

newly acquired status, participated in the functioning of the society in quite a similar manner to everyone else. Trimalchio is an image created by the Roman elite in Rome, maybe even a satire of the Roman upper classes or Emperor Nero himself; he does not necessarily have much to do with reality in towns outside Rome.

The Roman *domus* and its decoration is also given a large role in the book. The first example used is the Pompeian House of D. Octavius Quartio (II 2,2). This is a large "miniature villa" on the eastern side of Pompeii. The property covers more than 3/4s of a city block and features one of the more elaborate and fantastic gardens in the whole of Pompeii with fountains, huge fish ponds and statuary. It has also been described as the "Disney World of Pompeii" and used as an emblem of "freedman taste": imitating the large buildings and fine decorations of villas and doing it with rather poor results, cramming as much as possible into a small space; trying too hard and failing. The owner of the house remains unknown, but the decorations and the Isiac imagery found there have been connected to a rich freedman. If the house could be connected to the *gens* Octavia, it could be noted that members of that family had lived in the city since the establishment of the Roman colony and thus could not be described as of libertine status. The decorations are associated with a more common desire to include glimpses of art combined with nature in Pompeian houses.

The second domestic example is the House of L. Caecilius Iucundus (V 1,26), one of the few houses in Pompeii where the owner is known by way of an archive found in the house. At least two generations of the Caecilii family are known and they are of freedman stock. Hackworth Petersen associates the phases of extension and decorations to the two generations and argues how the freedman family created itself an ancestry by employing subtle indications that they shared a common history with the house. Although her analysis is quite plausible, the uncertainties of dating the changes and connecting a person to specific changes in the house make it slightly problematic. The case is so unique, even in Pompeii, that comparisons cannot be made.

Hackworth Petersen's book is a welcome fresh look at freedmen, their status and how they projected themselves in Roman society. It is also a welcome deconstruction of a stereotype created by modern scholarship, which affects interpretations of many kinds of evidence.

*Eeva-Maria Viitanen*

GEOFF W. ADAMS: *The Suburban Villas of Campania and their Social Function*. BAR International Series 1542. Archaeopress, Oxford 2006. ISBN 1-84171-974-9. IX, 175 pp., 72 Figs., 13 Tables, 42 Graphs. GBP 38.

Roman villas have been studied from many different points of view, although publications of excavation results and typology tend to be the most common ones. This volume by Geoff Adams is based on his doctoral dissertation and it concentrates on architectural analysis and social interpretations. The principal idea is very simple: to recognize spaces potentially used for entertainment in villas and compare their ground areas to the total ground area of the complex. In this way, it is hoped that the possible intended social uses of spaces and types of villas can be identified. The data set consists of the villas located near the ancient towns of Pompeii, Herculaneum and Stabiae, where the good preservation of architecture and other types of

material culture provide good opportunities for identifying uses of space. The premises are interesting and the results are promising, but, unfortunately, the book is riddled with so many flaws that it is difficult to truly appreciate these.

The slim volume is divided into an introduction, five main chapters and conclusions. After presenting the basic principles and methods, Adams starts the discussion by examining the literary evidence concerning *villae suburbanae*. Then he examines the Pompeian cases in two chapters. The following two discuss the villas around Herculaneum and Stabiae as well as making a small detour to Baiae in the Campi Flegrei area. Tables and figures are found at the end of the book. The figures are all maps or ground plans, readable as such, but, unfortunately, there are problems in indicating sites and rooms. The numbering of the villas in the text and on the general maps does not match – in some cases, it is possible to match the site and the number, but not always. In addition, in many cases, the numbering of rooms on plans and in the text is different and the descriptions are not accurate enough to recognize the spaces. Indicating all the rooms mentioned in the text and not just the entertainment spaces, would also have been beneficial for understanding the argument, as now it remains unclear which rooms are discussed. There are also many typographical and other errors – in general the book needed rigorous editing. The most embarrassing error is perhaps mistaking the poet Martial (Marcus Valerius Martialis) for Iulius Martialis, who had a villa on the Janiculum in Rome (4,64), which Adams compares at length to Martial's descriptions of his suburban estate located in Nomentum.

The first part of the book concerns the concept of the *villa suburbana*, its definition and uses. The treatise of literary evidence is limited to the specific cases of the words *suburbium* and *suburbanus* in all forms that they have been used in Latin literature, and particularly in connection with the word *villa*. In the end, the *villa suburbana* is defined as a villa located close to an urban centre, with a certain amount of luxury and possible productive parts, a complex suited for the intended lifestyle of the owner. Adams also concludes that the term can be applied to all urban centres and their surroundings. This latter part is problematic: can the term really be applied with confidence to other areas than the surroundings of Rome? Rome was the *urbs* and the terms discussed are used in connection to its surroundings by an overwhelming majority of references. Adams would also regard *suburbanus* as a concrete geographical term as opposed to the ideological significance it has also been given (cf. the article by E. Champlin in *Ancient Society* 1982 or J.W. Meyer's *Imus ad villam. Studien zur Villeggiatur im stadtrömischen Suburbium in der späten Republik und frühen Kaiserzeit*. *Geographica Historica* 20, 2005). *Suburbium* was not only a specific region, but also a certain kind of region, where the landowner was truly free of all obligations, both to Rome as well to possible local ones. The surroundings of Rome were such for many aristocratic Roman landowners: they usually had no legal, social or kinship ties to the region and were able to use it for pure recreation.

In addition, limiting the search to the terms discussed creates problems: most of the villas in the surroundings of Rome are not called *suburbanae* at all. In order to understand the uses of the villa, one should perhaps look at all the texts regarding villas in the area of Rome to see the possible similarities and differences, to set the suggested specific type in a wider context. Cicero's or Lucullus' famous Tusculan villas are never called *suburbanae*, but nevertheless they were, at least geographically. In some cases, Adams also discusses references to such villas, e.g., Horace's Sabinum, defining them himself as *suburbana*. Adams also seems not to see the difference in the uses of terms for an estate and its buildings. *Praedium* and *fundus* tend to be the ones used for the whole estate and *villa* is generally used when only the

buildings are mentioned. Taking this difference into consideration more actively might have changed some of the interpretations he presents.

The villa was used as an instrument of social promotion and as such, the *villa suburbana* in the surroundings of Rome was of importance. The Roman elite retired to the countryside and it was important to own a property there. The area of the Bay of Naples, including Adams' research area, was another similar zone in Central Italy. This raises another question concerning the use of the term *villa suburbana* as a concrete geographical term in that region. Who owned the villas in the surroundings of Pompeii, Herculaneum and Stabiae? If they were locals connected with local social competition, it could perhaps be said that having a *villa suburbana* near their own town might work in a similar way as one in the Rome region worked for the Roman aristocrat. Were the *villae suburbanae* owned by locals or Romans? Were they used to promote career and status locally or in Rome? In the latter case, the vicinity of Pompeii or Herculaneum would have been irrelevant; the most important thing would have been having an estate in the most popular resort area in Central Italy. In archaeological terms, discerning the villas owned by locals or the Roman aristocracy is impossible without the benefit of graffiti or other kinds of written sources and they are very rare.

The second part of the book concentrates on the description and analysis of various excavated villas. Most villa sites in the region have been included despite the limitations posed by the extent to which the buildings were excavated or what the level of data available for them is. A definition as a villa is also questionable for some buildings, particularly some of those located close to the gates of Pompeii. Most of the sites are located in the surroundings of Pompeii, which is easy to understand considering the ease of excavating the loose ashes and pumice gravel covering the area. The Herculanean region is most poorly represented, probably owing to the difficulty of excavating the hardened mud and also to dense modern habitation over the ancient remains. These considerations naturally limit the possibilities for interpretation. As comparative material particularly for Pompeii, the region of Puteoli would have been of interest, but, unfortunately, the level of data there is particularly poor. A number of town houses from Pompeii and Herculaneum have also been included in the discussion as comparative material. The buildings, of which only a small part have been excavated, could have perhaps been excluded from the analysis, since insufficient knowledge of the ground plan, use of space and total area make them unsuitable for the methods used by Adams. The town houses of Pompeii could have also included the series of buildings south of the *forum* area that are very similar in style and location to those of *Insula Occidentalis* on the western edge of the town. The region around Pompeii is divided into inner and outer suburban areas, but their difference is not specified very clearly; at least it is not based on distance from the city walls. The inner parts include the zones towards the coast as well as the villas located by the roads leaving Pompeii. The outer zone stretches to a 4–5 km distance from the city walls, but some of these villas are actually located closer to the city walls than the inner region sites. The division could perhaps better be described as "coastal" and "inland" rather than inner and outer.

The method is based on recognizing entertainment spaces in the villa. Entertainment space is defined as "an area of a residence that could be used for either relaxation or the receipt of visitors by the residents of the household" (p. 1). This definition is very general and if it is compared to what is indicated of use of space for most room types known from literary sources, potential entertainment space could cover most rooms in the building. The discussion on how to recognize the uses of space archaeologically is relatively short and mostly based on P. Allison's

analysis of Pompeian town houses (*Pompeian households: an analysis of the material culture*, Cotsen Institute of Archaeology at UCLA Monograph 42, 2004). Her architectural types are, in turn, based on the *atrium*-peristyle town house and connections to these two main spaces define many of the entertainment spaces. Unfortunately, this typology is rather difficult to apply to villas. A discussion of villa architecture in general as well as a comparison to the architecture of a town house would have benefited the argument. Of the ca. 40 villa ground plans Adams presents, only a minority have either main space clearly defined. Thus, the identification of space in the villas is usually based on the presence of lavish decorations and the size of the room, but not on its architectural type. Other types of material culture are rarely available for determining use of space. What is included in the end are not all potential reception and entertainment spaces, but rather the more private and larger spaces usually called *triclinia*, *oeci* or *exedrae*. Decorative gardens, usually in colonnaded courtyards, are also included in entertainment spaces and they serve as an indicator of an open, villa-style ground plan.

The main method is comparison of the amounts of entertainment space to the whole ground area of the complex. In general, the amount of potential entertainment space in larger and well-appointed villas is at least 25% and this is generally used as a determining point in defining a villa as *suburbana*. There are some exceptions to the rule, e.g., the Villa of the Mysteries at Pompeii, which is defined as *suburbana* because of its decorations despite the very low percentage of entertainment space. Adams has also calculated proportions of entertainment space with and without open spaces. The open areas have been excluded, particularly if their productive purposes seemed obvious, and Adams does not discuss these percentages if the villa seems to be otherwise suitable as a *suburbana*. The difference between a *villa maritima* and *villa suburbana* is also difficult to distinguish, e.g., which is the Villa of the Papyri at Herculaneum? What are the lavish villas lining the Roman coastline between Ostia and Antium? Is there really a difference between the two types? Both were intended more for the leisure of the owner than for productive purposes, so the appointments of the buildings would have been very similar. This further reflects the difficulty of classifying villas.

What emerge from Adams' analysis are perhaps the different trends of the villas in the Campanian coastal areas rather than definitions of types. The villas closer to the coast tend to be larger and the largest complexes can be found near Herculaneum and Stabiae. The latter sites also exhibit the largest amounts of entertainment space. Pompeii might be a commercial centre and a lively town, but it certainly did not attract the greatest villas to its neighbourhood. In fact, the largest and most spectacular sites are found near Stabiae, which was unimportant as an urban centre. This perhaps again indicates that the *villa suburbana* is a more complicated term than what Adams conceives. The vicinity of a town is recommended by Roman agronomists for all villas for having a market for products of the villa. In addition, an urban centre also served for services and provisions for the villa, if they should be needed. The size of the town did not have that great an importance in the latter case, but could be significant in the first, for the productive villa. The reason for building the most elaborate and fantastic villas at Stabiae was not Stabiae itself, but something else. The reason could have been the spectacular location on top of the ridge overlooking the bay area.

The results of the analysis of the amount of entertainment space are interesting with regard to house and villa design. In the large Pompeian and Herculanean town houses, the amount of entertainment space is remarkably uniform, at close to 30%, compared to the more varied villas. The town house sample is perhaps more consistent and uniform than that of the

villas, but the results probably indicate the more rigid and traditional design of the *domus* compared to the *villa*. The villa ground plans are hard to categorize because of their great variation (cf. L. Romizzi, *Ville d'otium dell'Italia antica*, 2001). In the countryside, there was always more space, the building did not have to reflect traditional values, and it could be opened up to the surrounding nature. In addition, the locations often feature extreme relief – cliffs, steep slopes, etc. – that required unique architectural solutions.

The archaeological villas form a continuum from the simplest agricultural establishments to the most elaborate residential complexes; dividing them into classes will always be arbitrary. The difference between the opposite ends of the continuum is easy to see, but for the rest, the situation is more complicated. Finding trends in villa architecture is difficult and Adams' graphs show this with the great variety that is striking with almost every aspect he examines. Adams' statistical analysis does not define an archaeological *villa suburbana* in any way, but does perhaps provide a useful tool for analysing various aspects of Roman domestic architecture.

*Eeva-Maria Viitanen*