

Véronique Dasen examines *imagines maiorum* in one of the most interesting essays of the book. After discussing what we know (and don't know) about the production and use of elite wax *imagines*, she collects evidence for and discusses alternate forms of *imagines*, such as plaster masks of imperial non-élite children, which may show freedmen reworking aristocratic practices of *memoria*. Dasen's section on children's plaster moulds and portraits found in funerary contexts is fascinating, with arresting illustrations of modern casts made from the originals. She speculates as to the reasons for making such moulds, which seem to show 'a desire to keep a faithful memory' of what these children actually looked like. Perhaps the creation of multiple copies of portraits of dead children served as a mourning strategy to help alleviate grief. On the other hand, a truly life-like portrait might prolong grief; Dasen proposes that idealized portraiture might have 'represented a comforting compromise' (144). In addition to funerary contexts, plaster and wax portraits of non-élite children served as a means to create family memory focused on descendants rather than ancestors.

Späth's essay uses Cicero's letters to discuss his emotional expressions regarding his son and daughter. To determine if his actions reveal what moderns construct as universal parental love, or 'a specifically Roman type of parental affection' (149), Späth identifies Cicero's stated concerns for his children and the gender-specific differences in his treatment of them. After examining their education and the different ways in which Cicero promoted their careers, Späth concludes that the orator and New Man loved his children as *imagines* of the Tullii Cicerones family who worked with him to construct their identity and memory.

Part 2 consists of essays investigating aspects of children of problematic status who are 'excluded from tradition' (12). Francesca Mencacci looks at the different kinds of speech allowed to free and slave children; whereas free children were socialized to exhibit self-control and *modestia*, *vernae* and *deliciae* were allowed verbal *licentia*. Relationships between masters and such slave children were close but of short duration, ending with adolescence. Mencacci outlines how this *licentia* served to 'mark from early on the social barrier that divides the freeborn from slaves, making it immediately obvious and almost "naturalizing" it' (239). She ends with Seneca's chilling account of running in to one of his former pet slaves, now an older, work-worn man. When the man asked if Seneca recognized him, he was treated contemptuously. Hence we get a glimpse of the emotional consequences for these small slaves, trained to behave in certain ways with their masters and rewarded with affection, only to be cut off from that relationship and booted out of the house at childhood's end. The final chapters concern threats to familial memory such as the sickness and death of children. Judith Evans Grubbs examines the dynamics of infant exposure in the imperial period and the 'legal attitude toward those who abandoned infants and toward the abandoned infants themselves' (293). In sum, the evidence shows that rescued *expositi* often lived as slaves in the same neighbourhood as their birth parents and exposers. Some families sought to reclaim their abandoned children later, a situation that often created conflict. If a person's free birth could be proven, his or her status was restored. It was a surprise to me that people often knew the real identity of these exposed children.

This is an interesting, generally well-edited book that extends our knowledge of the Roman family and children's rôles within it. The essays explore the ways in which actual practice could differ from the normative familial model, allowing for the messiness of 'real life' and its challenges for both the elite and non-élite. Those interested in ancient family life will profit from reading them.

Creighton University
caclark@creighton.edu

CHRISTINA A. CLARK

doi:10.1017/S0075435812000299

W. M. BLOOMER, *THE SCHOOL OF ROME. LATIN STUDIES AND THE ORIGINS OF LIBERAL EDUCATION*. Berkeley: UC Press, 2011. Pp. vii + 281. ISBN 9780520255760. £34.95.

In this study, Martin Bloomer offers a new synthetic account of Roman education, in the tradition of Marrou, Bonner and Clarke. In eight chapters he investigates the origins of Roman schools, discusses stories of the education of famous Romans, reconstructs the activities of Plotius Gallus and his school of rhetoric, presents some theories about the upbringing of children in the works of ps.-Plutarch and Quintilian, and assesses the significance of the study of grammar and elementary rhetorical exercises for Roman schoolboys. Syntheses of a subject are often welcome, especially when there has been a good deal of recent activity in the field. A study of education that focuses on Rome, rather than,

like recent monographs, on the wider Greek and/or Roman worlds, also has its attractions. Even better, B. takes the long view, showing us the evolution of educational practices from the middle Republic through to the later Principate. The picture he draws, however — whether due to the limitations of the sources or his style of analysis — turns out to be less strikingly novel than one might have hoped.

Conceptually, the book relies on earlier work. The theory that what gave Roman education unity was not institutions but a common curriculum; what ps.-Plutarch and Quintilian tell us about the psycho-social development of the child; what moralizing sayings and stories tell the schoolchild about the nature of the world; how what a Roman child read equipped him for a certain place in society; what one learns from grammar and elementary rhetorical exercises; all these ideas are almost uncannily familiar to this reviewer. There is nothing wrong with using conceptual frameworks developed by others, but it encourages the reader to look for originality either in the range of evidence presented or the conclusions drawn.

B. misses some opportunities to improve on the limitations of earlier work and to take into account advances which have been made since the publication of previous monographs. He mentions that Roman education included mathematics, but does not pursue it. He does not discuss a recent argument that the curriculum included the study of geography. He does not try to do more justice than did previous writers to the education of slaves or women. He makes most use of a group of well-known texts by Cicero, Plutarch, ps.-Plutarch, Suetonius, Quintilian, and ps.-Quintilian. This creates some difficulties for his project. His focus on Roman education is his justification for omitting, for instance, papyrological sources — but his Rome seems to encompass Plutarch and the authors of the Greek progymnasmata, not to mention early comedy and the distichs of Cato, which are heavily influenced by Greek gnomologies. If Roman education is distinct from Hellenistic education in this period, as B. wants to argue, then one wonders why he relies so heavily on Greek sources. If it is not, then I am not sure where his subject is. It might have been more productive to begin with the places where Roman education appears or claims to be distinctive and reflect on their rhetorical and/or socio-cultural currency.

B. takes an optimistic view of the sources, following Bonner in assuming, for instance, that we can on the whole accept the narrative implicit in Plutarch's *Lives* of a pre-Greek Roman aristocratic education. His investigation of the school of Plotius Gallus is more adventurous, and forms the basis for an entertaining reconstruction of the difficulties encountered by early schools of rhetoric at Rome.

Much of B.'s previous work has drawn our attention to topics which had been undeservedly neglected and shed a great deal of light on Roman society. Roman education is still, in some respects, such a topic; that B. has tackled it is to be welcomed, but it is a pity that he does not develop our understanding further than he does.

Oriel College, Oxford
 teresa.morgan@classics.ox.ac.uk
 doi:10.1017/S0075435812000305

TERESA MORGAN

K. BOWES, *HOUSES AND SOCIETY IN THE LATER ROMAN EMPIRE*. London: Duckworth, 2010. Pp. 120, illus. ISBN 9780715638828. £12.99.

This small book provides a convenient introduction to the state of research in the field of late Roman domestic architecture. It summarizes the historiography of the study of late antique houses and offers interesting theoretical questions that can be taken up by anyone wishing to investigate this current topic further. Divided into four chapters — 1. 'Inventing the Later Roman House'; 2. 'The Archaeology of Later Roman Houses'; 3. 'Houses and History'; 4. 'New Directions' — the book is a handy introduction to a fascinating subject and follows upon the author's dissertation and previous publications, which are all similarly oriented toward the territories of Western Europe, the western Mediterranean, North Africa, and the Balkans. The book lays out the basic inventory of late Roman houses in these regions and the theoretical frameworks that have been used by scholars, both past and present, in their analyses.

The book's first chapter 'Inventing the Later Roman House' presents a condensed literature review that breaks down the historiography of the field according to past approaches and methodologies. It emphasizes that the study of the late Roman house was at first used to point to the development of medieval architectural forms. Later, the layout of spaces in domestic architecture was seen to reflect