
Public Dress and Social Control in Late Republican and Early Imperial Rome

JONATHAN EDMONDSON

In the opening book of Vergil's *Aeneid*, Jupiter delivers a long speech to console his despondent daughter Venus and reassure her about the future greatness of Rome (Verg. *Aen.* 1.229–296). In a climactic, and much quoted, passage (1.282–286), he reveals the divinely laid plan:

his ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono;
imperium sine fine dedi. quin aspera Juno
quae mare nunc terrasque metu caelumque fatigat,
consilia in melius referet, mecumque fovebit
Romanos, rerum dominos gentemque togatam.

For them [sc. the Romans] I set neither physical nor temporal bounds on their possessions; dominion without limit I have bestowed. Furthermore, even harsh Juno, who right now terrorizes and harries sea, lands and heaven, will eventually return to better plans of action, and at my side she will nurture the Romans, masters of the world and the race that wears the toga.

So, for Vergil's Jupiter, the Romans would most of all be identified by their wearing of a shared, distinctive garment: the toga. Only Roman citizens were entitled to wear it. This was a point that the emperor Claudius was anxious to emphasize some sixty years or so after Vergil wrote the *Aeneid* when he was presiding at the trial of a Greek accused of usurping Roman citizenship. Throughout the judicial proceedings, Claudius was punctilious about the defendant's dress. When advocates were laying out the case for the prosecution, he required the defendant to wear Greek dress – the *pallium*; but during the speeches for the defence he allowed him to change into a toga

(Suet. *Claud.* 15.2). The strict correlation between Roman civic status and the right to wear the toga could not have been more emphatically underlined.¹ Roman citizen women, once married, had their distinctive dress too: the *stola*.² Roman citizens, therefore, both male and female, were marked by their entitlement to wear what was construed as distinctively Roman civic dress, or, to use Suetonius' term, *habitus patrius et civilis* (*Calig.* 52.1; cf. *Tib.* 13.1). By wearing the toga or *stola* on civic occasions, they demonstrated their membership in a defined and bounded community, the *gens Romana*; they laid claim to a shared Roman identity and the cultural traditions with which each of these garments was invested. Roman public dress helped to delineate precisely what it meant to be Roman. The purpose of this chapter is to explore some of the many different ways in which toga and *stola* served to define the Roman community in the late Republic and early imperial period.

It will be argued that these garments were very much the ceremonial, public dress of Roman citizens, by no means their everyday wear. The wearing of the toga began early in life, as Roman boys and girls were socialized by wearing it when they took part in Roman public rituals. As children grew to maturity, the precise form of their public dress changed at key moments in their development as citizens, helping to advertise publicly their changing roles in the civic life of the community. But for male citizens, in particular, public dress was doubly potent as an agent of social control. For at the same time as the toga united the citizen body, marking those who belonged within it and those who were excluded from it, it also allowed some of the many rank distinctions that divided the Roman citizen body into hierarchical social strata to be advertised, to be given very tangible form. Furthermore, it also visibly marked those who were currently vested by the Roman state with political and military power. But unifying though the uniform of the toga was, like all forms of fashion, it invited subtle and not so subtle deviations from the official dress code, as some Romans tried to use public dress to make powerful statements to their fellow citizens. As a result, Roman public dress had to be controlled in various ways. This was in part achieved by reinforcement from above – by legislation or through the intervention of Roman magistrates. But arguably more effective were the actions of Roman citizens themselves, who developed complex rhetorical strategies that underlined the moral force of correct dress. Thus, it will be argued, it was not just the wearing of the toga and *stola*, but the complex discourse that developed around public dress that functioned as important mechanisms of social control in Republican and early imperial Rome.

Toga and *Stola*: Defining the Roman Civic Body

Given its emblematic force, it is not surprising that male citizens were encouraged, indeed required, to wear the toga for all civic occasions – political, judicial, and religious. In the same period as Vergil was composing the lines with which this chapter began, Augustus was seeking in the 20s BC to reassert traditional Roman values after the disruption of civil war. As part of that campaign, he issued an edict that all citizens should wear the toga when entering the forum at Rome (Suet. *Aug.* 40. 5); they should be wearing traditional Roman civic dress to enter the civic heart of the city. He also encouraged citizens to wear it when attending the theatre and religious festivals. It is no surprise, therefore, that one of the most distinctive images of the new *princeps* showed him as the togate citizen, often with his toga pulled reverently over his head (*capite velato*), just as it would have been every time he officiated at sacrifice; see, for example, fig. 1.1, a statue of Augustus from the Via Labicana, Rome.³ Furthermore, his *lex Iulia theatralis*, to be dated to the period between 20 and 17 BC, banished to the back rows of the theatre those citizens who turned up dressed in dark-coloured ordinary clothes (*pullati*) rather than in white togas (Suet. *Aug.* 44.2). They had to sit alongside non-citizens and slaves, relegated to the fringes of Roman society.⁴

Togas were also required dress for citizens in Roman law-courts. The younger Pliny, a leading advocate in the centumviral court under Domitian and Trajan, commented in a letter written at the end of the first century AD that when he was released from his duties and found time to escape to his country villa in Etruria, there was mercifully no need to wear a toga (Pliny *Ep.* 5.6). A generation or so later another famous advocate, M. Cornelius Fronto, while returning home late one night from a dinner party during the reign of Hadrian, was amazed to find that the praetorian prefect Q. Marcius Turbo was already presiding in the courtroom in which Fronto was due to defend a client. When Fronto entered the court, he was still wearing his dining robes, his *synthesis*. This elicited an ironic ‘vale!’ from Turbo: that is, the greeting used in the evening rather than the form more appropriate for the morning, ‘salve!’ (Dio 69.18.3, Xiphilinus). Turbo’s sardonic witticism underlines the point that the toga was de rigueur for judicial proceedings in the Roman courts. This also explains why it was necessary for Quintilian to go to such lengths to explain how an orator should arrange his toga to make the best impression on his audience in his treatise on rhetorical training, completed in the AD 90s.⁵

Another major occasion on which the toga had to be worn was the daily morning ritual at which clients greeted their patron: the *salutatio*. Hence

Juvenal can refer to clients as ‘togate hordes’ (*turbae togatae*) scrambling to pick up the measly dole provided by their patron (*Sat.* 1.96), while Martial talks of the tasks that a client was obliged to provide for his patron as a ‘togate service’ (*opera togata*, 3.46.1).⁶ Togas came to be required as well, it seems, at imperial banquets. Hadrian always wore either a toga or a *pallium* when he presided at imperial banquets (SHA *Hadr.* 22.4), while in the AD 160s Septimius Severus, as a young man recently arrived in Rome from North Africa, committed the serious faux pas of arriving for one dressed in a *pallium*; his blushes were saved by the loan of one of the emperor’s own togas (SHA *Sept. Sev.* 1.7).⁷ The toga thus became symbolic of Roman civic life itself, and civic life was taken to include the *salutatio*, at which client greeted patron, and at imperial banquets, at which the emperor entertained his guests. Its centrality was underlined by the fact that it was very consciously put aside during the Saturnalia, the annual festival at which many Roman social norms were temporarily inverted.⁸

In similar fashion, female Roman citizens, once safely married, were marked out by the *stola* that they were now entitled to wear (see figs. 1.2 and 1.3). This was a heavy, sober, straight-cut garment worn over the tunic, fixed with straps, as is visible on a statue of a stolate *matrona* now in Parma (fig. 1.3); it was often covered with a mantle or *palla*, as can be seen, for instance, in the statue of a matron dating to the early first century AD found on Tiber Island in Rome (fig. 1.2). As this statue also makes clear, to its bottom hem was attached a ruffle (*instita*) that covered the ankles – and hence the modesty – of the woman. Headbands (*vittae*) appear to have been a further part of the matron’s attire, even though they are seldom visible on statues (but see fig. 7.4, a statue probably of Drusilla, sister of Caligula, from Caere).⁹ At the same time as he reinforced the wearing of the toga for males, Augustus also put a renewed emphasis on the centrality of the *stola* for female Roman citizens.¹⁰ The dress of the matron was designed to shield its wearer both physically and morally from the prying gaze of disreputable males who might impugn her chastity. This is a point underlined by Ovid in the prologue to the first book of his *Ars Amatoria*, written ca. 2 BC, where he warns off respectable *stolatae* from the saucy delights of his didactic work: ‘Stay far away, you slender headbands (*vittae*), symbol of modesty, and you long ruffle (*instita*), you who cover half of the feet’.¹¹ After his relegation to Tomis in AD 8, Ovid felt the need to reiterate the point that he had strictly excluded from his *Ars* all those women (i.e., matrons) who had assumed the *stola* and *vitta*, which ‘protect them from being touched with pollution’.¹² Not surprisingly, the terms *stolata femina* or *matrona stolata* came to be used from the later second century AD onwards as a term of social rank for those of equestrian status or above, the equivalent of *honesta femina*.¹³

The emperor Claudius' conduct at the trial of the Greek accused of usurping Roman citizenship, discussed above, emphasizes that non-citizens (*peregrini*) were denied the right to wear the toga. So, too, was any citizen deemed to be *infamis* – that is, one who had chosen to pursue an 'unspeakable' profession as a gladiator or actor, pimp or prostitute.¹⁴ Those citizens condemned to exile also lost the right to wear the toga.¹⁵ Similarly, Roman citizen women convicted of adultery were banned from wearing the *stola* and may have been required to wear the toga in public.¹⁶ In this way, they were assimilated to prostitutes, some at least of whom also wore togas in public, to mark them off from respectable women.¹⁷ By wearing this ostensibly masculine dress, they had given up any claim to feminine modesty.

As the dress that quintessentially defined Romanness, it is no surprise that the use of the toga gradually spread to overseas regions as they were brought under Roman control from the second century BC onwards. Roman soldiers may have provided the initial impetus; for when they were billeted for the winter in towns in the area of their campaign, it seems that they wore the toga. This is the implication of the fact that in 205 BC, the Romans required two Spanish tribes, the Ilergetes and Ausetani, to provide 'heavy cloaks and togas' (*saga et togae*) to supply the Roman army as part of the terms of settlement following their revolt (Livy 29.3). The following year the praetor serving in Sardinia sent 1,200 togas and 12,000 tunics to supply Scipio's legions operating in North Africa (Livy 29.36), while in 169 BC, the urban praetor let a contract in Rome for shipping 6,000 togas and 30,000 tunics to the army in Macedonia (Livy 44.16). Roman citizens residing overseas took to wearing the toga, as can be inferred from the fact that in 88 BC it made the Roman citizens of Asia so conspicuous that they became easy targets for Mithridates' assassins (Val. Max. 9.2. ext. 3; App. *Mithr.* 22–23; Plut. *Sulla* 24; cf. Cic. *Leg. Man.* 7, 11). As a result, in a speech that the historian Posidonius put into the mouth of the Athenian hoplite-general Athenion, such Roman citizens then 'changed their dress to *himatia*' and 'once more called their original cities their fatherlands' (Athen. 5. 213b = Posid. *Hist.* fr. 253 Kidd); that is, they abandoned the wearing of the toga, went back to their Greek dress, and stopped calling Rome their *patria*.

Furthermore, the Roman senate developed the practice of bestowing either the *toga picta* and *tunica palmata*, the dress of a triumphant general, or the *toga praetexta* of a curule magistrate on those foreign kings who were deemed worthy to become 'friends and allies of the Roman people.' This had allegedly occurred as early as the late sixth century BC in the case of Porsenna king of Clusium (Dion. Hal. 5.35.1), but a series of examples can be found from the third century onwards: for instance, Syphax and later Masinissa, kings of Numidia in 210 and 203 or 200 BC, respectively (Livy

27.4; 30.15; cf. 31.11); Antiochus, king of Commagene in 59 BC (Cic. *Q.fr.* 2.11 = Shackleton Bailey 15); or Ptolemy, king of Mauretania in AD 24 (Tac. *Ann.* 4.26: 'an ancient custom revived').¹⁸ By such means the connection between the Roman state and the toga was emphasized even more clearly.

Toga and *stola*, then, served as a powerful means for defining who belonged within, and who was excluded from, the Roman citizen body. As such, they fostered a sense of civic uniformity and cohesion, contributing in theory at least towards social order. However, Roman public dress had still greater potential, since within the officially sanctioned dress code there were a number of variations that highlighted status and rank. As a result, the particular type of toga that one wore in public and changes in the type of dress one was entitled to wear very strikingly marked and affirmed one's changing place within Roman civic society.

Mutatio vestis: Changes in Dress and Distinctions within the Citizen Body

Changes in dress occurred at key transitional moments in the life cycle of a Roman citizen. Roman boys and girls were distinguished from adult Roman citizens by their wearing of a purple-bordered toga (the *toga praetexta*). Such *togae praetextae* marked children out early as members of the Roman civic body and helped to socialize them into the traditions of their community, but interestingly did not differentiate them by gender. Before puberty their incipient Romanness, their membership in the *gens togata*, was much more crucial than whether they were male or female.¹⁹ The purple border around their togas and the little pouch or *bullae* that they wore around their necks intended to offer them prophylactic protection from physical and moral danger.²⁰ As Festus remarks (283 L = 245 M), 'No obscene word is to be spoken in the presence of a *praetextatus*,' that is, in the presence of a child wearing a *toga praetexta*. When a boy reached puberty, he dedicated his *toga praetexta* and *bullae* to his household gods (*Lares*) and assumed the pure white toga, the *toga pura* or *toga virilis*, the toga of manhood.²¹ Girls dedicated their *praetexta* and dolls to Fortuna Virginalis at the time they were deemed ready for marriage.²² From this moment onwards they may also have assumed a different kind of headband (an *altera vitta*), as Propertius implies when he has the ghost of Cornelia, daughter of the Scribonia who was later to marry Augustus, recall her marriage to L. Aemilius Paullus Lepidus, suffect consul in 34 and censor in 22 BC (Prop. 4.11.33–35):

mox, ubi iam facibus cessit praetexta maritis,
vinxit et acceptas altera vitta comas,
iungor, Paulle, tuo sic discessura cubili.

Later, when my (toga) praetexta gave way to marriage torches, and a different headband bound up my swept-up hair, I shared your bed, Paullus, only to leave it thus. (tr. G. Lee 1987)

Other rites of passage were symbolized by a temporary and very visible change in dress (*mutatio vestis*). A woman on her marriage day wore a woollen tunic woven on an upright loom (the *tunica recta*), belted with a special kind of girdle (*cingulum*) tied with a distinctive knot (a 'Herculean' knot), orange slippers (*lutei socci*), and, most strikingly, a flaming-yellow veil (*flammeum*) that covered a distinctive hairstyle, the 'six braids' (*seni crines*), otherwise only worn by Vestal Virgins.²³ Slaves on the day of their manumission had their hair shaved and wore a distinctive pointed cap, the *pilleus* (Polyb. 30.18.3; Livy 45.44). Hence, the term 'to summon slaves to the *pilleus*' (*servos vocare ad pilleum*) became a metaphorical way of describing manumission.²⁴ Candidates for election wore a special whitened toga, the *toga candida*.²⁵ Men in mourning appeared in 'sombre-coloured' togas (*togae pullae*), left their hair unkempt, and did not shave their beards.²⁶ Widows may have worn a fringed shawl (*ricinium*), while eventually old men, at least under Severus Alexander, were allowed to wear cloaks over their togas as protection against the cold, though matrons, we are told, were forbidden such a luxury.²⁷

Variations in rank and status were also made immediately clear through dress. Regular citizens wore the plain white toga: the *toga pura* or *toga virilis*, while equestrians were entitled to the *trabea*, a short toga of distinctive form and colour, as well as narrow purple stripes on their tunics (the *angusti clavi*), equestrian shoes (*calcei*), and the gold ring (*anulus aureus*).²⁸ Senators were distinguished by the broad stripe (the *latus clavus*) on their tunic and by their senatorial shoes (*calcei*). As a result, Varro mocks those who wore transparent togas to show off the broad stripe on their tunic (*Sat. Men.* 313 Bücheler), while Horace gently chides the folly of the man 'silly enough to wind those black straps [that is, of his senatorial *calcei*] around his calves and have a broad stripe (*latus clavus*) going down his chest' (*Sat.* 1.6.24–29).²⁹ Consequently 'to change one's shoes' (*calceos mutare*) became a metaphorical expression for 'becoming a senator.' For example, Cicero alleged that a certain Asinius simply 'changed his shoes' and became a *pater conscriptus* in the chaos following Caesar's death in 44 BC (*Cic. Phil.* 13.13.28).³⁰ Patricians were differentiated from plebeians by their patrician shoes (*calcei patricii*), black with moon-shaped buckles, the maximum price for which (150 *denarii*) was set 50 per cent higher than that for senatorial shoes (100 *denarii*) in Diocletian's Price Edict of AD 301, and 114 per cent higher than that for equestrian shoes (70 *denarii*). (For these three types of *calcei*, see fig.

1.4.) Julius Caesar, keen to distinguish himself among patricians, took to wearing the sort of red *calcei* that the kings of Alba Longa had reportedly once worn (Dio 43.43.2).³¹

Public dress also marked those who had been granted authority within the Roman state. Those who were appointed curule magistrates or priests were entitled to wear the *toga praetexta* both during their time in office and subsequently at certain festivals.³² The clearest statement of this entitlement occurs in a speech that Livy put into the mouth of the tribune of the plebs, L. Valerius, as he argues in 195 BC in favour of his proposal to repeal the *lex Oppia* (Livy 34.7.1–3). This law of 215 BC had prohibited women from wearing purple as an emergency frugality measure during the Hannibalic War.³³ How, L. Valerius contended, could Romans allow this ban to continue when Roman males were allowed to wear purple, especially *togae praetextae*?

Shall our wives be the only ones not to derive any benefit from the peace and national tranquillity we now enjoy? Shall we men wear purple, dressed in *togae praetextae* while holding magistracies and priesthoods? Shall our children wear togas bordered with purple? Shall we permit magistrates in colonies and municipalities and the *magistri* of the urban neighbourhoods (*vici*) here in Rome, low though they are in rank, the right to wear the *toga praetexta* and enjoy such a great distinction not only in life, but also after their death when they may be cremated in it? At the same time shall we deny women the right to wear purple? (Livy 34.7.1–3)

Whether this accurately reflects the situation in 195 BC is unclear, but it certainly reveals norms at the time that Livy was writing – under Augustus, who, as we have seen, was eager to reinforce distinctions of dress. A purple-bordered toga worn by an adult thus marked its wearer as someone, temporarily at least, invested with power, whether at the level of the Roman state, the local community, or even the urban neighbourhood.³⁴ It lent him a dignity and authority that elicited respect and obedience from his fellow citizens.

The special power of a Roman magistrate's dress is dramatically emphasized in Livy's narrative of the Gallic sack of Rome in 390 BC, where he conjures a vivid picture of Rome's senior senators (*seniores*) donning their *togae praetextae* or triumphal dress and sitting on their curule stools in the vestibules of their houses to await the marauding Gauls. When the latter arrived, they were simply dumbfounded at what they saw:

They gazed as in veneration at the beings seated in the vestibules of their homes, for their attire and bearing surpassed those of mortal men, and in majesty of countenance and gravity of expression they were most like to deities. (tr. T.J. Luce)³⁵

Again the historicity of the details of the incident matters less than the importance it reveals about Roman perceptions concerning the potency of the *toga praetexta*; it endowed the Roman elite with a statuesque, almost divine authority. Similarly Plutarch (*Pomp.* 24.6) reports the capture by pirates of two praetors, Sextilius and Belli(e)nus, probably in the year 68 or 67 BC. When apprehended, each was dressed in his *toga praetexta* and attended by lictors.³⁶ The fact that they were wearing their *togae praetextae* when seized caused more outrage, it would appear, than even their capture on Italian soil; the power of their official dress really should have repulsed the pirates and prevented their assault.³⁷

Ordinary Romans recognized, and usually respected, the distinctive dress of the elite. Cicero describes (*Brut.* 56) how during the conflict of the orders, M. Popillius, the consul of 359, was officiating at a sacrifice as *flamen Cernentalis* wearing his *laena*, a form of double toga traditionally worn by priests, when he was informed of a riot that had erupted elsewhere in the city. He hastened to the scene and arrived 'clad in his *laena*' (*laena amictus*). The aura of authority that this distinctive dress bestowed upon him was, allegedly, sufficient to quell the riot immediately without any further action required.³⁸ (For a statue of an official wearing a *laena* from the forum of the colony of Augusta Emerita [Mérida, Spain], see fig. 1.5. This forum was closely modelled on the Forum Augustum in Rome.)³⁹

At the very top of the *cursus honorum*, the censors wore all-purple togas to mark them out from the curule magistrates who wore the *toga praetexta* (Polyb. 6.53.7), while military commanders who qualified for a triumph, the Roman state's highest award, were granted the most striking form of public dress available: the *vestis triumphalis*, which comprised the *tunica palmata* (a purple tunic with gold palm branches embroidered into it) covered by a *toga picta* (a purple toga emblazoned with gold stars).⁴⁰ Public dress thus contributed significantly towards dividing the Roman citizen body into its various status hierarchies. Rome was a culture of spectacle, and the spectacle of dress helped to emphasize some of its most important values.

The potency of these distinctions in public dress is further underlined by the fact that occasionally the elite orders very visibly gave up the dress to which they were entitled. This occurred in particular at moments of public mourning. Our best evidence concerns mourning rituals after the death of a member of the *domus Caesaris*. In 10 BC, for instance, senators 'changed their dress' as a sign of respect following the death of Augustus' sister Octavia (Dio 54.35.5). What this entailed comes more sharply into focus in Dio's description of events immediately subsequent to Augustus' death in AD 14. At the first meeting of the senate after the body of the deceased *princeps* had reached the city of Rome, ordinary senators came wearing equestrian dress,

while the magistrates wore plain senatorial dress: that is, they had doffed their *togae praetextae* (Dio 56.31.2).⁴¹ As a mark of respect, each group down-dressed by one rank. When almost 200 years later Commodus ordered senators to wear equestrian dress and woollen cloaks at the amphitheatre, Dio, a contemporary witness, interpreted this as a clear omen of the emperor's imminent death, since 'this was a thing we [sc. senators] never do except when an emperor has just died' (Dio 72.21.3). The practice was also replicated at the local level in the municipalities and colonies of Italy and the provinces, where, as we have seen, local magistrates were required to take off their *togae praetextae* and assume darkened togas (*togae pullae*) as part of the mourning rituals following the death of Lucius and Gaius Caesar in AD 2 and 4, respectively (*ILS* 139, lines 16–22; *ILS* 140, line 22: *veste mutata*; lines 31–33).

Mourning dress, however, was not just worn after the death of a prominent citizen; it was also donned after a national disaster. For example, after the Roman army surrendered in disgrace to the Samnites at the battle of the Caudine Forks in 320 BC, senators took off their gold rings and their tunics with the *latus clavus* (Livy 9.7). In 56 BC, when the elections were disrupted by the vetoes of the tribune C. Cato, the senate 'changed its dress' in protest (Livy *Per.* 105: *vestem mutavit*). Dio, reporting the stormy politics of the same year, claims that the senators passed the resolution to change their dress 'as if at a time of public calamity' (Dio 39.28.2).

Such changes of dress could be used metaphorically to make powerful rhetorical statements. The *pilleus*, the cap donned by slaves at their manumission, could be worn by those of free birth to symbolize that they had been liberated from a difficult situation. For example, the senator Q. Terentius Culleo, one of the prisoners of war released by the Carthaginians as part of the peace terms following their defeat at the Battle of Zama in the Second Punic War, wore the *pilleus* at Scipio Africanus' triumph in 201 BC to remind everyone that his liberty had been restored (Livy 30.45; Val. Max. 5.2.5). Similarly, some of the colonists of Cremona and Placentia marched in *pillei* at the triumph of C. Cornelius in 197 BC to commemorate the fact that he had liberated these two Latin colonies from the threat of attack by the Insubres and Cenomani (Livy 33.23). When King Prusias II of Bithynia wore a freedman's *pilleus* in 168–167 BC to meet a Roman delegation, the contemporary historian Polybius objected to his conduct; it suggested too obviously that he was a servile dependant of the Romans (Polyb. 30.18.3–7; cf. Livy 45.44 for a more favourable version of the incident).

Mourning dress was particularly effective for conveying a rhetorical message. Defendants at trials, and their supporters too, often donned it in the hope that this would elicit the pity of the jury.⁴² So, when P. Rutilius chose

not to put on mourning dress nor take off his senatorial insignia at his trial during the civil strife of the 90s BC, he was making a powerful statement that he was being brought to trial unfairly (Val. Max. 6.4.4, in his section on 'impressive sayings and deeds': *graviter dicta et facta*). Presiding magistrates also changed their dress just before pronouncing the sentence. At his trial on a charge of extortion in 66 BC, as soon as C. Licinius Macer saw Cicero, the praetor and president of the court, taking off his *toga praetexta*, he realized that he was about to be found guilty. He sent a message to Cicero announcing that he intended to commit suicide, at which Cicero allegedly refrained from announcing the jury's verdict.⁴³

Mourning dress could also be put to political ends. In 133 BC, the property-owning classes appeared in *togae pullae* in the forum to protest the agrarian legislation of Ti. Gracchus (Plut. *Ti. Grac.* 10). In 98 BC, Q. Caecilius Metellus, who would become consul in 80, launched a campaign to get his father Q. Caecilius Metellus Numidicus, censor in 102, recalled from exile. He let his hair grow long, put on a dark-coloured toga, and went about the forum beseeching his fellow citizens to pass a law revoking his father's banishment. They eventually took pity on him and recalled Numidicus, while he gained the *agnomen* 'Pius' for the devotion he showed his father (Diod. Sic. 36.16.1). But the strategy of 'changing one's dress' to affect mourning could not have been clearer than in 58 BC, the year of P. Clodius' tribunate. In a dramatic gesture designed to signal his opposition to Clodius' measures as tribune, Cicero discarded his senatorial dress and went around the city dressed as an equestrian (Dio 38.14.7; cf. Plut. *Cic.* 30). The *equites* then changed into mourning dress in sympathy with Cicero (Plut. *Cic.* 31). This in turn prompted the senate to pass a resolution that all senators should 'change their dress' (i.e., put on mourning dress) to protest Clodius' machinations (Cic. *Sest.* 53). According to Cicero's version of affairs after his eventual return from exile in 57 (*Red. sen.* 12), Clodius had had the gall not only to disregard this resolution, but even to put on a *toga praetexta*, the dress of a curule magistrate, to which he, as tribune of the plebs, was not strictly entitled and which even the praetors and curule aediles had temporarily discarded. In February 56 the son of P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther, consul the previous year, also 'changed his dress' (*vestitum mutavit*) when the tribune C. Cato proposed a plebiscite relieving his father of his appointment as proconsul in Cilicia (Cic. *Q.fr.* 2.3.1 = Shackleton Bailey 7.1). Roman politicians clearly expected that dramatic, highly symbolic gestures such as this would bring them advantage in the stormy politics of the period.

The sheer effectiveness of Roman dress as an indicator of status is illustrated by the fact that certainly individuals laid claim to a higher status merely by wearing the type of public dress to which they were not enti-

tled.⁴⁴ If a non-citizen wanted to pass himself off as a Roman citizen, what better way than to appear in public in a citizen's toga? If an ambitious freedman wanted to claim equestrian status, why not simply dress like an equestrian? This had become a serious problem during the late Republic and civil-war period and was an issue that Augustus made a determined effort to tackle: hence his concern to regulate correct dress in general and for seating hierarchies in the theatre. Suetonius mentions his attempts to regulate dress (*Aug.* 40.5) immediately after discussing his endeavours to prevent non-citizens (*peregrini*) and slaves from usurping Roman citizenship (*ibid.* 40.3–4). In Suetonius' mind, at least, the issues were clearly interconnected. The problem of appropriating status recurred under Domitian, as is clear from a series of poems in Martial's fifth book of epigrams, published ca. AD 90, in which the poet pokes fun at upwardly mobile freedmen who tried to pass themselves off as equestrians by occupying seats in the fourteen rows of *equestria loca* in the theatre or by wearing scarlet and purple – perhaps the equestrian *trabea* – or both.⁴⁵ Conversely, on certain occasions some Roman citizens rejected the toga and *stola* altogether, preferring to wear other less cumbersome forms of dress.⁴⁶ Techniques had to be developed to control public dress, since deviation in terms of dress was seen as a threat to the social order and was very closely associated in Roman mentality with moral deviance; for the cohesion of the *res publica* such deviance had to be kept in check.

Controlling Dress

It was one of the responsibilities of the magistrates of the Roman state to ensure that the traditional Roman dress code was upheld. During the Republic, censors scrutinized the body politic every fifth year, and dress was one of the areas of their scrutiny. Cato the Elder, censor in 184 BC, penalized those families whose women possessed excessively luxurious clothing. He taxed them punitively, we are told, and lowered their property qualification and, in the process, their social rank (*Plut. Cat. Maj.* 18).⁴⁷ During the principate emperors took on a similar, censorial role. Tiberius in AD 16 as *corrector morum* had a *senatus consultum* passed prohibiting Roman citizen males from wearing silk clothes (*Tac. Ann.* 2.33; *Dio* 57.15.1). Nero banned women from wearing 'amethystine and Tyrian purple clothes' (*Suet. Nero* 32.3). Domitian, as *censor perpetuus* from AD 85 onwards, reasserted earlier Roman laws on public dress to stamp out the wearing of gaudily coloured clothing at the theatre, where he posted vigilant imperial freedmen to enforce this regulation and ferret out spurious *equites*.⁴⁸ Similarly, Roman magistrates sponsored a series of laws, going back to the XII Tables, which

attempted to limit the wearing of excessively luxurious dress; expensive fabrics and costly dyes (in particular, silk and purple) were the main objects of such legislation's attention.⁴⁹ The high costs involved in their production made them luxury items and, as such, obvious targets in the moralising discourse of a society that placed an ideological premium on the simple and the frugal.

During the civil wars in the late Republic there had been a considerable slackening in the observance of Roman dress codes at public events. As a result, in the 20s BC, Augustus decided to reassert by edict the requirement to wear the toga on public occasions in the city of Rome. He pursued the issue by instructing the aediles to stop people entering the forum unless they were wearing togas (Suet. *Aug.* 40.5). Earlier, as triumvir he had issued an edict in 36 or 35 BC restricting the wearing of purple to senators and magistrates alone (Dio 49.16.1), and further dress regulations may have been included in his *lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* that passed into law in 18 BC.⁵⁰ Correct dress was a key element of Roman tradition, and tradition (*mos maiorum*) meant a great deal to Augustus. He was furious, Suetonius reports, when a crowd of citizens turned up for a public meeting (*contio*) dressed in dark clothing (*pullati*) rather than in white togas. He lectured them, reminding them of Vergil's line about the Romans being a *gens togata* (Suet. *Aug.* 40.5). Similarly, his law regulating seating at the theatre and amphitheatre (the *lex Iulia theatralis*), passed between 20 and 17 BC, required that those who turned up wearing dark clothing (i.e., not wearing togas) be restricted to the very back rows (Suet. *Aug.* 44.2). Claudius, it appears, enforced a similar dress code in the Circus (Dio 60.7.4). Later, Hadrian used an edict to reassert the rule that senators and *equites* should wear the toga in public (SHA *Hadr.* 22.2; cf. Gell. *NA* 13.22.1). Edicts, *senatus consulta*, and laws were clearly needed to reinforce tradition. It is, therefore, not surprising to find that the charter for the Roman colony founded at Urso in Baetica in 44–43 BC includes the prescription that the colony's *duoviri* and aediles as well as its *pontifices* and augurs should wear *togae praetextae* when fulfilling their official duties.⁵¹ Even *peregrini* (i.e., non-Roman citizens) in the provinces were sometimes required to wear particular types of dress. Under Trajan, for instance, the Roman prefect of Egypt had an inhabitant of Alexandria executed for not wearing white at the theatre.⁵²

Emperors, however, also had to lead by example. Augustus always kept a toga and *calcei* close at hand within his private quarters (*intra cubiculum*) in case he had a sudden need to don them for official business (Suet. *Aug.* 73). This detail clearly implies that he always conducted public affairs dressed in a toga.⁵³ Hadrian, too, always wore a toga in public when in Italy (SHA *Hadr.* 22.2). In AD 14 Tiberius was concerned about the elite ignoring previ-

ous laws banning the wearing of purple. According to Dio (57.13.5), he decided not to enforce the terms of the law by fining offenders but, at a festival soon afterwards, he made a point of wearing a dark-coloured cloak over his toga. 'After that,' comments Dio, 'no-one dared any longer to wear any other sort of dress in public.' On this occasion, the emperor's example was sufficient to deal with the problem, at least temporarily.

Furthermore, emperors even had their own public dress regulated by law.⁵⁴ They did not have the automatic right to wear triumphal dress on all ceremonial occasions; it had to be granted to them by law or senatorial decree. The precedent was set by a special privilege bestowed upon Cn. Pompeius Magnus. A plebiscite granting him the right to wear triumphal dress at all festivals (*ludi*) was passed in 63 BC much to the consternation of traditionalists, including the younger Cato (Vell. Pat. 2.40.2; Dio 37.21.3–4). Julius Caesar, Octavian and M. Antonius jointly, and then Augustus again received the same honour by senatorial resolutions in 45, 40, and 25 BC, respectively (Dio 43.43.1; 48.31.3; 53.26.5), but Augustus seems to have exercised this right only rarely. Claudius was similarly authorized – presumably by means of a *senatus consultum* – to wear triumphal dress for the ceremonies marking the rededication of the Theatre of Pompey in AD 41, but chose to wear just a *toga praetexta* for everything but the dedicatory sacrifices (Dio 60.6.9). In so doing, each of them asserted their wish to be seen as a *civilis princeps*.⁵⁵ Conversely, Caligula was criticized for his constant wearing of triumphal dress before he had ever been on a military campaign (Suet. *Calig.* 52).

However, it is clear from the frequency with which laws, senatorial resolutions, and edicts had to be reasserted to enforce the dress code that regulation from above was not always effective. Rather more potent, I would argue, was the role that correct, traditional dress played in Roman civic ideology, and especially the continued centrality of the toga and *stola* to the very definition of what it meant to be Roman. Toga and *stola* were enshrined as the customary public dress of the Romans. As a result, arch traditionalists such as the younger Cato could even revert to the supposed archaic practice of wearing a toga without a tunic as a sign of his old-fashioned morality.⁵⁶ Even if he invented the tradition, this does not reduce its effect, since Romans of the late Republic clearly believed that it was traditional and hence morally authentic. By analogy, the kilt, the supposedly traditional dress of the Scottish, loses none of its force as a national symbol by the fact that it was a tradition invented in the nineteenth century.⁵⁷ The key point is that Roman authors and Roman rhetoricians throughout the late Republic and early Empire continued to appeal to the toga and *stola* as emblematic of moral probity and civic mindedness. Most of all, in political

and judicial rhetoric any deviations from the norms of the civic dress code provided ideal ammunition for a full-scale assault on an individual's moral character.

How one wore one's toga made a difference. As mentioned earlier, Quintilian devotes a long passage (11.3.137–149) to the most appropriate style of toga and the best way in which to wear it. 'It should be distinguished and manly' (*splendidus et virilis*, 11.3.137); 'excessive carefulness regarding the toga, the shoes, and the hair is as bad as excessive carelessness' (*ibid.*).⁵⁸ It was considered 'plebeian' to allow one's left hand to emerge from the toga's constraining folds, a vice of which Claudius was accused when he got rather over excited at the gladiators (Suet. *Claud.* 21.5). Cicero was reproached for wearing his toga too long, even if it was to cover his varicose veins.⁵⁹ Tunics had to be worn properly, too. Julius Caesar and Maecenas belted theirs too loosely, a dangerous sign, it was thought, that their morals might be similarly loose.⁶⁰

Roman magistrates who wore inappropriate dress when on public duty were the targets of even fiercer critique. Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius, when serving as proconsul in Further Spain against Q. Sertorius during the 70s BC, was censured for wearing a triumphant general's *toga picta* at private banquets.⁶¹ He was inappropriately, and hubristically, overdressed. Conversely, Roman magistrates opened themselves up to castigation if they spurned the official insignia of their position. Cicero worked up a number of memorable tours de force about the deviant dress of three of his greatest rhetorical targets: C. Verres, L. Calpurnius Piso, and M. Antonius.⁶² The first two were lambasted for appearing in Greek dress when serving as proconsuls in the provinces of Sicily and Macedonia in 73–71 and 57–55 BC, respectively. Piso was scornfully chastised as an '*imperator* in [Greek] sandals.'⁶³ Yet more scandalously, Verres wore clothing, we are led to believe, that was not just foreign, but effeminate as well:

He spent his time dressed in a purple *pallium* and an ankle-length tunic (*talaris tunica*), partying with women. People were not offended nor irritated by the absence of the magistrate from the forum, by the fact that there was no jurisdiction, that there were no legal hearings.⁶⁴

Cicero elaborates the image later in the same speech: 'There stood a praetor of the Roman people in his slippers, dressed in a purple *pallium* and ankle-length tunic, propped up against some little prostitute on the beach.'⁶⁵ Praetors of the Roman people should be seen in their senatorial shoes (*calcei*), not their slippers (*soleae*). They should devote themselves to the serious business of Roman provincial administration, not debauched beach

parties. Purple Greek-style cloaks (*pallia*) reeked of oriental luxury. Ankle-length and long-sleeved tunics were worn by women or by effeminate males, not by real men. More than 200 years later, Aulus Gellius drives home the same point in his discussion of long-sleeved tunics:⁶⁶

For men to wear tunics that extend beyond the forearm and reach as far as the wrists, and almost to the fingers, was indecorous at Rome and throughout Latium. Our countrymen (*nostrī*) used the Greek term *chirodotae* to describe those tunics, and they thought it seemly that only women should wear long and full-flowing clothing to protect their arms and legs from view.

And to clinch his argument, he quotes no lesser authorities than Vergil and Ennius (*NA* 6.12.6–7), those bastions of Roman morality and national custom (*patrius mos*).

But it is in the Second Philippic attacking M. Antonius in 43 BC that Cicero develops his most elaborate passage of invective around the theme of dress. First, while Antonius was still wearing the *toga praetexta* (i.e., while he was still a boy), he had gone bankrupt. Nevertheless, he brazenly insisted on sitting in the equestrian seats at the theatre, even though bankrupts had been assigned a special place in the *lex Roscia* of 67 BC, which had tightened up seating regulations at the theatre. Cicero then goes on to connect two supposed, very noticeable changes in Antonius' dress with his increasing sexual infatuation for C. Scribonius Curio. No sooner had Antonius assumed the *toga virilis* than he started playing the prostitute, switching his *toga virilis* for the *muliebris toga* that prostitutes traditionally wore. Curio then took him off the street, as it were, and set him up 'in stable and fixed wedlock'; it was, claims Cicero, as if he had given Antonius a *stola*.⁶⁷

In the imperial period, emperors and other members of the *domus Caesaris* had their dress just as carefully scrutinised. In AD 19 Tiberius felt the need to reprimand Germanicus, if mildly, for his dress (*cultus*) and comportment (*habitus*) during his stay in Egypt.⁶⁸ More outlandish Caesars such as Caligula, Nero, and Elagabalus had their unusual and effeminate dress habits excoriated. According to Suetonius, Caligula preferred not to be constrained by any norms of dress: 'As for his clothing, his shoes, and the rest of his dress, he never conformed to the traditional style of Roman civic dress; he wore clothing that was not even manly, and, in the end, inappropriate for a human being to wear.'⁶⁹ The same author claimed that Nero was 'utterly shameless in his dress and comportment,' appearing in public in his dining robes (his *synthesina*) and a neckerchief, with his tunic unbelted, and without his *calcei*.⁷⁰ He flouted tradition in wearing a short flowery tunic and muslin neckerchief to greet senators, much to the annoyance of the senator

Cassius Dio, who also criticized Elagabalus for wearing 'the barbaric dress of Syrian priests' in public (Dio 63.13.3; 79.11.2). The life of Elagabalus in the *Historia Augusta* contains even more vivid descriptions of his outlandish dress (SHA *Elagab.* 26).⁷¹ Conversely, an emperor's moderation in terms of dress won praise. So, Marcus Aurelius wore a plain citizen's white toga at *salutationes* under Antoninus Pius rather than 'the dress to which his rank entitled him' (Dio 71.35.4), while, as we have seen, Claudius was praised for not wearing triumphal dress for the entire festival that marked the rededication of the Theatre of Pompey in 41, even though he had been voted the privilege; he preferred the *toga praetexta* for all but the dedicatory sacrifice (Dio 60.6.9).

Writers such as Suetonius or Dio, and Roman citizens in general, were so accustomed to the traditional Roman dress code, the *habitus patrius et civilis*, to borrow Suetonius' telling phrase (*Calig.* 52.1, cited above), that they immediately noticed any deviations from it and developed stinging rhetoric to try and prevent any such depravity. Such rhetoric could only be produced, I would argue, in and for a community that had an elaborate dress code and one which was invested with deep ideological resonance. Since the appropriate wearing of the toga and *stola* was so much a part of Roman tradition (*mos maiorum*), invented or otherwise, so much a part of what it meant to be Roman, it served as an absolutely crucial litmus test when people's morals and public conduct were being scrutinized in front of their fellow citizens.

Conclusion

In his book on *Public Order in Ancient Rome* (1995), Wilfried Nippel emphasizes the important role that self-regulation within the citizen body played in the maintenance of public order at Rome. Regulation by magistrates using their legal powers was, he argues, 'merely complementary to mechanisms of social control underlying magistrates and the senate.'⁷² He singles out four features of Roman life that helped to enhance the authority of the elite and hence contributed towards cohesion and public order: (1) the discipline and respect for commanders inculcated through military service, a requirement for all citizens at least until the military reforms of 106 BC; (2) the far-reaching extent of *patria potestas*, the legal power of life and death over family members that the male head of the household (*paterfamilias*) possessed; (3) the almost sacred bonds between patrons and clients in Roman society; and (4) the influence of state religion, especially since the state's priests were at the same time its magistrates and senators and since so much of Roman public life took place in an overtly religious setting. According to Nippel, Polybius was right on the mark in observing (6.56.9) how

'superstition' (*deisidaimonia*) kept the Roman state together. In Polybius' view, 'every crowd is fickle, full of lawless desires, unreasoned passion, and violent anger. The multitude must be held in check by invisible terrors and such stagecraft' (*tragoedia*). I would argue that the elaborate nature of Roman public dress, which created a sense of civic uniformity across the citizen body, while at the same time marking difference and rank, was an important part of this *tragoedia*, this stagecraft. After all, in his famous description of Roman elite funerals (6.53–54), a passage that immediately precedes the one we have just been discussing, Polybius placed special emphasis on the various types of togas worn at these funerals by actors representing the ancestors of the deceased. As an outside observer on Roman public life, Polybius had carefully noted how consuls and praetors wore different togas from those worn by censors, whose togas were in turn distinct from those of *triumphatores*. The sight of these ancestors, brought back temporarily to life, arrayed in their togate finery was for Polybius, as it doubtless was for many Romans, too, an inspiring sight. 'There could not easily be a more ennobling spectacle for a young man who aspires to fame and virtue,' he concludes (6.53.9–10).

The efficacy of such ephemeral spectacles was reinforced in more permanent terms by the forests of togate (and occasional stolate) statues of the elite that were crammed into the public spaces of the city of Rome and of cities through the Roman Empire. So, for example, L. Volusius Saturninus, consul in AD 3 and later urban prefect, received no fewer than nine public statues following his death in AD 55 at the age of ninety-three: three showed him in triumphal dress (one in bronze in the Forum Augustum, two marble ones in the temple of Divus Augustus); three in consular dress (all of marble, one in the temple of Divus Julius and two others on the Palatine: one *intra tripylum*, and one in the *area Apollinis* facing the curia); one in augural dress in the Regia; an eighth comprised an equestrian statue set up near the Rostra in the forum; while the ninth depicted him sitting on a *sella curulis*, the magistrate's stool of office, and was set up in the Campus Martius in the Portico of the Lentuli near the Theatre of Pompey. These statues, with carefully distinguished types of dress, helped to remind Roman citizens of Volusius Saturninus' many contributions to the Roman state and to demonstrate the importance of dress distinctions in Roman public life.⁷³

Some have argued that the toga and *stola* lost much of their force as cultural signifiers as the first century AD progressed, since Roman citizens, especially those who lived outside Rome, increasingly abandoned their use.⁷⁴ It is true that the evidence for the use by Roman matrons of the *stola* is not extensive, especially in the post-Augustan period. But the silence of our sources could be explained on the grounds that they took for granted the

wearing of this ceremonial dress by female Roman citizens. And the gaze of our male sources only tended to focus on female subjects when they deviated from what males considered appropriate female conduct. As for the toga, it clearly continued to be the official, ceremonial dress of the male citizen – and not just in the eyes of Roman rhetoricians, as Vout has argued. Juvenal’s much quoted remark that the toga was hardly ever seen in Italy in his day except to drape the bodies of the dead at funerals (*Sat.* 3.171–172) should not be read literally. We should not forget that he makes this comment in a satire in which his central aim is to exaggerate the problems of residing in Rome, not least the chore of being a togate client, and to overplay the delights of living elsewhere.⁷⁵ The toga was never designed to be ‘everyday wear,’ and so its symbolic force was not diminished by the fact that most Romans went about their daily work dressed in tunics, tunics and cloaks, or even, in some colder parts of the Empire, in trousers.⁷⁶ But in the lawcourts, in the Forum, at the theatre, at religious festivals at Rome, in the cities of Roman Italy, and in colonies and municipalities across the Empire, the toga continued to be worn and still had the power to construct Roman identity and to mark Roman social distinctions in a highly visible manner. Roman provincial governors went on wearing the toga on official occasions. How else could Plutarch have claimed in his essay of advice on running a Greek city under Roman rule that ‘the *calcei* of the (Roman) proconsul continued to loom over the heads of the Greeks’ (*Mor.* 813e)?⁷⁷ And the moral and cultural resonance of the toga was felt even as late as the early sixth century AD. For around the year 510, the Gothic king Theoderic could appeal to all who resided in the Gallic provinces to show a willingness to follow Roman custom. ‘Now that you are restored to your ancient liberty through God’s favour,’ he urged, ‘clothe yourselves in the customs of the toga (*moribus togatis*), divest yourselves of barbarity, cast aside savagery of the mind, since it is not fitting for you to live in accordance with alien customs when these times of ours are so fair and equitable.’⁷⁸

The spectacle, the tradition, the moral discourse of dress all contributed, I would argue, towards the creation of a strong conservative ideology, whereby Roman citizens remained proud to wear the toga and *stola*. John Berger has noted how the urban and rural working classes in early-twentieth-century Europe came willingly to accept the wearing of suits in conscious imitation of the dress of the ruling class, despite the uncomfortable nature of such an unnaturally constraining garment.⁷⁹ Something similar, I would suggest, occurred with the adoption of the toga at Rome, in Italy, and, to a degree, in the Roman provinces. By wearing it, Roman citizens affirmed that they belonged within a peaceful, civilized community, which valued tradition (*mos maiorum*) and a set of shared values. The toga was symbolic of Romanness (*Romanitas*) and in particular of the peace that the force of

Roman arms allegedly brought to the Mediterranean world: the *pax Romana*. Vergil's Jupiter hints at this in the passage from the *Aeneid* with which this chapter began (1.282–286), and by the mid-first century BC, at the very latest, the word 'toga' was being used metonymically in Latin to mean 'peace.'⁸⁰ Furthermore, its force as a powerful signifier of the *pax Romana* is clear from the fact that certain regions of the Empire came to be classified as 'togate.' Cisalpine Gaul, for example, was known as 'Gallia Togata.'⁸¹ Cassius Dio explains the significance of the label when he discusses the allocation of provinces to the triumvirs in 43 BC (46.55.4–5): 'It was called "Togata" because it seemed to be more peaceful than the other parts of Gaul and because its inhabitants were already wearing Roman citizen dress.' He then goes on to compare it to the much less civilized region of Gallia Comata, 'Long-Haired Gaul.' Strabo had made essentially the same point about the so-called *togati* of central Spain: 'as you might call them, the peaceful ones, they had been transformed to a civilized disposition and to an Italic way of life, wearing their togas' (3.4.20; cf. 3.2.15 on the *togati* of Baetica). On the other hand, for Horace, those Romans who had forgotten about the toga (*togae oblitus*), like Crassus' troops captured by the Parthians after the battle of Carrhae in 53 BC, had essentially lost their Romanness (Hor. *Carm.* 3.5.10–11). Concepts such as these underline how effective public dress was in defining what it really meant to be Roman. Dress codes help to encourage conformity, but at the same time often invite evasion. This unquestionably happened at Rome. But the wearing of the toga and *stola* on civic occasions remained in force by a mixture of regulation from above and self-regulation from within the citizen body. It was by enshrining the toga and *stola* at the very heart of Roman ideologies about tradition, morality, gender, and Romanness itself that Roman citizens sought to define and control themselves as members of the Roman civic community.⁸²

Notes

- 1 On the toga, see in general Goette 1990; Stone 1994; Vout 1996, which all mark significant advances beyond the simplistic 'costume-history' approach of Wilson 1924. More briefly, Bonfante Warren 1973: esp. 590–3, stressing the toga's Etruscan origins.
- 2 On the *stola*, see Scholz 1992: esp. 13–88; more briefly Sebesta 1994a: 48–50; Olson 2002.
- 3 For the centrality of *pietas* to Augustus' program of cultural renewal, see Zanker 1988: 101–66, esp. 102–35. For the statue of Augustus from the Via Labicana, see Boschung 1993: 176–77, cat. no. 165 and plates 80 and 214.1. This image was

41 Public Dress and Social Control in Rome

- widely reproduced throughout the Roman Empire: note, for example, the portraits of Augustus *capite velato* from Emerita (Mérida, Spain) and Corinth in Greece: Boschung 1993: 163, cat. no. 130 and plate 74.1–4 (Emerita), 157–8, cat. no. 114 and plates 178 and 215.1 (Corinth).
- 4 Cf. Calp. Sic. *Ecl.* 7.26–29, comparing the *pulla sordida veste ... turba* sitting at the very back of a wooden amphitheatre in Neronian Rome with the *equus aut nivei ... tribuni* who occupied the seats at the front of the *cavea*. For a full discussion of the *lex Iulia theatralis*, see Rawson 1986.
 - 5 Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.137–149, 156, 160–161, with Fantham 1982.
 - 6 For the use of the toga at the *salutatio*, see the detailed discussion in George, chap. 4, in this volume.
 - 7 For recent analyses of dress in the *Historia Augusta*, see Molinier-Arbo 2003; Harlow 2005.
 - 8 See Mart. 14.141 (= 14.142 Shackleton Bailey). For the distinctive inversion of the Saturnalia, see Versnel 1993: esp. 150–63.
 - 9 For *vittae*, see, in detail, Fantham, chap. 7, in this volume.
 - 10 Zanker 1988: 162–6; Sebesta 1997.
 - 11 *Ars am.* 1.31–32: *este procul, vittae tenues, insigne pudoris, / quaeque tegis medios instita longa pedes*. As Hollis comments ad loc. (1977: 37–8), *instita* was often used *pars pro toto* to refer to the *stola*; cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.28–29: *sunt qui nolint tetigisse nisi illas / quarum subsuta talos tegat instita veste*. The latter passage is misunderstood by Sebesta (1994a: 49) to identify the *instita* as ‘sewn-on shoulder-straps’ to which the *stola* was attached. Rather, it clearly reinforces the point that the *instita* covered a matron’s ankles. For the more problematic *vittae*, see Fantham, chap. 7, in this volume. For their supposed origin as a privilege granted to matrons after the crucial role played by Coriolanus’ mother and wife in persuading him to withdraw his army from the gates of Rome in 489–488 BC, probably an invented tradition, see Val. Max. 5.2.1.
 - 12 *Trist.* 2.251–252: *ecquid ab hac omnes rigide summovimus Arte, / quas stola contingi vittaque sumpta vetat?* This follows immediately a passage (2.247–250), where he quotes *Ars am.* 1.31–34 verbatim.
 - 13 See *AE* 1974, 618 (Iulia Gordos); *CIL* III 5225, 5283, 5293 (Celeia, Noricum); *CIL* III 6155 = 7571 = *AE* 1978, 715 (Tomis), with Poulter 1978. In general, see Holt-heide 1980 (with further examples).
 - 14 Gardner 1993: 110–54; on these ‘unspeakable’ professions, see Edwards 1998.
 - 15 Pliny *Ep.* 4.11.3: *carent enim togae iure, quibus aqua et igni interdictum est*.
 - 16 This is the implication of Porphyry. schol. ad Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.63: *togatae autem in publicum procedere cogebantur feminae adulterii admissi convictae*. See further Gardner 1986: 127–30 (adulteresses), 250–3 (prostitutes), pointing out (129) that many adulteresses may have chosen to take up a life of prostitution, hence the toga; McGinn 1998: 156–93; Olson 2002: esp. 393–7, although it is puzzling how

- after citing the scholion of Porphyrio she can claim (p. 394) that ‘there is no specific evidence ... that the adulteress or prostitute was “compelled” to wear the toga.’
- 17 For detailed discussion of this complex issue, see Gardner 1986: 250–3; McGinn 1998: 156–93; Olson 2002: 393–401.
 - 18 For a full analysis, see Schäfer 1989: 57–63.
 - 19 See, further, Gabelmann 1985; Sebesta 2005; Dolansky, chap. 2, and Olson, chap. 6, in this volume. In early Rome, before the development of the *stola*, adult men and women both wore the toga: so Varro ap. Non. 867 L = 540 M: *toga non solum viri, sed etiam feminae utebantur*; 867–868 L = 540 M: *ante enim olim commune vestimentum diurnum et nocturnum et muliebri et virile*.
 - 20 On the *bulla*, see Goette 1986; Palmer 1989 [1998]; Dolansky, chap. 2, in this volume. Girls do not seem to have worn *bullae*, but sometimes wore *lunulae*: see Olson, chap. 6, in this volume.
 - 21 For a detailed analysis of the ceremony, see Dolansky, chap. 2, in this volume.
 - 22 Arnobius *Adversus nationes* 2.67; see further Olson, chap. 6, in this volume.
 - 23 Sensi 1980–81: esp. 58–9, 91–102; Fayer 1986; Treggiari 1991: 163; La Follette 1994. On the dress of the Vestals, see Beard 1980: esp. 16–17.
 - 24 For the phrase note Livy 24.32; cf. Livy 24.16. In general on manumission ceremonies, Fabre 1981: 19–20. Freedmen were expected to wear the *pilleus* on the day of their former master’s funeral: Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 4.24, with Fabre 1981: 148–9.
 - 25 Hence, Cicero’s speech *In Toga Candida*, delivered in the senate in 64 BC, when Cicero was a candidate for the consulship: note Asconius’ surviving commentary on it. See also Livy 4.25.13; Pliny *HN* 7.34.120; Isid. *Etym.* 19.24.6: *toga candida eadem cretata, in qua candidati, id est magistratum petentes ambiabant, addita creta, quo candidior insigniorque esset*; Deniaux 2003. For a vivid image of the debauched son of Scipio Africanus standing for the praetorship wearing a *toga candida* allegedly ‘soiled with the stains of turpitude,’ see Val. Max. 3.5.1b.
 - 26 On mourning dress, see Sen. *Controv.* 4.1; 7.3.7; 9.5.1. The regulations from Pisae for mourning the death of Lucius Caesar in AD 2 require that on the anniversary of his death (20 August) the local *duoviri* sacrifice to his departed spirits wearing *togae pullae* (*ILS* 139, lines 16–22); cf. the regulations on the death of Gaius Caesar in AD 4 (*ILS* 140, lines 31–33). For mourning dress in Cicero, note Heskell 1994: esp. 141–3.
 - 27 *Ricinia*: Varro *Ling.* 5.132; Cic. *Leg.* 2.23.59, 25.64; Festus 342 L = 274 M; see further Sensi 1980–81: 64–5; Sebesta 1994a: 50. Cloaks for old men: SHA *Sev. Alex.* 27.4.
 - 28 For *equites trabeati*, see Val. Max. 2.2.9; Tac. *Ann.* 3.2; Suet. *Dom.* 14.3; Stat. *Silv.* 5.2.17; Gabelmann 1977; Wrede 1988; Demougis 1988: 782–9. As a result, *trabea* was used metonymically to denote the equestrian order: for example,

43 Public Dress and Social Control in Rome

- Mart. 5.41.5. For the *trabea* in the later Empire, when the term was used to describe the distinctive dress of the consuls, see Dewar, chap. 11, in this volume. For *angusti clavi* on the tunic, see Demougin 1988: 777–82; not on the toga, as claimed, for example, by Garnsey and Saller 1987: 114.
- 29 Scholars still continue to claim erroneously that the *latus clavus* was a stripe on the toga: for example, Stambaugh 1988: 339; Fantham 1996: 111. Varro *Sat. Men.* 313 Bücheler (discussed above) clearly shows that it was on the tunic.
- 30 When Roman sculptors wanted to reuse a statue to depict a senator, they made sure to represent carefully the laces of the *calcei*: see Zanker 1988: 30 and fig. 23, discussing a seated statue of the Greek poet Poseidippos transformed into the image of a Roman senator.
- 31 For these various types of shoes, see Goette 1988. The plebeian C. Marius was granted *calcei patricii* as an honour for his services to the Roman state: *ILS* 59 (elogium from Arretium, based on his elogium in the Forum of Augustus). For the claim that emperors wore the same *calcei* as the kings, see Isid. *Etym.* 19.34.4, but unfortunately the text becomes defective just as he is about to describe their form.
- 32 For ex-magistrates and triumphators allowed to wear the *toga praetexta* and *vestis triumphalis*, respectively, at the Ludi Circenses, see Livy 5.41.
- 33 For further discussion of the *lex Oppia*, see Culham 1982; Baltrusch 1989: 52–9.
- 34 For the right of local *duoviri* and aediles in overseas colonies to wear *togae praetextae*, see the *lex Ursonensis* (*CIL* II²/5, 1022 = *Roman Statutes* no. 25), chap. 62; for local *pontifices* and augurs, *ibid.*, chap. 66. *Magistri* of *collegia* were also allowed to wear the *toga praetexta* when presiding at the Ludi Compitales: Ascon. *ad Cic. Pis.* 4.8: *solebant autem magistri collegiorum ludos facere, sicut magistri vicorum faciebant, Compitalicios praetextati.*
- 35 Livy 5.41: *adeo haud secus quam venerabundi intuebantur in aedium vestibulis sedentes viros, praeter ornatum habitumque humano augustiorem, maiestate etiam quam voltus gravitasque oris prae se ferebat simillimos dis.* For the event, cf. Val. Max. 3.2.7.
- 36 For the incident, cf. Cic. *Leg. Man.* 32–33; App. *Mithr.* 93; for the date and identity of the praetors, see Broughton, *MRR* 2.138, 141n3; Brennan 2000: 434.
- 37 Cf. Val. Max. 9.7.4: the urban praetor A. Sempronius Asellio was pulled limb from limb by a mob in 89 BC while dressed in his *toga praetexta*; cf. Liv. *Per.* 74. For the claim that he was killed while pouring a libation in the forum wearing ‘the sacred gilded dress that is normal at sacrifice,’ see App. *B Civ.* 1.54.
- 38 For the *laena*, see esp. Suet. fr. 167: *laena ... toga duplex, qua infibulati flamines sacrificant.* See further Bonfante Warren 1973: 594–5, 608–9; Goette 1990: 7–8 and 17 (texts 111–16).
- 39 See Trillmich 1995 and 1996.
- 40 For the dress of *triumphatores*, see Polyb. 6.53.7; Festus 228 L (s.v. *picta*); Bonfante Warren 1970; Versnel 1970: 56–61.

- 41 Magistrates also renounced their *togae praetextae* at the Parentalia, the annual festival (13–21 February) honouring the Roman dead: so Lydus *Mens.* 4.29, cited by Price 1987: 63n7.
- 42 See, for example, Cic. *Clu.* 18; *Planc.* 21; App. *B Civ.* 2.24; Dio 38.16; Val. Max. 6.5.2; for discussion, David 1992: 624–30.
- 43 See Val. Max. 9.12.7; cf. Cic. *Att.* 1.4.2, claiming that he did in fact pass sentence in this trial. Note also Petron. *Sat.* 58: a magistrate pronouncing the sentence *toga perversa*.
- 44 For usurpation of citizenship and higher social status, see Reinhold 1971.
- 45 Mart. 5.8, 23, 35; cf. 5.25, 27, 38, 41. For the date, Sullivan 1991: 35.
- 46 For further discussion, see Vout 1996; Olson 2002.
- 47 In general on this aspect of the censors' role, see Astin 1988.
- 48 Mart. 5.8, 14, 25, 35 (all mentioning Leitus), 5.23 (Oceanus).
- 49 For a full discussion, see Baltrusch 1989: 50–61; Clemente 1981; on purple, see further Reinhold 1970.
- 50 Cf. Prop. 4.11.61–62, which appears to contain an allusion to the grant of a distinctive form of dress for married women who had given birth to three children.
- 51 *CIL* II²/5, 1022 = *Roman Statutes* no. 25, chap. 62 (magistrates), 66 (priests). The recent discovery of a new plaque of the statute has revealed the presence of a *curia Asiniana* among the colony's *curiae* (chap. 15), proving that the colony's founder (*deductor*) was C. Asinius Pollio, propraetor in Hispania Ulterior from 44 to 42 bc: see Caballos Rufino 2005 and esp. 2006: 133–5 (text), 338–62 (commentary).
- 52 *P Oxy.* 471 = *Acta Alexandrinorum*, ed. Musurillo, no. 7 (*Acta Maximi*), cols. iv–v, lines 100–107; see Musurillo 1954: 36 (text), 42 (translation), 158 (discussion). On coloured dress for processions at festivals in the Greek East, see Jones 1999.
- 53 For an imperial slave responsible for the emperor's *vestis forensis*, see *ILS* 1757.
- 54 On emperors' dress, Alföldi 1935 remains crucial.
- 55 On this ideology, see in general Wallace-Hadrill 1982.
- 56 Plut. *Cat. min.* 44.1; Ascon. *ad Cic. pro Scauro* 29; Val. Max. 3.6.7. For the antique and manly practice, Gell. *NA* 6.12.3, with Keith 2000: 22–3. On the Ara Pacis the relief panel of Aeneas sacrificing to the Penates shows him wearing a toga pulled up over his head (*capite velato*) without a tunic, thus capturing the archaic style of wearing the toga in contrast with the contemporary togas so amply displayed on the south and north friezes (see fig. 6.2–3, 7.2 in this volume). For statues of Romulus and Titus Tatius wearing togas but without tunics, see Ascon. *ad Cic. pro Scauro* 29.
- 57 Trevor-Roper 1983.
- 58 See further Fantham 1982. On the masculinity of the toga, see recently Davies 2005. For the importance of physical appearance (*aspectus*) in the oratory of Q. Hortensius, cf. Val. Max. 8.10.2.

45 Public Dress and Social Control in Rome

- 59 Dio 48.18.2; Quint. 11.3.143, citing Pliny the Elder. For the ridicule that wearing one's toga too long elicited, cf. Val. Max. 7.8.1.
- 60 For Caesar, see Suet. *Iul.* 45.3; Dio 43.43.4. For Maecenas' discincture and flowing tunics (*tunicae solutae*), see Sen. *Ep.* 114.4–6; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 86.2; *Eleg. de Maec.* 1.21, 25–26.
- 61 Sall. *Hist.* 2.59, McGuishin; Val. Max. 9.1.5 (*cum palmata veste convivia celebrabat*). The incident probably took place after he had been saluted Imperator following his victories in 75 BC: see Broughton, *MRR* 2.98.
- 62 For fuller analyses, see Heskel 1994; Dyck 2001.
- 63 Cic. *Pis.* 38.93: *crepidatum imperatorem*; cf. 38.92: *crepidatus veste servili navem conscendit*.
- 64 Cic. *II Verr.* 5.13.31: *cum iste cum pallio purpureo talarique tunica versaretur in convivio muliebribus, non offendebantur homines neque moleste ferebant abesse a foro magistratum, non ius dici, non iudicia fieri*.
- 65 Cic. *II Verr.* 5.33.86: *stetit soleatus praetor populi Romani cum pallio purpureo tunicaque talari muliercula nixus in litore*.
- 66 Gell. *NA* 6.12, sections 1–2 cited. On the gendered semiotics of this passage, see Keith 2000: 22–3.
- 67 Cic. *Phil.* 2.18.44: *tenesne memoria praetextatum te decoxisse? ... sumpsisti virilem, quam statim muliebrem togam reddidisti. primo vulgare scortum, certa flagitii merces, nec ea parva; sed cito Curio intervenit, qui te a meretricio quaestu abduxit et, tamquam stolam dedisset, in matrimonio stabili et certo collocavit*.
- 68 Tac. *Ann.* 2.59: *cultu habituque eius lenibus vocibus perstricto*.
- 69 Suet. *Calig.* 52.1: *vestitu calciatuque et cetero habitu neque patrio neque civili, ac ne virili quidem ac denique humano semper usus est*. For the allegation that Caligula dressed up as a Roman matron and various gods (male and female), cf. Dio 59.26.6–10.
- 70 Suet. *Ner.* 51: *circa cultum habitumque adeo pudendus ut ... plerumque synthesinam indutus ligato circum collum sudario prodierit in publicum sine cinctu et discalciatus*.
- 71 The importance of dress in Suetonius does not receive the attention it deserves in Wallace-Hadrill 1983; for dress in Dio, see Freyburger-Galland 1993; in the *Historia Augusta*, Harlow 2005.
- 72 Nippel 1995: 30.
- 73 Tac. *Ann.* 13.30; cf. *AE* 1972, 174, with Eck 1972; for further discussion of the significance of statues for the Roman dress code, see Koortbojian, chap. 3, in this volume.
- 74 So Vout 1996: esp. 216–18; Olson 2002.
- 75 In the same vein, we must not read too literally Martial's comment (1.49.31–32) on the delights of living in Bilbilis in Spain, where a lunate shoebuckle (i.e. patrician shoes), a toga, or clothes reeking of purple dye are, he alleges,

- nowhere to be seen. On the toga in satirical writing, see George, chap. 4, in this volume.
- 76 For the phrase *tunicatus populus*, that is, ordinary people in their working clothes, see Plaut. *Poen.* 1121; Cic. *Leg. agr.* 2.34.94; Tac. *Dial.* 7. On trousers, see Wild 1985; Böhme 1985.
- 77 For the importance of Roman dress, especially the toga, in the law courts of Roman North Africa, see Bradley, chap. 12, in this volume.
- 78 Cassiod. *Variae* 3.17.1: *libenter parendum esset Romanae consuetudini ... atque ideo in antiquam libertatem deo praestante revocati vestimini moribus togatis, exuite barbariem, abicite mentium crudelitatem, quia sub aeternitate nostri temporis non vos decet vivere moribus alienis.*
- 79 Berger 1980: 38–9.
- 80 A point made explicitly at Cic. *De or.* 3.42.167: *Liberum appellare pro vino, campum pro comitiis, togam pro pace, arma et tela pro bello.* For the phrase *cedant arma togae*, note Cic. *Off.* 1.22.77; *Pis.* 30.73; Vell. *Pat.* 1.12.3; Tert. *De pall.* 5.
- 81 For Gallia Togata, see also [Caes.] *BG* 8.52; Cic. *Phil.* 8.27; Dio 48.12.5; Pomp. Mela 2.59.
- 82 I should like to thank audiences in Calgary, Victoria, Hamilton, Fredericton, and Toronto, as well as at the Institute of Classical Studies in London, for their comments on various preliminary versions of this chapter, and the anonymous referees for the press. I am grateful to them all for helping to improve it.