Edited by Jussi Rantala

# Gender, Memory, and Identity in the Roman World

Amsterdam
University
Press

Gender, Memory, and Identity in the Roman World

# Social Worlds of Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages

The Late Antiquity experienced profound cultural and social change: the political disintegration of the Roman Empire in the West, contrasted by its continuation and transformation in the East; the arrival of 'barbarian' newcomers and the establishment of new polities; a renewed militarization and Christianization of society; as well as crucial changes in Judaism and Christianity, together with the emergence of Islam and the end of classical paganism. This series focuses on the resulting diversity within Late Antique society, emphasizing cultural connections and exchanges; questions of unity and inclusion, alienation and conflict; and the processes of syncretism and change. By drawing upon a number of disciplines and approaches, this series sheds light on the cultural and social history of Late Antiquity and the greater Mediterranean world.

*Series Editor*
Carlos Machado, University of St. Andrews

*Editorial Board*
Lisa Bailey, University of Auckland
Maijastina Kahlos, University of Helsinki
Volker Menze, Central European University
Ellen Swift, University of Kent
Enrico Zanini, University of Siena

# Gender, Memory, and Identity in the Roman World

*Edited by*
*Jussi Rantala*

# Table of Contents

## List of Illustrations

# Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| *AE* | *L'Année épigraphique* |
| *Alex. Rom.* | *Alexander romance* |
| Amm. Marc. | Ammianus Marcellinus |
| App. *B Civ.* | Appian, *Bella civilia* |
| Apul. *Flo.* | Apuleius, *Florida* |
| Apul. *Met.* | Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* |
| Ar. *Vesp.* | Aristophanes, *Vespae* |
| Arnob. *Nat.* | Arnobius, *Adversus nationes* |
| Arr. *Anab.* | Arrian, *Anabasis* |
| Ath. *Deipn.* | Athenaeus, *Deipnosofistai* |
| Bas. *Ad adolesc.* | Basileios, *Ad adolescentes* |
| Bas. *Epist.* | Basileios, *Epistulae* |
| *BdI* | *Bullettino dell'Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica* |
| *BHG* | *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca* |
| *BHL* | *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina* |
| *BullNap* | *Bullettino archeologico Napoletano* |
| Cass. Dio | Cassius Dio |
| Cato, *Agr.* | Cato, *De agri cultura* |
| Cens. | Censorinus |
| Cic. *Ad Brut.* | Cicero, *Epistulae ad Brutum* |
| Cic. *Att.* | Cicero, *Epistulae ad Atticum* |
| Cic. *Fam.* | Cicero, *Epistulae ad familiares* |
| Cic. *Har. resp.* | Cicero, *De haruspicium responso* |
| Cic. *Mur.* | Cicero, *Pro Murena* |
| Cic. *Phil.* | Cicero, *Orationes Philippicae* |
| Cic. *Sen.* | Cicero, *De senectute* |
| Cic. *Verr.* | Cicero, *In Verrem* |
| *CIL* | *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* |
| *CJ* | *Corpus Juris Civilis* |
| Claud. *Cons. Hon.* | Claudianus, *De consulate Honorii* |
| Columella, *Rust.* | Columella, *De re rustica* |
| *C.Th.* | *Codex Theodosianus* |
| Curt. | Curtius Rufus |
| *Dig.* | *Digesta* |
| Diod. Sic. | Diodoros Siculus |
| Dion. Hal. | Dionysius Halicarnassensis |

| | |
|---|---|
| Enn. *Ann.* | Ennius, *Annales* |
| Ennod. *Pan. Theod.* | Ennodius, *Panegyricus Dictus Clementis-simo Rege Theodorico* |
| *Epit. de Caes.* | *Epitome de Caesaribus* |
| Euseb. *Vit. Const.* | Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* |
| *Ex.* | *Exodus* |
| *FIRA* | *Fontes Iuris Romani Anteiustiniani* |
| *FO* | *Fasti Ostienses* |
| Fulg. *De aet.* | Fulgentius, *De aetatibus mundi et hominis* |
| Fulg. *Myth.* | Fulgentius, *Mitologiae tres libri* |
| Gai. *Inst.* | Gaius, *Institutiones* |
| Gell. | Aulus Gellius |
| Greg. Naz. *Ep.* | Gregory of Nazianzus, *Epistulae* |
| Greg. Nyss. *Vita Macr.* | Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita Macrinae* |
| Hdn. | Herodianus |
| Herod. | Herodas |
| Hier. *Ep.* | Jerome, *Epistulae* |
| Hor. *Carm.* | Horace, *Carmina* |
| Hor. *Carm. saec.* | Horace, *Carmen saeculare* |
| Hor. *Sat.* | Horace, *Satirae* |
| *IG* | *Inscriptiones Graecae* |
| *IK* | *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien* |
| *ILAlg* | *Inscriptions latines de l'Algérie* |
| *Inscr. Ital.* | *Inscriptiones Italiae* |
| *IRT* | *The Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania* |
| *Itin. Alex.* | *Itinerarium Alexandri* |
| Joh. Chrys. *De sacerd.* | John Chrysostom, *De sacerdotio* |
| Jord. *Get.* | Jordanes, *Getica* |
| Jul. Val. *Res. Gest. Alex.* | Iulius Valerius, *Res gestae Alexandri Macedonis* |
| Julian. *Adv. Galil.* | Julian, *Contra Galilaeo* |
| Julian. *Ep.* | Julian, *Epistulae* |
| Julian. *Or.* | Julian, *Orationes* |
| Juv. | Juvenal |
| Lib. *Or.* | Libanius, *Orationes* |
| Liv. | Livy |
| Luc. | Lucan |
| Lucian, *De mort. Peregr.* | Lucian, *De morte Peregrini* |
| Lydus*, Mens.* | Lydus, *De mensibus* |
| Macrob. *Sat.* | Macrobius, *Saturnalia* |
| Manilius, *Astr.* | Manilius, *Astronomica* |

| | |
|---|---|
| *MANN* | *Catalogue of the Museo Archeologico di Napoli* |
| Mark | *Gospel of Mark* |
| Mart. | Martial |
| Men. Rhet. | Menander Rhetor |
| MGH, *SS. RR. Merov.* | Monumenta Germaniae Historica, *Scriptores rerum Merovigicarum* |
| Nep. *Att.* | Nepos, *Atticus* |
| Nep. *Hannib.* | Nepos, *Hannibal* |
| *NSc* | *Notizie degli scavi di Antichità* |
| *Num.* | *Numbers* |
| Oros. | Orosius |
| Ov. *Am.* | Ovid, *Amores* |
| Ov. *Ars.* | Ovid, *Ars amatoria* |
| Ov. *Fast.* | Ovid, *Fasti* |
| Ov. *Her.* | Ovid, *Heroides* |
| Ov. *Met.* | Ovid, *Metamorphoses* |
| Ov. *Trt.* | Ovid, *Tristia* |
| *PAH* | *Pompeianarum Antiquitatum Historia* |
| *Pan. Lat.* | *Panegyrici Latini* |
| Paus. | Pausanias |
| *P.Brux.* | *Papyri bruxellenses graeci* |
| Pers. | Persius |
| Petron. *Sat.* | Petronius, *Satyrica* |
| *PFOS* | *Prosopografie des Femmes de' l'Ordre Senatorial (I-II siècles)* |
| Philostr. *V S* | Philostratus, *Vitae sophistarum* |
| *PIR²* | *Prosopographia Imperii Romani Saeculi I, II, III* (second edition) |
| Plaut. *Aul.* | Plautus, *Aulularia* |
| Plaut. *Men.* | Plautus, *Menaechmi* |
| Plaut. *Truc.* | Plautus, *Truculentus* |
| Plin. *Ep.* | Pliny (the Younger), *Epistulae* |
| Plin. *HN* | Pliny (the Elder), *Naturalis Historia* |
| *P.Lips* | *Griechische Urkunden der Papyrussam-lung zu Leipzig* |
| *PLRE²* | *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* 1 (second edition) |
| Plut. *Alex.* | Plutarch, *Alexander* |
| Plut. *Ant.* | Plutarch, *Antonius* |
| Plut. *Brut.* | Plutarch, *Brutus* |

| | |
|---|---|
| Plut. *Cic.* | Plutarch, *Cicero* |
| Plut. *Cor.* | Plutarch, *Coriolanus* |
| Plut. *De Alex. Fort.* | Plutarch, *De Alexandri magni fortuna aut virtute* |
| Plut. *Mor.* | Plutarch, *Moralia* |
| Plut. *Ti. Gracch.* | Plutarch, *Tiberius Gracchus* |
| Plut. *Tim.* | Plutarch, *Timoleon* |
| *P.Mich.* | *Michigan Papyri* |
| *P.Mil.* | *Papiri Milanesi* |
| Polyb. | Polybius |
| *P.Oxy.* | *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* |
| *PPM* | *Pompei. Pitture e mosaici* |
| *Priap.* | *Priapeia* |
| Procop. *Goth.* | Procopius, *De Bello Gothico* |
| Prop. *Eleg.* | Propertius, *Elegiae* |
| *P.Ryl.* | *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library at Manchester* |
| *Ps.* | *Psalms* |
| *P.Sakaon* | *The Archive of Aurelius Sakaon: Papers of an Egyptian Farmer in the last Century of Theadelphia* |
| *P.Strasb.* | *Griechische Papyrus der Kaiserlichen Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek zu Strassburg* |
| *P.Thead.* | *Papyrus de Théadelphie* |
| *P.Vindob.* | *Papyrus Vindobonensis* |
| *P.Yad.* | *The Documents from the Bar Kochba Period in the Cave of Letters* |
| Quint. *Inst.* | Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* |
| *RG* | *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* |
| *Rhet. Her.* | *Rhetorica ad Herennium* |
| *RIC* | *Roman Imperial Coinage* |
| Sall. *Hist.* | Sallust, *Historiae* |
| *SEG* | *Supplementum ephigraphicum Graecum* |
| Sen. *Ben.* | Seneca (the Younger), *De beneficiis* |
| Sen. *Ep.* | Seneca (the Younger), *Epistulae* |
| Sen. *Helv.* | Seneca (the Younger), *Ad Helviam* |
| Sen. *Marc.* | Seneca (the Younger), *Ad Marciam* |
| Serv. *In Aen.* | Servius, *In Vergilii Aeneidem commentarii* |
| SHA *Ant. Pius* | Scriptores Historiae Augustae, *Antoninus Pius* |
| SHA *Comm.* | Scriptores Historiae Augustae, *Commodus* |
| SHA *Did. Iul.* | Scriptores Historiae Augustae, *Didius Iulianus* |

| | |
|---|---|
| SHA *Hadr.* | Scriptores Historiae Augustae, *Hadrian* |
| SHA *Marc.* | Scriptores Historiae Augustae, *Marcus* |
| SHA *Pert.* | Scriptores Historiae Augustae, *Pertinax* |
| SHA *Sev.* | Scriptores Historiae Augustae, *Septimius Severus* |
| Sid. Apoll. *Carm.* | Sidonius Apollinaris, *Carmina* |
| Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* | Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epistulae* |
| Suet. *Aug.* | Suetonius, *Augustus* |
| Suet. *Calig.* | Suetonius, *Gaius Caligula* |
| Suet, *Iul.* | Suetonius, *Divus Iulius* |
| Suet. *Nero* | Suetonius, *Nero* |
| Suet. *Tib.* | Suetonius, *Tiberius* |
| Symm. *Ep.* | Symmachus, *Epustulae* |
| Tac. *Agr.* | Tacitus, *Agricola* |
| Tac. *Ann.* | Tacitus, *Annales* |
| Tac. *Dial.* | Tacitus, *Dialogus de oratoribus* |
| Them. *Or.* | Themistius, *Orationes* |
| Theod. *Graec. Aff. Cur.* | Theodoret, *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio* |
| Ulp. | Ulpian |
| Val. Max. | Valerius Maximus |
| Varro, *Ling.* | Varro, *De lingua Latina* |
| Varro, *Rust.* | Varro, *De re rustica* |
| Vell. Pat. | Velleius Paterculus |
| Verg. *Aen.* | Virgil, *Aenid* |
| Xen. *Cyr.* | Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* |

# Preface

This collection of articles is, while dealing with an interesting and crucial question of interaction between gender, memory, and identity in the Roman world, also celebrating the birthday of Katariina Mustakallio by acknowledging her work and career. Thus, several of her colleagues were invited to contribute papers that deal with some of the subjects very close to Katariina's own interests.

To know Katariina is to know a person knowledgeable about a wide variety of topics. In the field of ancient history, she has dealt with both cultural and social questions from many perspectives. While this volume concentrates on gender, memory, and identity, Katariina has also had a keen interest in topics such as childhood, old age, death, and religion in ancient societies, particularly within the Roman Empire. Moreover, Medieval history and, more generally, world cultures and their history, have also been an important part of her work and vision as a scholar. Finishing her PhD thesis at the University of Helsinki, Katariina's impact on ancient studies at the University of Tampere has been extremely significant for over twenty years now. Her activity in organizing and providing lectures on ancient history, her scholarship, her willingness to help and encourage students and fellow researchers, and her ability to create an overall atmosphere of togetherness and good spirit among those who work close to her, has enabled Classical studies to become an important and lively part of history studies and research in Tampere. That said, she has acted in many notable academic positions at the University of Tampere but also elsewhere – for example, as the Director of the Institutum Romanum Finlandiae in her beloved Rome for the period of 2009-2013.

While the importance of her work can be noticed in many aspects at the University of Tampere, one should particularly mention her efforts as being one of the driving forces behind the very close co-operation between Classical and Medieval studies, practiced in Tampere for many years now, and emphasizing the significance of *longue durée* from Antiquity to the Middle Ages. One result of this quite unique co-operation has been the continuing series of the international conference *Passages from Antiquity to the Middle Ages*, which began 2003 and has been held every second or third year since, bringing together scholars of various fields of study to discuss diverse phenomena taking place in the period covering both Classical Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Moreover, Katariina was one of the key figures in the foundation of *Trivium* (Tampere Centre for Classical, Medieval and Early Modern Studies) in 2006, and has actively taken part in the projects of the Centre since that.

Of course, as Katariina herself is always first to remind the rest of us, great deeds are made in co-operation. Thus, when beginning to put this collection of papers together, it was known a difficult task lie ahead: as Katariina has worked with many people, and has many dear friends and colleagues who certainly would have been willing to honour her by participating in this book, deciding who to invite to take part in the volume was a problematic case indeed. Thus, many people who surely would have been able to provide a high-class contribution were unfortunately left out. To mention just a few, Professor Christian Krötzl, Docent Jussi Hanska, Docent Sari Katajala-Peltomaa, Dr Jenni Kuuliala, Dr Miikka Tamminen, MA Pia Mustonen, and MA Outi Sihvonen, all active figures in *Trivium* and other common projects of Classical and Medieval historians in Tampere, have all worked for years with Katariina, and all of them would have been fitting contributors to this volume. Indeed, the same story goes with many other friends and colleagues, both Finnish and international, of Katariina that are researchers suitable for the volume as such, yet had to be excluded for practical reasons.

Naturally, when deciding on those to invite to contribute, the main factor was to include people with a research history that covers the three main concepts of the volume. Accordingly, all the contributors of this volume not only have been working with Katariina in one way or another – some as doctoral students under her guidance, some as collaborators in other projects – but have also dealt in their previous research with questions of gender, memory, and identity in the Roman world, thus providing together an interesting and diverse collection of papers. Thus, I would like to express my warm thanks to all the contributors for their full-hearted response to the invitation to take part in this volume. Their participation enabled the production of what I believe is a collection of fine articles of appropriate distinction and a fitting way to celebrate Katariina and her past and present work, as well as to thank her for her warm friendship – something all the contributors of this volume can surely attest to. Moreover, a few people should particularly be mentioned. Dr Sanna Joska has provided valuable editorial assistance, of which I give her my sincere thanks. Docent Sari Katajala-Peltomaa, Dr Jenni Kuuliala, and Docent Ville Vuolanto kindly provided useful suggestions in the initial phase of the process, helping me in getting the work started smoothly. Finally, from my own behalf, I of course thank Katariina herself for all her help, guidance, encouragement, and friendship she has provided to me over the years. The fact that I am able to call a person like Katariina my friend makes me feel privileged indeed.

*Jussi Rantala*

## *Tabula Gratulatoria*

The people and institutions listed below, as well as many other friends and colleagues, congratulate Katariina Mustakallio on her 60th birthday:

Eeva-Liisa Aalto
Ria Berg
Christer Bruun and Greti
    Dinkova-Bruun
Julia Burman and Erkki Sironen
Laura Chioffi
Department of European and
    World History, University of
    Turku
Department of History and
    Ethnology, University of
    Jyväskylä
Rauno Endén
Lotta Eriksson and Pau Rosenberg
Finnish Historical Society
Pertti Haapala
Jussi Hanska
Mary Harlow
Markku Henriksson
Ilari Hetemäki
Markus Hiekkanen
Marjatta and Kari Hietala
Virve Hietala
Sabine R. Huebner
Martti Häikiö
Marja-Leena Hänninen
Institutum Romanum Finlandiae
Seija Jalagin
Sanna Joska
Mervi and Pekka Kaarninen
Marjo Kaartinen
Maijastina Kahlos
Arja Karivieri and Göran
    Kindström

Rami Karivieri and Riitta Iiponen
Elina Katainen
Kimmo Katajala
Sari Katajala-Peltomaa
Aino Katermaa
Pirkko and Yrjö Kaukiainen
Timo Keinänen
Tiina Kinnunen
Aura Korppi-Tommola
Kai Krohn
Christian Krötzl
Hannele Kurki and Teuvo Räty
Jenni Kuuliala
Liisa Laakso
Christian Laes
Antti Lampinen
Lena Larsson Lovén
Ray Laurence
Outi Lehtipuu
Ohto Manninen
Pirjo and Mikko Markkola
Marxiano Melotti
Leena and Hannu Mustakallio
Mikko Myllykoski and Silpa Maria
    Pöntinen
Marjaana Niemi and Kalevi
    Korpela
Markus Nummi
Eva Packalén and Jari Sedergren
Päivi Pahta
Tim G. Parkin
Seppo Parkkila
Jaakkojuhani Peltonen
Leena Pietilä-Castrén

Jussi Rantala
Mikko Saikku
Olli Salomies and Tiina Purola
Marjo-Riitta and Antti Saloniemi
Kaj Sandberg
Liisa Savunen and Markku
    Riekkinen
Pertti Seppälä
Outi Sihvonen and Antti T.
    Oikarinen
Heikki Solin
Agneta Strömberg

Elina Suolahti
Miikka Tamminen
Antero Tammisto and Liisa
    Laakso-Tammisto
Tampereen Historiallinen Seura
Trivium – Tampere Centre for
    Classical, Medieval and Early
    Modern Studies
Heli Valtonen
Krista Varantola
Ville and Pia Vuolanto
Simo Örmä

# Introduction

*Jussi Rantala*

Cultural identity has become a much-discussed topic among ancient historians, particularly from the 1990s onwards.[1] As we can notice from previous research, there is no straightforward answer to the question, 'what is identity'; in fact, it is practically impossible to define such an abstract concept as 'identity' empirically. However, in social and cultural studies, definitions of course can – and should be – attempted. One means to understanding identify is to define it as 'an abstract concept associated with the loyalty of an individual to a larger group, based on cultural, national, political, sexual, or other similar grounds'.[2] Likewise, both collective and individual identities can be seen as 'ascribed or negotiated characteristics which a person or group is agreed to possess'.[3] We can perhaps draw from different definitions a conclusion that identity is a concept which describes how individuals or groups understand themselves as unique entities, separated from other individuals and/or groups. Culturally, this requires shared values, a 'set of assumptions and experiences [...] expressed by following certain common practices or by employing accepted representations of mutual identity'.[4]

However, perhaps an even more important observation is that identity is not a fixed concept. This is the widely recognized norm in modern study, and deservedly so. People are constantly evaluating and re-evaluating their identities. While this process can take place in everyday life, it is particularly topical in times of crisis – collective or personal – or during other significant cultural, social, and political changes, or interference or influence from other individuals or groups, or other occasions as such.[5] Moreover, while we may admit that it is entirely possible for an individual

---

1    For the research on cultural identity of the 1990s, see, for example, Dench, 1995; Gruen, 1995; Laurence and Berry (eds.), 1998.
2    Rantala, 2017, p. 3.
3    Miles, 1999, p. 5.
4    Huskinson, 2000, p. 5.
5    See Sorensen, 2008, for discussion.

or a group to have one overarching identity, one that goes above all others in significance for her/him/them, there still is a large number of 'sub-identities' that exist. These are separate, sometimes changing, and even contradictory, emphasized in different ways during different times – often depending on context or where the individuals or groups are acting and evaluating themselves.[6] As a result, identity can be seen as a discourse – both at an individual and collective level. In this discourse, memory and tradition bring cohesion to identity; they create stories to which one as an individual or as a member of a community can identify. At the same time, those who are able to provide and explain these common stories for the members of their communities often become part of the same story themselves. As noticed by Helène Whittaker, being able to present abstract values, such as identity, in a tangible and perceivable manner, can be seen as a mark of authority and certain permanence among community.[7]

In all cultures, identities are very much shaped by the past. The world as we understand it, our culture, customs, values, and many other things important to us, are affected by facts and events which once were – or which we imagine once were. Regarding imagination of the past, we must of course refer to the classic study of Benedict Anderson (1983), in which he considered societies, such as nation-sates, as 'imagined communities': while most of the people living in the same state never meet and do not personally know each other, they still identify themselves to the same community and consider themselves as members of it. In fact, Anderson's idea of a state as 'imagined' has sometimes been misinterpreted as if he would point out that such communities are not 'real'. For Anderson, this seems not to be the main case; instead, he emphasizes that there are many 'imagined communities', national and other cultural communities among them, which admittedly can be based on historical and traditional myths, but which are nevertheless a social reality that affect our everyday lives in countless ways. Indeed, history and tradition, whether based on myths or not, are thus one of the most important foundations of all communities. These phenomena of the past, as we understand them, are preserved by memory (*memoria*), both at an individual and communal level; both individuals and cultures alike have their own ways of remembering.[8]

---

6    Smith, 1991.
7    Whittaker, 2011, p. 1. See also Sorensen, 2008, p. 21.
8    See e.g. Assmann, 2006; Connerton, 1989; Halbwachs, 1992; Whittaker, 2011. Particularly Assmann, building on Halbwach's classic study, points out the significance of memory both as a social and individual phenomenon.

Ancient Romans were of no exception to this process. In fact, even if memory is an important part of all societies and cultures explaining and understanding their identity, one may argue that this is especially true with the Romans. As Alain Gowing has stated, Romans held *memoria* in such importance that it can be traced in 'almost every aspect of their existence'. It was present in both public and private celebrations, at funerals and religious festivals, and can be traced in speeches, public monuments, and other pieces of art, architecture, or literature.[9] The power of *memoria* for Roman political life can be noticed already in the Republican period, as the memory of famous members of noble families was celebrated after their deaths by monuments and lavish celebrations. The political significance of this practice became even more important in Imperial times. Political authority was concentrated among fewer individuals, and, as a result, nobility that was wealthy but lacked direct political power tried to obtain more influence in society by demonstrating their might and influence in celebrating, for example, the legacy of their famous dead relatives in a more and more grandiose manner.[10] Another famous example of the significance of *memoria* in Roman political life, from the Republic all the way to the Late Antiquity, is the practice of *damnatio memoriae*, the erasing of the memory of an emperor or other person considered as a traitor from public monuments, and thus from public *memoria*.[11] After all, the power of memory not only consists of choosing what to remember, but also of choosing what to forget.[12]

Speaking of the Roman Empire, the 'providers' of collective memories are of course often understood as emperors and other members of the Imperial circle. However, this is naturally only part of the story within the vast entity known as Roman Empire. The subjects actively shaped society around them as well, creating new significance to their own identities based on various 'sub-identities', as mentioned above.[13] Thus, class, occupation, age, education, gender, and so on, were all important concepts to which individuals based

---

9    Gowing, 2005, pp. 1-2.

10   Larsson Lovén, 2011, pp. 128-129.

11   For *damnatio memoriae*, see e.g. Pekáry, 1985, pp. 134-142. Stewart, 1999, makes an interesting comparison between the ancient practice of *damnatio memoriae* and destruction of pagan statues by Christians in the fourth and fifth centuries CE, pointing out to continuity in cultural practices from Early to Late Roman Empire.

12   Flower, 2006, pp. 6-7. For memory in Rome, see also Galinsky, 2014, and Galinsky and Lapatin, 2016.

13   See Ando, 2010.

their identities on and, at the same time, affected the society surrounding the people dealing with these questions. As Janet Huskinson notices:

> Cultural identities are very much to do with relationships and how we perceive ourselves and each other in terms of particular social signifiers: for example, do we work on similarity or difference? Gender is one instance where this kind of relativity is used to shape identities, and in many recent studies of Roman women notions of 'same' and 'other' have provided useful key to understanding the construction and dynamic of their social roles.[14]

Gender is indeed a significant question when we deal with identities in the Roman world, particularly because of the highly patriarchal nature of Roman society. This key feature of Roman *communitas* is, of course, assessed by many studies already; the most well-known phenomena considering 'male-orientation' of the Roman world is probably the limited authority of women set by Roman law, leading to the official exclusion of women from many public and private duties. And yet, the significance of gender was much broader than that. It was present both as a legal and as an 'unofficial' entity in all spheres of the Roman Empire, from Imperial circles to the lowest strata of the society; it can be traced in Roman literature, composed by the elite for the elite, but also in other sources revealing practices of everyday life. Gender affected, from its own part, the ways Romans acted, how they remembered, and, as a result, how they built their identities.[15]

Thus, this collection of papers focuses on the interaction between gender, memory, and identity in the Roman world. The aim of the volume is to underline how this interaction took place all over within Roman society, taking many forms and including a wide range of practices. Moreover, the papers of the collection demonstrate that this was a continuous process, affecting social and political life of the Roman world for centuries. Accordingly, some of the chapters focus on Imperial politics and the role of the emperors and people close to them in the process, while others deal with the lower strata of society, with the time-span of discussion reaching from the Early Empire (first century CE) to the Late Antiquity, and even beyond that.

Indeed, when reading the various papers of this volume, we should always keep in mind that concepts such as 'Early Empire' or 'Late Antiquity' are

---

14   Huskinson, 1999, p. 190.
15   For sex and gender in Antiquity, see e.g. Montserrat, 2000; Nelson, 2007; Williams, 2010; Masterson, Rabinowitz and Robson, 2015; Foxhall, 2013.

often artificial by their very nature. Of course, one can admit that there are some understandable practical reasons behind these classifications. The continuous political and military troubles of most of the third century CE (from the end of the Severan Dynasty to the beginning of the reign of Diocletian), combined with the considerable lack of evidence from the same period, provide a 'natural' borderline between the early and later period of the Roman Empire. Moreover, the emergence of the 'Christian Empire' from Constantine the Great on has appeared as a period in which new intellectual values, provided by the Christian faith, affected the socio-political life of the Empire.[16] Thus, all of this leads to a temptation of overstating the change in the Empire and highlight the polarity between the Empire before, and after, Constantine. However, while new values and ideas undoubtedly took place and gradually affected Roman society, the totality of change should not be exaggerated. On the contrary, when we evaluate periods such as the Late Antiquity we should be rather careful not to see them as completely different cultural time spans.[17] After all, when we notice some new cultural, religious, political, social, and other kinds of changes taking place in the Later Roman Empire, we must also remember that adaptation of new ideas was a continuous process itself. Already from the Republican period on, and possibly even before that, Romans took lots of influence from neighbouring peoples such as the Etruscans and Greeks. One may even claim that, in accepting foreign customs and adapting them appropriately, we are at the very heart of Roman culture – although we should be careful not to exaggerate this aspect either. While Romans probably were more inclusive of outsiders compared, for example, to Greeks, they also regulated foreign influences and excluded them from some areas of their society and culture.[18] All in all, both continuity and change always existed, side by side, in ancient Rome.

The first articles of this volume focus on women's position in Roman society, from Early to Late Empire. As mentioned above, Roman society was, at least in principle, a highly patriarchal system, particularly if evaluated just from the legal point of view. According to Gillian Clark, for example, femaleness was generally a disadvantage in Late Antiquity; she also mentions that while Christianity did give some new possibilities for women to act

16    Clark, 1993, p. 1.
17    See e.g. Miles, 1999, p. 3. The cultural continuity from Early to Late Antiquity is stressed in many articles of the same volume (edited by Miles); see especially Huskinson, 1999; Morales, 1999; Stewart, 1999.
18    Huskinson, 2000, p. 12.

in society, it is hard to notice that Christianity as such made people think women in more positive light or treat them better: 'Christian teaching could either reinforce or subvert traditional beliefs about women – and it could use the traditional beliefs to construct Christian teaching'.[19]

This is, on a general level, a valid claim as such. On the other hand, if we take a closer look to sources dealing with 'lower' levels of Roman Empire, we can notice at least some possibilities for women to participate in public life of the society. While examining this 'lower' strata of ancient societies is challenging, and traces of women's activity particularly hard to find, some insight into the general picture of such is possible through material evidence. As shown by Ville Vuolanto in his article, while this evidence is also culture-bound and thus plays down the role of women in public life, it still provides glimpses and hints of women acting in various important roles in society, receiving even authority among their local communities. In other words, while particularly public monuments and memorials, as well as elite literature, were bound to the patriarchal patterns of Roman society – thus mostly lacking descriptions of memorable deeds of women – the actions of women can be traced in civic and commercial everyday life, implying civic activity on behalf of females; considering the cultural context, even small details pointing out to women's authority should be understood as significant factors. Using sources such as papyri and epigraphy, Vuolanto's article thus reminds us that we should not simply evaluate the role of women in society using the most visible evidence, as the reality behind the surface seems to be much more complicated than expressed in the rather patriarchal 'official' documents and thus in the most visible public memory.

The significance of inscriptions and other public monuments is obviously most evident when we see them commemorating emperors and their family members. However, we can also trace their importance to outside the Imperial context. Religious inscriptions in particular had a considerable significance in this aspect. For example, cultic sanctuaries around the Mediterranean world were, according to Ian Rutherford (1998), grounds for 'contesting the sacred'; in other words, people of different backgrounds coming from different places to sacred sites competed with each other to find a place as central as possible to erect their own honorary inscriptions. This 'fight' indicates the significance of religious inscriptions and the messages they conveyed for the groups or individuals erecting them. Regarding gender, religious inscriptions and the memory they carry provide a particularly

---

19    Clark, 1993, p. 119; 140. See also Cameron, 1993, pp. 148-151, for a bit more positive picture of the impact of Christianity on women in Antiquity.

interesting case, as they are one of the best ways to find answers to the question of a woman's role and identity in civic life. Roman culture, highly patriarchal by nature, limited in many ways the role in public life of women. However, there were exceptions, religious life providing some of them, particularly because of the very 'gendered' nature of Roman religious system. For Romans, harmony and balance was an essential feature of *pax deorum*, peace of the gods, and to maintain this balance, both men and women were needed. Thus, religion was one sphere of public life where women had a chance to be active and achieve an acknowledged position.[20] Marja-Leena Hänninen evaluates this religious activity of women in the harbour city of Ostia, as witnessed by epigraphic evidence, and investigates the ways women might have constructed their civic identities in a male-dominated society. The paper points out that these cults were particularly useful for women below the elite class; while females of the upper class could receive social distinction in other ways as well, such as by having monuments erected to honour them, by participating in cults women of the lower strata could find a recognized position among their community. Moreover, even if Roman society was traditionally dominated by men, Hänninen observes that, while participating in cults, women in fact acted in a similar manner as men did, although it seems that the social position of a husband affected the position of his wife in the cult she participated in.

While we are able to obtain at least some information about women living and acting in local communities, mainly in cities and towns, there are of course a vast number of women who have not left any direct traces about their lives. The problem is most obvious when we leave urban spaces and examine the countryside instead. Mere numbers can show us that women involved in cultivation were not by any means an insignificant part of Roman society. Agriculture formed the most important part of ancient economy, and a vast number of people lived in the countryside, working the land. As Lena Larsson Lovén shows in her article, the number of sources available do not give a proper picture of their importance, as we have very little evidence about the everyday life of women in rural areas. As a result, we need to draw pieces of information from 'between the lines' of ancient writers, who represented an entirely different socio-political group than agrarian women and were not interested of the subject at all. Larsson Lovén demonstrates this as she traces women working in the Roman economy and their activities in agricultural work, using Roman literature as her source. Thus, she concentrates on those who were, as she indicates in her article,

---

20   See Mustakallio, 2013.

the most silent women in the ancient world. As her paper demonstrates, despite the scant evidence, we may nevertheless presume that the life of women in the countryside reflected the similar gender-based ideals, as was the case in other parts of the society; their role was as wives and mothers, under male authority.[21]

While not as often noticed as emperors and empresses, Imperial daughters as public figures were a female group of considerable importance for Roman society during the Late Empire. This is easy to notice, for example, by observing writings of Gregory of Nyssa, who described the hysteria aroused in Constantinople when seven (or perhaps eight) years old Pulcheria, daughter of Emperor Theodosius and Empress Aelia Flavia Flaccilla, died in 385 CE:

> They filled the church and its forecourt, the square beyond, the alleyways and tenements, the *mesē* and the cross-streets, the open spaces atop buildings – all one could see was a mass of humanity, as if the whole world had rushed to a single place in its grief. And there one could view that sacred blossom brought forth on golden bier. How dejected were the faces of all who gazed upon her! How their eyes flowed with tears! They struck their hands together, and their keening too made known the pain filled their hearts.[22]

The importance of Imperial daughters (and, generally, children) is quite obvious as such: they represented symbolically the future and continuation of the Roman Empire. This idea was, of course, much older than Theodosian reign: it can be traced in practically every period of the Empire. Regarding this question, Sanna Joska takes a closer look to the public monuments honouring Imperial daughters during the second and third centuries CE. As Joska demonstrates, Imperial daughters were used by subjects of the emperor for their own, local, ends; honouring Imperial daughters signify remarkable activity and inventiveness by people at the local levels, even if they operated inside the cultural framework provided by Imperial power. Public monuments, and inscriptions particularly, are a significant source when tracing questions related to *memoria*; indeed, they were probably the most effective ways to preserve names, ideas, and values within public memory. The inscriptions communicated, of course, with those people

---

21   See Scheidel, 1995.
22   *Oratio consolatorio in Pulcheriam* (ed. by Spira), pp. 461-63 (adapted from Holum, 1982, pp. 21-22). Translations from Greek and Latin in this volume are made by the authors of the articles, unless otherwise stated.

who could read, but their significance went beyond, as they created and transmitted messages also through their physical presence. Public monuments were important not only because of the text they contained but also because of their size, beauty, and their location. Indeed, it was often precisely their location, which conveyed messages to those who could not read the actual message these monuments included. They told a story simply by being situated at important sites in the cities, next to other monuments celebrating historical and significant public deeds, and, at the same time, were bonded with these earlier statues and inscriptions, constructing a continuous story from past to present. This was an important factor in the process of building and maintaining a public identity. As pointed out in the classic study by Maurice Halbwachs, societies need landmarks.[23] By erecting monuments to honour the Imperial family, local people took part in local political discourses, shaped society and their own position as part of it, and as such, shaped their identity as members of their communities.

The first part of the volume has thus mostly dealt with females. However, while so called gender studies have sometimes tended to concentrate on women, it should be noted that men, manliness, and masculinity are of course also important aspects regarding questions about gender. As Dominic Montserrat has noticed, there has been a tendency to ignore the difference between concepts of (biological) sex and (cultural) gender, which sometimes has led to the situation where gender was associated almost automatically to something dealing with women.[24] And yet, masculinity did matter – even at the upmost levels of the Empire. Indeed, we may even argue that masculinity and manly virtues were one of the very cornerstones of Roman identity. Two concepts, *virtus* and *imperium,* underline this in particular. The first one, etymologically meaning 'manliness', pointed to the moral virtues of Roman men, often considered being opposite to 'women's vices', such as being mentally soft or unrestrained. *Imperium*, the rule or dominion, was related to *virtus*. It referred to the essential hierarchy as understood by the Romans, including a master's rule over a slave, man's rule over women, and rule of the magistrates over Roman people. However, this went also to the cultural level; it pointed out how Romans should rule foreign peoples and maintain control over 'barbarians'; in a similar manner a man should

---

23   See Halbwachs, 1992. Jan Assmann goes even further. As he mentions that Halbwachs concentrated on 'living memory', he himself wants to put more emphasis on the significance of historical tradition for cultural memory and, thus, for cultural identity. See Assmann, 2006, pp. 8-9. For inscriptions as preservers of *memoria* in Ancient Rome, see e.g. Bodel, 2001, pp. 23-27; Eastmond, 2015; Miles, 2000, pp. 50-51.
24   Montserrat, 2000, pp. 161-162.

remain in control over a woman.[25] The most striking evidence of this is the attitude of Roman historians to certain unpopular emperors; for them, the ultimate way to defame the reputation of a ruler was to describe him as an effeminate, woman-like figure unfit to act as a man, and thus unfit to rule the Empire and foreign peoples. In other words, unfit to be included in Imperial identity.[26]

In the rather masculine cultural memory of Romans, warfare and military virtues had a special place. Already from the Republican period, they were an important part of Roman self-understanding. Great deeds in war dominated the visual culture and literature of Early Rome, ensuring that the culture of memory remained rather masculine. And while during the Imperial era the actual army was composed mostly of soldiers drafted from the non-Italian people of the Empire, it is interesting to observe that martial manliness, signified by military metaphors as part of Roman cultural life and other such values, remained a central part of Roman masculinity all the way to the end of the Western Empire.[27] The legendary figure of Alexander the Great, a Macedonian King, but also a hero with an immense value for Roman culture, is a perfect example how masculinity, and particularly the militaristic values connected to it, remained in the Roman collective memory through the centuries.[28] Jaakkojuhani Peltonen points out in his article how *memoria* of Alexander as a manly, masculine figure was used all the way up to the Late Antiquity, and even beyond, to promote and strengthen identities of elite males and entire groups of people. Alexander's masculinity was also an important part of the intellectual debate within the Late Antiquity, where Christianity and paganism were compared and evaluated as a part of the contemporary cultural discourse. On the other hand, we can also try to trace continuity among groups socially, culturally, and politically quite distant from legendary heroes such as Alexander; indeed, we have already noticed how one way to define identity was 'ascribed or negotiated characteristics which a person or group is agreed to possess'.

While the starting-point of this collection is that individuals – not only emperors but also local elites and even ordinary people – actively shaped society, we must of course also recognize that Imperial politics indeed affected all strata of society and contributed to the local identities. In fact,

---

25   Williams, 2010, pp. 145-151.
26   The most famous cases are probably Emperors Elagabalus and Nero; see e.g. Rantala (forthcoming).
27   See e.g. Kuefler, 1995, pp. 37-45; Hänninen, 2011, pp. 42-43; Hahn, 2017, pp. 36-37.
28   For Alexander as a part of Roman culture, see e.g. Spencer, 2002.

as obvious as this sounds, it is a detail surprisingly often forgotten. While many modern studies have concentrated on highlighting how provincial people, particularly local elites, actively chose what to adopt from Roman cultural elements and what to ignore,[29] the Imperial power and its will to exercise this power have been, in recent studies, an 'elephant in the room', clearly present but still ignored, as mentioned by Vanacker & Zuiderhoek.[30] Thus, when we evaluate the cultural values and identities of the Roman Empire, we cannot ignore the significance of the emperors, particularly that of Augustus. Indeed, it was particularly during the period of Augustus when the basis for Roman Imperial identity, all the way to Late Empire, was created; it was Augustus who created the cultural framework in which both Imperial as well as local actors participated for hundreds of years. However, while this Augustan cultural framework was new, built by the civil war that collapsed the Republic, it was also related to the old values and concepts; both continuity and change were an important part of the process. One prime example is the concept of citizenship. As one of the most important markers of Roman identity, being a citizen was traditionally used to refer to having the right to vote. However, from the reign of Augustus on, this aspect of citizenship was pushed to the background and the cultural, symbolic value of being a citizen was highlighted instead. Here, we can notice some kind of a paradox; while Augustus practically pushed for a more or less autocratic system, he celebrated, among other values, citizenship – a concept traditionally associated to a subject's right to politically act within the city-state. This was essentially what Augustan 'revolution' was all about; emphasizing old ideas and values but, at the same time, giving them suitable significance in order to strengthen the new political reality.[31] Naturally, it was Augustus himself who appears as the central figure of this new age. However, despite the certain uniqueness of Augustus' figure in Roman history, he was also a Roman man, and as such bound to various cultural expectations. This situation is evident in the paper of Mary Harlow and Ray Laurence. As the article points out, the expectations and ideas related to the qualities of a Roman man followed Augustus throughout his early life. As these expectations formed the basis of discourses about one's deeds in Roman culture and society, we might read Augustus' *Res Gestae*, an inscription erected throughout the Roman Empire describing his achievements, as a new reference point given by the emperor referring to his youth. In

29   See e.g. Webster, 2001; Hingley, 2010.
30   Vanacker and Zuiderhoek, 2017, p. 2.
31   Wallace-Hadrill, 2008, pp. 452-453.

other words, it can be considered as a 'cultural transmission' to the youth of Augustus' own day and the future generations evaluating his deeds and response to the expectations of being a young Roman man. Augustus thus provides quite a unique, personal view to the question of what it actually meant to be a young man in Roman culture.

As mentioned above, memory is a crucial aspect in the process of building identity. Among cultures and individuals, we can notice many different, sometimes crude or often very elaborate, ways that memory is preserved. Large communities such as states do this, for example, with historical accounts and monuments celebrating past deeds, public festivals commemorating historical events, and so on. However, a somewhat similar process can also be traced among individuals. Dresses, personal memorabilia, established behaviour in certain stages of life, or one's role in different family celebrations, can all bind an individual to the memory and tradition of her/ his own, thus shaping one person's identity. The next articles of the volume thus concentrate on building cultural identities in the Roman Empire, both by literature covering the (imagined) past as well as by more concrete, material objects, used by individual members of the society.

While the memory of the past affected Augustus and his public figure, as explained by Harlow & Laurence, this was also true regarding values in the wider cultural sphere of Augustan Rome. Moreover, when we take a closer look at Augustan literature and the tales they tell about Roman past, we notice that gender is indeed a topic very much dealt with by authors such as Horace, Ovid, and Virgil. This is not surprising, as 'returning to proper morals of old' was one of the central themes in Augustan policies, as indicated, for example, by the moral laws instituted by the emperor.[32] In Jussi Rantala's paper, we focus on one example of a story, preserved in public memory by Augustan writers, that connects gender values and Roman identity closely together – the story of Carthaginian Anna, sister of Queen Dido. As Rantala shows, this figure of the past was fitted to the cultural atmosphere of the Augustan period by combining her memory with Augustan values, particularly marriage and a woman's role in relation to her husband, thus promoting values central for Roman cultural identity as it was understood in the contemporary cultural context. However, the article also shows that Roman authors – in this case Ovid and Virgil – took their own, rather independent approach to the subject, while remaining within the Augustan cultural and political framework. They actively operated in the context given by contemporary politics, taking part in intellectual and

---

32   Augustan moral laws: see Raaflaub and Samons, 1990, pp. 434-435.

political discussion regarding the grand themes of their day, but still held their own views, attitudes, and interpretations.[33]

As we have seen in some of the previous papers, inscriptions are perhaps the most important source when dealing with gender, memory, and identity among the lower social classes of the Empire. However, there is other material evidence as well that can tell something about the interaction and significance of our three key concepts. Regarding identity, we have already noticed the symbolic value of things such as public monuments and celebrations for collective identity; these were, and are, very concrete and powerful ways for a community to define itself, and remind them of who they are. However, we may also find at the individual level many tangible, even visual, elements referring to one's identity. A physical appearance is the most obvious of these. Things such as dress and jewellery can identify an individual and place her/him in a cultural, historical, or geographical context. Dress can also point to one's membership in a community but, on the other hand, differentiate her/him and rest of the members of the same group; it can be both inclusive and exclusive. Moreover, while dress may indicate one's social position in her/his community, gender identification is also part of this general process.[34] Romans indeed believed in the significance of dress for one's identity. The most famous example is probably the toga, a garment separating Romans, *gens togati,* from non-Romans, such as *pallati* (those who wore pallium, associated with Greeks) and *bracati* (those who wore trousers, non-Romans and non-Greeks who lived outside 'civilized' world). The Roman term *a toga ad pallium*, from toga to pallium, is a perfect example of the significance of one's dress related to her/his social status, as Romans used this phrase to describe one's sinking from a higher to lower position in society.[35] However, while togas might be the best-known garments we know of, we can also trace other examples where dress and other decorations signified the identity of an individual and her/his place in Roman society. This is shown in Ria Berg's article, where she takes a closer look at women working in Roman bars and inns, and the female dresses used in this context. Utilizing not only literary evidence but also iconographic material and jewellery, Berg demonstrates how clothing not only was used to express

---

33   Galinsky, 1996, pp. 244-246.

34   Barnes and Eicher, 1992, p. 2. Dresses were also an important part of Roman collective identity as part of iconography. For example, we can notice (female) figures in Roman art and coinage representing different provinces, dressed in clothes with cultural associations to the province in question; we can observe dresses and individual garments worn by gods representing ideas important for Roman *communitas*; and so on. See Huskinson, 2000, pp. 8-9.

35   Harlow, 2004, p. 47.

one's identity and status, but also how various objects of the Roman bars and inns, combined with dresses and jewellery worn by female workers, might have created together a context where cultural memories of the past, such as old mythological stories, were brought to life. At the same time, all of this indicates how significant cultural identity based on distant stories could have been for the people of lower strata of society, even if discussions on Roman cultural identity often remained in Imperial or other higher level of Roman *communitas*.

Last three articles of this volume take a closer look on gender, memory, and identity in a longer time-span, that is, as part of continuity and change. Thus, they widen the scope and tackle broader questions taking place from Early to Late Antiquity, sometimes even beyond that. In Late Antiquity, many old structures from the earlier period survived. Central administrative and governing system, with people paying taxes to that system and expecting security in exchange, continued to exist (with occasional disturbances, of course) until late fifth century CE, and in the eastern part of the Empire much longer still. In addition, cities continued to provide urban culture, something that many contemporaries saw as the backbone of civilization. Overall, the state structures of Early and High Roman Empire more or less survived, and with it, a large part of the traditional high culture. On the other hand, while Christian authors were part of Classical, pre-Christian culture as well, Christianity undeniably bought new ideals and ways of learning to Roman intellectual life and affected in other levels of society as well.[36]

Indeed, considering continuity and change in Roman society, we may claim that nowhere was their coexistence more evident than in religious life, making whole subject much more complex than it may first look like.[37] Marxiano Melotti's article on the cult of Saint Lucia provides an interesting view precisely on this aspect. As Melotti points out, the (Greek) cult of Demeter and her daughter Kore in the island of Sicily was pivotal in the building of a local and regional political identity. As the cult was later affected by Roman and Christian cultures, it resulted in a transformation of political, cultural, and religious practices. Thus, the figure of the Christian Saint Lucia eventually acquired some elements and functions of the ancient cult of Greek goddesses; the new cult metabolized the Greek ideas of death

---

36   Cameron, 1993, pp. 128-151.

37   Perhaps the most well-known example is the question of ancient monotheism. While it is sometimes claimed that what essentially distinguished Christians from pagans was that Christians believed in one God, while pagans worshipped a multiple of gods. However, even a question as basic as this is much more complicated; both polytheism and monotheism in Antiquity had many forms and aspects. For discussion, see Athanassiadi and Frede, 1999.

and fertility, and contributed to define a new identity for the Christian community. Despite this, we cannot simply read this as a transformation of pre-Christian cults into Christian ones. As Melotti demonstrates, the transformation was much more complicated, taking place in a very long time-span with various phenomena affecting the process. Thus, the article for its own part demonstrates the co-existence of continuity and change but also their complexity in Graeco-Roman culture through the centuries, from pre-Christian to Christian era; indeed, the article even reveals a surprising connection to Scandinavia and modern Sweden, emphasising precisely the complexity of ideas and beliefs carried out through the centuries.

As the Roman Empire grew, Imperial identity was naturally a question which emperors needed to tackle. Empire-wise, one of the most prominent issues considering cultural identity was the question of Greek culture as a part of the Roman world. Particularly, in the second and third centuries CE, we can observe a vivid discussion about 'Greekness' and its relationship with Roman culture, for example when Diogenes Laertius defended the Greek origins of philosophy. Moreover, writers such as Philostratus dealt with many distinctly Greek traditions, and some Greek historians, such as Herodian, apparently took an active part in the debate among the Greek elite on the cultural position of Greece, to mention just a few examples. Even early Christian writers such as Clement of Alexandria or Hippolytus took place in the debate about Greek culture and its relationship with philosophy, while Jewish intellectuals, in the footsteps of Josephus, tried to define their identity in relationship with the Greek culture that was dominant in the eastern part of the Mediterranean.[38] The reign of Emperor Hadrian (117-138), an enthusiast of Greek culture and history, can be considered as a crucial period regarding the cultural identity of Roman Greece. In her article, Arja Karivieri deals with the multifaceted identities promoted by Hadrian. She explains how this process reflects the identities of the leading figures of the Empire, including Hadrian himself, his wife Vibia Sabina, and his lover Antinoos, but also how the promotion of multiple identities affected local society in Roman Greece. The article thus demonstrates the significance of Imperial policy, particularly the example provided by public figures of Imperial family members, in the cultural change throughout the Empire.[39] Moreover, as Karivieri shows, this Hadrianic-era process continued in Late Antiquity. Mythic heroes of the Graeco-Roman past were compared

---

38   Whitmarsh, 2007, pp. 38-43. See also Sidebottom, 2007, pp. 80-81.
39   For the significance of Imperial couple as an example to their subjects, see also e.g. Rantala, 2017.

with Christian heroes, both in private country estates as well as in public monuments, such as the Arch of Constantine; this process created linkages from the past to the present and created new identity by using historical memory. Theory-wise, the paper deals with four contexts in which memories are constructed: representations, places, rituals, and texts, demonstrating how the using of these four was a continuous process, from Early to Late Roman Empire.

As a final observation, it would perhaps be pertinent to emphasize that often persons or groups who are labelled to certain categories according to their characteristics are usually not asked if they actually do agree to possess these characteristics; identities are often defined from the outside, by others. This practice was not unfamiliar in ancient societies. Roman literature, for example, is full of ethnic stereotypes about foreign nations and their 'un-Roman' habits.[40] Ancient Greeks were perhaps even stricter in this classification. As has been stressed by Paul Cartledge (1993), a polarization between 'us' and 'them' was at the very heart of the Greek culture, appearing in practice as ideological polar oppositions such as Greeks versus barbarians, citizens versus foreigners, free men versus slaves, and, indeed, men versus women. In other words, while identity often is about defining who you are and to which group you identify yourself, one aspect of identity is also identifying other people or groups to certain categories. These objects of identification are often precisely the 'silent ones' of the society, those without an opportunity to express their views. Christian Laes deals with one such group, the mentally disabled, and traces labels of 'madmen' in Mediterranean culture through a long-time period. As was the case with women in ancient agriculture, tracing gender issues is particularly difficult, as women were among the most silent groups of ancient societies, and indeed the mentally impaired women surely were the most silent ones among all the silent. Generally, while the Late Antiquity can be seen as a turning point considering hospitals as institutions of mentally impaired in general, accounts of 'madmen' in ancient tradition as a whole tend to highlight the goodwill of rulers or other significant figures, instead of telling the story of those people actually suffering with mental illness. The accounts thus continued the somewhat moralizing tradition of historical and other accounts, used to carry deeds of great men in public memory. In this tradition, the 'lesser' people were, for hundreds of years, kept very silent indeed and were subjects of identification at best – that is, if somebody bothered to identify them at all.

40   See Isaac, 2004.

This volume is not a definitive analysis on the relationships and interaction between gender, memory, and identity in Roman world, but provides case studies from as wide a range as possible. It shows the variety of possible points of view, providing examples for using many types of sources – both written and material evidence – to further approach the question. Of course, all the key concepts provide a rich, separate research tradition of their own. As mentioned, identity and difference have formed an active field of research from at least the 1990s on, expanding from the previous study of approaching ancient literature and other sources as plain, empirical 'data' to an idea of ancient texts as expressions of 'cultural forces', closely connected to the place and time in which they were created and thus with their own significances and meanings. Questions of memory have been an important part of identity studies; as mentioned, identities are built on foundations provided by the understanding of the past. Moreover, gender studies have obviously been a lively part of ancient studies for decades as well, expanding from something located quite strictly in the sphere of women to questions of masculinity and femininity, 'gender-blending', sexuality, and so on. However, the interaction of these three is mostly dealt with in only a few separate articles over the years, with a systematic approach more or less lacking.[41] Thus, this collection for its own part fills a gap in modern research. Here, the contributors have explored what they consider important aspects regarding the subject. Moreover, the articles of the volume present a wide range of theoretical and methodical possibilities to study gender, memory, and identity, and their interaction in Roman world. Using both material and textual evidence, the papers deal with social historical, even microhistorical, problems, as well as questions related to literary analysis, comparative approach, and so on. All in all, this collection will hopefully encourage a much-needed further study of inter-linkages between the three crucial concepts that considerably shaped the Roman Empire and its culture through the centuries.

41   Some research is available, though; see e.g. Huskinson, 1999; Whittaker (ed.), 2011; Revell, 2015. Obviously, there is a large number of research combining two of the three concepts dealt with here; see the works cited in individual articles of this volume.

# Bibliography

Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983).

Clifford Ando, 'Imperial identities', in *Local knowledge and microidentities in the imperial Greek world*, ed. by Tim Whitmarsh (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010), pp. 17-45.

Jan Assmann, *Religion and Cultural Memory: Ten Studies* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006).

Polymnia Athanassiadi and Michael Frede, ed., *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

Ruth Barnes and Joanne Eicher, ed., *Dress and Gender: Making and Meaning* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992).

John Bodel, ed., *Epigraphic Evidence. Ancient History from Inscriptions* (London: Routledge, 2001).

Averil Cameron, *The Mediterranean World in Late Antiquity AD 395-600* (London: Routledge, 1993).

Eva Cantarella, 'Fathers and Sons in Rome', *Classical World*, 96:3 (2003), 281-298.

Paul Cartledge, *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

Gillian Clark, *Women in Late Antiquity. Pagan and Christian Life-styles* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).

Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

Emma Dench, *From Barbarians to New Men. Greek, Roman and Modern Perceptions of the Central Apennines* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).

Suzanne Dixon, *The Roman Mother* (Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988).

Suzanne Dixon, *The Roman Family* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992).

Antony Eastmond, *Viewing Inscriptions in the Late Antique and Medieval World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

Harriet Flower, *The Art of Forgetting. Disgrace and Oblivion in Roman Political Culture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).

Lin Foxhall, *Studying Gender in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

Karl Galinsky, *Augustan Culture. An Interpretive Introduction* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).

Karl Galinsky, ed., *Memoria Romana: Memory in Rome and Rome in Memory* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2014).

Karl Galinsky and Kenneth Lapatin, ed., *Cultural Memories in the Roman Empire* (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2016).

Jane Gardner, *Being a Roman Citizen* (London: Routledge, 1993).

Alain Gowing, *Empire and Memory: The Representation of Roman Republic in Imperial Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Erich Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995).

Johannes Hahn, 'Rituals of killing: public punishment, *munera* and the dissemination of Roman values and ideology in the *Imperium Romanum*, in *Imperial Identities in the Roman World*, ed. by Wouter Vanacker and Arjan Zuiderhoek (London: Routledge, 2017), pp. 16-35.

Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992).

Mary Harlow, 'Clothes maketh the man: power dressing and elite masculinity in the later Roman world', in *Gender in the Early Medieval World. East and West, 300-900*, ed. by Leslie Brubaker and Julia Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 44-69.

Richard Hingley, 'Cultural diversity and unity: Empire and Rome', in *Material culture and social identities in the ancient world*, ed. by Shelley Hales and Tamar Hodos (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 54-75.

Kenneth Holum, *Theodosian Empresses. Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982).

Janet Huskinson, 'Women and learning: gender and identity in scenes of intellectual life on late Roman sarcophagi', in *Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity*, ed. by Richard Miles (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 189-213.

Janet Huskinson, 'Looking for Identity and Power', in *Experiencing Rome. Culture, Identity and Power in the Roman Empire*, ed. by Janet Huskinson (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 3-27.

Marja-Leena Hänninen, 'Juno Regina and Roman Matrons', in *Female Networks and Public Sphere in Roman Society*, ed. by Päivi Setälä and Liisa Savunen (Rome: Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, 1999), pp. 39-52.

Benjamin Isaac, *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004).

Mathew Kuefler, *The Manly Eunuch. Masculinity, Gender Ambiguity and Christian Ideology in Late Antiquity* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995).

Lena Larsson Lovén, 'The Importance of Being Commemorated: Memory, Gender, and Social Class in Roman Funerary Monuments', in *In Memoriam: Commemoration, Communal Memory and Gender Values in the Ancient Graeco-Roman World*, ed. by Helène Whittaker (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011), pp. 126-143.

Ray Laurence and Joanne Berry, ed., *Cultural Identity in the Roman Empire* (London: Routledge, 1998).

Mark Masterson, Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz and James Robson, ed., *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World* (New York: Routledge, 2015).

Richard Miles, ed., *Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity* (London: Routledge, 1999).

Richard Miles, 'Communicating culture, identity and power', in *Experiencing Rome. Culture, Identity and Power in the Roman Empire*, ed. by Janet Huskinson (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 29-62.

Dominic Montserrat, 'Reading gender in the Roman world', in *Experiencing Rome. Culture, Identity and Power in the Roman Empire*, ed. by Janet Huskinson (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 153-181.

Helen Morales, 'Gender and identity in Musaeus' *Hero and Leander*', in *Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity*, ed. by Richard Miles (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 41-69.

Katariina Mustakallio, 'The Life Cycle: from Birth to Old Age', in *A Cultural History of Women in Antiquity*, ed. by Janet Tullock, (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), pp. 15-32.

Sarah Nelson, *Women in Antiquity: Theoretical Approaches to Gender and Archaeology* (Rowman Altamira: Lanham, 2007).

Thomas Pekáry, *Das römische Kaiserbildnis in Staat, Kult und Gesellschaft: Dargestellt Anhand der Schriftquellen* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1985).

Kurt Raaflaub and Loren Samons, 'Opposition to Augustus', in *Between Republic and Empire. Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate*, ed. by Kurt Raaflaub and Mark Toher (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), pp. 417-454.

Jussi Rantala, *The* Ludi Saeculares *of Septimius Severus: The Ideologies of a New Roman Empire* (London: Routledge, 2017).

Jussi Rantala, 'Ruling in the Purple... and wearing Make-up. Gendered Adventures of Emperor Elagabalus as seen by Cassius Dio and Herodian', in *Exploring Gender Diversity in the Ancient World*, ed. by Jennifer Dyer and Allison Surtees (Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh, forthcoming).

Louise Revell, *Ways of Being Roman: Discourses of Identity in the Roman West* (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2015).

Ian Rutherford, 'Islands of the Extremity: Space, Language and Power in the Pilgrimage Traditions of *Philae*', in *Pilgrimage and Holy Space in Late Antique Egypt*, ed. by David Frankfurter (Leiden: Brill, 1998), pp. 227-256.

Walter Scheidel, 'The Most Silent Women of Greece and Rome: Rural Labour and Women's Life in the Ancient World', *Greece and Rome,* 42:2 (1995), 202-217.

Harry Sidebottom, 'Severan historiography: evidence, patterns, and arguments', in *Severan Culture*, ed. by Simon Swain, Stephen Harrison and Jas Elsner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 52-82.

Anthony Smith, *National Identity* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1991).

Jorgen Sorensen, 'A Theory of Ritual', in *Religion and Society. Rituals, Resources and Identity in the Ancient Graeco-Roman World*, ed. by Anders Rasmussen and Susanne Rasmussen (Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 2008), pp. 13-21.

Diana Spencer, *The Roman Alexander. Reading a Cultural Myth* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2002).

Peter Stewart, 'The destruction of statues in late antiquity', in *Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity*, ed. by Richard Miles (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 159-189.

Yan Thomas, 'The *Division* of the *Sexes* in *Roman Law'. History of Women in the West, vol. 1: From Ancient Goddesses to Christian Saints*, ed. by Pauline Pantel (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1994), pp. 83-137.

Yan Thomas, 'Fathers as Citizens of Rome, Rome as a City of Fathers (Second Century BC-Second Century AD)', in *A History of the Family, Volume I: Distant Worlds, Ancient Worlds*, ed. by Andre Burguière, Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, Martine Segalen, and Françoise Zonabendand (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1996), pp. 228-269.

Wouter Vanacker and Arjan Zuiderhoek, ed., *Imperial Identities in the Roman World* (London: Routledge, 2017).

Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, *Rome's Cultural Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

Jane Webster, 'Creolizing the Roman Provinces', *American Journal of Archaeology*, 105 (2001), 209-225.

Tim Whitmarsh, 'Prose literature and the Severan dynasty', in *Severan Culture*, ed. by Simon Swain, Stephen Harrison and Jas Elsner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 29-51.

Helène Whittaker, ed., *In Memoriam: Commemoration, Communal Memory and Gender Values in the Ancient Graeco-Roman World* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011).

Craig Williams, *Roman Homosexuality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

## About the Author

Dr **Jussi Rantala** is a Researcher at the University of Tampere.