

hierarchisch strukturiert worden, wenn schon nicht zu verifizieren, so doch auf ihre Plausibilität hin zu untersuchen' (332).

Die 'Zeit' meint dabei das dritte Jahrhundert. Durch die Schwerpunktsetzung auf diese Epoche reiht sich Peter Eich in die Reihe der Forscher, die sich damit und insbesondere mit der Krisenhaftigkeit der Zeit auseinandersetzen. Der Terminus 'Krise des dritten Jahrhunderts' wird dabei vom Autor unkritisch übernommen und damit die seit Jahren schwelende Diskussion um dessen Richtigkeit ignoriert. Auch von einer militärischen Krise kann nur bedingt die Rede sein, vielmehr ist die Situation in gewisser Weise die konsequente Weiterentwicklung der vom Autor in Kapitel sieben skizzierten Entstehung der Stellung des Prätorianerpräfekten. Fest steht jedoch, dass die Situation im dritten nachchristlichen Jahrhundert dem steten Ausbau eines Verwaltungsapparates und der Konsolidierung der Beamtenhierarchien zuträglich war. Dieser Entwicklung spielte die 'Transformation Roms von einer realen zu einer ideellen Hauptstadt' (386) und der damit verbundene Vorteil für die Provinzen in die Hand. Trotz der nachweislichen Herausbildung von Hierarchien und Strukturen in der Administration des Imperiums, resümiert Peter Eich, dass 'die spätrömische Administration mit dem Weberschen Idealtyp (...) ohne Zweifel nicht kompatibel ist' (390).

Bei der vorliegenden Arbeit handelt es sich — wie das Vorwort betont — 'um die im Umfang stark gekürzte Fassung' (9) der vom Autor eingereichten Dissertation. Der veröffentlichten Fassung fehlt das Kapitel über die Administration Ägyptens in der Kaiserzeit, welches der Autor aber hofft, separat publizieren zu können. In Anbetracht der Sonderstellung dieser Provinz im *Imperium Romanum* ist dies sicher eine sinnvolle und viel versprechende Vorgehensweise. Insgesamt ist das Veröffentlichte noch immer sehr umfassend, was die Arbeit mit dem Werk nicht leicht und ohne die regelmäßigen Zusammenfassungen vor und nach den einzelnen Kapiteln sogar recht beschwerlich machen würde. Inhaltlich bietet die Promotionsschrift von Peter Eich jedoch eine gründliche Untersuchung eines wesentlichen Teils des kaiserzeitlichen Verwaltungsapparates. Das Ergebnis der Arbeit, nämlich die Erweiterung des Beamtenapparates im Laufe der römischen Kaiserzeit, ist allerdings keine wissenschaftliche Überraschung. Vielmehr besteht der Verdienst der Darstellung in der ausführlichen und quellenreichen Entwicklung dieses bereits vorgefassten Ergebnisses.

Katrin Herrmann

Universität Mannheim

Eve D'Ambra, *Roman Women (Cambridge Introduction to Roman Civilization)*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 215 pp. ISBN-13: 978-0-521-81839-1.

Caroline Vout, *Power and Eroticism in Imperial Rome*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 285 pp. ISBN-13: 978-0-521-86739-9.

As part of the *Cambridge Introduction to Roman Civilization* series, Eve D'Ambra's *Roman Women* presents itself as a general introduction for students. Acknowledging the prior bias given to 'exceptional women' when discussing Roman women (2-3), D'Ambra focuses instead on Roman women's everyday lives. She notably does not include an introduction or conclusion to the work, but simply divides her analysis into four chapters: 'Gender and Status', 'Marriage and the Family', 'Women's Work', and 'Public Life'.

Chapter 1, 'Gender and Status', is the most diffuse chapter, with D'Ambra introducing concepts central to her study, as well as providing a general treatment of the changing Roman historical backdrop. Her goal here is admirable, for she asserts that women's history must be placed within a wider context to be truly comprehensible. Such a vision allows her to situate the attitudes and practices that governed Roman women's lives within a broader Roman social order,

one that was firmly based, as she writes, 'on inequality and elitism' (2). Yet I found this chapter symptomatic of some of the organizational difficulties in the book. The discussion of 'Marriage by Capture', for example, seeks to establish the symbolic role of marriage in Roman thought (i.e., its reference to 'woman' as both a quintessential outsider and a link between male communities), and would fit better in the actual chapter on Roman marriage, where such symbolic resonance is scarcely referenced. So, too, D'Ambra draws a fascinating contrast between the vision of motherhood on Augustus' Ara Pacis and on the Arch of Trajan at Benevento (38-39), but it would contribute more if moved to her later discussion of Roman motherhood.

Chapter 2, 'Marriage and the Family', explores Roman marriage via institutions such as Roman law and the wedding ceremony. In approaching marriage, D'Ambra considers the parallel question of property rights, as well as the prohibition on female adultery. Chapter 2 also provides useful information about other phases of Roman women's lives, including an interesting discussion of how little girls might have been socialized through their play with dolls (61-62). My greatest disappointment with this chapter is that D'Ambra's opening definition of marriage feels too limited, especially given her attempt to elucidate a range of women's experiences. Defining at first only the differences between marriages with and without *manus* (46), only later does D'Ambra mention some of the alternatives, such as *contubernia* between slaves (72), and the non-legal unions adopted by Roman soldiers, who were prohibited from marrying (131).

I found Chapter 3, 'Women's Work' the most puzzling. It is clear that D'Ambra seeks to use the term in an expansive (and modern?) way to include women's work inside the home, i.e., unpaid and mostly invisible labor. While this generally works well in regard to Roman women, allowing D'Ambra to examine the structure of the Roman household, it is certainly not the full story, and D'Ambra's emphasis leads her to give women's paid work, mostly by lower-class women, disappointingly short shrift (135-140). She does not discuss variations of sex work undertaken by Roman women at all, a real gap in the chapter. Still, D'Ambra provocatively identifies *cultus* as women's work, a theme that allows her to consider women's use of cosmetics and other adornments. Her claim that women were not necessarily passive users of such devices, but could be active agents employing cosmetics as part of a conspicuous public performance, is an important one, although I would have liked more specific examples of how this might work (115).

Chapter 4 is in some ways the most conventional chapter, as D'Ambra considers 'Public Life' through the lens of famous Roman women (the kind of 'exceptional women' that she acknowledges often make their way into historical analysis) and through an examination of Roman religious life, including the revealing and much-discussed case of the Vestal Virgins.

In all, D'Ambra's work provides a solid introduction to many aspects of Roman women's lives. While I found the organization at times frustrating, I also found admirable her attempt to inject new frameworks, such as the workings of the Roman army, into the discussion. So, too, the book features many wonderful illustrations, allowing the reader to reach beyond written texts for an understanding of the diversity of images and social practices that circumscribed Roman women's lives.

In one part of her work, D'Ambra alludes to the palpable contradictions present as Augustus undertook an aggressive form of 'social engineering', one that his own family clearly defied (52-53). Precisely how such an inconsistency would be viewed by the Augustan public, D'Ambra does not consider, yet Caroline Vout makes this question (the practices of the emperor and the perceptions they create) the central focus of her new book, *Power and Eroticism in Imperial Rome*. In regard to Augustus himself, Vout offers the novel conclusion that it is precisely through such hypocrisy that Augustus was able to command public respect (4).

Augustus aside, Vout's book concerns itself primarily with later emperors, as she seeks through a number of case-studies, most prominently that of Hadrian and Antinous, to examine the role of the Roman emperor's sexual practices in the discourse of *imperium*. Vout establishes the primary methods for her work when she writes: 'I have chosen to concentrate on stories and

images of the emperor desiring and being desired by his subjects; in other words, how imperial power, intimacy and transactions with the emperor were constructed and contested through the representation of sexual relations' (7). Vout also provides a survey of Roman attitudes toward sexual practice and identity, reminding the reader that Roman men seem more concerned with power differential and status than the sex of their partner, an important precursor to her work given that her case-studies, with one exception, focus on emperors engaging in sexual relationships with other men. Noting that classical scholars often assume that active and passive roles in ancient sex correlate with power and powerlessness respectively, Vout perceptively notes not only that partners might exchange roles, but also that passivity might itself yield a kind of power.

Throughout her work Vout emphasizes the ways in which feelings, desires, 'gossip', and fantasies rather than 'actual' sexual practices worked to open connections between the Roman viewer and his/her emperor. While her approach clearly raises new and exciting ways of thinking about the intersections of Roman sexuality, power and empire, her reliance on such subjective responses, as Vout herself realizes, also leaves the work vulnerable to the criticism that her interpretations themselves can only be speculative. Likewise, as she points out, readings of Antinous in particular are often influenced by his later status as a favorite target of early Christian writings or, more recently, a kind of gay icon. When examining the case of Antinous, Vout herself begins with the question, 'How does Antinous make the viewer feel?' (71). She acknowledges the problems inherent in scholarly attempts to identify statues of Antinous, but nonetheless suggests two possible responses to his widely circulated image: an impulse for ownership (i.e., encouraging the viewer to possess Antinous as Hadrian did) or an impulse for empathy (i.e., encouraging the reader, like Antinous, to be possessed by Hadrian; 104-107), both of which propose that Roman viewers sought to position themselves in terms of the Roman emperor via readings of his sexual desires. Antinous's designation as divine in some sources also broadens the terrain of his potential meanings, leading Vout to argue for a re-evaluation of the Roman imperial cult.

While the idea of 'Greekness' as a position of cultural or ethnic 'Otherness' for the Romans features in Vout's analysis of Antinous, the term becomes even more central to her remaining case-studies. These chapters utilize textual evidence, and Vout here narrows her scope considerably, perhaps because the trope itself is tightening as the empire progresses. Looking at representations of Nero's marriage to the castrated Sporus, for example, Vout argues for connotations of 'Greekness' in the representation of male-male marriage, concluding that the level of outrage 'may have depended on how Roman one was seen to make male-male desire' (157), in other words, criticism of Nero's actions may have been less about the sexual practice itself, as the attempt to present it as compatible with 'Romanness' (157). In the case of Domitian's passion for Earinus, Vout focuses on the specific representations of Earinus' castration in the writings of Martial and Statius, arguing that '(i)dentifying with Earinus as Martial and Statius seem to do is to confront the loss of identity (as active, male, Roman) head-on' (204). Thus, whereas viewing Antinous might offer many positions and pleasures, reading Earinus, and consequently sharing a putative intimacy with the emperor, has by Domitian's age become a source of anxiety. In her final case-study, Vout interprets Lucian's representations of Lucius Verus' Greek mistress Panthea, arguing that the work of reading changes fundamentally with the gender of the emperor's lover, and that fragmentation, rather than castration, symbolizes the emperor's relationship to his lover's difference, both ethnic and sexual.

Overall, Vout's work covers considerable ground and deservedly claims its place in the field of Roman imperial studies (16). While I found some imbalance in her case-study approach, finding some cases more persuasive than others, I enjoyed the opportunity to think about sexuality and power at the level she recommends, and to wonder for myself what it might mean for a Roman to 'get close' to the emperor in imperial Rome.