Introduction to part B

1 Sources and methods

Part B aims to reconstruct the appearance of female Roman dress from its obscure beginnings to about 200 CE. It uses all literary primary sources left in the respective period while relegating secondary sources—i.e. ancient scholars' talk about garments they did not know firsthand—to parts C and D.[1] In general, part B does not discuss basic textual matters. If the transmission of a text is difficult or equivocal, it is dealt with in parts A, C, and D.

The investigation focuses on more than forty terms designating a specific female dress item in neutral language. For the purposes of this study, 'neutral language' is defined as the linguistic idiom you use in everyday life without sounding technical, poetical, or obscene. You can employ it both on your garment shopping list and when writing a book (excluding epic poems, tragedy, and political history). Neutral language is opposed to (1) literary language that is only employed in 'high' literature and to (2) scholarly language (glosses) that is only used by grammarians and *poetae docti*.[2] Literary and scholarly dress terms are discussed in the parts A and C, D respectively in order to not mix different language registers, or in semiotic language, to not mix different discourses. In this part, terms or usages that belong to the other groups are only adduced when necessary. Glosses are marked by an asterisk (*) to highlight their problematic character.

The study within the single chapters proceeds, in case the evidence allows for it, in three steps.

1. At the beginning, the technical meaning of a term (= the meaning that is necessary for producing the dress item) and the appearance of the garment it designates are elucidated. It is at this point that archaeological sources come into play the most. In many cases, they help us identify the respective item of dress and to interpret the texts. They give us the visual information we need in order to fill some of the blank space left by literature. For this reason, illustrations (relating to Roman monuments) are added at the end of the book.[3]
2. Then, the social usage of the garment and the underlying social code are explored. The analysis hence focuses on the 'social' meaning of the dress terms. It is about the general notions Roman society would connect with the single words and about how and when the respective garment could be worn without behaving in an

1 For the methodological reasons, see the general introduction and the conclusion.

2 For further definition, cf. Introduction to Part D p. 587.

3 Many studies on the subject indiscriminately mix up mythical and 'everyday' depictions of Greek and Roman dress. In contrast, this book strictly keeps to the Roman 'everyday' evidence if it is possible and indicates the exceptions.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110711554-016

extraordinary manner. The second step is also about the social status indicated by clothing.

3. Finally, the evolution of terms and the history of the garments and of dress style are considered. In general, we see that some old words and traditional garments fell out of use, and new words and new garments cropped up. There were breaches of social norms that evolved into a new normality, and behaviour that was once normal became old-fashioned at a later time. There are words that were part of the everyday idiom once, but were scholarly glosses by the end of the second century CE.

Although the different aspects sometimes overlap, the distinction has been kept to facilitate access for those interested in only one of the three issues.

2 Terminology

The terms for female clothing either have a Latin etymology or they are loanwords from other languages. Apart from *pallium*, which is related to *palla*, all terms designating major garments belong to the A-declension. This obviously was the grammatical paradigm for the formation of dress words, as the adjustment of foreign words like the Celtic word *gausapa* shows. Latin terms for accessories are mostly neuters of the O-declension. Many of the terms designating the most important items of Roman dress (*palla*, *tunica*, *stola*, *toga*, *paenula*, *abolla*, *calceus*, *soccus*, *crepida*, *solea*) have a riddling etymology. All must be very old,[4] but only *toga, calceus*, and *solea* have a clear Latin etymology;[5] the words *stola* (στολή), *paenula* (φαινόλης), and *crepida* (κρηπίς) are Greek loanwords, but the term *stola* differs from the later Greek loanwords in that it does not have exactly the same meaning as the Greek matrix. Unlike the general Greek term στολή (= *vestis*), the Latin word *stola* designates a specific long female garment.

The etymologies of *palla*, *tunica*, *abolla*, and *soccus* are still under dispute. In the eyes of the non-expert in Indo-European language (like the author), they look similar to Greek words designating the same form of garment and appear like garbled (indirect) Greek loanwords. The form *pal(l)a* is close to Homeric φᾶρος (*pharos*),[6] *tunica* to Greek χιτών (*chiton*),[7] *abol(l)a* to Doric ἀνα- or ἀμβολά (*ambola*), *soccus* to συκχάς (*sykchas*). The terms *palla* and *pharos* designate an ornamental cloak, *tunica* and *chiton* the tunic, *abolla* and *ambola* a wrap (ἀναβάλλειν = to throw up and over), and *soccus* and

4 Some of them are later used to translate Greek garment terms. *Palla* (χλανίς), *tunica* (χιτών), *pallium* (ἱμάτιον), *stola* (πέπλος), *abolla* (τριβών), *calceus* (ὑπόδημα), *soccus* (ἐμβάς).

5 The term *toga* refers to an Etruscan garment what was called *tebenna*.

6 We must assume an exchange of the liquids L and R and an adjustment of the ending to a new grammatical paradigm.

7 Usually both words are thought to derive from a Semitic word.

sykchas a kind of shoe. The equivalence of the dress items designated by the similar Latin and the Greek words is very striking, but the etymological connection is not as straightforward as in the later Greek loanwords, and has vexed modern scholars for a long time. Perhaps, we may interpret the evidence as follows: The Romans inherited the Greek words, already mediated in a slightly altered form, from other Italian peoples or from the Etruscans, to whom they owed the alphabet, some religious customs, and upper-class culture like the *toga*. This is, of course, nothing more than a tentative hypothesis, but we should keep in mind that what we now call 'Roman' culture was, from the very beginning, not a homogenous entity but a mixture of Latin, Greek, and Etruscan elements, as is still reflected in the heterogenous foundation myths and narratives of primeval Roman history. Romans always adapted to their cultural environment and took up things from their neighbours that they found practical, which was one of their strengths. We can see this with how they proceeded in the case of the gods. They adapted Greek religion to their own by just changing names and amalgamizing the rest: Zeus became Jupiter; Ares became Mars; Artemis became Diana; and Aphrodite became Venus. If there was no equivalent on the Roman side, foreign names could stand or prevailed, which is why Apollo remained Apollo.

The example of gods and goddesses is the most striking, but we can also observe the same process with dress terms in later times. When the Roman Empire expanded towards Greece in the second century BCE, the above-mentioned terms were already established 'Latin' words. Romans used them to translate Greek terms of new dress items they adopted or came to know more closely. They thereby extended the terms' traditional meaning. The term *tunica* (tunic) hence came to comprise the Greek *chiton* as well; the term *pallium* (cloak) included the Greek *himation*, the term *soccus* (laced shoe) the Greek *embas*, and the term *reticulum* (hairnet) the Greek *kekryphalos*. In some cases, this causes difficulties for us because the Latin and the Greek garments were not completely equal, but our knowledge of them is too limited to note the small differences. We can see that the *chiton* slightly differed from the Roman tunic (B 1) and the *kekryphalos* (hair bag) from the *reticulum* (B 12). In the case of the *himation* and the *pallium* (B 2), we find no difference at all, but Greeks in Imperial times felt the need to create the Latin loanword πάλλιον and to distinguish between a *pallium* and *himation* in lists.[8]

In contrast, if the Romans did not know a respective Greek or other foreign dress item, they adopted the strategy that we can already observe in the case of the early major garments. They simply used foreign terms to supplement their own language. Ancient scholars thought that luxury came to Rome in the second century BCE together with Greek culture and left an imprint on Roman customs. And indeed, when we look at the second stratum of direct Greek loanwords for dress items, the Greek influence can indeed be felt. We find several Greek loanwords for various accessories: *anadema*

8 Cf. B 11 p. 422.

(hairband) (B 14), *mitra* (head scarf) (B 13), *strophium* I (hair circlet) (B 15), *strophium* II (cord) (B 21), and *zona* (belt) (B 20). In Imperial times, there are also Greek loanwords designating new garment forms—*cyclas* (B 9) and *synthesis* (B 10)—and new types of material—*vestis Melitensis* and *vestis Coa*. In addition, there is the Celtic term *gausapa* (B 9).

There was sometimes a rivalry between an old Latin and a new Greek loanword. As a rule, if a word with Latin etymology existed, it usually prevailed. There are only two exceptions from this: *stola* and *zona*. These terms exist alongside the expressions *vestis longa* and *cingillum*, and they seem to have gotten the better of the Latin terms for political and literary reasons. The short word *stola* was probably championed by Augustan propaganda because it better suited its male counter-part—the term *toga*—than the long expression *vestis longa*.[9] The *cingillum* was unwieldy in verse and, being a diminutive, had a whiff of the trivial. It is therefore no wonder that poets preferred the Greek term *zona*.[10]

As to the words with clear Latin etymologies, we can identify the form of the various garments without doubt. Most take their meaning from the function, as for example *toga* (*tegere* = to cover) (B 6) and *cingillum* (*cingere* = to gird) (B 20). Some take it from their structure, like *praetexta* (*praetexere* = to border something) (B 5) and *vitta* (*viere* = to plait) (B 16), and others derive it from the part of the body the garment applies to, like *calceus* (*calx* = heel) (B 26) and *focale* (*faux* = throat) (B 19). The same statement holds true for the Greek loanwords *anadema*, *strophium*, and *zona*.

3 Appearance

There is no better introduction to what Roman dress looked like than Anne Hollander's remarks on Greek dress in her book *Fabric of Vision* (2002):

> Clothes were very simple. Most civil garments were lengths of stuff woven to size and worn as they came off the loom, hung and wrapped or tied and pinned around the body. A suit of clothes consisted of one garment on the body and a wrap over it; both these differed in size and length, and in styles of draping and fastening, according to the wearer's sex, occupation and region, along with the garment's function. Tailoring, the cutting out and piecing together of shaped cloth segments to make a three-dimensional garment, was unknown. The beauty of clothing dwelt in the distinction of its woven fabric and in the elegance or aptness with which it was draped around the individual body. Any ugliness or awkwardness in clothing would arise from the lack of such aptness and distinction, or from noticeable disrepair of the stuff. Beyond that, the aesthetic

9 Cf. B 4 p. 302.
10 Cf. B 20 p. 493.

> quality of clothing might be enhanced or diminished or made absurd according to the way its folds behaved when the wearer moved, or how they were acted on by wind or other circumstance.

Hollander's description hits the mark, and there is not much to add to it. It should only be stressed again that there was a general difference between ancient Roman and, if we may generalize in this way, current European dress style. Roman and Greek clothes did not follow the shape of the body. Ancient observers would have probably found the garments we wear today quite 'obscene' because they emphasize the body of the wearer so much. Ancient garments were only minimally tailored, and they did not cling to the torso and did not imitate its forms. Girding was therefore much more important than it is today. If a woman wanted to underline her physical appearance, she had to wear a cord or a belt.[11] There was no tapered cut, no well-fitted bra, nor any stays that would expose the physical feminine features. All a woman could do in case she wanted to accentuate her physique was tighten the fabric and make folds appear at the right places. This is an important difference from modern European dress, and we should not underestimate the impact this made to outlook, gait, and female self-representation. The best contemporary examples can be found in South Asia. A woman's *sari* is a long rectangular piece of cloth that creates its beauty through the quality and ornamentation of the fabric and the way it is draped around the body. The ancient tunic also has a close relative in the *kurta*/*kurti*, the long loose-fitting main garment worn by men and women.

The contrast between ancient Rome and modern Europe gets even clearer when we take a look at ancient female shoes. These did not have a feature that in our times most distinguishes them from male shoes and, as it were, 'defines' them. In Antiquity, women's shoes did not have special (high) heels, which are an invention of the 16th century. The reason why they had none is obvious when we consider both the function of high heels and the appearance of ancient costume. Heels distort the body into an unnatural position and force women to walk in a swaying manner. This effect is intensified by increasing the height. In this manner, two sexual traits of the female physique are accentuated: the backside and the breasts. High-heeled shoes thus have an erotic function, and they shape modern thought about the female body more than one might think. The reason why this overall erotic effect is possible is that modern dress clings to the body and reproduces its shape. Movements of the wearer's body are therefore not obscured by fabric. This then helps explain the absence of high heels in ancient women's wardrobes. The loose nature of ancient garments would have hidden the biomechanical effect of high heels anyway. The ornamental effect of ancient female shoes therefore lies only in the quality of the shoes and the appearance of the feet themselves.[12]

---

11 On this aspect, cf. also B 20 pp. 494–496.

12 You may watch this effect on the paintings in Classicist style you find in Hollander's book.

4 Social usage

Dress terms are a shortcut to definition, and they designate not only a form (or sometimes a colour and material), but also a function. They are embedded in statements that often underline these aspects and always imply a social usage of the specific garments. Social usage is not completely congruent with social use and may change in the course of history. We will deal with these changes later and focus in this section only on some basic general social rules as they might have existed in the first century BCE.

Female and male Roman garments often had the same name. In general, Roman male and female dress style existed in less of a dichotomy than has long been the case in modern Europe (for example, trousers vs. skirt). Nevertheless, there were some important differences. Female dress was longer; it consisted of more fabric; and it had more freedom as regards material and colour, whereas male dress was subject to stronger social restrictions. The long tunic and the *stola* were forms reserved for women, as were (exceptional) tunics with sewn-on sleeves. The only restriction there was for women was that they should not dress like men. Their tunics therefore had to be longer and reach over the knees.

The greater freedom of female attire is also borne out in the multitude of accessories that are often mocked by literary misogynistic stereotype. There were more kinds of female headwear than male and—if we take Herondas' lists into account—many more types of shoes for women than for men. We may also be missing some female dress options because our literary sources only rarely mention subspecies or describe an individual garb. Petronius' Fortunata, one of the hidden female heroes of this book, is an exception. However, we see that fine fabrics like cotton and silk and bright colours were more permitted with women than with men. As to colour, the difference in usage resembles that of 'traditional' modern dress. Women could use almost every colour without giving offence while men could not. It is only at the end of the period considered in this book when the boundary between male and female dress style became less rigid. But in the first century BCE, the elegant Roman man would avoid colour in public except on insignia.

The general social code that distinguished male and female garb is formulated by Cicero. In his *De officiis* (44 BCE), Cicero instructs his son as to reasonable behaviour, i.e. behaviour becoming of a member of the upper classes. Although Cicero's treatise is based on the writings of the Greek philosopher Panaitios (ca. 185–110 BCE), there are many interesting remarks in it concerning proper Roman societal behaviour. In a section on *decorum*, Cicero also touches on the question of dress. He starts from an abstract definition of *pulchritudo* (beauty) and its two subcategories *venustas* (grace) and *dignitas* (dignity) and then attributes them to the different genders: "Grace," he tells us, "should be considered a female, dignity a male quality."[13] He then goes on

13 Cic. off. 1.130: *venustatem muliebrem ducere debemus, dignitatem virilem*.

to explain that men must avoid all that deviates from a dignified appearance. As to dress style (*vestitus*), it is best to keep to *mediocritas* (avoidance of extremes).[14] Cicero does not talk explicitly about the specifics of female costume—this would have been improper for him—, but we may safely assume that he believed that female dress should express *venustas* (grace, loveliness), something that could be conveyed through the tasteful usage of artificial colour, fine fabric, and a long cut. But we do not have only Cicero. In his *Ars amatoria*, Ovid relates all female costume somewhat more bluntly in relation to how it produces *forma* (handsome appearance). As usual in Latin literature, we only get one side of the coin (the male one), but the female view of things might have been very similar. As modern female fashion shows, garments do not only serve a dress function, but are used as an ornament. This at least was similar in Antiquity.

The basic structure of the Roman women's garb in the first century BCE can be described as follows:

headwear:	*mitra*, *reticulum*, *vitta*, etc.
coat:	*pallium* (*palla*), *paenula*
intermediate garment:	*stola*
basic garment:	*tunica*
bodywear:	*subucula*, *fascia pectoralis*, *subligar*
footwear:	*calceus*, *soccus*, *solea*, *crepida*

The basic garment worn by most women was the *tunica* (= Roman tunic, Greek *chiton*). You had to wear a tunic in public; otherwise, you would have been considered naked (*nuda*). You could put on an extra tunic over it at will if you felt cold. Normally, you would wear the tunic girded with a belt (*cingillum*). Under it, you could have a second tunic, an undertunic (*subucula*), on your skin. In the first century BCE, a *subucula* was normal if weather, circumstance, individual dress style, or sheer poverty or asceticism did not preclude you from using it. A (traditionalist) alternative to the combination tunic/undertunic was wearing a *stola* and an undertunic. If you used a *fascia pectoralis* ('bra') and a Greek tunic (*chiton*), you probably dispensed with the undertunic. All this is documented quite well and does not cause difficulties. In contrast, evidence on women's body- or underwear around the pubic region and buttocks—the so-called *subligar*—is ambiguous. All in all, there are reasons to assume that 'panties' were less common than nowadays. On the foot, you would wear—depending on situation and weather—either a closed shoe (*calceus*, *soccus*) or a sandal (*solea*, *crepida*). The informal *soccus* and the *solea* were probably the most popular footwear. As to socks, we face the same problem as with the other bodywear. Even though the Romans had something akin to modern socks (*fasciae pedules*), they were quite uncommon. This may seem surprising at first view, but we should keep in mind that Romans did not

14 Cic. off. 1.130*: eadem ratio est habenda vestitus, in quo, sicut in plerisque rebus, mediocritas optima est.*

know knitting. In addition to all these small- and medium-sized garments, you could put on a cloak—either a *pallium* (cloak) or a *paenula* ('poncho')—when going out. If you wanted to cover your head, you could use either of the two or a scarf (*palliolum*). There were no hats or caps for women as we know them today. If you wanted to have an additional ornament for your hair, you used one of the various pieces of headwear.

This is, of course, an idealized picture, similar to that we find on archaeological representations. In reality, the dress options you used depended on your personal preference, age, and social status. Young women dressed differently from old ones; poor women dressed differently from rich ones. The multifaceted dress world of Roman women is lost to us. All we have left for our imagination are literary stereotypes. The *puellae* of Love Elegy—young and attractive freedwomen—are often shown wearing only a single (Greek) tunic and a *fascia pectoralis*. In contrast, the rich Roman matrons appear dressed in a long robe (*stola*) and an ornamental *pallium* or even a *palla*. Unfree prostitutes wear a *toga* when at work. Female (and male) Roman children feature a *toga praetexta*. In Imperial times, Augustus strengthened social symbolism by creating legal dress privileges for married Roman women (*matronae*) and their children. These are the stereotypes we most often find in Roman literature. Reality was certainly more diverse than this, and we sometimes have glimpses of it. We see, for example, that mistresses of Love Elegy also wear two tunics at the same time and that Roman *matronae* did not always use a *stola*. In any case, our view remains lopsided, since we mostly hear about rich and elegant women, whereas average and poor women only sometimes (as in Petronius) make an appearance in literature. Texts pertaining to the garb of the low classes or the average people are rare, but there are at least some. In a famous passage, the jurist Ulpianus is defining the *vestis familiarica*, and he tells us that it consisted of a *tunica* and a *paenula* ('poncho').[15] These two items, or perhaps a *pallium*, will have been normal dress for the majority of ordinary people in the first century BCE. Their costume consisted of normal wool or linen and usually did not feature much artificial colour. It was *pullus* (drab-coloured). Colour was something for the rich and those who wanted to appear fashionable.

5 History

Modern research often presents Antique Roman dress as a uniform entity that was all of a sudden gone in Late Antiquity, like one colour slide being replaced by another. This study, in contrast, tries to show that this change was a process and that Roman dress style was transformed over time. The evolution of Roman fashion was slower and less visible than it is today; but there was some change, and it gathered speed at the end of the Roman Republic.

15 Cf. B 7 p. 375.

The history of female Roman dress from about 700 BCE onwards has a dark and a bright period. The five hundred years up to the year 200 BCE are quite obscure because there is nearly no literary or archaeological primary evidence. Ancient scholars talked much about early Roman dress, but this is all historical fiction. Their hypotheses are considered and deconstructed in the parts C and D. As to the dark period, all we can do ourselves is to look at the etymology of the most important Latin words designating dress and draw some hypothetical conclusions. Some dress terms have a Latin, some a Greek, and some an obscure root, which on the basis of cultural inferences we can posit as Italian or Etruscan. As this linguistic mixture shows, Roman dress culture was already a hodgepodge of heterogenous elements early on. However, it is useful treating it as a cultural entity and calling it 'Roman' dress style in order to compare it with Greek and Celtic dress styles that came to influence Roman dress when the empire expanded. In the terms of Niklas Luhmann, Roman culture can be called a 'system' that was massively influenced by new 'environments' (Greek, Celtic culture) afterwards.[16] Among the garments that constituted early Roman costume were the *tunica* with seams on the shoulder (B 1), the *palla* (ornamental cloak) (B 3), the long robe (*stola*) (B 4), the toga (*toga*) (B 6), the *toga praetexta* (*toga* with a purple hem) (B 5), the closed shoe (*calceus*) (B 26), and the hairnet (*reticulum*) (B 12). We may infer that these were more or less the traditional Roman components of women's clothing, since the equivalent Greek garments differ slightly in appearance.

The bright period starts about 200 BCE with our earliest written sources. At the beginning, it is not very bright because the sources are still few, but our knowledge is considerably better for this period than for the period before. After the Second Punic War (218–201 BCE), Rome received new cultural impulses. There had been influence from the neighbouring Greek cities in Italy before, but that had been relatively weak. Now, Rome expanded its power beyond the sea and created new and stable trade connections. In the second century BCE, it came to control the entire Tyrrhenian and conquered large parts of Greece and Asia Minor, turning them into *provinciae*. Greek cultural influence therefore grew and became more pervasive. It was not only Greek philosophers that arrived at Rome. In the first century BCE, Roman society suffered a 'crisis of identity.' Rapid political and cultural expansion led to what we might call an 'over-extension' of power. Historians usually focus on politics and the various civil wars fought on Italian soil, but Roman culture and its transformation is as interesting. In many respects, the first century BCE is a decisive time. In politics, an old system (the Roman Republic) was replaced by a new one (Principate). As to dress, 'traditional' Roman garments disappeared in daily use and became 'historical,' while 'foreign' dress items advanced. Since the mass of our literary and archaeological sources increases during the period, we can watch the transformation in more detail from this time on.

16 Cf. on this the Epilogue p. 709.

Cultural evolution—Roman fashion being a great example of this—usually does no submit to politics, and single political events on their own hardly ever trigger concrete trends. Nevertheless, for heuristic reasons, it is useful to roughly distinguish the following periods:

1. From the end of the Social War to Augustus (88 BCE–30 BCE):
   Traditional Roman everyday garments vanish.
2. The reign of Augustus (30 BCE–14 CE):
   'Roman' garments become dress insignia.
3. From Tiberius to Trajan (14–117 CE)
   'Roman' dress insignia start to decline.
4. Hadrian (117–138 BCE)
   A 'supranational,' Greek-inspired costume becomes the new *Leitkultur* in the Roman Mediterranean world.

The events and politics mentioned here—let this be stressed once again—are meant to be heuristic milestones on a long path and should not be misunterstood in terms of a single causation. Overall cultural trends and far-reaching dress changes (in contrast to fashions) do not follow on battles nor on political decisions. The Americans do not wear jeans as a popular form of dress because they won the Second World War, even though the post-war properity propelled a trend! As to the period at hand, there might be other historical events that would make for a good division. However, the Social War seemed to me to be a suitable milestone,[17] since it was waged over social status and Roman civil rights (with which Roman dress is connected). I also thought Augustus and Hadrian might be useful historical characters, since they both 'designed' a specific and influential imperial dress culture.

The Roman political history of this period has often been written, and the following remarks are only meant to call to mind what happened to Roman society in this time. Following the *Bellum sociale* (91–88 BCE) and then in the ensuing civil wars, the composition of the Roman elite, which strongly influenced Roman culture, changed considerably. Citizenship was granted to all inhabitants of Italy up to the Po Valley. Romans born in Rome and its environs became a minority in the Roman citizenry. Other social groups (who were not 'native' Romans either), gathered influence in Roman society. Most visibly, freedmen, i.e. former slaves, became increasingly important in the economy and started to grow rich. For all these reasons, 'Roman' customs and 'Roman' costume were losing ground. They became less important among the elite and in society

17 On the Social War as a turning point, cf. also A. Wallace-Hadrill, Rome's Cultural Revolution, Cambridge 2008, 81, 126–128, 209, 443–449. I came to my conclusions independently of him and was glad to see that other cultural areas had also suggested to him the choice of this marker.

17 On the Social War, cf., for example, G. Alföldy, Römische Sozialgeschichte, Stuttgart [4]2011, 94–95, 101–102 (on social change); D. Maschek, Die römischen Bürgerkriege, Archäologie und Geschichte einer Krisenzeit, Darmstadt 2018, 145–173 (on archaeological data).

in general, given that the 'Hellenization' of Roman culture was already well under way since the second century. Traditional Roman garments like the *palla* (B 3), the *stola* (B 4), and the *praetexta* (B 5) became exceptional costumes; other garments like the *tunica* (B 1) and the *pallium* (B 2) acquired more variety. The conquest of the Celtic territories in present-day France by Julius Caesar and the province *Gallia Cisalpina* becoming Roman territory in 42 BCE further accelerated this trend of decreasing influence of traditional 'Roman' elements in dress. Celtic costume like the *gausapa* (B 9) and the *Gallica* (B 30) started to become a common part of Roman dress style.

Under Augustus, the transformation did not stop, and it even sped up. Peace boosted the Roman economy and broadened the leisure class. After the battle of Actium (31 BCE), Alexandria was conquered, and Egypt, the once Ptolemaic kingdom, was turned into a *provincia*. Trade contact to the far eastern cultures became regular. Rome saw new articles of clothing from the Far East (silk) because trade routes to China were being opened up by Roman conquest. Dress items like the *vestes Coae* (B 9), the *cyclas* (B 9), and the *phaecasia* (B 30) became fashionable in Rome. This, as is often the case with new things, was not to everyone's liking. Augustus tried to put a stop to this cultural change and stabilize society. As can be seen from his legislative measures affecting the Roman upper class and the freedmen, he tried to create new homogenous social and functional strata. For this purpose, he established a sort of 'traditional' Roman culture based on (purportedly) early Roman customs. In the case of clothing, he made use of some 'Roman' garments (*toga*, *stola*, *vitta, praetexta*), which were still worn by the elite and their clients as festive costumes, and turned them into legal privileges. He preserved the basic form of these clothes, but as the male *toga* and the *stola* show, he seems to have embellished them—at least on statues.

The propagandistic and legislative measures Augustus took to sustain 'traditional' Roman costume and values remained in force under the Julio-Claudian dynasty. The Flavian emperors did not change the policy of their predecessors either. In fact, when looking at the general picture, they might even have strengthened the Roman cultural roots after the intermezzo of the 'Hellenistic' experiments of the emperor Nero. Nevertheless, their interventions did not reverse the trend in fashion. Roman dress style yielded more and more to 'foreign' influences. In the second half of the first century, a new dinner dress, called *synthesis* (B 10), also made its debut and remained popular for the next two centuries.

A fundamental change in the image of official dress culture then took place under Hadrian. He created a new, Greek-inspired official Roman dress culture. 'Traditional' Roman dress was probably completely obsolete by his time, and Hadrian in some way officially acknowledged this. He replaced the old with a new public image of imperial clothing based on Greek fashion, or to put it more precisely (since we find emperors dressed in 'Greek style' before Hadrian), he dropped the 'traditional' Roman element in imperial dress representation and stressed the 'Greek' element. The *stola* (B 4) and *vitta* (B 16), which formerly had been celebrated by the Augustan poets as a sign of the Roman *matrona*, but now looked somehow ridiculous, disappeared for good and

did not even remain in art. In Roman everyday life, they had probably vanished a long time before.

In the second century CE, when this account ends, Roman culture and dress style were 'supranational.' Various ethnic elements from the Roman Empire had been melted into one and in this form returned to the Roman provinces. To give a brief impression of what Roman Imperial culture was like at this period: Eastern gods like Mithras and Isis were now also worshipped in Roman Gaul, and western garments with Spanish and Celtic names were also worn in Roman Egypt. As to its forms and colours, female Roman dress had retained almost all old options (except the *stola*) and had acquired many new ones. Male dress style had undergone major changes as to colour and length. As to outward appearance in clothing, gender roles had become less restrictive.

6 Structure of part B

Apart from B 9, B 25, and B 30, all chapters are centred on single garments. The chapters are not ordered alphabetically, but are structured to form a coherent narrative. The overall arrangement is simple. B 1–10 concern the major garments, B 11 is an interlude on colours, and chapters B 12–30 deal with accessories in a broad sense.

B 1–10, the chapters on the major garments, are arranged according to the following social and historical rationale: As to social usage, B 1–2 consider two garments that (though in different versions) were worn by every social group. B 3–5 turn to three garments that were rather upper-class, at least since the first century BCE. B 6 heads for the opposite of the social scale. B 7–10 then form a kind of reprise. B 7–8 again concern common garments, B 9–10 luxury dresses. The arrangement that starts from the 'normal' has been chosen to contravene the perspective of ancient literature (and often modern research) which focuses on upper-class dress.

As to history, B 1–2 deal with what were presumably the oldest Roman garments, upon which similar Greek garments were grafted and which survived until the end of the second century CE. B 3–5 turn to the traditional Roman garments that fell out of use in Imperial times. B 7–9 concern old garments that came into broader use and new garments that cropped up. B 10 considers the last dress combination that only came up in the first century CE and is most suitably called *synthesis*. The historical finale is reached with B 11, which is on colours and dress style. At the same time, the chapter on ornament is meant to set the tune for the subsequent chapters on accessories.

In addition, B 1–6 also contain a methodological discourse on the difficulties we face concerning terminology and definition. B 1 (*tunica*) shows how a Greek (*chiton*) and a Roman garment coalesce in the same word and how the new broader meaning superseded the traditional one. B 2 (*pallium*) is about the effects of 'normality' that makes a common female garment nearly disappear in our sources (and in dictionaries). B 3 (*palla*) is about the chaos that ensues when a term has two different meanings. B 4

(*stola*) is about a word bordering on the sub-literary that finds a homestead in literature. B 6 (*toga*) explores what happens when modern analysis keeps to the secondary sources.

The arrangement of B 12–30 follows similar rules. The methodological, social, and historical narratives of B 1–11 repeat themselves on a smaller scale. The chapters, which all concern minor dress items, are roughly ordered according to the position of the respective garments on the body from head to toe. B 12–21 deal with what are accessories in a proper sense. Within these chapters, the common garments precede those pertaining only to limited social groups. B 22–25 are on bodywear and underwear. B 26–30 consider shoes and sandals. The last chapter, B 30, is on subspecies and fashion and has some parallels with B 9. All chapters can easily be understood on their own, although there are often interrelations between them.

7 Appendix Terminology

Tab. 1: Terminology

Latin term	etymology	Greek equivalent	meaning
abolla	ἀμβολά (?)	τριβών	rough woollen cloak
amictorium	amicire		'top'
anadema	ἀνάδημα	ἀνάδημα	headband
analeptris	ἀναληπτρίς	ἀναληπτρίς	strap
ansa		ὕσκλος	eyelet
calceus	calx	ὑπόδημα	Roman shoe
cingillum	cingere	ζώνη	belt
capitium	capere (?)		breast-wrap
crepida	κρηπίς	κρηπίς	Greek sandal
cyclas	κυκλάς	κυκλάς	'cyclas'
fascia pectoralis	fascis	στηθόδεσμος	breast-wrap
flammeum	flamma		bridal scarf
focale	faux		neckerchief
gausapa	gausap- (celt.)	γαύσαπος	shaggy woollen fleece
impilia	ἐμπίλια	ἐμπίλια	felt inner shoes
instita	instare	πεζίς	border
ligula	ligare	ἱμάς	lace
lingula	lingua	γλῶσσα	shoe tongue
mamillare	mamma		leather breast band
manuleus	manus	χειρίς	long sleeve
mitra	μίτρα	μίτρα	headscarf
paenula	φαινόλα	φαινόλα	'poncho'
palla I	φᾶρος (?)	χλανίς (?)	ornamental cloak
palla II (poet.)	"	πέπλος	'peplos'
pallium	palla	ἱμάτιον	regular cloak
palliolum	pallium		scarf
phaecasium	φαικάσιον	φαικάσιον	type of soccus
praetexta	praetexere		toga with purple border
reticulum	rete	κεκρύφαλος	hairnet
sandalium	σανδάλιον	σανδάλιον	sandal
soccus	συκχάς	ἐμβάς	laced shoe
solea	solum	σανδάλιον	sandal
stola	στολή	χιτών	long dress
strophium I	στρόφιον	στρόφιον	hair circlet
strophium II	"	"	cord
subligar, -gaculum	subligare	ζῶμα/περίζωμα	'loin-cloth'
*supparus	supparo- (osc.) (?)		short over-coat (?)
synthesis	σύνθεσις	σύνθεσις	combination
toga	tegere	τήβεννα	toga

Tab. 1 – continued

Latin term	etymology	Greek equivalent	meaning
tunica	ktn (phoen.)	χιτών	tunic
t. manicata	χ. χειρίδωτος	χ. χειρίδωτος	tunic with sleeves
t. *regilla	χ. ὀρθοστάδιος	χ. ὀρθοστάδιος	unbelted long tunic
t. talaris	χ. ποδήρης	χ. ποδήρης	long tunic
vitta	viere		plaited headband
zona	ζώνη	ζώνη	belt