

A new Pompeian textbook

Steven J. R Ellis

JOHN J. DOBBINS and PEDAR W. FOSS (edd.), *THE WORLD OF POMPEII* (Routledge, London 2007). Pp. xli + 662, 251 figs., 3 tables, 4 maps, CD-ROM in end pocket. ISBN-10: 0-415-17324-8. \$240.

The world of Pompeii is a monumental undertaking, the product of a decision taken in the late 1990s to create a book on all things Pompeian for the Anglophone world for which, the editors tell us (xxvii), nothing of its kind existed. Indeed, nothing of its kind exists in any language. Thirty-nine chapters are laid across 662 (+ xli) pages (of c.10" x 7" format) that hold 234 illustrations, 4 maps, and 3 tables. The book is organized thematically into 4 sections: "Beginnings" (8 chapters, plus appendix); "The Community" (8); "Housing" (12); "Society and Economy" (11). A 'free' CD-ROM is included, and a website accompanies the book. While Dobbins and Foss aimed not to produce a "new Mau" — which they rightly consider to be the last comprehensive treatment of Pompeian archaeology and history, albeit now over a century old — they hoped that theirs would be a book that they themselves could turn to as the "first to consult" (xxvii). With that aim in mind, and with a target audience that ranges from scholars and university professors to students of all kinds and the general public, what results is a healthy range of papers that caters to general overviews as well as to more focused and detailed research questions. One could expect the execution to vary in quality, and this is much the case. But *The world of Pompeii* is at heart a university classroom textbook (although the editors never specifically define it in this way), and a different type of review is necessary to those most often seen in the pages of *JRA*. Thus, in spite of any criticisms that may follow, the contributions ought best be treated as fuel for classroom discourse, rather than as fodder for academic dissection. I have therefore kept in mind the book's pedagogical qualities, but recognize the many gems that exist for the more experienced practitioners of Pompeian scholarship. I myself have used the book both in the classroom and on site during fieldwork.¹

1. "Beginnings"

Chapters 1-8, plus an appendix, provide the initial setting and framework for the archaeological and historical record. P. G. Guzzo (1: "City and country: an introduction") opens this section with a very brief, but well-informed, overview of the history of Pompeii and, especially, its relationship with the hinterland, the *ager*. J.-P. Descœudres (2: "History and historical sources") broadens this scope of introduction with a splendidly referenced, 'must-read' chapter on the full range of sources for Pompeian history. His "written and unwritten" sources are clearly explained through some dramatic examples. These sources are then selectively drawn upon to furnish a brief but rich history of the city, with a focus on urban affairs

¹ Several chapters were used for reading and discussion material in my graduate seminar on Pompeian archaeology given at the University of Cincinnati (Autumn 2007) and I have kept the book close at hand during the 2008 field season of the Pompeii Archaeological Research Project: *Porta Stabia*.

that contrasts effectively with Guzzo's. Descœudres' history is synthetic, well articulated, and rich in people, their behavior and their social context.

P. Foss (3: "Rediscovery and resurrection") and H. Sigurdsson (4: "The environmental and geomorphological context of the volcano") offer two different historical frameworks, the first on the chronological development of the various episodes in Pompeii's recovery, the latter on the history of Vesuvius. For Foss, Pompeii's long history of recovery is a story dominated by individuals as the key protagonists — rightly so, given that it was individuals like Weber, Winckelmann, Fiorelli, Mau, and Maiuri, to name just a handful, who shaped the various approaches to the study not only of Pompeii and Herculaneum but beyond, albeit with mixed results. Sigurdsson introduces a topic that is less well covered in the textbooks. His history of Mount Vesuvius considers its volcanic activities, the responses to the volcano in antiquity, together with an expected focus on the fateful eruption of A.D. 79.

The following three contributions penetrate Pompeii's earlier history, but with varying foci and approaches. P. Carafa's chapter (5: "Recent work on early Pompeii") on "recent" excavations is an important addition to any Pompeian textbook, if already outdated (no work since 2001 is cited). Although the 1990s might rightly be seen as a boom period for Pompeian excavations, the years of the new millennium are still more so.² Even so, his contribution is a good reminder to undergraduates of the directions in which Pompeian archaeology has been heading since the 1990s with the willingness of its Superintendent, P. G. Guzzo, to issue excavation permits to qualified teams — though not all of those teams have repaid their debt through appropriate publication of their endeavors. This chapter ought to rate high on the editors' list for updating in subsequent editions, and even before that in the linked Web content (see below). S. De Caro (6: "The first sanctuaries") employs the results from a number of these excavations to penetrate the pre-Roman history of the various sanctuaries, linking them (refreshingly for Pompeian studies) into some of the broader regional cults, but without wholly synthesizing them as an urban group. His approach and use of stratified evidence contrasts strikingly with that of H. Geertman (7: "The urban development of the pre-Roman city") who, while also interested in early Pompeian history, instead follows a long line of scholars (Haverfield, von Gerkan, Castagnoli, Eschebach, Ward Perkins) by drawing on the spatial arrangement of its street system, property divisions and *insulae* as they stood in 79, along with their measurements in Oscan feet, as an index for relative (and sometimes absolute) chronological change. For Geertman and his followers,³ the exposing of large swathes of the urban network, especially from the wide-scale clearance of volcanic débris in the early 20th c., can "reconstruct the origins and the history of its urban structure" (82). In reality, the clearance of volcanic débris from the buildings as they stood in 79 does nothing of the sort, for the walls that now stand are attributable only to a couple of hundred years at best: necessary in order to read the origins of the city are excavations *below* the A.D. 79 surfaces, as demonstrated by Carafa's chapter. This is an odd chapter that provides some heavy and confusing reading.

This first section is closed by J.-P. Adam's brief but useful contribution (8: "Building materials, construction methods, and chronologies") on the more practical side of architecture and construction, a topic less commonly covered than the more aesthetic treatments and thereby another "must read" for most students. It is more of a summary of parts of his own textbook⁴ than an update and so limited to descriptions of the most common wall construction techniques and materials. There is no citation of work on architecture since 1994; absent too, for example, is any mention of *pappamonte*, a local friable tuff, the use of which in the early construction of foundations at Pompeii has sparked much interest. Nevertheless, the chapter familiarizes the reader with the vocabulary of Roman wall styles that recur throughout the book. To the same

² Cf. P. G. Guzzo and M.-P. Guidobaldi, *Nuove ricerche archeologiche a Pompei ed Ercolano: Atti del convegno int., Roma 2002* (Rome 2005); and P. G. Guzzo and M.-P. Guidobaldi, *Nuove ricerche archeologiche nell'area Vesuviana (scavi 2003-2006): Atti del convegno int., 2007* (Rome 2007).

³ The 'Geertman school' now includes several Ph.D. students who have adopted the same methodology and approach, and thus achieve similar results.

⁴ J.-P. Adam, *Roman building: materials and techniques* (London 1994).

end, J. Dobbins (“A note on Roman concrete [*opus caementicium*] and other wall construction”) serves up an important appendix of the descriptive terms associated with Roman concrete and its various facings.

2. “Community”

With the contextual background (the city’s history, urban shape, and archaeological recovery) satisfactorily outlined, the next 8 chapters aim to cover the broad theme of ‘community’. Most focus on the Roman period following the creation of the colony in 80 B.C. In so doing, they return to themes already covered for pre-Roman Pompeii.

R. Ling (9: “Development of Pompeii’s public landscape in the Roman period”) gives a roll-call of Roman public buildings, starting with those in existence before 80 B.C., in order to measure the impact of the new Roman social order on public infrastructure. The public munificence of veteran soldiers is seen as an agent of change. He then introduces other public buildings conceived under Augustan influences or responding to post-earthquake urban revival.

C. Westfall’s chapter (10: “Urban planning, roads, streets and neighborhoods”) brings to mind Geertman’s in examining the arrangement of streets and sectors, but he is more interested in the Roman influence on these systems and especially in the way Pompeians perceived of districts and neighborhoods. He imagines 4 zones: an outdoor amusement area, a genteel district around the Central Baths, a cultural district for entertainment, and a forum district. While we might assume that Pompeians distinguished some local neighborhoods from others, Westfall is unclear on how they actually “defined” (129) these districts, so his chapter risks circularity of argument. C. Chiaramonte (11: “The walls and gates”) joins the list of those interested in the shape of the city, telling something of its history and construction styles. She provides a clear and succinct account of the developmental history of the walls and their study. In so doing, she offers one of those chapters that is of as much value to the Pompeian scholar as it is to the student. It pairs naturally with the chapter by J. Dobbins (12: “The forum and its dependencies”), who provides a “condensed account” of some of the results of the work by his Pompeii Forum Project (University of Virginia), which builds “on the pioneering efforts of August Mau to interpret the architectural remains of the forum” (151). With a focus on the buildings that were (re)built following the earthquake, Dobbins’ aim is to investigate the dynamics of urban change within a tightly defined period. He sees the most important influences as those coming “from Rome, local patronage and the response to the earthquake of AD 62” (153). He also accounts for the buildings in their present state, as well as their history in antiquity.

A. Small’s chapter (13: “Urban, suburban and rural religion in the Roman period”) is another that can be paired with an earlier chapter (6) on the same theme. Some background on the pre-Roman period results in overlap with De Caro, but the focus on the Roman period enables him to introduce not just monumental spaces for cultic activity, but also the typically Roman compital and ‘domestic’ shrines, and then the more ephemeral cults (i.e., those for which archaeology has not identified dedicated meeting-places), from Dionysus to Christianity and Judaism, and even magic. Refreshingly, his inquiry extends to the rich remains from Herculaneum.

Last come treatments of entertainment and water infrastructure. C. Parslow (14: “Entertainment at Pompeii”) describes structures given over to entertainment and summarizes something of their histories, reminding us of their cultural significance: after all, no other town in the region competed in the number of entertainment buildings. A. Koloski-Ostrow (15: “The city baths of Pompeii and Herculaneum”) lays out a very structured, and much welcomed, architectural overview of the public and private baths at both towns which will rightly become popular reading in most Pompeian classrooms. This leads naturally to G. Jansen (16: “The water system: supply and drainage”), who offers a very brief and basic, though useful, chapter on water collection, toilets, and drainage.

3. “Housing”

A more clearly defined set of papers follows with “Housing”. It is unsurprising for a book on Pompeii that this section includes the largest number of chapters, and as a group they are pro-

bably of the highest quality. They focus primarily on the architectural shape of houses, their decoration, the finds made among their various rooms and spaces, and some of the social consequences of house location within and without the city.

P. Allison (17: “Domestic spaces and activities”), beginning with a tour through the extant remains of the common ‘atrium’ style house, gives a very brief summation of what the archaeological finds from her sample of 30 Pompeian houses tells us (or not) about the use of some domestic spaces. In outlining the shape of the house and the mostly Vitruvian names assigned by scholars to each part, she reminds us that these terms are, and should be treated as, conventions for studying the various spaces, rather than as a tool (or, worse still, as evidence) for determining the function of those spaces. This is a well-worn line of argument for Allison, and she is right to use it. Even so, to this day Pompeian studies still suffer from forces of habit — not limited to domestic studies.⁵ Her stance is somewhat at odds with A. Wallace-Hadrill (18: “The development of the Campanian house”), who, in the very next chapter and after reminding us of the value of reading together a number of contributions on the same theme, suggests that there is nothing “inherently unreasonable in the assumption that what Vitruvius described might be found not just at Rome, but even in provincial Pompeii” (279). Many such contrasts exist within this book, and much can be gained from them: for while Wallace-Hadrill also conducts a tour of the “atrium nucleus”, he is much more content to do so in the company of Vitruvius than through a juggling of artifact assemblages. It remains for the student to decide, not which of these seemingly divergent approaches is the more effective, but how each can become more absorbent of the other. These issues aside, Wallace-Hadrill unravels an historiography of the development of the Campanian house, and addresses the processes by which they were “hellenised” — by which he means the cultural process by which Italy became Roman. The following chapter by J. Berry (19: “*Instrumentum domesticum* — a case study”), which also looks at the study of artifact assemblages in domestic contexts, ought also to be read in conjunction with Allison’s. Berry’s focus, however, is much different again in that her case-study is more focused on the contents from a single house (I.9.1-2).

V. Strocka (20: “Domestic decoration: paintings and the ‘Four Styles’”) makes a chronological survey of each of the 4 Pompeian styles, a classification born from Mau’s deft recognition in the late 19th c. of chronological (and so cultural) developments in wall-painting schemes. Scholars have tried ever since — if largely in vain — to achieve more than a fine-tuning of his scheme. Apart from a descriptive explanation of each style, Strocka includes a helpful table of select examples which include some from beyond the Vesuvian cities. J. Clarke (21: “Domestic decoration: mosaics and stucco”) broadens the decorative scope to describe mosaic and stucco decoration, organizing his examples under the canonical wall-painting scheme so that any stylistic trait of a mosaic, for example, must be seen as secondary to the type of schema found on the wall. Clarke is right to recognize a coordination between the decoration of floor, wall, and ceiling, but some discussion of this imposed hierarchy would have been welcome. Given the rarity of mosaics as compared to wall-paintings, as well as the fact that they could be signed by the mosaicist, could we legitimately reverse this order of importance? Still concerned with the decorative arts, J. C. Fant (22: “Real and painted [imitation] marble at Pompeii”) shows how a sharp eye for marble types — a unique skill in Pompeian circles — can open up a range of questions about Pompeii’s place in the Mediterranean trade in rare marbles.

S. Nappo (23: “Houses of Regions I and II”) revisits the topic of the shape of *insulae* (cf. Geertman and Westfall), and so the streets that bound them, but with a tighter focus on Regions

⁵ See E. Leach, “Oecus on Ibycus: investigating the vocabulary of the Roman house,” in S. Bon and R. Jones (edd.), *Sequence and space in Pompeii* (Oxford 1997) 50-72; A. Riggsby, “‘Public’ and ‘private’ in Roman culture: the case of the *cubiculum*,” *JRA* 10 (1997) 36-56; P. Allison, “Approaches to Roman domestic space at the turn of the millennium: using the material and the written sources,” *AJA* 105 (2001) 181-208. On the dangers of this habit spreading beyond domestic architecture to commercial, see S. J. R. Ellis, “The distribution of bars at Pompeii: archaeological, spatial and viewshed analyses,” *JRA* 17 (2004) 371-84; and “The use and misuse of ‘legacy data’ in identifying a typology of retail outlets at Pompeii,” *Internet Archaeology* 24 (2008): http://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue24/ellis_index.html.

1 and 2 and one that is much informed by recent stratigraphic excavations. He provides case-studies of 7 properties of various size and adornment in which the chronological developments of their layouts are described in good detail. This approach to the organization of space is again contrasted with the following chapter by K. Peterse (24: "Select residences in Regions V and IX: early anonymous domestic architecture"), who uses wall-construction styles as index for the chronologies of various houses in those regions; his sample is of "select" residences based on their supposed early date (4th-3rd c. B.C.) and their being smaller than other similar examples (he cites [383] the House of the Surgeon as 4th c., yet in the very next chapter [Jones and Robinson, p. 392] we discover that the house dates to only c.200 B.C.). How various wall-construction techniques (rather than the excavation of datable deposits) can be used explicitly to date a house is never fully explained: we have to trust Peterse that the limestone-framework era of construction can be dated "indicatively" from the mid-5th to the end of the first quarter of the 2nd c. B.C. A more systematic methodology is offered in the chapter by R. Jones and D. Robinson (25: "Intensification, heterogeneity and power in the development of Insula VI.1"). They chronicle the development of a city block as told through their excavations of pre-A.D. 79 deposits. Theirs is a long-considered story of intensification, heterogeneity and power (their protagonists being the owners of the Houses of the Vestals and the Surgeon), one which is traditionally told from a top-down perspective. The synthetic interpretations are patently worthwhile, although the excavators seem almost surprised to discover that an open space might become more intensively occupied over the years of urban occupation, and that social inequality (the very hallmark of Roman culture) should ensue.

R. Tybout (26: "Rooms with a view: residences built on terraces along the edge of Pompeii [Regions VI, VII and VIII]") presents yet more architectural case-studies: the stunning terraced houses that were built upon the defunct fortification walls across the SW arc of Pompeii. With the defeat of Sulla's enemies in the Social War, Pompeii not only became a colony under Roman dominion, but was encased within a security system that now extended far beyond the familiar range of danger. With the fortification wall retired, coupled with increased population density, habitations moved right up to, onto, and beyond those parts of the Archaic Wall that afforded the most magnificent views over the Sarno valley and coastline of the Bay of Naples.

The next two chapters take us to the residences of Herculaneum (J.-A. Dickmann) and the villas and country houses in the immediate territory (E. Moormann). These outlines provide fine opportunities for students not only to extend their awareness of domestic space beyond Pompeii, but also to counterbalance appropriately the Pompeian material. Moreover, these two contributions are amongst the most rational and well-considered approaches to housing in this part of the book. Dickmann (27: "Residences in Herculaneum") reviews the study of houses at Herculaneum before leading us on an informative tour of several examples which vary in social class. Moormann (28: "Villas surrounding Pompeii and Herculaneum") reviews the more-than-one-hundred known villas around Pompeii, although this number is too high given that (as Moormann rightly points out) the term 'villa' is too easily applied to extra-urban structures of what could have been different kinds of buildings. He then looks at the rôle that extra-urban villas played in the operation of their dependent city.

4. "Society and economy"

In the final section, the 11 chapters fan out across more diverse topics. F. Pirson (29: "Shops and industries") covers the full range of commercial production associated with Pompeii's many shops and industries. His approach to rental arrangements and the organization of living spaces by these businesses is guided as much by epigraphic data as by architecture, the successful results of which contrast markedly with J. DeFelice (30) on inns and taverns, who misunderstands the appropriate relationship that can exist between archaeology and text. His study is built upon the identification of Pompeii's hospitality businesses as defined by the Latin labels that were casually and unsystematically attached to them upon discovery. Such an egregious misunderstanding of the Pompeian data-set undermines the entire essay, which might otherwise have treated the owners of and workers within the town's hospitality businesses, their clientele, and the social activities played out.

The late W. Jashemski (31: "Gardens") raises the level with a chapter — the product of 60 years' work in Pompeian archaeology — that illustrates the centrality of the garden among houses humble and haughty. Throughout Pompeii, Herculaneum and the surrounding villas, 626 gardens have been documented. Different again, in approach and results, is W. Jongman (32: "The loss of innocence: Pompeian economy and society between past and present"), who gives a detailed and theoretically-driven historiographic essay on the study of the Pompeian economy. His is a much less optimistic and anachronistic vision than that championed by M. Rostovtzeff in the early 20th c., which saw Pompeii as a 'modern', sanitized and comfortable city. Instead, Jongman follows the Finley generation who imagine a less modernized ancient world with cities whose urban development did not lead to a related economic growth — the familiar 'consumer *versus* producer city' paradigm, with Pompeii representing the former by its parasitic reliance on the countryside, and thereby in contrast to the economic modernization of European cities. In the next historiographic offering, J. L. Franklin, jr. (33: "Epigraphy and society") provides a good overview of the development of epigraphic studies at Pompeii. He leaps to the defence of his illustrious counterpart, M. Della Corte,⁶ who conjured the names of Pompeian house-owners based upon electoral posters scribbled onto the façades of several houses — an approach that has been much criticized, "overly" so in Franklin's estimation (519). F. Bernstein (34: "Pompeian women") also draws primarily upon the epigraphic record in her study on the rôle of women, especially with regard to the usual family arenas: economy, politics, society, and religion. Her assessment is unsurprising (or maybe surprising to some?), that women played an "active rôle" in all social affairs at Pompeii (534). Next M. George (35: "The lives of slaves") reviews the slave experience, with special emphasis given to the relationships that developed among and between slaves or slave networks, which were quite apart from the more 'top-down' relationships that might have been tolerated to varying degrees by the slave-owner.

K. Welch (36: "Pompeian men and women in portrait sculpture") provides an excellent and comprehensive overview of the range of portrait styles at Pompeii. By examining the 50 or so examples found in public and private contexts, and by incorporating the "sub-élite" with the more often studied élite portraiture, she carefully discerns some of the decisions taken in self-commemoration. She repopulates the city, and its study, with the proud images of some of the town's most celebrated citizens. This is especially important given the removal of statuary as early as the days or weeks following the destruction of 79, at least from the Forum, and certainly during the clearance of volcanic débris. This is one of the especially strong chapters that balance overview with insight. With S. Cormack (37: "The tombs at Pompeii") the pace shifts once more to a more generalized yet lengthy overview of the range of evidence for burial practice. Death is again the focus of E. Lazer (38: "Victims of the cataclysm"), but her subjects are those who died during the 79 eruption. In her study of the skeletal remains, she found that the sample of victims was not skewed to any particular sector of the population, such as those we might perceive as less likely to have escaped — the old or very young, or the sick and injured.

It seems fitting that the last of the 39 chapters may well be the best. A. Laidlaw (39: "Mining the early published sources: problems and pitfalls") writes not about houses, the economy, or the society (the sort of topics that might usually make a grand finale) but instead serves up a well-structured and fundamental outline of the archives of Pompeian archaeology from 1748 to 1900, with some mentions of more recent works that she considers invaluable. Two appendices cover Zangemeister's list of Pompeian officials and Superintendents from 1748 to 1860 and a glossary. By her own admission, her selection is not exhaustive, but even so it is surprising that she omits L. Garcia y Garcia as a source on Pompeian bibliography.⁷ After such a long, rich, complicated and multicultural, not to say multifarious, history of excavation at

⁶ See especially M. Della Corte, *Pompeii, the new excavations (houses and inhabitants)* (Valle di Pompei 1927) and *Case ed abitanti di Pompei* (Napoli 1965).

⁷ L. Garcia y Garcia, *Nova bibliotheca pompeiana: 250 anni di bibliografia archeologica ... ad uso degli studiosi, degli amatori, dei collezionisti e dei librai. Repertorium bibliographicum pompeianum* (Rome 1998).

these sites, any overview is long overdue, especially one as good as this.⁸ The lesson to be drawn is that we must appreciate the information gleaned from the records, rather than simply denigrate them for any flaws they may display when set against the latest scholarship and techniques. This is not merely to sugarcoat a long and indifferent record out of deference to long-gone *Pompeianisti*, for one can often find much of value in the academic acumen and foresight of the earliest sources. Today, with so much of the city crumbling as vegetation rips masonry from mortar, as wall-paintings fade in direct sunlight or decay from freezing and acidic rains, as mosaics scatter under foot, and as tourists/looters chip away souvenirs or scratch their names into artworks, it is important to recognize the value of early publications that recorded what will never be seen again. Yet in spite of the value of that information, Laidlaw is absolutely right to stress “the necessity of an intimate knowledge of the site itself, since in almost all the early published accounts and far too often today scholars have relied on the information in earlier publications without checking for themselves” (620). We should all be grateful to her for the (perhaps indirect) impact her contribution should have on future Pompeian scholarship.

Some final remarks

Overall, students and scholars alike have much to be grateful for. ‘Hits and misses’ were to be expected given the enormity of the editorial process, the range of topics, the long gestation, and, it might be added, the varying qualifications of the contributors. I have tried not to dwell on the weaker contributions, some of which verge on being disappointing when contrasted with their stronger peers: in any case, as a pedagogical device they too can serve good purpose. And while it may not take long to find some better treatments of certain topics elsewhere, nowhere can they be found in a single volume: this is the strength of the book.

The editors state that their authors struck a “balance between outline and originality” (xxix), but the weight must surely be on “outline”. Many summarize the particular author’s (life’s) work — which actually works well for a textbook. Coupled with the historiographies, which are central to so many of the chapters, these outlines will prove especially useful, not least as a gauge for what has already been done (and when, why, and how) at this heavily tapped site, but also for what remains to be done. Still, many might take issue with the already outdated nature of some of these summaries, and consequently of the project itself. The issues behind the long gestation of the book, or indeed for just how long the process was held up, cannot be known to this reader, but the results are quite telling. Apart from the fact that citations dry up in the late 1990s or very early 2000s, the few more recent ones appear as appended entries rather than as works that have significantly influenced the outcome of any chapter.⁹ Given the spate of excellent publications on Pompei over the past 5 years, it is simply disappointing that none of the present chapters benefited from the most recent work.¹⁰ Conspicuous also is the relative dearth of Italian contributors, who otherwise have dominated in publication of the most recent (and best) work. While the range of nationalities is broad (from Australia to Iceland, and much in between), only 5 Italians made the team of 40 authors, with fully half being Anglo-American (20), followed by other European (11).

Editorial mistakes are surprisingly few for a project of this size and should hardly register with the tolerant reader. Of more concern is the lack of a single comprehensive bibliography. While the editors claim that each of the chapters contain their “own set of bibliographic

⁸ This is in fact an update of the “Commentary on bibliography” in Laidlaw’s *The First Style in Pompeii: painting and architecture* (Rome 1985) 2-13.

⁹ A. Wallace-Hadrill is the most explicit in dating his entry, noting (289 n.1) that he had not updated his text since 2002.

¹⁰ For some of the most recent, ‘cutting edge’ research, see: most volumes of the *Studi della Soprintendenza archeologica di Pompei series*, especially F. Coarelli and F. Pesando, *L’insula 10 della regio VI di Pompei* (Rome 2005); Guzzo and Guidobaldi 2005 (supra n.2); Guzzo and Guidobaldi 2007 (supra n.2); the several excavation reports published in the *Journal of Fasti Online* at <http://www.fastionline.org/>, and, not least, the Soprintendenza’s own *Rivista di Studi Pompeiani*.

references in the endnotes" (xxviii), this is not enough to fully satisfy in a book of this kind; in actuality, some 14 of the contributions include their own bibliography, the rest just endnotes. Bibliographies for every chapter would have proved immeasurably useful — and have brought consistency — but an overall bibliography even more so, both for the educational component and for 'trawling' purposes. Given the princely sum asked by the publisher, the purchaser might also expect a higher quality set of photographs. While exceptions exist (notably the chapters of Dobbins and Welch), most of the black-and-white images have poor contrast and focus, and many appear simply to be tourist shots; the line drawings and plans, on the other hand, are excellent. A paperback edition (expected imminently at the time of writing) is said to be priced around \$50, which will greatly improve its reception as a textbook. The excellent Web interface is the key to success in that area.¹¹ The Website is an invaluable and dynamic component, particularly its more pedagogical aspects; it joins the Pompeii Soprintendenza's own site (<http://www2.pompeiiisites.org/>) and E. Poehler's *Pompeiana* (<http://www.pompeiana.org/>) as the first stop for students and scholars. The book's web content currently includes:

- 1 Marginalia, to provide supplementary and primarily Web-based teaching and resource material, organized under each chapter. The dynamic nature of this medium should ensure the on-going updating of most chapters as necessary (at the time of writing, only the first 13 or so chapters have received some comprehensive coverage).
- 2 An "e-book" publication of A. Mau, *Pompeii: its life and art* (transl. F. W. Kelsey; 2nd edn., New York 1907), which has been scanned into downloadable PDF files.
- 3 An indexed listing of houses and other properties at Pompeii, Herculaneum and their hinterland mentioned in the text. A necessary concordance of (conventional) house/property names with their more appropriate address labels is supplied.
- 4 A "master bibliography" (missing from the book itself) is listed as "forthcoming".
- 5 Website links considered essential for further study.
- 5 (*sic*) A table of contents for the book.
- 6 Information on how to buy the book itself.

The accompanying CD-ROM includes high-quality maps and plans (in multiple formats and sizes) of the Bay of Naples, Pompeii, and Herculaneum, as well as color versions of figs. 3.1 and 10.1 in the book. Maps and plans are appropriately labeled, and the Pompeii plan has georeferencing information that will permit its insertion into a Geographic Information System (GIS).

Dobbins and Foss have bestowed upon us a landmark publication on the art and archaeology of Pompeii. With the aim not to produce "the new Mau", they have in fact achieved still loftier heights, for it is likely that *The world of Pompeii* will be drawn upon by new generations of students and scholars for years to come.

steven.ellis@uc.edu

Department of Classics, University of Cincinnati

¹¹ The website presently resides at: <http://homepage.mac.com/pfoss/Pompeii/WorldOfPompeii/index.html>.