research to a wider chronological range, especially when one thinks about the extensive restoration works carried out across the city during the Severan period, and how the concept of innovative restoration may be applied to the interventions of Maxentius and Constantine in the urban fabric of the city in the early fourth century.

*Newcastle University* THEA RAVASI
thea.ravasi@newcastle.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435823000291

© *The Author(s), 2023. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.*

SOPHIA BÖNISCH-MEYER, *DIALOGANGEBOTE: DIE ANREDE DES KAISERS JENSEITS DER OFFIZIELLEN TITULATUR* (Impact of empire 39). Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2020. Pp. x + 625. ISBN 9789004443730. €125.00.

How should one talk about the Roman emperor? How should one address him? For people living in the Roman Empire, these questions were far less trivial than they may seem at first glance. An example from Asia Minor serves to illustrate: when the people of the Phrygian city of Hierapolis decided to honour Antoninus Pius with a statue sometime during his reign, the emperor's titulature on the statue base included the designation 'lord of the earth and the sea'. The original wording γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης δεσπότης was later changed by replacing δεσπότης with (probably) κύριος, a word that was considered more moderate and less harsh in expressing the emperor's position around the middle of the second century C.E. (*SEG* LIII 1463; see also T. Ritti, *Storia e istituzioni di Hierapolis* (2017), 425–6). Although there was an official form in the nomenclature of Roman emperors, known from administrative documents like imperial letters or military diplomas, there is plenty of evidence that subjects addressed emperors with formulations not present in the official imperial language, mostly by using honorary expressions that formed the so-called unofficial titulature of Roman emperors. It is in the very nature of things that the unofficial titulature of Roman emperors had generally a somewhat experimental character, and sometimes attempts to address the emperor were subsequently perceived as inappropriate for one reason or another, as in the case of the inscription from Hierapolis. One of the numerous merits of the book under review, Sophia Bönisch-Meyer's *Dialogangebote,* is its demonstration that the use of such formulations was subject to change over time. Some decades later, in the time of the Severans, applying the formulation γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης δεσπότης to Roman emperors had become a widespread practice in the Greek East of the Roman empire.

It might come as surprise that there has been less systematic analysis of the unofficial titulature of Roman emperors than one would expect. In studies of Roman emperorship, a top-down perspective has been counterbalanced by a bottom-up approach that has become increasingly relevant over the last three decades or so. Studies of perceptions and constructions of the emperors by their subjects are today no less important than those of the emperors' forms of self-fashioning towards the various groups of the empire's population, not least because current scholarship considers the self-representation of Roman emperors as either anticipating or reacting to the expectations of the addressees. Thus, B.-M.'s massive study on the unofficial imperial titulature from Augustus to Severus Alexander is a highly necessary and most welcome contribution to scholarship and resolves a true desideratum.

The book, originating in a Heidelberg doctoral thesis, is divided into three principal chapters (84–418), preceded by a long introduction (1–83) and followed by short conclusions (419–22). The nondescript heading 'Appendix: Tabellen 1–4' conceals a major resource for ancient historians working on Roman emperors: in four tables extending over more than 100 pages (423–536), B.-M. catalogues the literary, epigraphic, numismatic and papyrological evidence for the unofficial titulature of each Roman emperor in the period under consideration. A comprehensive bibliography (537–65) and a detailed index (566–625) conclude this invaluable study.

This contribution, resting upon a meticulous collection and careful analysis of the evidence, is well structured. The three major chapters ('Inoffizielle Epitheta in diachroner Perspektive', 84–208; 'Inoffizielle Epitheta im thematischen, medialen und funktionalen Kontext', 209–319;

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435823000278 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'Handlungsakteure', 320–418), focus on the evidence, its contexts and various actors, clearly showing the process of negotiation that framed the dialogue between Roman emperors and their various subject groups by the means of unofficial epitheta. B.-M. makes a crucial contribution to a field of research that took one of its starting points in Egon Flaig's 'system of acceptance' (E. Flaig, *Den Kaiser herausfordern. Die Usurpation im Römischen Reich* (1992, 2019[2]). Whereas Flaig restricted his analysis to groups relevant to the politics of becoming and remaining emperor, studies such as this new volume help to illuminate the wider integration of the Roman empire through the person of the emperor.

The estimable importance of B.-M.'s *Dialogangebote* might be highlighted by expressing the hope that her study might be followed by comparable works on imperial family members and usurpers in the future.

*University of Tübingen* MATTHIAS HAAKE
matthias.haake@uni-tuebingen.de
doi:10.1017/S0075435823000278

© *The Author(s), 2023. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.*

STEPHANIE PEARSON, *THE TRIUMPH AND TRADE OF EGYPTIAN OBJECTS IN ROME: COLLECTING ART IN THE ANCIENT MEDITERRANEAN* (Image and context 20). Berlin and Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2021. Pp. viii + 264, illus. ISBN 9783110700404. £91.00.

In this monograph, Stephanie Pearson looks at Egyptian material in Rome through the lens of Roman connoisseurial collecting culture, arguing that 'the Romans prized Egyptian art because it was art, and the Romans were art collectors' (4). In making this argument, P. aims to 1) change how scholars approach Egyptian material in Rome; 2) broaden our notion of 'Roman' art beyond the Graeco-Roman horizon; and 3) contribute to the art-historical paradigm shift toward valuing and studying luxury and decorative items alongside the traditional genres of sculpture and painting.

The book consists of six parts: an introduction, four central chapters and a brief conclusion. Part I critiques traditional approaches to Egyptian art in Rome as over-iconographical, mired in prejudices against 'copies' and decorative items, and therefore insensitive to the artistic merit of the material. Where prior scholarship has interpreted Egyptian art in Rome as religious, political or merely fashionable, P. proposes to see it *as art*: 'valuable cultural material, often of outstanding craftsmanship and beauty, and … used accordingly' (5). Part II showcases P.'s methodology by examining the depiction of Egyptian items in the frescoes of the Upper Cubiculum of the so-called House of Augustus and Cubiculum *b* of the Villa Farnesina. P. argues that Second-Style wall-paintings transform three-dimensional collector's items in consistent ways and that Egyptian material, like golden jewellery with pharaonic crown motifs, was subject to the same transformations as non-Egyptian, i.e. Greek, material. The frescoes thus furnish evidence that Roman connoisseurs treasured Egyptian luxury objects just as they did Greek.

Part III notes that these Egyptian objects suddenly appear in the material record around 35–25 B.C.E. and proposes Octavian's triple triumph of 29 B.C.E. as the reason. Once again the comparison with Rome's treatment of Greek objects is central: much as earlier triumphs had introduced the Roman people to Greek artworks and luxury goods, so too did Octavian's triumph whet the Roman appetite for Egyptian items, especially fine banqueting vessels and tables. Despite making this connection, however, P. insists that the Egyptian objects amassed in domestic contexts and showcased in frescoes did not carry triumphal or political significance. Part IV continues to investigate the historical mechanisms that made Egyptian material popular and available in Rome, turning to the trading networks that linked Rome to Alexandria and beyond. P. focuses on the textile trade, again using Roman wall-paintings as evidence for lost materials and for the Roman collector's love of things Egyptian. She also includes a brief digression on Indian goods that arrived in Italy through Egypt, noting that despite the brisk trade in other luxury items, the Romans never acquired a taste for Indian artwork. Evidently there was something special about Egyptian art rather than foreign art in general, which P. suggests 'may have [had] to do with a sense of well-being that the Romans associated with Egyptian art' (154).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435823000278 Published online by Cambridge University Press