Andreas Gavrielatos, ed., *Self-Presentation and Identity in the Roman World*.
Cambridge 2017. Pp. 273. ISBN (10): 1-4438-9983-6; ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-9983-
3.

Issues of self-presentation and identity have repeatedly turned classics, over the past
several decades, into an embattled field. Whatever the criteria chosen – national,
cultural, ideological, religious or concerning a particular, narrower field –[1], the aim
has been to challenge the stability of established notions of identity, to examine the
idea of a monolithic identity as opposed to possible multiple identities, to interrogate
whether identity is shaped by external forces or an internal construct projected
outwards. There is little awareness of such methodological and terminological
problems in the present volume. It examines self-presentation in antiquity through
various media, literary, epigraphic and archaeological. A preface, followed by short
presentations of the contributors, offers a brief definition of the concept, as well as
the contents of the papers making up the volume. Beyond that, however, little
attempt was made to more thoroughly define and discuss the issues at hand and the
terminology pertaining to them, nor to more closely interrelate the various papers, as
the use of the term "chapter" for the individual contributions would suggest. Such an
approach would have been necessary in order to not dilute the volume, as the various
papers come from different fields of study, both the notions of identity and self-
presentation are broad and it is not clear whether "in the Roman world" announced
in the title is not too large a catchphrase. To be sure, some of these issues are
addressed by individual contributions, some of which are of high quality; but for the
overall volume, the concept of self-presentation offers but a parenthesis for
juxtaposing papers with discrete subject matters and methodology. They fall neatly
into three distinct categories: Latin literature and rhetoric (chapters 1-6);
archaeology and artefacts (chapters 7-8); epigraphy and onomastics (chapters 9-12);
finally the lone chapter 12, which refers to Greek and Latin literary sources.

Neil W. Bernstein, "*Persona*, identity and self-presentation in Roman
declamation", examines the relation between the declaiming *persona* and the
assumptions of his audience concerning the identity of the speaker. As constructing a
fictional *persona* depends on the context and learning declamation presupposes the

---

[1] E.S. Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (London 1993); A.L. Boegehold and
A.C. Scafuro, eds., *Athenian identity and civic ideology* (Baltimore 1994); J.M. Hall, *Ethnic Identity in
Greek* Antiquity (Cambridge 1997); G. Woolf, *Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Civilization in
Gaul* (Cambridge 1998); R. Lawrence and J. Berry, eds., *Cultural Identity in the Roman Empire*
(London 1998); S. Goldhill, ed., *Being Greek under Rome. Cultural identity, the second sophistic and the
development of empire* (Cambridge 2001); G. Weber and M. Zimmermann, eds., *Propaganda –
Selbstdarstellung – Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreich des 1. Jhs. n. Chr.* (Stuttgart 2003); C.J.
Howgego, V. Heuchert and A.M. Burnett, eds., *Coinage and Identity in the Roman provinces* (Oxford
2005); E. Iricinschi and H.M. Zellentin, eds., *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity* (Tübingen 2008); A.
Matthaei, *Münzbild und Polisbild*, München 2013; N.J. Andrade, *Syrian Identity in the Greco-Roman
World* (Cambridge 2013).

presentation of different, even opposite points of view, the debater enjoys greater freedom than in a real court. However, the author presents situations (such as obscene expressions or suggestions, borrowing formulae or ideas from others, ignorance of tribunal procedure or political risks) which can dispel the illusion the declaimer strives to produce. He concludes by discussing the advantages of debate and of constructing a *persona*.

Cédric Scheidegger Lämmle, "Last words: Cicero's late works and the poetics of a literary legacy", discusses the ways of self-presentation in four of Cicero's philosophical dialogues (*De oratore, De republica, De senectute, De amicitia*). Cicero chose as carriers of his ideas personalities no longer alive and placed the dialogues (even at the price of subverting factual chronology) shortly before the death of the protagonist, thus turning his words into the swan-song of a man trying through self-representation to impose closure on a history still in the making. This sort of Nachlasspoetik, setting Cicero apart from the Platonic model, constructs the aesthetic value of historiography as a basis for his own legacy and the way posterity would regard him.

Saskia T. Roselaar's paper, "Pride and prejudice in Cicero's speeches", examines the dilemma of an author simultaneously belonging to several social groups whose characteristics were not always compatible. He was at the same time a leading senator of his time and a *homo novus*, a man originating from a small Italian town, from outside the tightly knit circle of senatorial aristocracy. The strategies he employed (mainly in his speeches) in order to defuse the contradiction between Rome and Italy are here used to highlight the identity constructs during the late Republic in the tense area between Romans and Italics, between elite and sub-elite. The image of Italic towns (including the distinctions drawn between urban and rustic speech) is shown to be, with small exceptions, positive; however, Cicero constructs a hierarchy of Italic towns, according to the services and loyalty rendered by the community under discussion to Rome.

Ellen Greene, "Propertian self-presentation and Augustan ideology", focuses on Propertius' poem 2.7 in order to examine the poet's dichotomies of self-presentation. She chimes in the discussion concerning the ongoing debate in literature on whether elegiac poetry stands opposed to traditional Roman values (supported by Augustus) and shows that a more nuanced view is necessary, as Propertius both challenges and affirms traditional Augustan values.

Boris Kayachev, "The *sphragis* of Virgil's *Georgics*: constructing identity through intertextuality", while discussing the most explicitly autobiographical passage in Virgil's work, does not propose to examine the place of the poet in his contemporary world (and implicitly his relationship to Augustus under the new regime), but the identity of the poet in the light shed not only by his own work, but by some of his predecessors'. The intertextual approach he suggests draws mainly upon Cicero and Catullus and he is able to show that Virgil does not suggest the

retreat of the poet from the real world, but the possibility of his responsible implication in it, while at the same time maintaining his privacy.

Spyridon Tzounakas, "Self-presentation in Pliny's Epistle 9.23", examines the relevance of private correspondence for the self-presentation of a person, especially when this person is an (insufferably self-praising) man of letters who writes even to his intimates with an eye to eventual publication. The author focuses on letter 9.23 as a characteristic example for the way in which Pliny, concentrating on the way others responded to his person, shaped his social and cultural identity, such as he wished it to be transmitted to posterity.

Christophe Schmidt Heidenreich's "The self-presentation of the Roman soldier on military tombstones from the Rhineland in the 1st c. AD" is a thorough and in-depth examination of the reasons – personal or collective – for the choice of a monument's iconography, based on the interrelation between text and image, the analysis of the monuments' dating, its iconographic type and the category of military unit to which the soldier belonged. The preferences and choices of legionary soldiers can be traced back to Italy and were imitated by those serving in auxiliary units. While a certain uniformity in the choice of the type of monument and its decoration is inevitable in a military milieu which had no penchant for originality, the author finds that the soldier's status is essential in deciding on the funerary representation. In time, the Italian models and the preference for representations of the fighting soldier were superseded by the more standardized funerary banquet, perhaps due to the onset of a longer period of peace on this frontier.

Danijel Dzino, "Reclaiming the past in the valley of Una: re-use of Iapodean urns in Roman times", discusses Iron age stone cinerary urns used in the area in north-western Dalmatia inhabited by the Iapodes, which were re-used in the 1st- 2nd c. AD in the context of different cultural practices. The examination of three individual strategies of self-presentation shows that pre-Roman traditions were reinvented and reinterpreted, that the inclusion of the inhabitants of this area into the structures of the Roman Empire led to a selective combination of the extant cultural settings with elements of Roman provincial culture.

Rada Varga, "Beyond the epigraphic habit: reflection and self-reflection on the funerary monuments of *Dacia Porolissensis*", examines the funerary inscriptions of the province of Dacia Porolissensis as to the relevance of the included information for the presentation of the deceased. Based on quantitative analyses, on statistical data and on the discussion of relevant individual cases, she looks at issues such as the relation between dedicator and deceased, the onomastics and legal status of the attested persons (including, regrettably, Imperial freedmen who, being *in* the province but not *of* the province, ought to have been left out) and some information (such as the origin of persons, their tribe or their cause of death) which has been more often than not excluded from inscriptions.

Andreas Gavrielatos, "Latinate nomenclature for a Romanized identity: attempts to construct an aspired displayed identity", takes graffiti with names on Gaulish *terra sigillata* as his starting point for a discussion of the efforts attested in Roman provinces to create self-presentations that support a Romanized identity. He sees bilingualism as the main tool for constructing such an "aspired displayed identity", which he suggests as a definition, and, in discussing onomastic issues (such as the significance of the alternation between *tria nomina* and just the *cognomen*, or the importance of translation names and assonance names), shows how they can be used in constructing a Romanized identity, how bilingualism leads to biculturalism.

Kalin Stoev, "The hereditary nomenclature in Moesia Inferior and its value as a source for the study of identities", is the longest contribution in the volume. After a substantial historical introduction, the author proposes the introduction of a typology of naming that would contribute to gaining new insights into the practice of name-giving in the province of Moesia Inferior and into the influence of the various social and cultural backgrounds. His typology, summarised in the table on p. 207 and dividing the material into 15 distinct naming types, is then illustrated on the basis of the epigraphic material of this province. Some of the resulting categories include too few names to be of much relevance. The main flaw is however his glossing over the importance of the juridical status of the persons discussed. He seems to consider the use or non-use of the *tria nomina* system a matter of personal preference (e. g. on p. 187, 188, 193) and consistently uses the term "peregrine cognomen" (type 1.1 and 2.2) when referring to non-Latin *cognomina*. This detracts significantly from the value of his conclusions. There are also, even given the bulky epigraphic material the author has been handling, some errors, of form as well as of substance (e. g., on p. 177 n. 60 the *nomen* of the oldest son of L. Aemilius Severus is also Aemilius, not Aelius; on p. 190, the reference (ISM II 295) to the inscription about Apollonius Dadae discussed here is missing, while describing his mother as a "woman of high standing" on the sole strength of her being referred to as "*sacerdos Tomitanorum*" is of doubtful value; the claim on p. 161 that Tomis is an exception to "the predominance of the Greek language in the Hellenic towns on the coast" is unsubstantiated and untenable). One would also like to have seen, given the importance of onomastic studies for the topic here chosen, the use of some recent work in this field[2].

Dionysios Benétos, "From *divus Augustus* to *vicarius Christi*: examples of self-presentation in a period of transition", examines the evolution of the divine component of the projected image of the emperor from Augustus to Constantine and the way it transformed under the influence of Christianity. A lengthy introduction, rich in quotations, discusses the meaning of basic terms such as *deus* and *divus* and the distinction between them. From the emperors' abandoning the title *pontifex*

---

[2] For instance, D. Dana, *Onomasticon Thracicum. Répertoire des noms indigènes de Thrace, Macédoine orientale, Mésies, Dacie et Bithynie* (Athens 2014), or N.G. Brancato, *Repertorium delle trasmissioni del gentilizio nel mondo romano sulla base della documentazione epigrafica I. Provinciae* (Rome 2009).

maximus (which he places in the 4ᵗʰ century), he reaches the somewhat surprising conclusion that the bishops of the Christian church and especially the bishop of Rome substituted their own authority for that of the emperors already in Late Antiquity, although the title of *pontifex* was still used, even by Christian emperors, up until the 6ᵗʰ century AD. In order to strengthen his argument, he adduces the *donatio Constantini*, which refers to a much later historical context, that of the early Middle ages, when the relations between Imperial and ecclesiastical authority had already gone their different ways in the former Eastern and Western empires.

The volume is technically tidy, typos are infrequent (p. X end, Haüssler instead of Häussler; p. XV l. 19 "aresidence"; p. 65 l. 26 ["of" is lacking]; p. 191 l. 23 wrong Greek accent on the word *archon*; most unfortunately, "asses" instead of "assess" on p. 166 n. 23 l. 8). The editors have chosen, as is often done, to place the entire bibliographical list at the end of the volume. It is perhaps inevitable that in compiling and unifying many different lists of literature, some titles should fall through the cracks (for instance, the abbreviation Metzger 2005 in Roselaar's note no. 4 is missing from the final list; the same for Morpurgo Davies 2000 in Gavrielatos' note no. 4). More bewildering is the absence of all abbreviations of epigraphic corpora and publications and of any references to the abbreviations used for Greek and Latin authors.

LIGIA RUSCU
DEPARTMENT OF ANCIENT HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY
BABEŞ-BOLYAI UNIVERSITY, CLUJ, ROMANIA
ligia.ruscu@ubbcluj.ro