox, Matthew. *Roman Historical Myths: The Regal Period in Augustan Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Gardner, Jane. *Women in Roman Law & Society*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.

Gill, Aisha K., Carolyn Strange & Karl Anton Roberts. *"Honour" Killing and Violence: Theory, Policy and Practice*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Goldstein, Matthew A., "The biological roots of heat-of-passion crimes and honour killings," *Politics and the Life Sciences* 21, 2 (2002). Web.

Grubbs, Judith Evans. *Women and the Law in the Roman Empire: A Sourcebook On Marriage, Divorce and Widowhood*. London ; New York: Routledge, 2002.

Hallett, Judith P. *Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society: Women and the Elite Family*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Helba, Cynthia & Bernstein, Matthew. *Report on Exploratory Study Into Honor Violence Measurement and Methods*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2015. Web.

Joshel, Sandra. “The Body Female and the Body Politic: Livy's Lucretia and Verginia,” in *Sexuality and Gender in the Classical World: Readings and Sources* (ed L. K. McClure), Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Oxford, UK. 2002. doi: 10.1002/9780470756188.ch6.

Klindienst, Patricia. "Ritual Work on Human Flesh': Livy's Lucretia and the Rape of the Body Politic". *Helios.* 17:1 (Spring) 1990.

Langlands, Rebecca. *Sexual Morality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Leverenz, David. *Honor Bound: Race and Shame in America*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2012.

Lowrie, Michèle & Susanne Lüdemann. *Exemplarity and Singularity: Thinking Through Particulars in Philosophy, Literature, and Law*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2015.

McGinn, Thomas A. *Prostitution, Sexuality, and the Law in Ancient Rome*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Milnor, Kristina. *Gender, Domesticity, and the Age of Augustus: Inventing Private Life*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Mueller, Hans-Friedrich. "Vita, Pudicitia, Libertas: Juno, Gender, and Religious Politics in Valerius Maximus." *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1974-)* 128 (1998): 221-63.

--- *Roman Religion in Valerius Maximus*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Phang, Sara Elise. *Roman Military Service: Ideologies of Discipline in the Late Republic and Early Principate*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Richardson, John. *Augustan Rome 44 BC to AD 14: The Restoration of the Republic and the Establishment of the Empire*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012.

Roller, Matthew B. "Exemplarity in Roman Culture: The Cases of Horatius Cocles and Cloelia." *Classical Philology* 99, no. 1 (2004): 1-56. doi:10.1086/423674.

Skidmore, Clive. *Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen: The Work of Valerius Maximus*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1996.

Vasaly, Ann. *Livy's Political Philosophy: Power and Personality in Early Rome*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Walsh, P. G. *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods*. Cambridge [Eng.]: University Press, 1961.

Welchman, L. & Hossain, S. *"Honour": Crimes, Paradigms, and Violence against Women*. London ; New York: Zed Books, 2005.