The longer poetry of the period similarly engages the reader, through pictorial imagery, in the supplementation of narrative (Z. adduces here ps.-Theocritus, *Heracles Leontophonus*). The literary phenomenon parallel to the *Einfigurgruppe* in statuary is, of course, epigram, a genre that in its literary incarnation requires a great deal of supplementary work on the part of the reader.

'Reader or Viewer Integration' (Chapter 4) is likewise evidenced in both the sister arts. The famous *Boy with a Goose* (Pl. 23) invites the viewer to pick it up, while Hellenistic Aphrodites tantalize the viewer with barely-hidden vistas, rendering the viewer complicit in their falsely modest attempts to cover up. The sensation viewers must have felt in the presence of such statuary is achieved also in poetry: Nossis' 'behold!' (8 G-P) and Asclepiades' 'let's check out!' (35 G-P) are obvious instances of what Callimachus more subtly achieves in his highly-visual integration of the reader into the scenes set in his mimetic *Hymns to Apollo*, *to Athene*, and *to Demeter*.

In 'An Eye for the New' and 'Viewing Pleasure and Pain', the last chapters of *Modes of Viewing*, Z. forges beyond the relationship between viewing subject and viewed object onto more traditional ground covered by Fowler (above), noting that *Kleinwelt* depiction and the grotesque loom large as Hellenistic-era novelties in both art and poetry. But now the issue is not so much 'whether' but 'in what social context?' In court art and poetry, the saltwater separation of Pergamum from Alexandria is a wide gulf. Alexandrian art and poetry alike revel in the clash between generic expectation and delivery, between the grand and the insignificant, in the blurring of distinctions, but not Pergamene art. Why? In Z.'s account, the domestic ideology of the Ptolemies, the relative accessibility of the royal palace, and their *theosis* claims provide a political and social context—indeed, programme—of boundary crossing and blurring. Art and poetry, in which subject matter and medium are by classical canons oddly mixed, reflect just this. Grotesques and pathos-filled groups like the Suicidal Gaul also participate in this aesthetic sensibility. However, the latter do not revel in their self-conscious flouting of traditional boundaries and themes *per se*, but 'seem to break with the expectations traditionally entertained of their serious function, only to reaffirm that seriousness on a new, deeper emotional level' (p. 158).

Z.'s careful argument is supported by an adequate range of representative plates and ample close analysis of texts. Reuse of the volume is facilitated by a good index. The only minor irritation—this, the publisher's charge—is the use of endnotes employing author-date-page citation: tracking a footnoted thought thus requires keeping one's place in the endnotes and in the works cited list. Fortunately, Z.'s engaging, dense text more than compensates for that shortcoming.

*The University of the South, Sewanee* JON STEFFEN BRUSS
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni364

## ROMAN VISUAL DYNAMICS

D. FREDRICK (ed.): *The Roman Gaze. Vision, Power, and the Body*. Pp. xiv + 335, ills. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002. Cased, £32. ISBN: 0-8018-6961-7.

Coming at the crest of recent scholarly interest in the visual dynamics of Greco-Roman culture, this volume of nine essays tries to carve out a uniquely Roman space for a set of concerns at the intersection of the body, the gaze, and social class. As we know, Greek and Roman culture shared crucial beliefs about the workings of

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni365 Published online by Cambridge University Press

vision: the most piercing of the senses, the source or receptor of potentially dangerous optic particles, the organ responsible for the evil eye, a catalyst for erotic love, a policing force that constrains the behavior of the privileged classes. If Plato in the *Phaedrus* grants vision a rôle in the birth of philosophical *eros*, Propertius laments his erotic servitude to his mistress's eyes; if the gaze can be characterized as a projectile (e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 241, 742), Varro seems to have derived *visus* from *vis* (*DLL* 6.80, with L. Spengel's emendation); and both the persuasive power of Roman exemplarity and the duration of Gyges' good behavior (*Republic* 2. 359b–360d) were described as depending on its existence.

The editor of this volume, David Fredrick, would like to focus on what is uniquely Roman here. Citing the tendency of some modern scholarship to assume the presence of a simple 'Mediterranean' dynamics of vision and to elide Rome under Athens, F. notes that this kind of essentialism also be found in contemporary theories in feminism and film theory that treat the linkage of the phallus, representation, and the eye as a trio inherent in the structure of Western power relations. Granted that violence and the eye may be connected in antiquity as in the modern world, F. reminds us that the assumptions of ancient optical theories (extramissive, intromissive, and variations on the two) are completely alien to our current understanding of vision, and as such the history of sight cannot represent a simple continuum.

Nonetheless, much of what follows in this volume builds precisely on feminist film theory, which has moved away from the model of 'aggressive male gazer'/'victimized female object of the gaze' represented in the work of Laura Mulvey. Film theorists such as Kaja Silverman, Carol Clover, and Teresa de Lauretis (like F.'s contributors) have argued for polyvalence in viewing and being viewed; men may take pleasure in identifying with the 'passive' position of the doomed female lead in a horror film, and the possibilities for identification may be multiple. It bears noting, too, that ancient optical theory is originally Greek before its influence is evidenced in the writing of Romans such as Ovid, Lucretius, and others—it is hard to avoid Mediterranean reductivism here. In addition, recent books by Carlin Barton, Jas Elsner, and Matthew Leigh have focused specifically on Roman ways of looking.

The collection itself affords much evidence for the importance of a topic that some scholars might too readily dismiss as a trend. The essays span the literary, the art-historical, and the anthropological: *in brevi*, we have Cindy Benton on Seneca's *Troades*, Katherine Eldred on Lucan's Vulteius episode, Pamela Gordon on Lucretius on sex, Zahra Newby on the Spada reliefs, John Clarke on the *apodyterium* of the Suburban Baths at Pompeii, Anthony Corbeill on the political implications of the gait, Carlin Barton on shame and sight, F. on the concept of penetrability, and Alison Sharrock on the problematics of reading and viewing.

Limited space will not allow for an accounting of each essay here. Three, however, merit special mention for the light they throw upon particularly Roman formulations of the activity of the eye. Gordon's essay on 'Some Unseen Monster: Rereading Lucretius on Sex' takes up the slander of Epicureanism as 'effeminate' evidenced by Seneca, Diogenes Laertius, and others. Gordon argues persuasively that Lucretius' damnation of aggressive sexual behavior in *DRN* 4 should be read as an Epicurean rejection of the power dynamics inherent in Roman sexual activity and sparked by the desirous gaze. If *eros* and the eye conspire to create a self-destructive desire to possess, Lucretius wants no part of it. And if Lucretius abhors 'the pervasive formulation of both intercourse and the gaze as domination' (p. 106), we understand why his school might be tagged as cinaedic.

This is interesting material, though Gordon does not tackle the complex issue of

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni365 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the intromissive—and thus penetrative—dynamics of what the Lucretian lover sees. It is also worth noting that more than one philosophical school in the early empire had to endure such taunts; Juvenal (*Sat.* 2.8–13) has particularly harsh words for the 'Socraticos cinaedos' around him (and cf. Martial *Epig.* 9.47.) Of course, Greek philosophy itself was subject to criticism as an unmanly practice. And (as I have suggested elsewhere) one of the major problems for Roman philosophy is precisely the tolerance some Platonic texts grant élite homosexuality with young citizens-to-be. Even beyond Lucretius, there is no openly positive rôle to be found for *erotic* vision in Roman philosophy.

In another thought-provoking essay, Anthony Corbeill offers a sensitive reading of Cicero's criticism of the gait and *habitus* (in Bourdieu's sense) of the *populares*—their effeminate walk (or even their overdone efforts to appear masculine in their stride), the finger scratching the head, the excessive movement of the body during oratory. Corbeill asks the obvious question: given the negative charge of this kind of self-presentation, why did all Roman politicians not simply adopt the positively categorized dignified gait? He suggests three factors: an individual's access to certain forms of education, the actual topography of political debate (the *contio* demanded exaggerations in gesture and voice), and willful self-definition on the part of men who rejected the stances (political and bodily) of the *boni*. Corbeill's observations pull us away from the simple binaries exploited by the Romans themselves. I suspect that Cicero's texts often demonstrate the prioritizing of ideological rhetoric over observable reality; a dignified man with the wrong politics could easily be tarred with a *cinaedic* brush.

F.'s subtle essay on 'Mapping Penetrability' lays out a critique of the simple equation of sex or beating with penetration offered by some scholars of ancient Rome. F. would expand the notion of violation to the combined effects of economics, politics, gender, and sexuality in 'the establishment of boundaries, access to privacy, the means to meet physical needs, and the ability to control the flow of information' (p. 237). Case studies of the theater, the forum, and the *domus* explore the Roman organization of space to illustrate how lower status resulted in a more precarious hold 'on discourse, on subjectivity as the ability to assert oneself outside the limit of one's body' (p. 258)—even as the dangers of some élite sites such as the *triclinium*, with its luxurious fabrics, pleasurable activities, and exotic foods, can threaten to undermine the very class it accommodates.

Other essays are suggestive, if sometimes speculative (no pun intended). For example, Eldred and Benton both read their texts as evidence for the new vulnerability of the élite male body in the early empire. Once, at what Benton calls 'the apex of Rome's visual economy' (p. 41), the élites' ambiguous position under the emperor's gaze is said to be reflected both in the suffering of Seneca's Trojan women (Benton derives from film theory the notion that the male spectator can repress the feminine aspects of his own self and project them onto the women he is watching) and in Lucan's treatment of Vulteius' men, who die invoking Caesar's approbative spectatorship, but in a jumble of bodies and without any attendant *gloria*. Both articles thus focus on the Roman upperclass consciousness of the imperial corruption of traditional visual exemplarity and senatorial self-display.

Questions arise. To the first one—is this collection important and insightful?—the answer is a resounding yes, although of course not all the essays are equally persuasive. To the second—have the contributors succeeded in carving out an authentically Roman space for the dynamics of vision?—the answer is more complicated. On the one hand, yes: the gaze that is both philosophically charged and

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni365 Published online by Cambridge University Press

erotic has little place in Rome, and the impact of the senatorial classes' increasing political impotence has no parallel in classical Athens. Concerns about slipping into the cinaedic and the presence of a wide range of class and ethnic distinctions seem more pronounced on the Roman side. But there still exist many shared Greco-Roman ideas about the rôle of vision in love, ethics, shame, violence, and the evil eye. And finally, to the third question—does the volume avoid essentializing?—the use of modern film theory suggests a no, although this does not necessarily pose a problem. Concerns about passivity, about the gendering of the gaze, and about the violence done by or to the spectator are all ancient enough to have influenced modern Western thought rather than vice versa. Perhaps most valuably, the contents of this collection remind us to search beyond binary constructions such as those of active–passive or aggressor–victim despite the explicit programmatic statements of many an ancient witness—if not to avoid them, then to pluralize them.

*University of Chicago* SHADI BARTSCH
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni365

## IMPERIAL HOUSES

S. HALES: *The Roman House and Social Identity*. Pp. xvi + 294, ills. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. Cased, £55, US$75. ISBN: 0-521-81433-2.

Many studies of Roman houses have appeared recently, but none, Shelley Hales would argue, has sufficiently treated these structures within an imperial framework. The book under review represents an interesting and wide-ranging, but ultimately problematic, effort to fill this gap. H. moves in three parts, from Rome via Pompeii to the provinces, seeking to assess the relationship between a house's decoration/architecture and its inhabitants' identities, and also to consider how this relationship illustrates the dynamics of acculturation across the empire.

Part One, 'The Houses of Rome in Ancient Literature', is primarily a text-driven examination of the ideology surrounding élite domestic arrangements in Rome. H. establishes an unorthodox foundation for this topic. She contends that one's 'Romanness' was constructed by adopting and defending one pole of a rhetorical dichotomy. For example, one might equally claim to be Roman as an illiterate farmer or an urbane man of letters. In regard to houses, H. sees two effects of this model. First, in speech and writing, when authors describe or condemn a house, they similarly embrace one side of several *topoi—domus–villa*, city–country, austerity–luxury, etc. Second, in actual houses, owners did not have to be so selective, but could claim *Romanitas* by bridging these dichotomies through what H. calls the 'art of impression'. Wall-painting epitomizes this phenomenon for H.: its relatively cheap cost is balanced by the luxury it depicts. Ultimately, one wonders if this provocative, though not fully convincing, discussion is well served by being cast in terms of 'Romanness'. This frame often feels forced or even superfluous, since H. herself shows how adaptable this concept could be, and ancient authors rarely reference it when discussing houses.

While H. is right to eschew a prescriptive view of the Roman house, her replacement is too amorphous to be very valuable. Even if the *topoi* H. identifies were crucial for a house owner, does engagement with them offer the best index of someone's claims of, or reaction to, Romanness? Moreover, how should this concern

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni365 Published online by Cambridge University Press