

1 *tunica* – Roman *tunica* and Greek *chiton* (pls. 2–6)

1. Terminology
2. Appearance
 - 2.1 The upper part
 - 2.2 The middle part
 - 2.3 The bottom end
 - 2.4 Material and colour
3. Usage
4. Roman tunic and Greek chiton – a hypothetical history
5. ‘Greek’ special forms of the tunic
 - 5.1 *tunica talaris*
 - 5.2 *tunica manicata*
6. The undertunic (*subucula*)
7. Case studies
 - 7.1 Single *tunica* – Corinna (Ovid)
 - 7.2 *subucula* and *tunica* – Fortunata (Petronius)
 - 7.3 *subucula* and *stola/vestis longa* (Lucan)
 - 7.4 Two literary stereotypes in contrast – Byrrhena and Photis (Apuleius)

This chapter concerns the female (and male) garment called *tunica* in Latin literature. It is the most elementary piece of clothing in the Roman and Mediterranean world. Everyone had a *tunica*. If you did not wear it, you were considered naked. You were either extremely poor or a Cynic philosopher. It is the garment Adam and Eve wore—albeit made of animal skins—when expelled from Paradise.¹ It is also the dress form that offers the most variety and was the most open to cultural change. For this reason, it is dealt with first in this part of the book. It is also placed here to counteract the top-down view of Roman dress culture offered by our ancient sources, whose focus was on the extraordinary. The study of the *tunica* illustrates the two difficulties we face when dealing with common Latin dress and dress terms in an exemplary manner: (1) Whenever there is some unspecific mention of a woman’s garment, the *tunica* is implied. It is taken for granted. Due to this omnipresence, the tunic is only very rarely described (when was the last time a novel described a dress shirt or t-shirt in any amount of detail?). The mere term *tunica* is sufficient to characterize it. It is then up to readers to imagine the clothes worn by the woman mentioned based on the social and literary context and to fill in the gaps in the description. This was easy for ancient readers because texts talked about the world they lived in, but it is very difficult for us who lack first hand cultural knowledge.

1 Vulgat. Genesis 3.21: *fecit quoque Dominus Deus Adae et uxori eius tunicas pelliceas et induit eos.*

(2) The second problem arises from the term *tunica* itself, since it is used in Latin literature without distinction to designate the Roman *tunica* and the Greek *chiton*. This is a result of all our literary sources mirroring a Hellenized Roman society, since they all belong to the period when Romans were influenced by Greek culture. For this reason, although the Roman *tunica* and the Greek *chiton* differ slightly in their shape,² Latin sources constantly meld them together in a single term (as do Greek texts, calling both types χιτών). Apparently, the Romans perceived them as different species of the same garment. The historical genesis only played a role when it came to special forms. Reading the texts, the ambiguity of the term always leads to the question: Is the woman being described wearing a *tunica*, or is she rather wearing a *chiton*? In most cases, we can answer this only by a cultural hypothesis. Not surprisingly in a world full of Greek fashion, most Latin texts refer to what would precisely be called a *chiton*.

Regarding its importance, the *tunica* has not been treated much in previous research. This may be due to the above-mentioned difficulties. In the standard cultural histories of the 19th and 20th centuries, the woman's *tunica* only appears in the function of an undergarment (*subucula*);³ in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (RE), there are two entries on the Greek χιτών,⁴ but none on the *tunica*; in U. Scharf, *Straßenkleidung der römischen Frau* (Street Clothing of the Roman Woman) (1996), the garment is completely missing. It is only recently that Pausch (2003) dedicated a monograph to the tunic, which suffers, however, from some serious errors.⁵ Research is also characterized by the fact that the *stola* of married women (B 4), which is called *vestis longa* and *stola* in the ancient sources (but never *tunica*), is wrongly considered a species of the *tunica*.⁶ Moreover, numerous glosses⁷ are included in the analysis and are elevated to real technical terms.⁸ This all leads to an ahistorical and false picture of what a *tunica* was.

The following chapter aims to correct it as far as possible, at least as concerns the female garment. It will approach the subject matter from different sides. First, the *tunica* is described in general terms (1–3). Then, the difference between the two main species—the Roman tunic and Greek *chiton*—is stressed (4), leading to the description of two 'Greek' *subspecies*: the *tunica talaris* and the *tunica manicata* (5). Then, the focus shifts to the undertunic (*subucula*) (6), drawing attention to how the *tunica* was

² Cf. below pp. 246–250, 255–261.

³ Becker/Göll (1882) 250; Marquardt/Mau (1886) 573–574; Blümner (1911) 229–232.

⁴ RE 3.2 (1899) s.v. χειρίδωτος χιτών, col. 2206–2217; s.v. χιτών, col. 2309–2335 and suppl. I (1903), col. 288–294 (W. Amelung).

⁵ Cf. p. 674.

⁶ Becker/Göll (1882) 254; Marquardt/Mau (1886) 573; Wilson (1939) 155; Pausch (2003) 155; GRD (2007) 182.

⁷ For a definition, cf. 587.

⁸ Cf. Blümner (1911) 230–231; DNP 12 (2003) s.v. Tunica, 920–921; GRD (2007) 201–202. The monograph by Pausch (2003) is completely undermined by its careless use of glosses.

worn both as an inner and an outer garment. Finally, several literary case studies will explore the different ways the *tunica* was used and combined with other garments (7).

The purpose of these case studies is to sharpen the sense of the literary stereotype and of the perspective that derives from it. It also wants to draw attention to the limits of our knowledge. Incomprehensible words and pseudo-terms (such as **supparus*, **indusium*, **calasis*, and **regilla*) are omitted in this chapter.⁹ They should not be used anymore in historical studies on the tunic.¹⁰

1.1 Terminology

The term *tunica* generally refers to a primary garment that covers the shoulders. **(pl. 2)** It is worn on the skin if it is not an outer tunic.¹¹ In its normal form, the female *tunica* extends to at least the calves and is usually worn with a belt. In contrast to the *stola/vestis longa* (B 4), a floor-length dress with shoulder straps, the *tunica* is shorter and more closed on the shoulders.

Within this general form, there are many varieties. All these are called simply *tunica* and *vestis* in Latin literary sources if the context is unambiguous. In poetic texts, there are also other nouns for it. Often, even this is spared, the tunic being implied in expressions like ‘X was dressed, or X was dressed in red, or X had no girdle.’ A specific qualification is added only if there is some doubt as to what type of tunic is worn or in case a particular characteristic is going to be emphasized.

Besides this, there are some general terms that concern the parts of the *tunica*. The panels of cloth it was made of were called *plagulae*.¹² The upper part above the breasts is called *sinus*.¹³ The lower border/hem is called *ora*¹⁴ as is the upper.¹⁵ The exceptional long sleeve is called *manuleus* or *manica*.¹⁶ In Tacitus, the term *manica* is used to also describe the faux-sleeve found on most tunics. Further linguistic evidence is lacking. As to the strings of the *chiton*, a word designating them is missing. The knots that fastened the garment at the shoulders may have been called *nodi* or *noduli*.¹⁷

⁹ Cf. on them part D.

¹⁰ This statement holds especially true for the so-called **calasis*, which has been brought into being by Scholz (1992) and is beginning to make an appearance in more recent archaeological literature.

¹¹ Cf. below p. 254.

¹² Varro LL 9.79; cf. below p. 247.

¹³ Cf., for example, Ovid. am. 2.15.14.

¹⁴ Ovid. Fasti 2.347–348; Quint. 11.3.138.

¹⁵ Ovid. am. 1.747–48.

¹⁶ On the *tunica manicata*, cf. pp. 257–261.

¹⁷ Paulus/Festus p. 44.28–30 L. (see on it D 6 p. 666).

1.2 Appearance

1.2.1 The upper part (pls. 2,4)

In contrast to the *stola*, the *tunica* covered the shoulders. The fabric panels used for the *tunica* were wider than the body. When tightened at the waist, the panels produced short sleeves, which should be rather called faux-sleeves since they resulted from the fabric being cinched by the belt and were not extra fabric that was sewn on. In modern tailoring terminology, this could be described as a ‘dropped shoulder.’¹⁸ This type of cut for the shoulders of the *tunica* is known to us through numerous archaeological sources.¹⁹ In literature, there are only some indirect references to it. Propertius tells us that the *tunica* covered the upper arm (*lacertus*);²⁰ Lucan says it covered the *primus umerus* (the beginning of the shoulder).²¹ Another important source is a passage in the *Germania* of Tacitus which describes the dress of the Germanic tribes. Tacitus’ remarks are to be read against a Roman background. He has Roman clothing in mind while describing the Germanic one, as do his readers. First, Tacitus turns to the costume of the Germanic men and explains that it was close-fitting (*stricta et singulos artos exprimente*) in contrast to the Sarmatian and Parthian costume. He then goes on to describe the garb of the Germanic women:

Tac. Germ. 17.2

nec alius feminis quam viris habitus, nisi quod feminae saepius lineis amictibus velantur eosque purpura variant, partemque vestitus superioris in manicas non extendunt nudae brachia et lacertos, sed et proxima pars pectoris patet.

The women wear the same garments as the men, except that the women more often dress in linen clothes and decorate them with purple. They do not extend the upper part of their dress to form sleeves. Their forearms and upper arms are naked; in fact, even the adjacent part of the breast is visible.

The robe of the Germanic women is similar to the Roman *stola*.²² The words *partem vestitus superioris* are equivalent to *partem superiorem vestitus*, describing its upper part.²³ Tacitus emphasizes that the robe of the Germanic women is not cut like a *tunica* and does not have dropped sleeves (*manicae*). For this reason, the arms are left completely visible, as is the part of the breasts that is adjacent to the armpits.

¹⁸ The upper portion of the panel for the bodice is cut wider than shoulder width so that the hem of the arm hole ‘drops’ onto the arm instead of being on top of the shoulder.

¹⁹ Cf. Archaeological Evidence, p. 676.

²⁰ Prop. 3.6.13; see below n. 124.

²¹ Lucan. 2.360–364; cf. below p. 272.

²² On the passage, cf. also B 4 pp. 351–352.

²³ For the hypallage of *superioris*, see the commentary of Reeb (1930) ad loc.

Furthermore, due to the historical fusion of the Roman *tunica* with the Greek *chiton*, there were different types of shoulder binding (along the lateral line between the arm holes and the neck hole) (pl. 4). The front and back panels were either sewn together or tied together with several knots along the shoulder.

Although the different types are well attested in archaeological evidence,²⁴ literary evidence is scarce. There is no text pertaining to a specifically female Roman tunic, but we may rely on what is told about the male one. In a passing remark, Varro describes how the garment was produced by sewing two panels of cloth together. His example concerns the *tunica* of the knight or the senator, which had small or broad stripes (*clavi*).²⁵

Varro LL 9.79

non si quis tunicam inusitate ita consuit, ut altera plagula sit angustis clavis, altera latis, utraque in suo genere caret analogia.

Even if you should sew a *tunica* together in an unusual way, so that one panel of fabric has narrow *clavi* and the other broad *clavi*, each panel does not lack conformity in its own class.

Similarly, we hear of the shoulder seams of the Roman *tunica* in an anecdote told by Suetonius about the young Octavianus and future Emperor Augustus. Tellingly, it is also about the *tunica* with broad stripes (our Latin texts written by members of the social elite often talk about the dress of this social strata):

Suet. Aug. 94.10

sumenti virilem togam tunica lati clavi resuta ex utraque parte ad pedes decedit. fuerunt qui interpretarentur non aliud significare, quam ut is ordo cuius insigne id esset quandoque ei subiceretur.

When he (sc. Octavianus) put on the *toga virilis*, his *tunica* with broad stripes, being unpicked on both sides, fell to his feet. Some interpreted this to mean nothing other than that the political body whose insigne it was (i.e. the senate's) would be subjected to Octavianus some day.

It is hard to say for what reason Octavianus' *tunica* was opened at the upper edge—the prodigious incident, which suits its political interpretation so well, is very likely invented in any case. However, it is based on the typical nature of a Roman *tunica* with seams along both shoulders. In this case, the stitching of the shoulder seam was undone (*resuere*) so that the garment fell down.²⁶

²⁴ Cf. below p. 272.

²⁵ Cf. also Marquardt/Mau (1886) 551; and most recently Pausch (2003) 72–73.

²⁶ Most instructive in this respect is also a passage in Josephus' *Antiquitates*. Josephus tells his readers that the tunic worn by the Jewish high priest—again we hear about the dress of an elite—differed from a normal Roman tunic. Joseph. Ant. 3.74: ἔστι δ' ὁ χιτῶν οὗτος οὐκ ἐκ δυοῖν περιτμημάτων (*plagulae*),

All these remarks square with the archaeological evidence so that there is not doubt as to the nature of a ‘normal’ Roman *tunica*. It was not more than two wide panels of fabric sewn together with four seams (two horizontal seams along the shoulders and two vertical ones along the sides).

In contrast, the Greek *chiton* did not strictly speaking have shoulder seams. Instead, it had what would be called an ‘opening’ in modern terminology since the knots could be untied.²⁷ Literary Latin evidence giving us a precise description of the ‘reusable’ shoulder binding (i.e. opening) of the female *chiton* is even less, although most of our Latin texts on female *tunicae* must be talking about this kind of garment. The reason for this is simple. Most of these texts are poetry, and poets usually do not care to describe technicalities in the way modern dressmaking patterns do. Nevertheless, we can understand the descriptions because we already know (from their context or external evidence) that they must relate to a *chiton*. This statement also holds true for the two texts that most closely describe its shape and draping. The first one is a section in Ovid’s *Fasti* depicting the Naiads in a procession of Bacchus. The Greek ‘spirit’ of the passage indicates that all of them are wearing a *chiton*:

Ovid. *Fasti* 1.405–410

*Naiades effusis aliae sine pectinis usu,
pars aderant positis arte manuque comis;
illa super suras tunicam collecta ministrat,
altera dissuto pectus aperta sinu;
exserit haec umerum, vestem trahit illa per herbas,
impediunt teneros vincula nulla pedes.*

The Naiads were present, partly with loose and uncombed hairs, partly with an artificial coiffure. Acting as servants, one has pulled up her tunic up above her calves, one has loosened the upper part of it and bared her chest. One shows her shoulder, one pulls her robe through the grass. No shoes impede their tender feet.

As Ovid shows, there are many ways a *chiton* could be draped. It could be gathered up with the help of a girdle, or loosened and then lie on the ground. It could be opened at the top to bare the breast, or the short sleeve could be gathered or pulled down, exposing the shoulder. In general, Ovid’s description is very clear, but problems start in the case of the shoulder binding. Ovid uses the expression *dissuto sinu*. The word *sinus* designates the upper front part of the tunic. The word *dissuere*, to be connected

ὥστε ῥαπτὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων εἶναι καὶ τῶν παρὰ πλευράν [This tunic does not consist of two pieces of cloth to be stitched on the shoulders and at the sides].

²⁷ The term ‘opening’ here is used in its modern tailoring sense. It refers either to a hole that remains open (allowing for the head or limbs to pass through) or to where the garment is closed and opened (such as the central vertical opening of modern dress shirts held together by buttons or a fly held together by a zipper).

with *suere* (to sew), at first glance seems to mean ‘to unpick a seam’ (i.e. destroy it). But was the Greek Naiad wearing a sewn Roman *tunica*? Did she prepare it by unpicking the seams with a needle or sheers in advance? This is unbelievable in this kind of scene showing us a Bacchantic reveling. The Naiad must thus be wearing a *chiton* with its ‘reusable’ opening. The verb *dissuere* then refers to the loosening of the ribbons tying together the panels along the shoulders, which might have come close in appearance to a seam.

A Greek parallel text shows how we have to imagine this process. In Aristophanes F 338, a woman similarly bares her breast by opening her *chiton*: τὴν πτέρυγα παράλυσσασα τοῦ χιτῶνιου καὶ τῶν ἀποδέσμων, οἷς ἐνῆν τιτθίδια (she loosened the ‘wing’ of her *chiton* and the strings that held her breasts).²⁸ Ovid’s version is very similar to this description in Aristophanes. In any case, what is important to Ovid is not the exact nature of the opening of the tunic, but that the Naiad is showing her naked breasts.

The second Latin evidence is also in Ovid’s *Fasti*. Ovid describes the female clothes that Hercules dressed in while being a servant at the court of the Lydian queen Omphale.²⁹ We can also only understand his description in full when we know what a *chiton* looks like. For Hercules must wear this type of *tunica* in what is a Greek ‘comedy scene.’ His costume is just as we see it in the archaeological evidence.³⁰

Ovid. *Fasti* 2.319–324

dat tenues tunicas Gaetulo murice tinctas,
dat teretem zonam, qua modo cincta fuit.
ventre minor zona est; tunicarum vincla relaxat,
ut posset magnas exseruisse manus.
fregerat armillas non illa ad brachia factas,
scindebant magni vincula parva pedes.

She (sc. Omphale) gives him her tender *tunicae* dyed with African purple; she gives him the braided girdle she herself wore a moment ago. The girdle is too small for his belly. He loosens the fastenings of his *tunicae*. In this way, he can thrust his big arms out. He had already ruined the bracelets not made for such arms. His big feet have split the small shoes.

Ovid’s description—which is to be read against the background of a similar one in Propertius³¹—is remarkable in that the female garb is described completely: It consists

²⁸ The Imperial grammarian Pollux 7.62, who quotes this passage from Aristophanes, equates the πτέρυξ (‘wing’) with what is called *plagula* in Latin. This could be wrong. Maybe, the term refers to one shoulder section of the *chiton*, which resembles a wing in its appearance.

²⁹ On the entire passage, see the commentaries of Bömer (1958) and Robinson (2011).

³⁰ Cf. on it Robinson (2011) in his commentary. Clodius has similar difficulties when dressing up as a woman. He hardly gets the tight sleeves over his arms, see A 10 p. 204.

³¹ Prop. 4.9.47–50: *idem ego Sidonia feci seruilis palla || officia et Lydo pensa diurna colo, || mollis et hirsutum cepit mihi fascia pectus, || et manibus duris apta puella fui* [I performed menial services clad

of two *tunicae*, which are belted with a cord (*teres zona*).³² The joke is that the female clothing does not suit the muscular Hercules and is too small. Among other things, we learn that Hercules widens his garment to stick out his thick arms. For this, Ovid uses the expression *vincla tunicarum relaxat*. Knowing the nature of the *chiton*, the word *vincla* cannot refer to sleeves but must designate the strings with which the garment was fastened at its upper edge along the shoulders. Hercules does not have to tear open a seam (i.e. destroy it), but only has to loosen these strings (*relaxat*) (i.e. undo in such a manner that they can be retied).

1.2.2 The middle part (pl. 2)

The middle part of the *tunica*, as we also see it with Hercules' dress, was usually fixed by a girdle (*cingillum*, *zona*) or a cord (*strophium*). This also served to regulate the length.³³ That this was the normal way to wear it can be seen *e contrario* from the many descriptions noting that a belt is either loosened or missing. In Ovid, the girdle once prevents the furious 'lover' from completely stripping his mistress:

Ovid. am. 1.747–48

*aut tunicam a summa diducere turpiter ora
ad mediam?—mediae zona tulisset opem.*

(Was it not enough) to pull apart her *tunica* from the upper border to its middle in order to shame her? The girdle would have supported the middle part of it.

In Love Elegy, mistresses usually wear *chitones*,³⁴ which is also shown by this description. The furious 'lover' pulls the garment down at the shoulders so that it opens up in the centre, thus laying bare the chest of the woman. The girdle in the middle prevents the garment from being completely pulled down. In contrast to a *chiton*, a Roman tunic can only be removed by pulling it over the head. Otherwise, it is destroyed. In the scene at hand, there is no hint that the garment is torn by being pulled down. It is the disgracing act of someone other than the wearer pulling it apart (*diducere*) that is at issue.

in a purple *peplos*, spinning wool everyday with the Lydian distaff. A soft *fascia* contained my hairy chest, and despite my rough hands I was a quite good maid]. In Ovid, Hercules wears two tunics, in Propertius a *peplos* and a breast band (*fascia*). Cf. on it also B 22 p. 511. In Ovid, the purple is denoted in metonymy by the adjective *Gaetulus* (~ African), in Propertius by the adjective *Sidonius* (of Sidon), referring to different places of Phoenician purple production.

³² Cf. B 21 p. 499.

³³ See below p. 251 and B 20 pp. 494–496.

³⁴ See below p. 265.

1.2.3 The bottom end (pls. 2–3)

The woman's tunic covered the knees and reached to the calves—which are mentioned several times in this context—or to the ankles.³⁵ A man's tunic was shorter.³⁶ The length of a tunic was not only determined by the cut, but could also be regulated by the way it was girded. Some sources describe the 'normal length' of the female tunic. For example, the rhetoric teacher Quintilian tells us how an orator should wear his tunic, distinguishing it from the garb of other 'social' groups. Again, the *tunica* with *clavi* is the point of reference for many orators belonging to the upper classes:

Quintilian. 11.3.138

cui lati clavi ius non erit, ita cingatur, ut tunicae prioribus oris infra genua paulum, posterioribus ad medios poplites usque perveniant: nam infra mulierum est, supra centurionum.

Those who do not have the right to wear the *latus clavus* should gird themselves as follows: In the front, the borders of their tunics should reach a little below the knees, in the back, to the hollows of the knees. For below the knees is women's dress, above them centurion dress.

In this passage, the woman's longer tunic and the soldier's shorter tunic serve as benchmarks. The knees (*genua*) and the hollows of knees (*poplites*) are the dividing line. Similarly, the chauvinist Juvenal recommends that a female 'intellectual' might as well behave totally like a man and hike up her tunic to her thighs (*succingere*), i.e. shorten it to the usual length of the male garment.³⁷

Iuven. 6.444–446

*imponit finem sapiens et rebus honestis.
nam quae docta nimis cupit et facunda videri
crure tenus medio tunicas succingere debet.*

The wise man sets a limit even to honourable things. For a woman who wants to appear all too learned and eloquent must gather up her tunics to the middle of the leg.

The rules described by Quintilian and Juvenal in the Imperial period already constituted the social norm during the Roman Republic. We have no sources from the earlier period which mention a woman, but it is clear from Plautus' and Cicero's accounts of men's violations of norms³⁸ that a woman's tunic was usually long. Plautus calls a Phoenician

³⁵ On the archaeological sources, cf. Archaeological evidence p. 675.

³⁶ Marquardt/Mau (1886) 551–552; Pausch (2003) 92.

³⁷ Against Courtney's commentary ad loc.: "She should wear a tunic instead of a stola."

³⁸ RAC 4 (1950) s.v. effeminatus, col. 630 (H. Herter); A. Corbeill, Controlling Laughter. Political Humor in the Late Roman Republic, Princeton 1996, 160. The literary common place is already found in Attic comedy, cf. Eupolis F 104 K.-A.

man feminine (*mulierosum*)³⁹ because of his *tunicae demissiciae*; in invectives, Cicero describes Verres and the followers of Catilina as wearing foot-long robes (*tunicae talaes*).⁴⁰ Later sources from the Imperial period do have descriptions of women. However, only one of these seems to be from the real world (as opposed to from the world of myth), namely Fortunata—a character that will repeatedly come up in this part of the book.⁴¹ As we have seen above in Ovid's *Fasti*, a Naiad hikes up her tunic over her calves (*super suras*) in the manner of a servant, while another lets it hang down to the ground⁴² (i.e. she has loosened her belt). In Ovid's *Fasti*, we also find a scene where Faunus begins to undress Hercules (who is wearing female tunics while in the service of Omphale) starting from the bottom fringe (*ab ima ora*). Hercules' tunics are obviously long, insofar as they cover his legs.⁴³ The same applies to the garment of the nymph Lotis, which Priapus lifts starting at her feet (*a pedibus*).⁴⁴

1.2.4 Material and colour

A *tunica* could be made of different materials. However, there are only few literary sources which tell us about it. We hear of wool,⁴⁵ of linen,⁴⁶ and of cotton.⁴⁷ The tunic's intended function must have played a large role in the choice of material. For example, the comic playwright Caecilius refers to an 'inner' tunic (*interula*) made of cotton.⁴⁸ Supple cotton is a more suitable material for this type of garment than scratchy wool. After the conquest of Egypt, silk was also used.⁴⁹ However, our Latin sources focus on

³⁹ Plaut. Poen. 1298–1303: *quis hic homo est cum tunicis longis quasi puer cauponius? <...> sane genus hoc mulierosumst tunicis demissiciis* [Who is this man dressed in long tunics like the waiter at an inn? ... He is certainly a womanish person with his tunics reaching to the ground]. On the formation of the adjective *demissicius*, which is a hapax, cf. A 4 (*caesicius*) p. 77. The suffix *-icius* shows that the adjective does not refer to a given situation (*demissus*), but to a habitus. On the costume of innkeepers, see Prop. 4.2.38 and Marquardt/Mau (1886) 552 for further examples of tunics of men hanging too low.

⁴⁰ See below pp. 256, 260.

⁴¹ See below pp. 268–272; B 4 p. 310 and B 11 passim.

⁴² Cf. below p. 248.

⁴³ Ovid. *Fasti* 2.347–348: *interea tunicas* (sc. *Herculis*) *ora subducit ab ima*: || *horrebant densis aspera crura pilis* [Meanwhile he pulled up Hercules' tunics from the bottom border. Legs showed bristling with thick rough hair].

⁴⁴ Ovid. *Fasti* 1.431: *a pedibus tracto velamina* [I pull her clothes pull up from her feet].

⁴⁵ Plaut. *Epid.* 229, Aul. 508; Ovid. *Ars* 3.222: *quas geritis vestis, sordida lana fuit* [the clothes you wear were once ordinary wool]. For wool, see A 4 pp. 75–76; A 5 pp. 95–96.

⁴⁶ Plaut. *Epid.* 229, Aul. 512; Apul. *Met.* 2.7 (see p. 275). On linen, see A 4 p. 76; A 5 pp. 100–101; B 9 p. 384.

⁴⁷ Plaut. Aul. 515; Caecilius, Pausimachus F 3. On cotton and its terminology, see A 5 p. 104; A 7 pp. 139–141; B 9 p. 384.

⁴⁸ See below pp. 261.

⁴⁹ Cf. B 9 pp. 386–391.

the exquisite material itself, so that we never explicitly hear about a *tunica*, but only generally about clothes (*vestes*) made of silk.⁵⁰ As far as wool and linen are concerned, the fabric could have different qualities, and the garment was differentiated according to these. We get a small sample of the language of the fashion world in the dress catalogue of Plautus' *Epidicus* (A 4). Plautus first mentions a *tunica ralla* (= *rara*) as well as a *tunica spissa*, then presumably a *tunica linteola caesicia*, and finally two incomprehensible technical terms (*indusiata*, *patagiata*).⁵¹ The first two expressions refer to the thickness of the wool fabric, the third denotes—if my hypothesis is correct—a fine type of linen.⁵² As regards the *tunica* of the mistress in Roman Love Elegy, the poets only tell us that it was made of a fine fabric without further specifying it.⁵³ The translucent *Coa vestis* worn by her probably was extremely thin.⁵⁴ As Ovid explains, the garments of a *puella* were not made for cold weather:

Ovid. ars 2.301–302
astiterit tunicata, 'moves incendia' clama,
sed timida, caveat frigora, voce roga.

When she comes in her tunic, shout 'you are kindling fires,' but ask her in a frightened voice to beware the cold.

In this section, Ovid contrasts the thin tunic with the *gausapum*, a garment of Celtic origin.⁵⁵ We do not know exactly what a *gausapum* looked like, but it was made of wool cloth that was left unshorn on one side. It was therefore thicker than the tunic and could be worn in cooler weather (especially important for the Celts). Otherwise a cloak (*pallium*) was used over the tunic.⁵⁶

As far as the colour is concerned, most tunics were probably natural-coloured. Since this was the normal case, it is rarely mentioned.⁵⁷ There was also a whole range of artificial colours. The use of colours is explored in chapter B 11. Many of the colours are listed by Ovid in the *Ars amatoria* in a catalogue that gives us a sense of the variety and possibilities of a coloured garment.⁵⁸ Ovid mentions azure blue (*caeruleus/caerulus*), turquoise (*colour aquae marinae*), and red (*crocinus/croceus*). There is also dark green (*myrteus*), violet (*amethystinus*), pink (*roseus*), light pink, nut brown (*caryinus*), almond brown (*amygdalinus*), and beige (*cereus*). In addition, other sources refer to various

⁵⁰ Cf. Cass. Dio 72.17 (n. 82) on Commodus, who wore a silk *chiton*.

⁵¹ On the two glosses, cf. D 3 pp. 607–614.

⁵² Cf. A 4 p. 76.

⁵³ See below p. 261.

⁵⁴ Cf. B 9 p. 387.

⁵⁵ Cf. on it, B 9 pp. 394–399.

⁵⁶ Cf. Introduction to part B 1 p. 233.

⁵⁷ Cf. for example Mart. 1.96.4–9, 14.127, 129.

⁵⁸ Cf. Ovid. ars 3.173–184; on the entire passage, see B 11 pp. 410–420.

other shades of red (*cerasinus*, *puniceus*),⁵⁹ yellow-green (*galbinus*),⁶⁰ and depending on the circumstances and the occasion, black and white.⁶¹ There were also patterned tunics, of which we are granted a glimpse by Juvenal, who describes a passive homosexual dressed in a tunic with a blue checkerboard pattern (*caerulea scutulata*).⁶² The further variety of patterns that must have existed is beyond our knowledge. Likewise, we know only little of when a tunic in artificial colours was worn. It seems very likely though that the Romans used coloured tunics at dinner parties, whereas they preferred natural colours with tunics worn outside and in everyday life.

1.3 Usage

The *tunica* was the primary garment for Roman women (and men) and could be duplicated when the situation required it. This is shown by the famous passage in Suetonius, who describes the clothing of Augustus:

Suet. Aug. 82.1

hieme quaternis cum pingui toga tunicis et subucula et thorace laneo et feminalibus et tibialibus muniebatur.

In winter, he used to arm himself with a set of four tunics and a thick *toga*, as well as with an undertunic, a woollen ‘waistcoat,’ and with wraps around the lower and upper parts of his legs.

The emperor Augustus (in contrast to imperial propaganda) is presented here as a frost-sensitive old man (with feminine features).⁶³ He is said to have worn four tunics on top of each other in addition to his *subucula*. This example is certainly extreme, but it teaches us that schematic thinking regarding the tunic should be avoided. In the ‘normal’ case, men and women probably wore two tunics: the main outer tunic and the undertunic (*subucula*) (pl. 5). They could also wear more tunics if they wanted to. The *subucula* and the standard combinations will be studied later in the chapter.⁶⁴ For now, it is time to have a closer look at the *chiton*.

⁵⁹ Cf. B 11 p. 409.

⁶⁰ Cf. B 11 p. 408.

⁶¹ Cf. B 11 pp. 426, 434.

⁶² See Iuven. 2.95, cf. B 11 p. 432.

⁶³ On the passage, cf. also B 25 p. 521.

⁶⁴ See below pp. 261–264.

1.4 Roman *tunica* and Greek *chiton* – a hypothetical history

A source-based early history of the female *tunica* in Rome can no longer be written because we have no contemporary evidence for it. It remains a theoretical model, suggested by the garment as it is historically attested in later times. Even though the model must ultimately remain hypothetical, it is still based on archaeological evidence and the few literary sources available to us. The early history of the tunic could have been as follows: The tunic (*tunica*) initially consisted of two panels of fabric sewn together along shoulders and was cut relatively tightly. This type of *tunica* was originally worn by women (and men) in Rome. For this reason, we may call it the Roman tunic. In the course of the Hellenization of the Roman world, which began in third century BCE, the Greek *chiton* (also referred to as *tunica* in Latin) was introduced in Rome as part of Greek fashion. In contrast to the Roman tunic, the *chiton* had strings along the shoulders and was more voluminous in fabric.⁶⁵ The tight-fitting tunic with seams at the top is identified as Roman in origin by way of exclusion because we have no evidence of this kind of garment among the Greeks. There are no early sources that show us the Roman female clothing before Greek influence started. On the contrary, the Graeco-Roman mixture that constituted Roman culture at the time when literary transmission begins is most evident with the *tunica*—more than with any other garment. By the first century BCE at the latest, both forms of tunic were used by Roman women without distinction. A foreign fashion had become a normal dress. The process of acculturation had been completed.

The difficulty caused by our literary transmission also pertains to the linguistic level. It consists of the fact that the Latin word *tunica* is used indiscriminately for the Roman tunic and the Greek *chiton* since the beginning of our textual transmission. Conversely, a Roman tunic might be called a χιτὼν in Greek texts. The reason for this wide use of the word may be that both garments were similar in function and appearance. They are closed garments (either sewn or knotted) which are put on over the head and in their normal form reach over the knee. A terminological distinction was therefore probably not considered necessary. The differences were less important than the similarities. Both articles of clothing could be regarded as species of one and the same garment, namely the *tunica*.

1.5 ‘Greek’ special forms of the tunic

Nevertheless, some traces show that the Romans were still aware of the different cultural origin of both kinds of tunic in the first century BCE. We see it in the case of

⁶⁵ A difference between the materials (wool = Roman tunic, linen = Greek *chiton*), as the archaeological evidence might suggest (see on it p. 676), is not supported by the literary sources.

two special forms, which are called *tunica talaris* and *tunica manicata*. Their un-Roman (= Greek) origin is still evident in Cicero. Both expressions will be explained in the following. A third term may also translate another Greek technical term: *tunica *regilla* (χιτὼν ὀρθοστάδιος). It is, however, a gloss. The only primary evidence we have is in Plautus.⁶⁶ It will therefore be discussed in part D.⁶⁷

1.5.1 *tunica talaris* (χιτὼν ποδήρης)

The Romans assigned the foot-long tunic to women.⁶⁸ It is called *tunica talaris* (*talus* = ankle) three times in Latin literature.⁶⁹ It is a visible, outer tunic. The Latin words only translate the Greek χιτὼν ποδήρης.⁷⁰ For this reason, the garment should be considered a wide tunic in the Greek tradition (*chiton*). The three Latin examples point in this direction as well. They all concern men (Verres, the followers of Catilina, and Caligula) who are described as violating the male dress code.⁷¹ It is not surprising that the term *tunica talaris* is only used with men. With a woman, a long tunic is neither exceptional nor reprehensible (and therefore almost tautological). For this reason, the word *tunica* on its own is usually sufficient to designate it. Some of the Greek heroines in long tunic mentioned above wear a *tunica talaris* (χιτὼν ποδήρης). Hercules' *tunica* is also clearly one and is designated by Lucian as χιτὼν ποδήρης.⁷² For a man, however, the general term *tunica* was not a sufficient basis to describe an 'abnormal' type of garment. Cicero therefore describes the inappropriate costume of the Roman praetor Verres as follows:⁷³

Cic. Verr. 2.5.31

cum iste cum pallio purpureo talarique tunica versaretur in conviviis muliebribus.

when he took part in women's parties, dressed in a purple *pallium* and a *tunica talaris*.

Cicero stigmatizes Verres by having him wear a foot-long tunic like those worn by the women. Furthermore, the Greek context plays a major role. Here, as elsewhere, Cicero

⁶⁶ Plaut. Epid. 223; cf. A 4 p. 67.

⁶⁷ D 3 pp. 602–606.

⁶⁸ Against Pausch (2003) 168; GRD (2007) 202.

⁶⁹ In addition to the discussed passages, the term *tunica talaris* is found in Suet. Cal. 54.2 (The emperor Caligula as singer): *cum palla tunicaque talari* [with a 'peplos' and *tunica talaris*].

⁷⁰ For examples, see LSJ s.v. ποδήρης, and Amelung (n. 4) 2332–2333.

⁷¹ Corbeill (n. 38) 160. A similar common place is the accusation that the man's tunic is badly belted and therefore falls down too long. The most famous example of this is Caesar, who was called a *male praecinctus* (= *cinaedus*) by Sulla. See Suet. Div. Julius 45.2.

⁷² Lucian. Dial. Deorum [79] 15.2.

⁷³ J. Heskel, Cicero as Evidence for Attitudes to Dress in the Late Republic, in: Sebesta/Bonfante (1994) 134; Edmondson (2008) 35–36. Cf. also Cic. Verr. 5.86: *stetit soleatus praetor populi Romani cum pallio purpureo tunicaque talari muliercula nixus in litore* [The praetor of the Roman people stood on the beach in sandals, dressed in a purple *pallium* and a *tunica talaris* and leaning on a little lady].

suggests that Verres has succumbed to the Greek exuberant lifestyle when governing the Greek-influenced *provincia* Sicily. He accuses Verres of two faux pas related to the dress code of a dignified Roman man: showing himself in a luxurious Greek *pallium* instead of the *toga* he should have worn as a Roman official and dressing in a wide and foot-long *chiton* instead of the tight and short Roman male tunic. The change of clothes is supposed to be indicative of Verres' change of mind. According to Cicero, Verres laid down all Roman values together with his Roman garments. He behaves like a female guest at a Greek symposium. Cicero evokes similar ideas in the case of the followers of Catilina, whom he shows in *tunicae talares* and in tunics with sleeves in order to present a critical image.⁷⁴

1.5.2 *tunica manicata* (χιτὼν χειριδωτός) (pl. 6)

The *tunica* had no 'real' sleeves in its normal form, meaning they had no tailored piece of cloth that was attached with a seam. The width of the fabric usually resulted in short 'faux sleeves.'⁷⁵ There was, however, one type of *tunica* with long sleeves attached.⁷⁶ This is to be regarded as a special form and is designated by the addition of various adjectives. The following argues that it was originally a fashion from Asia Minor that was first adopted by the Greeks and then by the Romans.

1.5.2.1 Terminology

In Greek, the tunic with attached sleeves is called χιτὼν χειρίδωτος.⁷⁷ In Latin literature, it is referred to by the Greek loanwords *chiridotus* (and *chirodyta*⁷⁸), as well as by the Latin adjectives *manuleatus* and *manicatus*. The Greek loanwords are restricted to archaic Latin literature.⁷⁹ The noun *manuleus* ('glove' or 'sleeve') is only found in Plautus and other archaic and archaistic authors.⁸⁰ The adjective *manuleatus* is found

⁷⁴ See below p. 260 and Hessel (n. 73) 140; Corbeill (n. 38) 161–162.

⁷⁵ See above p. 246.

⁷⁶ For the tunic with sleeves, see Becker/Göll (1882) 208–209; Marquardt/Mau (1886) 551; Blümner (1911) 207; Pausch (2003) 172–180; GRD (2007) 31–32.

⁷⁷ The Greek term χειρίς or χειρίδιον means either sleeve or, very rarely, (like *manuleus*), glove. See RE 3.2 (1899) s.v. χειρίς, col. (1899) 2217–2220 (W. Amelung) and LSJ s.v.; for the adjective χειριδωτός, see Herodot. 7.61.1 (n. 87); Strab. 4.4.3 p. 196 C., 11.13.9 p. 526 C.; IG II² 1514.6, 1523.275, 1529.10, and RE loc. cit. 2219.

⁷⁸ On the rare Latin word, cf. D 4 p. 631.

⁷⁹ Scipio Minor F 17 Malcovati, Lucilius F 71 (n. 87), Novius *Paedium* F 4 (n. 94).

⁸⁰ Cf. Accius *Didascalica* F 12 PL (n. 89); Fronto p. 59.10 van den Hout: *cur Parthi laxioribus manuleis uterentur* [why the Parthians use wider sleeves]; Plaut. *Cistellaria* 252. The passage, which is usually not quoted in full in the dictionaries, is badly preserved in the transmission. In the Codex Ambrosianus only the following words can be deciphered: *quid tu ergo < > ... te manuleo*. A quotation by Fulgentius in

in Plautus in the phrase *tunica manuleata*,⁸¹ but it is not used again until the Imperial period, when it refers to the wearer and means ‘dressed in a tunic with sleeves.’⁸² The noun *manicae* [pl.] and the adjective *manicatus* are used slightly differently. In contrast to *manuleus*, the noun *manicae* is first used by Virgil to designate ‘sleeves,’ whereas it had previously been used to designate only handcuffs.⁸³ The adjective *manicatus* is already found in Cicero;⁸⁴ it refers exclusively to robes and means ‘with long sleeves.’ It remains to be asked whether the terms *manicae* [pl.] and *manuleus* denote the same type of sleeve, as is the traditional view.⁸⁵ In contrast, Pausch assigns the term *manuleus* to the faux sleeves resulting from the dropped shoulder and the term *manicae* to the long ‘proper’ sleeves.⁸⁶ However, the written sources do not suggest such a distinction. Tacitus in the description discussed above, for instance, uses the word *manica* to designate short faux sleeves. For this reason, the traditional opinion is to be preferred. It seems more likely that different usage of the various words at different times is due to linguistic tendencies and does not imply a differentiation of sleeve types.

his commentary on Vergil may serve as a supplement: *apud antiquos caiatio dicebatur puerilis caedes: quid? tu amicam times ne te manuleo caiet* [In the ancient days, a blow like that of a child was called *caiatio*. ‘What? You’re afraid that your girlfriend will beat you with the *manuleus*?] It is an open question whether the gloss *caio* ever existed—the silence of all other lexicography is against it—or whether it is a misreading of *caedit*. In any case, it is certain that a girl here uses the *manuleus* against her boyfriend. Her weapon was probably a glove. The Latin *manuleus* thus covers the same semantic field as the Greek word χειρίς.

81 Plaut. Pseud. 737–738: A: *sed iste servos ex Carysto qui hic adest ecquid sapit?* || B: *hircum ab alis*. A: *manuleatam tunicam habere hominem addecet*. [A: But this slave from Karystos, who is present here, does he show any good sense (= does he smell of something)? || B: Like a he-goat from the armpits. A: The man should wear a *tunica manicata*]. The pun is based on the double meaning of the Latin word *sapere*, meaning both ‘to have understanding’ and ‘to smell like something.’ Person B misunderstanding person A, answers his question whether the slave has any good sense by saying that he smells from the armpits. This pun is not possible in Greek. It is thus Plautus’ addition.

82 Plaut. Pseud. 738; Sen. epist. 33.2; Sueton. Cal. 52 (Caligula): *saepe depictas gemmatasque indutus paenulas manuleatus et armillatus in publicum processit, aliquando sericatus et cycladatus* [Often he appeared in public dressed in colourful *paenulae* (coats) with precious stones, in tunics with sleeves and bracelets, sometimes in a silk garment and in a *cyclas*]. For the *cyclas*, see B 9 pp. 391–394. Suetonius characterizes Caligula as an Oriental despot by having him wear a long-sleeved tunic. On Commodus wearing a similar garb, cf. Cass. Dio 72.17: *χιτώνα χειριδωτὸν σιρικὸν λευκὸν διάχρυσον* [a tunic with sleeves, of silk, white, and decorated with gold].

83 Vergil. Aen. 9.616; Stat. Theb. 7.656–657; Tac. Germ. 17.2 (see above p. 246).

84 Cic. Cat. 2.22 (see below p. 260); Clod. et Cur. F 22, 23 (see below p. 260 and A 10); Curtius Rufus 3.3.13 (n. 87).

85 See, for example, Marquardt/Mau (1886) 551.

86 Pausch (2003) 172–180.

1.5.2.2 Usage

In Greek and Latin literature, the *tunica manicata* is often mentioned as the garment of foreign peoples such as the Persians and Orientals,⁸⁷ the Galatians of Asia Minor,⁸⁸ and actors⁸⁹ (whose clothing derives from the costume of Dionysus).⁹⁰ However, already starting in Classical Greece, this kind of tunic is considered a special female garment (with possibly Oriental roots). The clothing catalogue of Artemis Brauronia twice mentions female *chitones* with sleeves.⁹¹ Similarly, we find uses of *tunica manicata* that designate a female tunic in Latin literature. It can therefore be considered part of women's fashion in Rome (albeit a special part). The use of the Greek loanword *chiridotus* in the archaic Pre-Classical texts along with the shifting Latin terminology also suggests that it was Greek women's fashion which the Romans adopted in the context of Hellenization. In general, a man wearing the garment was considered barbaric or effeminate. In other words, it was unbecoming of a Roman man.⁹²

But on what occasion was the *tunica manicata* used? It is noticeable that already in the Brauron clothing catalogue the long sleeves form part of a short (χιτωνίσκος) and an ornamented (κατάστιχτος) *chiton*. Both are garments that were probably used in the house and not in the street. They belong to the symposium rather than to everyday life. The ornamented tunic recalls the colourful clothes of Dionysus.⁹³ The 'Dionysian' context is also more or less present in all Latin sources which mention a tunic with sleeves. Twice we learn that it was a *crocota* (= a red tunic). The comic playwright

⁸⁷ Herodot. 6.72.2, 7.61.1: κιθῶνας χειριδωτοὺς ποικίλους [colourful tunics with sleeves]; Xenoph. HG 2.1.8; Strab. 11.13.9 p. 526 C.; Lucilius F 71 (= 71 Chr./Garb.) (Orientals) *chirodytae auratae* [in golden tunics with sleeves], cf. on the difficult text D 4 pp. 630–634; Vergil. Aen. 9.616 (Trojans): *et tunicae manicas et habent redimicula mitrae* [their tunics have sleeves and their *mitrae* have chinstraps], see on it also B 13 pp. 462–463; Sen. epist. 33.2: *apud me Epicurus est et fortis, licet manuleatus sit; fortitudo et industria et ad bellum prompta mens tam in Persas quam in alte cinctos cadit* [with me Epicurus is also brave, even if he wears a tunic with sleeves. Bravery and diligence and a belligerent spirit can be found with Persians as well as with high-belted people (= Spartans)]; Curtius Rufus 3.3.13: *vestem auro distinctam habebant manicatasque tunicas, gemmis etiam adornatas* [they had a gold-ornamented garment and tunics with sleeves, even decorated with precious stones].

⁸⁸ Plutarch. Otho 6.6: Γαλατικῶς ἀναξυρίσι καὶ χειρίσιν ἐνεσκευασμένος [dressed like a Celt with trousers and a tunic with sleeves]; Strab. 4.4.3 p. 196 C.

⁸⁹ Lucian. Jupp. Trag. [21] 41: καὶ τοὺς ἐμβάτας (*cothurnos*) καὶ τοὺς ποδήρεις χιτῶνας (*tunicas talaris*) καὶ χλαμύδας (*pallia*) καὶ χειρίδας (*manicae*) [and the boots, the foot-long tunics, the coats, and the tunics with sleeves]; Accius *Didascalica* F 12 PL (= Nonius p. 286.18–19 L.): *actoribus manuleos baltea machaeras* [the actors had sleeves, belts, knives]; on the work, see Courtney in his edition (2003) 60.

⁹⁰ Cf. Stat. Theb. 7.656a (about the robe of a priest of Dionysus): *bracchiaque in manicis* [arms in sleeves].

⁹¹ IG II² 1523.9–10, 1529.315; see RE (n. 77) 2219 on the passage.

⁹² Cf. Vergil's famous dictum of the Trojans Aen. 9.616 (n. 87); in addition, H. Bender, *De Habitu Vestis: Clothing in the Aeneid*, in: Sebesta/Bonfante (1994), 147; on the invective trope, see RAC (n. 38) 630; Corbeill (n. 38) 161.

⁹³ See, however, Cleland (2005) 117.

Novius has a young girl wear a soft *crocata* with sleeves.⁹⁴ According to Cicero, Clodius wore such a garment while dressed as a female lyre player (*psaltria*).⁹⁵ In both cases, the symposium is the context in which a tunic with sleeves is worn.

This is also true of two other instances in which a *tunica* with long sleeves figures in Latin literature. Scipio Africanus Minor accuses Sulpicius of having worn such a garment at banquets while reclining on a couch with his male lover. To make matters worse, Sulpicius is also branded a passive homosexual (Scipio describes him as acting like the submissive younger instead of the dominant ‘senior’ partner):

Gellius NA 6.12.5 (= Scipio Minor F 17 Malcovati²)

in conviviis adolescentulus cum amatore cum chiridota tunica inferior accubuerit

at banquets, he reclined as a young man with his lover, dressed in a *tunica* with long sleeves on the inner side of the couch

A similar sense underlies Cicero’s invective against the followers of Catilina. Cicero portrays them as ‘effeminate’ dandies busying themselves only with dinner parties (*cenae*):

Cic. Cat. 2.22

quos pexo capillo, nitidos, aut imberbis aut bene barbatos videtis, manicatis et talaribus tunicis, velis amictos non togis, quorum omnis industria vitae et vigilandi labor in antelucanis cenis expromitur.

You see them with combed hair, well groomed, either beardless or with a fine beard, dressed in tunics with sleeves and in foot-long tunics, wearing frocks not togas. They spend all their life energy and waking hours in banquets that last until dawn.

The expression *manicatis et talaribus tunicis* is grammatically ambiguous since it could also refer to one type of garment that had both characteristics (a foot-long tunic with sleeves).⁹⁶ However, both adjectives are used separately in a technical sense

⁹⁴ Novius Paedium F 4 + 3 (Nonius): A. <...> *molliculam crocotam chiridotam reticulum ... supparum purum Melitensem*. B. *interii, escam meram!* [(A) <She was wearing> a soft *crocata* with long sleeves, a hairnet, a **supparus*, pure Maltese stuff. (B) I am doomed, a true bait!]; cf. A 7 pp. 168–174; D 5 p. 656.

⁹⁵ Cic. in Cur. et Clod. [14] 22: *manicatum tunicam et mitram et purpureas fascias* [a tunic with sleeves, a *mitra*, and purple sandal straps]; 23: *cum vincirentur pedes fasciis, cum calvatica capiti accommodaretur, cum vix manicatum tunicam in lacertos induceres, cum strophio accurate praecingerere* [when your feet were wrapped with straps, when your bonnet was fitted to your head, when you pulled your tunic with sleeves over your upper arms with difficulty, when you carefully girded yourself with a cord]; De harusp. resp. 44: *P. Clodius a crocata, a mitra, a muliebribus soleis purpureisque fasceolis, a strophio, ... est factus repente popularis*. [P. Clodius is suddenly made a *popularis* (member of the ‘popular’ party) by the *crocata*, by the bonnet, by the women’s sandals and the little purple *fasciae*, by the cord]; cf. on it in general A 10 pp. 201–207.

⁹⁶ Cf. also the Loeb translation.

elsewhere. This suggests that Cicero is speaking of two different types of tunic: the *tunica manicata* and the *tunica talaris*. Like all other examples, his remarks show that the *tunica manicata* was an originally Greek garment worn at banquets by both women and men (assuming the invectives have a true core). Perhaps it was part of the coloured *vestis cenatoria* which we hear about in the Imperial period.⁹⁷

1.6 The undertunic (*subucula*) (pl. 5)

In the case of the undertunic—mainly called *subucula*—a precise definition is necessary since our dress custom is slightly different and the word undertunic might cause misunderstanding.⁹⁸ A *subucula* can be worn by both genders. Contrary to what is said in modern research, it is not equal to modern lingerie in a strict sense. Although it was worn directly on the skin and under (*sub*) another garment (similar to lingerie), it was socially acceptable to show some part of it in public. It could be visible underneath the outer garment, another tunic, or the *vestis longa*. Varro also says that a husband liked variety in his wife's *subuculae*. This suggests that a Roman woman would probably wear a *subucula* without an outer garment at home or in an informal situation without feeling naked. It is, in short, a garment in which you would not feel ashamed to open your door to the postman. This is different with true lingerie—a *fascia* ('brassiere') or a *subligar* ('slip'). These must necessarily be worn with another garment, or else you are regarded as *nudus* (naked). The undertunic is therefore dealt with in this chapter, whereas true underwear (in the sense of lingerie) is dealt with in the chapters B 22–25.

In our sources, the undertunic is variously called *interula*, *subucula*, and *tunica interior*. There seems to be no difference of meaning between these terms.⁹⁹ The term *subucula* predominates, and it is already referred to implicitly in Plautus (see below);¹⁰⁰ then we find it several times in Varro and other authors.¹⁰¹ In contrast, the word *interula* is only used twice. It may have been used by the comic playwright Caecilius, who speaks of a cotton tunic.¹⁰² The first certain mention is in the archaist Apuleius, where it refers to a tunic worn in bed. Apuleius may well be using the word as a linguistic archaism.¹⁰³

⁹⁷ Cf. B 10 p. 401.

⁹⁸ See Becker/Göll (1882) 250; Marquardt/Mau (1886) 485; Blümner (1911) 208, 229; RE 4.1 A (1931) s.v. *subucula*, col. 509 (E. Schuppe); Wilson (1939) 164–165; Potthoff (1992) 184–185; Goldman (1994) 235; Pausch (2003) 143–154; GRD (2007) 183.

⁹⁹ Against Pausch (2003) 143–154.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. p. 263.

¹⁰¹ See below p. 263 and C 1 pp. 571–573; on the etymology, see Potthoff (1992) 185.

¹⁰² Caecilius, Pausimachus F 3: *molochina interula* [a cotton undertunic], cf. A 7 p. 140.

¹⁰³ Apul. Met. 8.9.

In Valerius Maximus, dating to the reign of Tiberius (14–37 CE), we also find the term *tunica interior*.¹⁰⁴

In the Roman Republic and the early Imperial period, the undertunic was clearly called *subucula* in everyday language.¹⁰⁵ Festus (Verrius) comments on the word: *subucula: de tunicae genere notum est omnibus* (*subucula*: everyone knows this kind of *tunic*).¹⁰⁶ If the context does not require it, an undertunic may simply be called a *tunica* or *tunicula*. This is especially the case if both tunics (*tunicae*), the inner and the outer tunic, are referred to in the plural.¹⁰⁷ The fact that the *subucula* (like the *chiton*) could be referred to with the generic term *tunica* (at least in certain contexts) suggests that it was considered a full-fledged garment that could be worn on its own. This sometimes causes difficulties for modern analysis since we lack the requisite cultural knowledge or do not know the literary context. The Greek equivalent to *subucula* seems to be χιτώνιον and χιτωνίσκος. Other names for the undertunic have not been transmitted. The gloss **indusium*, which is often interpreted as an undergarment, is a philological chimaera.¹⁰⁸ In contrast to what Imperial (and modern) scholars maintain, the gloss **supparus* (D 5) also does not designate the *subucula*. The Late Antique term *camisia* should likewise be excluded from discussions of the Classical garment.

We learn little about the specific appearance of the female *subucula* in literature. What was the difference between the inner and the outer tunic? Was there any? Because all of our sources are from upper class authors, we have no texts from craftsmen (such as a tailor) giving us more details. Varro's talk of *varietas* implies that it could have many colours and patterns. Once, we also hear about the artificial colour of a *subucula*. As will be seen below,¹⁰⁹ Fortunata, the wife of Trimalchio, wears a flashy crimson undertunic under her outer *tunica*, whose colour is not mentioned. Both sources taken together may indicate that the *subucula* was the point where colour could manifest itself on the clothing of a (modest) Roman housewife, the outer *tunica* instead being of a natural colour. As far as the material is concerned, some sort of soft fabric (like the cotton tunic mentioned above) would have been used, given that it was worn on the skin.

The undertunic was worn as clothing by women (as well as men) of all social classes. But as is to be expected of upper class authors, we mainly hear of wealthy women. One exception is the *Carmen Priapeum* 12, which also shows us the tattered

¹⁰⁴ Val. Max. 7.4.5. In correspondence with this, Apul. Met. 11.4. calls the outer tunic of a man *tunica superior*.

¹⁰⁵ Hor. epist. 1.1.95–96: *si forte subucula pexae || trita subest tunicae* [if, for example, under the brand-new *tunica* there is a threadbare *subucula*]; Suet. 82.1 (see above p. 254).

¹⁰⁶ Festus p. 402.29–30 L.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. below p. 268.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. C 1 p. 571; D 3 p. 571.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. p. 269.

subucula of a poor old woman.¹¹⁰ It was presumably considered a sign of extreme poverty (*egestas*) if one was forced to do without a *subucula* and to wear only the coarser outer *tunica*. Accordingly, eschewal can be considered an expression of asceticism. Cynic philosophers only wore one tunic, and Christ expressly called upon his disciples to renounce a second tunic.¹¹¹

The exact date when the undertunic became established in Rome cannot be determined, but the garment was probably introduced very early.¹¹² The literary evidence shows that it was an everyday garment during the time of the Roman Republic. Already Plautus (early 2nd century BCE) provides indirect evidence for this. He uses the term *subucula* as the basis for a pun about the woman's visible tunic, which he jokingly calls **inducula*.¹¹³ A detailed discussion of the *subucula* is found at the end of the Republic in Varro's *De vita populi Romani*, in which he, presumably guided by Plautus, considered the *subucula* to be an invention of early Roman times. The passage indicates that Varro did not understand Plautus' pun:¹¹⁴

Varro VPR F 329 S. (45 R.)¹¹⁵

posteaquam binas tunicas habere coeperunt, instituerunt vocare subuculam et induculam

when they began to have two tunics each, they started to call them *subucula* and **inducula*.

In *De lingua Latina*, Varro also casually says that husbands prefer their wife's undertunic to show some variety:¹¹⁶

itaque in vestitu ... delectari varietate, non paribus subuculis uxoris respondeo

That is the reason, I answer, why we like variety in case of dress and when the *subuculae* of our wife are not all the same.

¹¹⁰ See below p. 272 and pp. 316–318.

¹¹¹ On the evidence in the Gospels, cf. M. Leutzsch, Grundbedürfnis und Statussymbol. Kleidung im Neuen Testament, in: A. Köb/P. Riedel (eds.), *Kleidung und Repräsentation in Antike und Mittelalter*, München 2005, 24–26. It shows that two tunics were in normal use by men throughout the Graeco-Roman world.

¹¹² Against Pausch (2003) 144.

¹¹³ Cf. A 4 p. 67.

¹¹⁴ Against Pausch (2003) 143.

¹¹⁵ Nonius p. 870.20–22 L.; cf. the comments of Riposati (1939) 161 and Pittà (2015) 222–224.

¹¹⁶ Varro LL 9.33.

Another supposed passage from Varro¹¹⁷ saying that the *subucula* was no longer worn by women has unfortunately muddled research on the female tunic.¹¹⁸ However, it should not be attributed to Varro but to the much later Nonius, and it therefore only reflects Late Antique conditions.¹¹⁹ According to the passage, the undertunic was no longer in use in Antiquity. It is difficult to say when the custom of wearing a *subucula* stopped. The last author to use the word *subucula* is Suetonius, when talking about Augustus' clothing; the last to implicitly mention it is the novelist Apuleius in the second half of the second century CE.¹²⁰ The term *subucula* is missing in the lists of Latin dress terms given by the jurist Ulpianus († 223/228 CE). This may give us a *terminus ante quem*. There is also reason to think that the *subucula* morphed into or was eclipsed by the dress custom of wearing a *synthesis*, a combination of *tunica* and *palliolum* (B 10). This dress custom started in the first century CE. A *synthesis* was used at banquets and thus comes close in function to wearing an inner and an outer *tunica*. Like the *subucula*, it was a colourful garment.

1.7 Case studies

The female tunic is very rarely described in the Latin texts. A few case studies may illustrate dress customs related to it. In the period dealt with in this book (200 BCE–200 CE), there are three main modes of wearing a *tunica* (all of which are corroborated by archaeological evidence):¹²¹ (1) a single *tunica* (with a belt), (2) an undertunic and an outer *tunica*, and (3) a *tunica* under a *vestis longa*. Every woman was allowed to wear a single or a double *tunica*. In contrast, the combination with the *stola*/*vestis longa* was generally reserved for the Roman *matrona* (B 4). Roman literature (and by extension Roman society) connected general stereotypes with the three different modes. The single *tunica* was closely associated with young and beautiful women, *meretrices* and mistresses. Wearing a double *tunica* suggested a mature married woman. The combination of *tunica* and *vestis longa* also referred to a married woman, but specifically

¹¹⁷ Nonius p. 880.33–37 L. (Varro F 329 Salvatore = 46 Riposati): *Varro de vita populi Romani lib. I palliolum breve voluit haberi. castula [!] est palliolum praecinctui, quo nudaē infra papillas praecinguntur; quo mulieres nunc et eo magis utuntur, postquam subuculis desierunt* [Varro contends in the first book *On the life of the Roman people* that it is a short piece of cloth. The *castula* is a small piece of cloth functioning as a wrap. They gird themselves with it naked underneath the breast. Women use it even more now that they have stopped using the undertunic (*subucula*)].

¹¹⁸ Cf. most recently, Pausch (2003) 149, who thinks, due to the contradictory nature of the sources, that the *subucula* fell out of fashion for a short time.

¹¹⁹ Cf. D 6 pp. 663–665.

¹²⁰ See below p. 274.

¹²¹ Cf. on it, Archaeological Evidence p. 677.

one married in Roman *matrimonium*. The distinction between ‘full’ *matrimonium* and other forms of legal union will be relevant.¹²²

The following sections cover four literary case studies in order to show how the *tunica* was worn and which social associations each had: (1) Ovid’s mistress Corinna, who wears only one *tunica*; (2) Petronius’ freedwoman Fortunata, a mature woman who lives in a relationship with Trimalchio and who wears a double *tunica*; (3) the Roman wedding dress not worn by Marcia in an epic poem by Lucan; and finally (4) two descriptions in Apuleius where the stereotype of the *matrona* and the young mistress are pitted against each other. Each case study shows how the women are dressed and what social group they belong to.

1.7.1 single *tunica* – Corinna

The mistress of Roman Love Elegy is a Greek freedwoman as to her social status. Her garb is similar to that of the various *hetaerae* depicted in love scenes on the walls of some houses in Pompey. She is usually presented in a single *tunica* (*chiton*) with a belt—though this is frequently either loosened or missing in literary descriptions. We occasionally learn that the mistress wears a *fascia* (‘brassiere’) (B 22). She can also put on a *pallium* (B 1). This is the literary stereotype, although we sometimes hear that she dresses in two *tunicae*—as would be normal outside the house.¹²³ That the mistress is presented in only one *tunica* has to do with the fact she is often shown in intimate situations in her own or her lover’s boudoir (*cubiculum*). This raises the question of whether the single *tunica* mentioned in this intimate setting is in fact a *subucula*. In such scenes, the young woman is often sleeping (either naked or dressed)¹²⁴ or is hastily

¹²² On the Roman *matrimonium*, cf. B 4 pp. 320–327.

¹²³ Ovid. am. 2.15.11–12: *tunc ego cum cupiam dominae tetigisse papillas || et laevam tunicis inseruisse manum* [then, when I liked to touch the breasts of my mistress and put my left hand into her tunics]; 3.14.27: *indue cum tunicis metuentem crimina vultum* [put on a face that is afraid of reproach when you put on your tunics]; Ovid. ars 3.108–110 (n. 131); 3.301–302a: *haec movet arte latus, tunicisque fluentibus auras || accipit* [this is moving her flanks with skill and takes in the breeze in her flowing tunics]; 3.639: *custode foris tunicas servante puellae* [while the guard outside watches over the tunics of the girl]; 3.707–708a (Procris): *ut rediit animus, tenues a pectore vestes || rumpit* [as soon as she came to her senses, she tore the delicate tunics from her chest]; epist. 6.27 (Hypsipyle): *protinus exilui tunicisque a pectore ruptis* [I immediately jumped up and tore the tunics from my chest]; 10.38 (Ariadne): *et tunicas lacrimis sicut ab imbre graves* [and my tunics, which were heavy with tears, as with a rain]; Fasti 2.171 (Callisto): *exuerat tunicas* [she had taken off her tunics].

¹²⁴ Prop. 2.15.5–6: *nam modo nudatis mecum est luctata papillis, || interdum tunica duxit operta moram* [sometimes she wrestled with me with bared breasts; sometimes she made a delay, wrapped in her tunic]; 17–18: *quod si pertendens animo vestita cubaris, || scissa veste meas experiere manus* [but if you persist in sleeping dressed, I will tear your clothes, and you will feel my hands]; 2.29.24–26; 3.6.13: *ac maestam teneris vestem pendere lacertis* [and the robe hangs sadly on her tender arms]; Ovid. am.

getting out of bed dressed in an ungirded *tunica*.¹²⁵ Sometimes her *tunica* is torn by her impatient lover.¹²⁶ Its material is usually very thin and even translucent.¹²⁷ It has many artificially colours, preferably tasteful shades of reds.¹²⁸ The favourite garment of the mistress (and her lover) is the *Coa vestis*, which seems to have combined all of these traits.¹²⁹ Ovid therefore makes the personified Love Elegy appear in the *vestis tenuis* (compare English ‘tenuous’).¹³⁰ In contrast to this delicate garment, the matron’s tunics are made of thicker fabric¹³¹ and are decorated with gold and other trimmings.¹³²

Ovid provides a famous example of all this in a scene in an erotic elegy where he describes how he tears the clothes off his lover Corinna in a noonday ‘lover’s tryst’:¹³³

Ovid. am. 1.5.9–18
ecce, Corinna venit, tunica velata recincta,
candida dividua colla tegente coma.
qualiter in thalamos formosa Semiramis isse
dicitur et multis Lais amata viris.
deripui tunicam, nec multum rara nocebat;
pugnabat tunica sed tamen illa tegi.

3.14.21: *illic (sc. in lecto) nec tunicam tibi sit posuisse pudori* [do not be ashamed there (i.e. in bed) to take off the tunic].

125 Prop. 4.8.61: *direptisque comis tunicisque solutis* [with dishevelled hair and ungirded]; Ovid. am. 3.1.51: *delabique toro tunica velata soluta* [to glide out of bed dressed in a loosened tunic]; 3.7.81: *nec mora, desiluit tunica velata soluta* [she immediately jumped out of bed dressed in a loosened tunic]; Ars 1.529–530 (Ariadne): *utque erat e somno tunica velata recincta, || nuda pedem, croceas inreligata comas* [just as she came from sleep, dressed in an ungirded tunic, with bare foot, with blond hair not tied]. On the literary motif, see Cat. c. 64.60–70 (A 12 p. 217) and Ovid. Fasti 3.645 (Anna flees out of her bedchamber): *cumque metu rapitur tunica velata recincta* [she runs away in fear, wrapped in an ungirded tunic].

126 Tib. 1.10.61: *sit satis e membris tenuem rescindere vestem* [it shall be enough to tear the delicate garment from the body]; Prop. 2.5.21: *nec tibi periuro scindam de corpore vestis* [I will not tear the tunic from your perjured body]; Ovid. am. 1.7.47–48 (cf. B 20 p. 494); Ars 2.171: *nec puto, nec sensi tunicam laniasse* [I do not think and I did not notice that I tore your tunic].

127 Tib. 1.10.61; Ovid. am. 3.2.35–36: *suspicio ex istis et cetera posse placere || quae bene sub tenui condita veste latent* [I suspect from the things I see that the rest hidden under your delicate garment could also be pleasing].

128 Cf. B 11 pp. 410–420.

129 Cf. B 9 pp. 386–391.

130 Ovid. am. 3.1.9: *forma decens, vestis tenuissima, vultus amantis* [a beautiful figure, a very delicate garment, the face of a lover]; on the passage in general, cf. B 3 pp. 296–297.

131 Ovid. ars 3.108–110: *si fuit Andromache tunicas induta valentes, || quid mirum? duri militis uxor erat* [No surprise if Andromache was dressed in strong tunics! She was the wife of a hard soldier].

132 Ovid. ars 3.131: *nec prodite graves insuto vestibibus auro*, [do not show yourselves in public, heavy with gold sewn to your garments]; 3.169: *quid de veste loquar? nec vos, segmenta, requiro* [What will I say of the garment? I do not need you, ornaments]; Apul. Met. 2.2 (see below).

133 On the entire the scene, cf. McKeown (1989) in his commentary.

*quae cum ita pugnaret, tamquam quae vincere nollet,
victa est non aegre prodicione sua.
ut stetit ante oculos posito velamine nostros,
in toto nusquam corpore menda fuit.*

Behold, there comes Corinna, dressed in an ungirded *tunica*. Her white neck is covered by her parted hair. In this way, they say, the beautiful Semiramis went into her bedchamber, and Lais, who was loved by many men. I tore off Corinna's *tunica*. It did not prohibit the view much, being of a fine texture. Nevertheless, she still fought to be covered by her *tunica*. While she thus struggled, as one who did not want to gain victory, she was overcome, not reluctantly, by her own betrayal. As she stood before my eyes with her clothing put off, there was no blemish in all her body.

In Ovidian fiction, Corinna is a young and beautiful Greek freedwoman living in Rome. In this scene, she wears a *tunica* without or with a loosened belt (*recincta*).¹³⁴ It should be noted that a belt (*cingillum*) is a standard part of the normal tunic and is a symbol of female chastity. The fact that Corinna wears a loose tunic indicates that she has prepared herself for the meeting with Ovid and wants to have sexual intercourse with him. This is also made clear by the fact that she comes to him in the hours of the early afternoon and that she does not struggle too much against her lover. It is all part of erotic play, the woman nearly always presented as the more passive part to save decorum.

Since the social milieu of Love Elegy is Greek, Corinna's *tunica* is a *chiton*. This is also evident from the description of the garment itself and of the way in which it is removed. In contrast to a Roman *tunica*, which can only be pulled off over the head, a *chiton* can be removed by pulling it down after the knots along the shoulder opening are untied, as is the case here. In addition, Ovid uses the verb *velare*, which shows that the garment is wide and rich in fabric, since it fully shrouds Corinna.¹³⁵ The indication that she is not girded points in the same direction. It is only visually meaningful if one imagines a long flowing garment rather than one that fits snugly. The famous Greek hetaeras with which Ovid compares Corinna also suggest a Greek cultural context. Ovid concludes by briefly hinting at the erotic qualities of Corinna's *tunica*. He describes it as *rara*. This adjective refers to the weaving technique.¹³⁶ The fabric is wide-meshed and fine (similar to modern gauze) and probably shows much of Corinna's charms. It might even be a silken *Coa vestis*. In any case, it was an elegant Hellenistic-Roman tunic. Roman readers will have filled in the blank spaces better than we can. We have only the depictions in Pompey to compare.

¹³⁴ See Ovid. am. 1.747–48 (see above p. 250); 3.1.51. The belt prevents a tunic from being taken off quickly.

¹³⁵ Cf. also Cicero Cat. 2.22 (see above p. 260), who designates the togas of the followers of Catilina as *vela* (sails).

¹³⁶ Cf. A 4 p. 75.

1.7.2 *tunica* and *subucula* – Fortunata

The costume usually worn by (mature) women in public is mentioned in our texts, but only rarely. Beyond the mistress of Love Elegy, our sources in the Imperial period focus on the married Roman woman and her dress—the *stola/vestis longa*. They also almost exclusively concern the female clothing of higher social classes. The antithesis between *meretrix* and *matrona*, which we already met in early Latin literature, is thus given an up-to-date appearance. In consequence, we learn next to nothing about the clothing of ordinary women in ‘normal’ situations, leading to a cultural-historical gap that distorts our view. Fortunately, our sources offer some glimpses of what must have been ‘normal,’ thus disrupting the literary stereotype. We hear, for example, that the mistresses of Love Elegy did not always wear a single (translucent) *tunica*, but adapted their dress to the circumstances.¹³⁷ We also learn that they wore two tunics when moving in public.¹³⁸ Two tunics are also attested in the archaeological evidence (pl. 5). Most women probably dressed in this way in the Roman world. However, it must again be stated that literary texts referring to mature women outside of the ideal Roman *matrona* are exceedingly rare.

An interesting description concerning the dress of a ‘married’ woman outside of the social elite is found in the *Satyrica* of Petronius. It describes a non-elite woman (Fortunata) and her desire to copy elite dress. Petronius teaches us something not only about rich freedwomen’s clothing, but also about that of women of the Roman upper class, since Fortunata seeks to imitate them. His fictional character behaves like many other real freedwomen who display the insignia of the upper class on their graves. Her husband Trimalchio behaves in a similar manner and wants to imitate the costume of a knight.¹³⁹ But let us first look more closely at the social status of Trimalchio and Fortunata. They are very rich, but they do not belong to the social class of the Roman *equites*, despite all their wealth. Trimalchio is something like an ancient Jay Gatsby: aspiring to a higher social position, but despised by the old elite. Trimalchio and Fortunata are not even born free (*ingenui*), but are former slaves. Their relationship is legally not a Roman marriage (*matrimonium*), but only a *contubernium* (the type of legal union which slaves were allowed to make with each other).¹⁴⁰ The legal distinction seems to be a determining factor for the peculiar way Fortunata is dressed.

¹³⁷ Ovid. am. 2.297–302; cf. B 9 p. 396.

¹³⁸ See above p. 265.

¹³⁹ On the passage, cf. also B 4 p. 310; B 11 passim.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. B 4 p. 321.

Fortunata's clothing is described by Petronius in two places, most extensively on the occasion of her first appearance at the banquet (*cena*).¹⁴¹ Like Ovid's Corinna, Petronius' Fortunata is given a special entrance on stage (*venit*):

Petron. 67

venit ergo (sc. Fortunata) galbino succincta cingillo, ita ut infra cerasina appareret tunica et periscelides tortae phaecasiaeque inauratae. tunc sudario manus tergens, quod in collo habebat, applicabat se ... toro. ... eo deinde perventum est, ut Fortunata armillas suas crassissimis detraheret lacertis Scintillaeque miranti ostenderet. ultimo etiam periscelides resolvit et reticulum aureum, quem ex obrussa esse dicebat.

So there came Fortunata, who had gathered her garment up with a light green belt, so that underneath appeared a crimson tunic, twisted leg bands, and gilded bootees. Then, wiping her hands with a napkin she wore around her neck, she sat down upon the ... couch. ... Then it came to that Fortunata pulled off her bracelets from her very fat upper arms and showed them to Scintilla, who looked at them with admiration. Finally, she even took off her leg bands and the golden hairnet, which she said was made of pure gold.

Petronius' description raises a problem at the crucial point. How many tunics is Fortunata wearing? Is it one or is it two?¹⁴² Friedländer (1906) in his commentary argues that it is two tunics (and rightly so).¹⁴³ Fortunata is indeed wearing a *tunica* and a *subucula*. The difficulty of expression is that there is no explicit mention of the outer *tunica*. It is only implied in *succincta*. The adjective *succinctus* is often used in the sense of 'someone who is dressed in a *tunica* that is girded up' without adding the garment.¹⁴⁴ The *tunica cerasina* we read of is not the outer tunic that is girded up, but the *subucula*, whose lower part is usually hidden under the longer outer tunic. In the case of Fortunata, the undertunic emerges below (*infra*),¹⁴⁵ because the outer tunic is now removed.

Petronius does not describe the outer *tunica* of Fortunata. He only emphasizes the striking light green colour of the belt (*cingillum*) and then immediately turns to the dark red undertunic (*tunica*), whose colour is no less eye-catching than that of the belt. It is the *subucula* that later slides down Fortunata's knees when Habinnas raises her legs in an obscene joke (he seems to know Fortunata all too well):

¹⁴¹ Cf. in general now the commentary by Schmeling (2011). However, it does not go into clothing in any greater detail.

¹⁴² Unfortunately, many translations are not clear on that point.

¹⁴³ Friedländer (1906) 331: "*Infra* unter dem Oberkleide, das so hoch gegürtet war, dass die kirschröte Tunica darunter zum Vorschein kam. Vielleicht ist vor *galbino* ein Wort (*vestem, stolam, pallam*) ausgefallen, allenfalls kann es hinzugedacht werden."

¹⁴⁴ Cf. OLD s. v. *succinctus* 1a and 2. See in general B 20 pp. 495–496.

¹⁴⁵ The interpretation of *cingillum* as a sash under which the *tunica* appears is not tenable. The word *cingillum* means 'belt' and *infra* spatially means 'below' and not 'under' (*sub*). The statement that an outer *tunica* should only be visible *below* the belt is not meaningful.

Petron. 67.12–13

Habinnas furtim consurrexit pedesque Fortunatae correptos super lectum immisit. "Au! au!" illa proclamavit aberrante tunica super genua. Composita ergo in gremio Scintillae incensam rubore faciem sudario abscondit.

Habinnas got up secretly, grabbed Fortunata's feet and threw them over the the couch. She shouted "Oh dear!," as her *tunica* wandered up above her knees. Lying then in Scintilla's lap, she hid her face, which was burning red, in her napkin.

This is a veritable slapstick scene: people being thrown over furniture, clothes flying, people hiding faces.¹⁴⁶ But let us turn back to Fortunata's first appearance at the *convivium*. Summoned by the guests like an actress at a theatrical performance, Fortunata appears on stage. She plays her role just as carefully as her husband Trimalchio, even though she fails and has something comical about her (at least in the eyes of the author and his readers). It is therefore important to understand the various aspects of Fortunata's appearance and the resulting social faux pas. On the one hand, Fortunata wants to present herself as a capable housewife who has eagerly worked in the kitchen. To this end, she has girded up her *tunica*, just as servants do at work. She is also wearing a *sudarium* (a napkin or little towel), as was probably also used in the kitchen.¹⁴⁷ On the other hand, Fortunata wants to show her wealth and to appear beautiful. For this reason, she has gold jewellery on all parts of her body and a *subucula* in crimson colour.

But why does Fortunata choose this colour and why does she display in this way? Her get-up only reveals its full meaning when one considers the dress she wants to imitate. During the Imperial period, rich Roman matrons of equestrian status dressed in the *stola* (B 4). This reached down to the feet. It was decorated with a conspicuous, perhaps even purple lower border (*instita*).¹⁴⁸ The *stola* was very likely a legal privilege at that time, probably reserved for women who had entered into a Roman marriage (*matrimonium*).¹⁴⁹ However, the condition for such a *matrimonium* was that both partners were no longer slaves at the time of the marriage. And just this legal prerequisite is not fulfilled by the union of Trimalchio and Fortunata. They are only living in a *contubernium*. Fortunata is therefore not allowed to wear a *stola* with trimming. To compensate for this social 'defect,' she tries to create at least a similar impression by cleverly combining two *tunicae*, making a dark red undertunic appear under the outer *tunica*. She also imitates another fashion that was common among women of

¹⁴⁶ On the obscene gesture of Habinnas, which seems to indicate that there is some hidden previous relationship between him and Fortunata, cf. Cic. ad Att. 2.1; Mart. 10.81.4; 11.71.8.

¹⁴⁷ On neckerchiefs, cf. B 19.

¹⁴⁸ On the very tenuous literary evidence as concerns the colour, cf. B 4 p. 310; on the archaeological evidence see p. 683.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. B 4 pp. 333–342.

the equestrian order¹⁵⁰ by using golden anklets (*periscelides*) on her legs.¹⁵¹ Perhaps this also applies to her fashionable shoes (*phaecasiae*),¹⁵² although we are not able to prove this.

Fortunata, however, spoils her efforts to appear like a lady by tastelessly combining the various items of dress. The combination of the different roles fails, because the costume of the housewife does not fit with that of a rich *matrona* from the equestrian order. On the one hand, Fortunata's *tunica succincta* recalls the garb of servants (and thus betrays her former slave status). On the other hand, the amount of gold jewellery, which is even shown around later, is excessive, suggesting her new status as 'new money' (rather than the 'old money' of the nobility). The *sudarium* around the neck might be a faux pas along with the fact that the undertunic was visible at all below the girded up outer garment. A fine Roman matron in her foot-length *stola* looked very different from Fortunata's hapless *imitatio*. And then the striking colours! The conspicuous light green belt (which might have had something plebeian about it in Petronius' eyes¹⁵³) along with the dark red *subucula* create a noteworthy contrast. Although Fortunata has chosen an 'expensive' shade of red, the colour red remains an erotic signal colour.¹⁵⁴ In Roman culture, it is usually reserved for young women and is not appropriate for a rather old matron. It indicates untimely sexual desire (Romans thought that sexuality was only something for young women). In addition, the red and the green garments show a combination of colours which would have been gaudy in the eyes of ancient (upper class) readers.¹⁵⁵ Fortunata is also wearing the combination of colours that is typical for Trimalchio's household, even down to the slaves.¹⁵⁶ Petronius perhaps wants to point out the origin of the couple from the slave class through their choice of strong colours. We do not have much evidence on

150 For exaggerated gold jewellery worn by matrons from the order of the knights, see in particular Pliny NH 33.41 and B 4 p. 350.

151 See Menander F 618 K.-A. for the *περισκελίδες*; Nikostratos F 32 K.-A.; Com. Adesp. 1084.27 K.-A.; Longus 1.5: *περισκελίδες χρυσαῖ* [golden anklets]. As the name indicates, the jewellery is worn around the leg (*σκέλος*) or the calves.

152 Cf. B 30 pp. 552–553.

153 Cf. B 11 pp. 430–433.

154 Cf. B 11 pp. 436–437.

155 There is an interesting imitation in Chekhov's drama *Three Sisters*. Natasha (N), the provincial fiancée of the brother of the three sisters, wears a pink dress with a green sash in her first appearance in the first act. Olga (O), one of the sisters, comments in shock: O: "You are wearing a green sash! My dear, that is not good. N: Does it mean something bad? O: No, it just does not go with your dress ... and looks strange ... N: (with tears): Yes? But it is not green, it is rather a dull colour." Natasha's odd dress is also mentioned later on, showing that she does not fit in with the household of the three sisters. Chekhov's provincial banquet takes inspiration from Trimalchio's symposium in other details as well. Obviously, he (like others) understood the passage in Petronius to refer to a single belted tunic.

156 On the choice of colours in the household of Trimalchio, cf. H. M. Currie, *Petronius and Ovid*, in: C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History V* (Coll. Latomus 206), Brussels 1989, 318–319, and B 11 pp. 443–445.

colour preferences, but it seems that lower classes preferred strong colours.¹⁵⁷ In this way, Petronius tells his readers that Fortunata's and Trimalchio's previous status as slaves cannot be concealed despite all their wealth. This would fit in with the rest of his description of their dinner party. Although both try to appear to behave like members of the upper class, the distance to their servants is very small and, in the end, breaks down completely under the influence of heavy drinking.

1.7.3 *subucula* and *stola* – Marcia (Lucan)

The following section is about two paradoxes. First, it is about a costume a woman is *not* wearing. Then, it is about a text which does not call the garments—the *stola* and the *subucula*—by their proper names. Despite this, it is highly important for identifying the *subucula*. The *stola/vestis longa* is often mentioned in Latin literature. It is part of the costume of the Roman *matrona* and became a symbol for Roman *matrimonium* in Augustan times. However, descriptions of the entire matronal garb, including the *subucula*, are exceedingly rare. Archaeological evidence shows that the *stola* was normally combined with an undertunic,¹⁵⁸ but there are only two texts which mention both garments. One is the unpleasant *Carmen Priapeum* 12 making fun of the *scissa tunica* (torn tunic) and *stola russea* (red *stola*) of a lewd old woman (again, a red garment!).¹⁵⁹ The other mention is in the passage in Lucan dealt with in this section.

In his epic Poem *Bellum civile*, Lucan (39–65 CE) fictionalizes the civil war fought between Caesar and the party of the senate (49–46 BCE). At the beginning of the war, Marcia 'remarried' Cato, both portrayed by Lucan as true Stoic philosophers. If there was any wedding ceremony at all, it must have been very simple because Marcia only returned to her former husband after an interim marriage with Cato's friend Hortensius. For this reason, Lucan focuses on what was *not* present at the scene. His description runs as follows:¹⁶⁰

Lucan. 2.360–364
non timidum nuptae leuiter tectura pudorem
lutea demissos uelarunt flammea uoltus,
balteus aut fluxos gemmis astrinxit amictus,
colla monile decens umerisque haerentia primis
suppara nudatos cingunt angusta lacertos.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. B 11 pp. 438–443.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Archaeological Evidence pp. 698–699.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. B 4 pp. 316–318.

¹⁶⁰ Cf. also on this passage B 4 p. 319 and D 5 pp. 651–653.

No yellow bridal shawl covered the lowered face in order to lightly cover the timid reserve of the bride; no belt with gemstones fastened the flowing robe; no elegant necklace hung around the neck; no **supparum* hanging on the base of the shoulders closely surrounded the naked arms.

As to the non-existent clothing, Lucan has in mind the costume we see on many statues of married women in Imperial times.¹⁶¹ He is clearly talking about the undertunic and the *stola*. However, he does not call any of these garments by their everyday name because he could not use them in his epic poem for stylistic reasons. This is a problem that we have with Latin ‘high literature’ in general, but which is most pronounced in epic poems and history. In a very literal and in a wider sense, authors aiming to write in a high style cannot call a spade a spade! Readers therefore have to know what is meant by the stylistically appropriate terms. In Lucan, the *stola* is called an *amictus*; the undertunic is called a **supparum*. The word **supparus* (Lucan uses the wrong gender) is a venerable gloss which is dealt with in chapter D 5. Lucan uses it for stylistic effect. The grammarian Verrius Flaccus (ca. 55 BCE–20 CE) in his dictionary claims that the word designated a *subucula*.¹⁶² His explanation is very likely wrong, but Lucan (as a *poeta doctus*) obviously relied on it. Putting aside whether Verrius’ claim was correct, its use by Lucan proves that a *subucula* was worn under the *stola*. The logic is this: Lucan needed a stylistically appropriate term for a particular meaning he had in mind (the garment under the *stola* usually called *subucula*). He therefore turned to a reliable source (Verrius) looking for a venerable term he might use. Trusting Verrius, he included the term **supparus* in order to designate what he needed (i.e. the *subucula*). Lucan’s description of the simple marriage ritual therefore becomes the only (indirect) literary proof that the elegant *tunica* we see on statues under the *stola* was also called a *subucula*, although the particular variant differed significantly in appearance from the unspectacular *subucula* we often find with the outer *tunica*.

1.7.4 Literary stereotypes in contrast – Byrrhena and Photis (Apuleius)

The social (and moral) stereotype of wife (*matrona*) and whore (*meretrix*) pervades nearly all descriptions of female clothing in Latin literature. It will be discussed in detail in the chapters on the *stola* (B 4) and the *toga* (B 6) because these garments embody this social contrast. However, as we have seen, the *tunica* can also be used in a moralizing manner (though less strongly). It depends on how many tunics and what kinds of tunic are worn. The mistress is characterized by one *tunica* and, at best, a ‘brassiere.’ The *matrona*—when not wearing the full garb with *stola*—dresses in a *tunica* and a *subucula*. In its pure form, we also find this contrast in the last literary description of women we have from Classical Antiquity: the matron Byrrhena and the servant Photis. They

¹⁶¹ Cf. Archaeological Evidence pp. 698–699.

¹⁶² Cf. D 5 p. 644.

are described in the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius (ca. 124–170 CE). Apuleius' novel is a particularly difficult source as far as everyday Roman culture is concerned. While the narrative world in Ovid and Petronius is based on Roman-Italian reality, this is not the case with the world of the archaist Apuleius. In the *Metamorphoses*, Greek reality and set pieces from early Roman literature mix to such an extent that it is often difficult to determine where reality ends and where fiction begins. This is true not only of the cultural content, but also of the style of the work. Archaic words, sometimes even glosses, are used indiscriminately like normal terms.¹⁶³

The literary substrate of the characters Byrrhena and Photis is clearly Greek, Apuleius' source being a Greek novel. Both women live in Thessaly. Their clothing probably mirrors female clothing as it was worn in the Graeco-Roman world in the second century CE. Both figures are deliberately formed according to the trope of the contrasting pair of *matrona* and *meretrix*, which Apuleius adopted from Roman comedy.¹⁶⁴ In addition, each of the women symbolizes a life-choice for young Lucius (*adulescens*), the hero of the novel. Like Hercules, Lucius is at a crossroads, but chooses the wrong path. The matron Byrrhena warns him against reckless behaviour; the female servant (*ancilla*) Photis successfully seduces him into such. In Apuleius' philosophical concept, the *matrona* embodies reason and virtue, while the *ancilla* embodies sexual desire and vice. Both women are stylized in opposite ways in the novel according to their social position and philosophical function, and clothing plays an important part in it. The matron Byrrhena is described by Apuleius as follows:¹⁶⁵

Apul. Met. 2.2

*mulierem quampiam frequenti stipatam famulitione ibidem gradientem adcel-
ato vestigio comprehendo; aurum in gemmis et in tunicis ... matronam profecto
confitebatur.*

I quickened my steps and caught up with a woman (sc. Byrrhena) who was walking there surrounded by numerous servants. Gold on her rings and her *tunicae* ... showed without doubt that she was a *matrona*.

Apuleius evokes the literary image of a *matrona* by using several stereotypes. Byrrhena is accompanied by many servants. The literary motif can be traced back to the beginnings of Latin literature with Plautus.¹⁶⁶ The description of Byrrhena's apparel is also a trope. She has golden rings and is wearing several tunics (at least a *subucula* and one outer *tunica*, or two *chitones*). She is not wearing a *stola* because this is the costume of a Roman wife, and Byrrhena is Greek. Moreover, the *stola* had already disappeared

¹⁶³ Cf. also D 3 pp. 610, 613.

¹⁶⁴ Cf. on this B 6 passim.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. G. N. Sandy, *The Greek World of Apuleius. Apuleius and the Second Sophistic*, Leiden 1997, 240 and the commentary by van Mal-Maeder (2001) ad loc.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. A 5 p. 88 and B 4 p. 332.

as dress in the second century CE.¹⁶⁷ Byrrhena's garments are decorated with gold. Both jewellery and expensive robes are usually associated with rich matrons in Latin literature—Apuleius even says as much (*matronam confitebatur*). A look at the *Asinus* of Pseudo-Lucian, the parallel Greek novel based on the same literary source as Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, shows that Apuleius may have slightly changed his Greek model in order to sharpen the contrast.¹⁶⁸

Ps.-Lucian. *Asin.* 4

γυναιῖκα ὀρῶ προσιοῦσαν ἔτι νέαν εὐπορουμένην ... ἱμάτια γὰρ ἀνθινὰ καὶ παῖδες καὶ χρυσίον περιττόν.

I see a still young, well-off woman coming towards me ... For she had colourful dresses, lots of slaves, and extravagant gold jewellery.

In contrast to Pseudo-Lucian, Apuleius' *matrona* Byrrhena is not young, but—as he says later on in his novel—a mature woman. She does not wear colourful robes, but gold-embroidered ones. Apuleius obviously wanted to not connect a colour indication with Byrrhena. We will find it later with Photis. This has to do with the fact that conspicuous colours are considered unbecoming of a dignified *matrona* in Latin literature (that is where Fortunata goes wrong). They are instead well suited to a young, unmarried women—such as those addressed in Ovid's colour catalogue in the *Ars amatoria*.¹⁶⁹ Moreover, the unspecific Greek expression ἱμάτια (clothes) has been turned into *tunicae*. This may be because Apuleius resorted to a literary motif from Latin texts, according to which the matron wore several tunics—the *subucula* and the *tunica*.

Byrrhena's appearance stands in clear contrast to that of Photis, whose social status is low. She is a servant (*ancilla*), but she is young and beautiful.

Apul. *Met.* 2.7

ipsa linea tunica mundule amicta et russea fasceola praeinitente altiuscule sub ipsas papillas succinctula illud cibarium vasculum floridis palmulis rotabat in circulum

She (sc. Photis) was dressed neatly in a linen *tunica* that was girded up with a red *fascia* in a somewhat high position just under her nipples that struck the view. She turned the vessel round with her lovely hands.

The sentence given here is part of a larger erotic scene. Photis is preparing some food under the curious eyes of Lucius. She accompanies her action with movements that might suggest sexual intercourse to him. The language is characterized by an abundance of diminutives (created by Apuleius ad hoc) to show that the narrator Lucius is already in love with this 'sweet creature.' Photis' robe, like that of Corinna,

¹⁶⁷ Cf. B 4 p. 352.

¹⁶⁸ See the introduction by van Mael-Mader (2001) 10–11 and the commentary on the passage.

¹⁶⁹ Cf. B 11 pp. 410–420.

consists only of a single simple, white *tunica*. In contrast to the robe of Byrrhena, it has no ornaments. The Greek setting implies that it is a *chiton*. The colour white is typical for a young woman.¹⁷⁰ It often denotes purity and chastity and underlines a certain neatness in dress. However, as is typical for servants at work,¹⁷¹ Photis has girded her tunic up (*succincta*) so that her legs show, creating an erotic side-effect. In addition, she wears a *fascia*. The diminutive form *fasciola* does not mean that this garment is of a small size, but that it serves as a hypocorism. The word does not designate belt, but a narrow strip of cloth that is wrapped around the breast (B 22). It is part of lingerie. Photis' *fascia* shines forth (*praenitens*) because she has wrapped it a little bit higher (*altius*), just under her nipples (*papillae*). In modern terms, she lets Lucius see parts of her 'brassiere.' The positioning of the *fascia* was perhaps also chosen to make Photis' décolleté more prominent. The colour of the *fascia* is a conspicuous red (*russeus*) and directs Lucius' view directly to Photis' *papillae*. As with Fortunata, red is an erotic signal colour. The colour *russeus* differs from *cerasinus* insofar that it denotes a lighter and perhaps more plebeian shade.¹⁷² In contrast to Fortunata's clothes, Photis' garments are an adequate garb for her, being a servant. It is also the attire we know from the *meretrices* of Pompeian wall paintings and from Roman Love Elegy. It is worn for erotic effect, and that is exactly what Photis is after. Apuleius' inconsiderate young hero immediately falls into a rapture of love, which contributes to his later downfall. He acts just like an *adulescens* in Roman comedy, whereas Photis performs the role of the young *puella*. Both are stock figures from comedy.¹⁷³

Byrrhena and Photis clearly embody two archetypes Roman authors (and men) were fond of: the wife and the vamp. Each woman's dress is described by Apuleius to strengthen the trope. In fact, all women we have seen in this chapter are literary stereotypes. These certainly contain a grain of historical truth—or else they would not have been used. The case studies must also be properly situated in Roman culture. They only offer a narrow slice of a far more complex and diverse reality. The *tunica* was a common, ubiquitous garment, and its explicit inclusion in literature always suggests a particular intent. As with modern literature, the mundane and normal usually does not merit mention in Latin texts. The *tunicae* seen in these four examples are all worn (or not worn) in a way that indicates something about the wearer precisely by deviating from neutral, everyday custom. In the end, the *tunica* was such an ordinary and ubiquitous article of clothing that when a person was not explicitly undressed, he or she was wearing at least one tunic (be it Roman *tunica*, Greek *chiton*, or the finer *subucula*).

¹⁷⁰ Cf. B 11 pp. 434–436.

¹⁷¹ See above p. 271.

¹⁷² Cf. B 11 pp. 440–443.

¹⁷³ Cf., for example, A 4 p. 65; A 7 p. 130.