

**KITCHENS AND DINING ROOMS AT POMPEII:
THE SPATIAL AND SOCIAL RELATIONSHIP
OF COOKING TO EATING IN THE ROMAN HOUSEHOLD**

Volume I

The Text

by

Pedar William Foss

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Classical Art and Archaeology)
in The University of Michigan
1994

Doctoral Committee:

Assistant Professor Susan E. Alcock, Chair
Professor John H. D'Arms, Dean of the Rackham School of Graduate Studies
and Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
Professor Bruce W. Frier
Professor Elaine K. Gazda
Professor John H. Humphrey

ABSTRACT

KITCHENS AND DINING ROOMS AT POMPEII: THE SPATIAL AND SOCIAL RELATIONSHIP OF COOKING TO EATING IN THE ROMAN HOUSEHOLD

by

Pedar William Foss

Chair: Susan E. Alcock

The physical, environmental, decorative, and ritual arrangements for cooking and dining are documented in a large sample of residences from six contiguous *insulae* at Pompeii. The descriptions, measurements, photographs, and plans will prove an invaluable resource for Pompeian archaeologists and architects, and historians of Roman domestic life and foodways. An analysis of this archaeological evidence shows how residents organized domestic space for the purposes of taking their daily meals. The units of analysis are groups of buildings carefully defined by architectural criteria, and which represent the place of their occupants along the socio-economic spectrum of the community. Against a background of ancient literature and modern scholarship, I investigate how meals structured Roman social relationships.

The preparation and consumption of meals in Pompeii and the Roman world acted as a social barometer. Larger households had larger, better decorated, and more numerous dining areas, and a larger cooking capacity than smaller households. Larger households not only had more mouths to feed, but their dinners were social occasions to which guests were invited, and at which status was evaluated. In order to impress their guests, cultivate social ties and reinforce their position, owners constructed arrays of dining areas that were environmentally moderated, highly decorated and had views onto gardens and water-play.

The number and size of dining areas, the expense given over to their elaboration, the physical distance between dining and cooking areas, and the social distance between free and slave household members all decreased toward the lower end of the socio-economic spectrum. In larger households, intra-household social distinctions between slave and free were highlighted and formalized at dinner. Kitchens were located far from dining areas, and sections of the largest houses were reserved for slaves to cook and eat their food. In the smallest shops, eating and cooking were done informally in the same space, with no contingency for mealtime social interaction with outside guests -- company was enjoyed at neighborhood meeting places, over the snacks and drinks of lunch counters and diners. In sum, socially proximate individuals tended to eat together, in environments that befit their status.

"This task will become comparatively easy, however, and surely interesting and with a foreboding of many delights and surprises if we penetrate the jungle aided by the experience of predecessors...and armed with the indispensable equipment for gastronomical research, i.e., the practical and technical knowledge of cookery, mastery of languages, augmented by practical experience gathered by observations and travel in many lands, and last but not least, if we are obsessed with the fixed idea that so menial a subject is worth all the bother."
(J. D. Vehling, *Apicius. Cookery and Dining in Imperial Rome*, New York, 1936, 35).

© Pedar William Foss 1994
All Rights Reserved

To my parents, Rodney and Susan,
for their belief, patience, and love;
I say it from the hearth.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

One hundred years ago on Sept. 1, 1894, a particularly hot and dry summer and a severe temperature inversion conspired to turn two small forest fires into a tremendous blaze that destroyed one-quarter of a million acres, six towns and killed about 600 people in the area of Hinckley, Minnesota. Despite the obliteration of the landscape, the towns were rebuilt by winter, and families soon arrived to work the newly cleared and enriched soil, among them my own family, who farms there still. In some small way, the legacy of the Great Hinckley Fire has brought me to investigate the cataclysm that Vesuvius visited on Pompeii and surrounding towns. My first archaeological experience was stumbling through the foundations of homesteads that were established by those early settlers. Even then, bottles, rusted utensils and ceramic pots provided clues to the lives of my great-grandparents' neighbors. Few farms are left now, and the fact that my parents remain is testament to their great strength and courage through difficult times. Without their encouragement and support, I never would have been able to venture this course of study.

Inspiration for this particular project is due in part to the work of Professor Andrew Wallace-Hadrill and his reviviscence of Roman domestic studies. I thank the members of my committee, Profs. S. E. Alcock, J.H. D'Arms, B.W. Frier, E. K. Gazda and J.H. Humphrey, as well as Prof. D. J. Mattingly, who encouraged and aided my search for the answers. D. O. Ross provided advice on certain, difficult Latin passages. This work was undertaken with the generous financial support of the United States Government in the form of a Jacob K. Javits fellowship, the Mellon Foundation, the University of Michigan Rackham School of Graduate Studies and Interdepartmental Program in Classical Art and Archaeology.

For the permission to conduct fieldwork at Pompeii and Herculaneum in the summer of 1993, I thank Baldassare Conticello, the Superintendent of Antiquities for Pompeii and Herculaneum, Antonio Varone the Vice-Superintendent, Antonio d'Ambrosio and Ernesto De Carolis, the directors of the sites. Practical on-site assistance was provided by Vittorio Boccia and all of the staff, guards and workmen who patiently afforded me access to houses large and small.

The fellow researchers at Pompeii with whom I had the pleasure of making acquaintance were very helpful in accustoming me to the problems and opportunities of working at Pompeii. I especially thank C. Parslow, L. Jacobelli, U. Pappalardo and P. Allison. I would like to thank B.

Ault, J. Berry, A. Cubberley and C. Parslow for permission to cite as yet-unpublished manuscripts which they were kind enough to provide. E. Dwyer helpfully supplied assistance on sources for insula I.4. I also thank the library staff at the British School at Rome and the University of Michigan, who were always able to find the books I needed.

Participation in conferences on domestic architecture at Washington and Reading, England was most stimulating and caused me to rethink many of my ideas; I learned much in discussions with L. Nevett, B. Ault, J. Berry, F. Pirson, M. George, L. Hitchcock and G. Ince. During the course of writing, I was always cheered by the good humor of B. Richards, D. W. Reynolds, C. Goodnoh, M. B. Garrison, A. Hogg, E. Tombari, and the Schindlers. Most of all, I owe this work to the support, love and critical editorial eyes of RKS and MKS. I thank them all for their help, and naturally do not hold them accountable for any of my errors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME I -- The Text

DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	x
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER	
I. THE CONTEXTS OF COOKING AND EATING	6
What is cooked and eaten?	8
How is cooking and eating done?	12
Culinary information	13
Food storage	14
Cooking techniques and instruments	17
<i>Cooking stands and braziers</i>	18
<i>Baking covers</i>	19
Serving and eating utensils	20
Table etiquette	22
When is cooking and eating done?	27
The daily routine	27
Seasonal considerations	30
Where is cooking and eating done?	32
Cooking and eating outside the home	32
<i>Public feasts</i>	32
<i>Eating clubs</i>	34
<i>Eating establishments</i>	35
Cooking and eating inside the home	37
<i>Proximity</i>	39
<i>Accessibility</i>	39
<i>Perceptibility</i>	41
<i>Amenities</i>	42
<i>Sanctity</i>	43
Who cooks, serves and eats (and with whom)?	45
Age	45
Gender	47
Rank and status	50

II. DEFINING COOKING AND DINING AREAS	57
Parameters	58
The samples	58
The Pompeian evidence	59
Chronology	62
Typology and terminology: cooking areas	62
Literary sources for cooking areas and installations	62
<i>Focus, foculus/foculare</i>	63
<i>Furnus/fornax, fornacula</i>	66
<i>Caminus</i>	68
<i>Culina</i>	69
<u>In vestibulo</u>	69
<u>In atrio</u>	70
<u>In postico</u>	71
<u>In the dining room</u>	73
<i>Water, drainage, fires and smoke</i>	74
An archaeological typology of kitchen installations	78
Type HE, "Hearth"	78
Type ST, "Stove"	79
Type LO, "Large Oven"	82
Type SO, "Small Oven"	83
Typology and terminology: dining areas	84
Literary sources for dining rooms	84
<i>Cenatio, cenatiuncula</i>	88
<i>Cenaculum</i>	88
<i>Oecus</i>	90
<i>Triclinium</i>	91
<u>Interior architectural elaboration</u>	94
<u>Environmental setting</u>	99
An archaeological typology of dining areas	105
Type DR, "Dining Room"	106
Type DH, "Dining Hall"	112
Type DI, "Dinette"	113
Type DO, "Dining Area (Open-Air)"	114
Type DB, "Dining Benches"	115
Degrees of confidence in dining area identification	115
 III. AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS	
OF COOKING AND DINING AREAS AT POMPEII	116
Building categories for comparison.	117
(Work)shops	118
(Work)shop-houses	120
Commercial eating establishments	122
<i>Lunch counters</i>	122
<i>Diners</i>	122
Houses with or without (work)shops	123
<i>Casa piccola</i>	124
<i>Casa media</i>	124
<i>Casa grande</i>	124
Summaries, correlations and patterns.	128
Cooking area amenities	128
<i>Heat</i>	128
<i>Light and ventilation</i>	134

<i>Water and drainage</i>	136
<i>Floor and wall decoration</i>	139
Dining area amenities	140
<i>Dining area types and evidence</i>	140
<i>Light, aspect and orientation</i>	146
<i>Floor and wall decoration</i>	150
Storage	153
The relationship of ritual to cooking and dining areas	158
Proximity & accessibility of cooking and dining areas	165
Perceptibility of cooking areas from dining areas (sight, sound and smell)	167
 IV. THE SOCIO-CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT OF MEALS . . .	 169
Community organization	170
Household organization	171
Physical topography	171
Social topography	174
 V. GAZETTEER	 178
Introduction: definitions and format	178
Gazetteer, part I: microanalysis	185
1. I.4.1-3: Casa + Popina	185
2. I.4.4: Taberna	187
3. I.4.5-6+25+28: Casa del Citarista	188
4. I.4.7: Fullonica di Passaratus e Maenianus	195
5. I.4.8, 10: Tabernae	196
6. I.4.9: Casa	196
7. I.4.11: Caupona di Coposius	198
8. I.4.12-17: Bakery+Taberna di Iunius Proculus	199
9. I.4.18, 19, 20-21: Tabernae	200
10. I.4.22: Casa del pressorio di terracotta	201
11. I.4.23,24: Tabernae	203
12. I.4.26: Fullonica di Dionysios	204
13. I.4.27: Popina	205
14. I.6.1: Officina	205
15. I.6.2+16: Casa del Criptoportico	206
16. I.6.3: Officina e taberna di Verus	210
17. I.6.4: Casa del Sacello Iliaco	211
18. I.6.5-6: Popina	217
19. I.6.7: Fullonica di Stephanus	218
20. I.6.8-9: Casa + Caupona	223
21. I.6.10: Taberna	227
22. I.6.11: Casa dei Quadretti Teatrali	228
23. I.6.12: Taberna del faber ferrarius Iunianus	231
24. I.6.13-4: Casa di Stallius Eros	232
25. I.6.15: Casa dei Ceii	235
26. I.7.1+20: Casa di P. Paquius Proculus	241

27. I.7.2-3: Casa di M. Fabius Amandus	245
28. I.7.4: Officina vasaria di Corinthus	247
29. I.7.5: Casa di Philippus	248
30. I.7.6: Taberna di Primilla	250
31. I.7.7: Casa del Sacerdos Amandus	250
32. I.7.8-9: Popina	253
33. I.7.10-12: Casa dell'Efebo	254
34. I.7.13-14: Caupona di Masculus	265
35. I.7.15-17: Officina degli scrittori murali, Tabernae	268
36. I.7.18: Taberna di Niraemius	270
37. I.7.19: Casa annessa alla Casa dell'Efebo	274
Gazetteer, Part II: Macroanalysis	280
38. I.8.1-3: Casa e popina di Stephanus	280
39. I.8.4-6: Casa della Statuetta Indiana	280
40. I.8.7: Taberna	281
41. I.8.8-9: Casa e caupona di L. Vetutius Placidus	281
42. I.8.10: Casa di Pulcinella	282
43. I.8.12: Stabulum/Officina	283
44. I.8.13: Officina di A. Granius Romanus	283
45. I.8.14: Casa di M. Epidius Primus	284
46. I.8.15-16: Caupona di N. Fufidius Successus	285
47. I.8.17+11: Casa dei Quattro Stili	285
48. I.8.18: Casa di Balbus	286
49. I.8.19: Officina tinctoria di Terentius	287
50. I.9.1-2: Casa del Bell'Impluvio	288
51. I.9.3-4: Casa e caupona di Successus	288
52. I.9.5-7: Casa dei Cubicoli Floreali	289
53. I.9.8: Casa	290
54. I.9.9: Casa	291
55. I.9.10: Casa	291
56. I.9.11: Caupona di Amarantus	292
57. I.9.12: Casa (Lupanare di Q. Mestrius Maximus)	292
58. I.9.13-14: Casa di Cerere	293
59. I.9.15: Officina	294

60. I.10.1: Casa	294
61. I.10.2-3: Casa e popina di Coponia	295
62. I.10.4+14-17: Casa del Menandro	296
63. I.10.5-6: Fullonica	298
64. I.10.7: Casa del Fabbro	299
65. I.10.8: Tessitoria di Minucius	300
66. I.10.9: Taberna di P.C.F.	301
67. I.10.10-11: Casa degli Amanti	301
68. I.10.12: Taberna	302
69. I.10.13: Popina dei Poppaei	302
70. I.10.18: Casa degli Aufidii	303
REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS	304
<u>VOLUME II -- The Figures</u>	319
CHAPTER I	319
CHAPTER II	332
CHAPTER III	362
CHAPTER V	363
Plans of the sample insulae	363
Figures for insula I.4	384
Figures for insula I.6	395
Figures for insula I.7	405
Figures for insula I.8	426
Figures for insula I.9	439
Figures for insula I.10	450

LIST OF TABLES

Table

2.1	Lengths and widths of couches in study sample dining areas as reconstructed from the measurements of their couch niches, in meters (total of 22 reconstructed couch sizes).	111
2.2	Frequency of dining area types from the study sample (total of 168 dining areas).	112
3.1	Wallace-Hadrill's (1994, from Table 4.2) building categories for urban analysis, based on ground area (total of 234 buildings).	117
3.2	Ground areas and counts for building categories in this thesis (total of 81 functionally distinct units within 75 buildings).	118
3.3	List of building categories and the locations and types of cooking and dining areas that appear in each building.	126
3.4	Comparison of average total number and ground area of dining areas between building categories.	145
3.5	Comparison of the average distance and average number of spaces to the front door of a building from fixed cooking areas and dining areas according to building category.	166
4.1	Diagram of trends in the physical and social topography of cooking and dining areas across the socio-economic spectrum.	173

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

1.1	Cooking pots and pans stored on the walls and found on the stove of kitchen (m) of the Fullonica di Stephanus, I.6.7 (Della Corte 1927, 17, Fig. 5).	319
1.2	Storage closets with bracket holes for shelving in the SE corner of atrium (3) of the Casa di Caesius Blandus, VII.1.40.	319
1.3	Marble table (<i>urnarium/cartibulum</i>) with bronze vessels on top (left to right): small jug, strigil, patera, large jug. Located against the W wall of atrium 41 in the Casa del Menandro I.10.4 (Maiuri 1933, 432, Fig. 163).	320
1.4	The kitchen stove in the Casa dei Vettii, VI.15.1 (w). Objects (left to right): two small <i>caccabi</i> , <i>caccabus</i> on iron tripod, <i>ahenum</i> on iron tripod, iron grill, large <i>caccabus</i> .	320
1.5	The kitchen stove in the Casa dei Vettii, VI.15.1 (w). Detail (left to right) of : <i>ahenum</i> on iron tripod, iron grill.	321
1.6	Terracotta <i>olla</i> (Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, #132).	321
1.7	Part of the silver service from fauces (1) of Casa di M. Epidius Primus, I.8.14: two drinking cups (<i>pocula</i>) and one ladle (<i>simpulum</i>) (Castiglione Morelli del Franco & Vitale 1989, Fig. 20).	322
1.8	Part of the silver service from storeroom [B] under the baths of the Casa del Menandro, I.10.4: four serving trays, three in the shape of sea-shells (at corners), two jugs (center top), three casseroles and one perfume bottle (center bottom) (Maiuri 1933, Fig. 105).	322
1.9	Terminology and schematic typology for cooking supports, stands, and braziers: (a) cooking support, (b) cooking stand, (c) cooking brazier, (d) brazier, (e) stand (Scheffer 1981, 26, Fig. 1).	322
1.10	<i>Fornello</i> (cooking-stand) of clay, unknown provenance, Museo Nazionale di Napoli (Collezioni 1989, 200-201, #193).	323
1.11	<i>Braciare</i> (portable brazier) of clay, unknown provenance, Museo Nazionale di Napoli (Collezioni 1989, 200-201, #194).	323
1.12	Casa dell'Efebo I.7.10-12: rectangular brazier found stored in room (18) (Maiuri, NSc 1927, 80 Fig. 47).	324
1.13	Circular portable brazier of bronze from peristyle (c) of the Casa del Menandro, I.10.4 (Rediscovering Pompeii 1992, 173, #58).	324

1.14	Late Republican-early imperial baking cover (<i>clibanus, testum</i>) from Matrice, Molise (Cubberley et al. 1988, 104, Fig. 1.2).	325
1.15	Late Imperial baking cover (<i>clibanus, testum</i>) from Matrice, Molise (Cubberley et al. 1988, 104, Fig. 2.6).	325
1.16	Bronze hot-water heater from Pompeii, Museo Nazionale di Napoli, inv. 73018 (Pernice 1925, Taf. VII).	326
1.17	Bronze-hot-water heater from Pompeii, room (9) of the Casa dei Cubicoli Floreali, I.9.5-7 (Rediscovering Pompeii 1992, 189, #85).	326
1.18	Cutaway reconstruction of the masonry dining rooms in the Portico dei Triclini at the <i>pagus maritimus</i> of Pompeii (Elia 1961, 201, Fig. 2).	327
1.19	Line drawing of a painted panel showing customers eating at an inn or tavern and being served by a boy, panel #3 from room (b) of the <i>caupona</i> VI.10.1 (Blanck 1980, Abb. 10).	327
1.20	Lararium painting in an aedicula of stucco relief showing a veiled Genius sacrificing at a tripod, flanked by two Lares, Bacchus and Mercury, above an altar flanked by two serpents. From behind the counter of diner I.8.8.	328
1.21	Niche lararium in small garden court (n), Casa I.4.9 (Jashemski 1993, 32, Fig. 33).	328
1.22	Aedicular lararium from the NW corner of atrium (b) of the Casa del Menandro (I.10.4).	329
1.23	Banquet scene from the E wall of dining room (r) of the Casa del Triclinio, V.2.4, Museo Nazionale di Napoli inv. 120029 (Fröhlich 1991, Taf. 20.2).	329
1.24	Banquet scene from the W wall of dining room (r) of the Casa del Triclinio, V.2.4, Museo Nazionale di Napoli inv. 120030 (Fröhlich 1991, Taf. 21.1).	330
1.25	Banquet scene from the N wall of dining room (r) of the Casa del Triclinio, V.2.4, Museo Nazionale di Napoli inv. 120031 (Fröhlich 1991, Taf. 21.2).	330
1.26	Banquet/drinking scene, from Herculaneum, Museo Nazionale di Napoli (Pirzio Biroli Stefanelli 1990, 20, Fig. 17).	331
1.27	Reconstruction of the standard seating order in triclinium (e) of the Casa di Paccius Alexander, IX.1.7.	331
2.1	Map of Pompeii showing the location of the insulae of the study sample and the houses included in the comparanda.	332
2.2	Map of the insulae and streets of the study sample at Pompeii, and the distribution of building types (after the RICA 1:1000 map of CTP III).	333
2.3	Map of sample insula for cooking and dining area typology: insula I.4 with street names, addresses and room numbers/letters (after the RICA 1:1000 map, CTP III).	334
2.4	Map of sample insula for cooking and dining area typology: insula I.6 with street names, addresses and room numbers/letters (after the RICA 1:1000 map, CTP III).	335

2.5	Map of sample insula for cooking and dining area typology: insula I.7 with street names, addresses and room numbers/letters (after the RICA 1:1000 map, CTP III).	336
2.6	Map of sample insula for cooking and dining area typology: insula I.8 with street names, addresses and room numbers/letters (after the RICA 1:1000 map, CTP III).	337
2.7	Map of sample insula for cooking and dining area typology: insula I.9 with street names, addresses and room numbers/letters (after the RICA 1:1000 map, CTP III).	338
2.8	Map of sample insula for cooking and dining area typology: insula I.10 with street names, addresses and room numbers/letters (after the RICA 1:1000 map, CTP III).	339
2.9	Map of sample insula for cooking and dining area typology: insula VII.1 with street names, addresses and room numbers/letters (after the RICA 1:1000 map of CTP III).	340
2.10	Map of sample insula for cooking and dining area typology: insula VII.14 with street names, addresses and room numbers/letters (after the RICA 1:1000 map of CTP III).	341
2.11	Map of sample insula for cooking and dining area typology: insula IX.1 with street names, addresses and room numbers/letters (after the RICA 1:1000 map of CTP III).	342
2.12	Map of sample insula for cooking and dining area typology: insula IX.2 with street names, addresses and room numbers/letters (after the RICA 1:1000 map of CTP III).	343
2.13	Squarish hearth of sub-type (1) in atrium (41) next to the door to court (44) in the Casa del Menandro, I.10.4. Scale 0.50 m.	344
2.14	Quarter-circle shaped hearth of sub-type (1) in the SW corner of atrium (b) in the Casa di Stallius Eros, I.6.13-14. Scale 0.50 m.	344
2.15	Triangular hearth of sub-type (1) in the SW corner of atrium (2) in the Casa VII.14.14-15. Scale 0.50 m.	345
2.16	Stub-walls for hearth sub-type (2) against the E wall of kitchen (i) in the Casa dei Ceii, I.6.15. Scale 0.50 m.	345
2.17	Masonry hearth of sub-type (3) built against the S wall of room (3) in the Casa del Menandro, I.10.4.	346
2.18	Masonry hearth of sub-type (4) built into the end of the service counter of the Caupona I.4.27.	346
2.19	Stove sub-type (1) in kitchen (8) of the Casa dei Quadretti Teatrali, I.6.11. Scale 0.50 m.	347
2.20	Single-arched stove sub-type (2) with front curb of imbrices and back curb of tegula lips in kitchen (m) of the Fullonica di Stephanus, I.6.7. Scale 0.50 m.	347
2.21	Double-arched stove sub-type (2) with front curb of imbrices and back curb of upright tiles in kitchen (x) of the Casa dei Diadumeni, IX.1.20. Scale 0.50 m.	348

2.22	Triple-arched stove sub-type (2) in kitchen (14) of the Casa di Paquius Proculus, I.7.1. Scale 0.50 m.	348
2.23	Stove sub-type (3) with front curb of imbrices and back curb of upright tiles in kitchen (21) of the Casa dell'Efebo, I.7.10-12. Scale 0.50 m.	349
2.24	Stove sub-type (3) in the hallway (c) of the upstairs apartment in the Casa a Graticcio, III.13 at Herculaneum. Scale 0.50 m.	349
2.25	Combination one-arch and solid platform stove in kitchen (b) of the Taberna IX.1.4. Scale 0.50 m.	350
2.26	Combination two-arch and solid platform stove with back curb of upright tiles in kitchen (52) of the Casa del Menandro I.10.4. Scale 0.50 m.	350
2.27	Single-arched stove sub-type (2) with front curb of imbrices and back curb of upright tiles, masonry burners and arched hood in kitchen (11) of the Casa del Fabbro, I.10.7. Scale 0.50 m.	351
2.28	Single-arched stove sub-type (2) with arched hood and smoke vent in room (a) of Caupona IX.2.25. Scale 0.50 m.	351
2.29	Bee-hive type of large oven (Fulvio 1879, Tav. II.5).	352
2.30	Double-chambered type of large oven (Fulvio 1879, Tav. II.9).	352
2.31	Double-chambered large oven in kitchen (12) of the Casa di Siricus, VII.1.25+47. Scale 0.50 m.	352
2.32	(left to right) Work bench with hand mill below lararium niche, small oven, double-arched stove sub-type (2) with back curb of upright tiles in kitchen (20) of the Casa della Regina d'Inghilterra, VII.14.5+17-19. Scale 0.50 m.	353
2.33	(left to right) Small oven built into house wall, work bench with hand mill, broken catillus for a large mill sunk into the floor and re-used as a container in kitchen (21) of the Casa dei Cinque Scheletri, VII.14.9. Scale 0.50 m.	353
2.34	' <i>Oecus Tetrastylus</i> ' (4) in the Casa delle Nozze d'Argento, V.2.I (Adam 1984, 336, Fig. 715).	354
2.35	' <i>Oecus Corinthius</i> ' (24) in the Casa del Meleagro, VI.9.2.	354
2.36	' <i>Oecus Aegyptius</i> ' (5) of the Casa dell'Atrio a Mosaico, IV.2, at Herculaneum.	355
2.37	Remains of two wooden dining couches in dining room (19) of the Casa dell'Alcova, IV.4, at Herculaneum.	355
2.38	Remains of two wooden dining couches in dining room (2) of the upstairs apartment in the Casa a Graticcio, III.14, at Herculaneum.	356
2.39	Remains of wooden dining couch in dining room (5) of the upstairs apartment in the Casa a Graticcio, III.13, at Herculaneum.	356
2.40	Reconstructed dining couch of wood and bronze with inlaid silver from Pompeii in the Museo Nazionale di Napoli, Inv. 78614/615 (Engelmann 1904, Fig. 87).	357

2.41	Three niches for dining couches in dining room (11) of the Casa di Sutoria Primigenia, I.13.2.	357
2.42a-c	Perspective views of couch niches for the (a) <i>lectus summus</i> , (b) <i>lectus imus</i> , and (c) <i>lectus medius</i> in dining room (e) of the Casa di Paccius Alexander, IX.1.7 at Pompeii.	358
2.43a-b	Lengths and widths of dining-couches as reconstructed from their couch niches. Scatterplot (left) and cluster analysis (right) reveal two distinct groups of couch sizes (A & B). n=22.	358
2.44	Scatterplot of the dimensions for all types of dining areas, from the study sample: I.4, 6-10, VII.1, 14; IX.1-2.	359
2.45	Scatterplot of the dining area dimensions from the study sample with the boundaries for types DR, DH and DI, and 1:1 and 2:1 proportions indicated.	359
2.46	Masonry dining couches, table, dining benches and storage cabinet in portico (16) of the Casa del Criptoportico, I.6.2.	360
2.47	Marble-revetted masonry dining couches with cascade behind and pool in center, dining room (83) in the Praedia di Julia Felix, II.4.	360
2.48	Masonry dining couches with table and three sets of dining benches with two tables in the Caupona of the Praedia di Julia Felix, II.4.7.	361
2.49	Masonry dining-benches in room (4) of the Caupona di N. Fufidius Successus, I.8.15-16. Scale 0.50 m.	361
3.1	Histogram of total ground area according to building category. Each bar = 15 m.	362
 Plans of the sample insulae		
5.1	Key to the coding of building plans.	363
5.2	Ground floor insula plan showing the nodes, connectors, and static spaces in I.4 (after CTP III).	364
5.3	Ground floor insula plan showing the nodes, connectors, and static spaces in I.6 (after CTP III).	365
5.4	Ground floor insula plan showing the nodes, connectors, and static spaces in I.7 (after CTP III).	366
5.5	Ground floor insula plan showing the nodes, connectors, and static spaces in I.8 (after CTP III).	367
5.6	Ground floor insula plan showing the nodes, connectors, and static spaces in I.9 (after CTP III).	368
5.7	Ground floor insula plan showing the nodes, connectors, and static spaces in I.10 (after CTP III).	369

5.8	Detailed microanalysis plan of Casa + Popina I.4.1-3 and Taberna I.4.4 (after CTP III).	370
5.9	Detailed plan of kitchen (42) in Casa del Citarista I.4.5-6+25+28: heating installations, water sources, drainage and relationship to bath complex (after CTP III).	370
5.10	Detailed microanalysis plan of Casa del Citarista I.4.5-6+25+28 and Fullonica di Passaratus e Maenianus I.4.7 (after CTP III).	371
5.11	Detailed microanalysis plan of Casa I.4.9, Tabernae I.4.8, I.4.10 and the Caupona di Coposius I.4.11 (after CTP III).	372
5.12	Detailed microanalysis plan of Bakery I.4.12-14+17, and the Taberna di D. Iunius Proculus I.4.15-16 (after CTP III).	373
5.13	Detailed microanalysis plan of Tabernae I.4.18, I.4.19, I.4.20-21, I.4.23-24 and the Casa del pressorio di terracotta I.4.22 (after CTP III).	374
5.14	Detailed microanalysis plan of the Fullonica di Dionysios I.4.26, and the Popina I.4.27 (after CTP III).	374
5.15	Detailed microanalysis plan of the Officina I.6.1, the Casa del Criptoportico I.6.2, the Officina e taberna di Verus I.6.3, and the Casa del Sacello Iliaco I.6.4 (after CTP III).	375
5.16	Detailed microanalysis plan of the Casa del Sacello Iliaco I.6.4, Popina I.6.5-6, and the Fullonica di Stephanus I.6.7 (after CTP III).	376
5.17	Detailed microanalysis plan of Casa + Caupona I.6.8-9, Taberna I.6.10, the Casa dei Quadretti Teatrali I.6.11, and the Taberna del faber ferrarius Iunianus I.6.12 (after CTP III).	377
5.18	Detailed microanalysis plan of the Casa di Stallius Eros I.6.13-14 and the Casa dei Ceii I.6.15 (after CTP III).	378
5.19	Detailed microanalysis plan of the Casa di P. Paquius Proculus I.7.1+20 (after CTP III).	379
5.20	Detailed microanalysis plan of the Casa di M. Fabius Amandus I.7.2-3, the Officina vasaria di Corinthus I.7.4, the Casa di Philippus I.7.5, the Taberna di Primilla I.7.6, the Casa del Sacerdos Amandus and the Popina I.7.8-9 (after CTP III).	380
5.21	Detailed microanalysis plan of the Casa dell'Efebo I.7.10-12 (after CTP III).	381
5.22	Detailed microanalysis plan of the Caupona di Masculus I.7.13-14 and the Officina + Tabernae degli scrittori murali I.7.15-17 (after CTP III).	382
5.23	Detailed microanalysis plan of the Taberna di Niraemius I.7.18 and the Casa annessa alla Casa dell'Efebo I.7.19 (after CTP III).	383

Figures for insula I.4

5.24	Casa I.4.1-3: view E through atrium (b), with hearth at left, garden court (f) and dining room (g) in the far back.	384
------	---	-----

5.25	Casa I.4.1-3: view NW at dining room (g) right, garden court (f) center, and tablinum (c) and corridor (e) left towards atrium (b).	384
5.26	Taberna I.4.4: view NW at stove in back room (b) and through window and door to front room (a).	385
5.27	Casa del Citarista I.4.5-6+25+28, kitchen (42): view N at latrine left, stove right. Scale 0.50 m.	385
5.28	Casa del Citarista I.4.5-6+25+28, kitchen (42): view E at stove with basin and drain below right, and arched niche above right. Scale 0.50 m.	386
5.29	Casa del Citarista I.4.5-6+25+28, kitchen (42): view S at small oven with compartment above for a hot water tank for the baths right. Scale 0.50 m.	386
5.30	Casa del Citarista I.4.5-6+25+28, kitchen (64): view S at hearth right and passage left to storage area. Scale 0.50 m.	387
5.31	Casa del Citarista I.4.5-6+25+28, peristyle (17): view W at dining-hall (18) at opposite end of central pool.	387
5.32	Casa del Citarista I.4.5-6+25+28, dining-hall (19): view W out of hall to peristyle (17).	388
5.33	Casa del Citarista I.4.5-6+25+28, dining room (58): view E into room from peristyle (56).	388
5.34	Fullonica di Passaratus e Maenianus I.4.7: general view E into the building; low walls for work-basins at left.	389
5.35	Casa I.4.9: view SE from the stairs over the tablinum (h) to kitchen (o) with l-shaped stove (center left) and latrine (center right). Small court (n) left, with cistern head and niched shrine.	389
5.36	Casa I.4.9, dining-hall (m): view N, with central opus sectile emblema.	390
5.37	Caupona di Coposius I.4.11: view E in front room (a), with hearth in narrow room at left, and dining-area (b) right.	390
5.38	Caupona di Coposius I.4.11: detailed view SW at the low hearth in the narrow room off front room (a). Scale 0.50 m.	391
5.39	Bakery I.4.12-14+17: view E at entrance #13A at small oven, and work area (b) in back with large oven, back right.	391
5.40	Taberna I.4.18: view S, door to back room (b) left, and evidence for upper floor.	392
5.41	Taberna I.4.19: view S at two-room (work)shop. Stairs were located in the back left corner.	392
5.42	Taberna and upstairs apartment I.4.20-21: view SE at location of storage urns buried in the ground under the stairs against the left wall.	393
5.43	Casa del pressorio di terracotta I.4.22, kitchen (h): view SE at stove, right, and raised masonry podium, left. Scale 0.50 m.	393

5.44	Casa del pressorio di terracotta I.4.22, atrium (b): view NW at dining room (d), left, cubiculum (c), right, fauces (a), far right.	394
5.45	Fullonica di Dionysios I.4.26: view S, door to back room (a) left, remnants of "furnace" back center, washing basin back right.	394
5.46	Popina I.4.27: view S at counter, door to back room (b), left, and latrine partition (a), right.	395

Figures for insula I.6

5.47	Officina I.6.1: general view S; main room (1) with remains of basins on left and once a hearth in the center of the room. Cubiculum (2) with bed niche back right; back room (3) with bench along E wall and latrine on S end, back left.	395
5.48	Casa del Criptoportico I.6.2: detail N of the stove in loggia (16). Scale 0.50 m.	396
5.49	Casa del Criptoportico I.6.2: view E over the masonry dining couches and dining benches at the W end of loggia (16), towards the stove (first opening on the left).	396
5.50	Casa del Criptoportico I.6.2/Casa del Sacello Iliaco I.6.4: detailed plan of bath suite and dining room (22); E side of cryptoporticus (Maiuri NSc 1933, Tav. VII).	397
5.51	Casa del Sacello Iliaco I.6.4: view NE at stove left and latrine right in kitchen (n). Scale 0.50 m.	397
5.52	Casa del Sacello Iliaco I.6.4: view NE at lime kiln in room (s). Scale 0.50 m.	398
5.53	Casa del Sacello Iliaco I.6.4: view at W wall of dining room (c) at 4th style decoration and entrance.	398
5.54	Casa del Sacello Iliaco I.6.4: Plan of bipartite floor decoration in dining hall (p) (Spinazzola I, Fig. 608).	399
5.55	Popina I.6.5-6: view S past front counter and attached hearth towards back of shop; base for stairs to upper floor at right.	399
5.56	Fullonica di Stephanus I.6.7: view SW at the pots, pans, tripod and grill 'as found' on the stove and wall of kitchen (m) (Spinazzola II, Fig. 763).	400
5.57	Fullonica di Stephanus I.6.7: view NE at 4th style decoration in dining room (g), past the impluvium/wash basin to the street (Conticello 1987, 32).	400
5.58	Casa + Caupona I.6.8-9: view S through atrium (c) towards dining/reception room (d), below upper story cenaculum. Fixed dolia for front shop (b) and stove (c') left.	401
5.59	Casa + Caupona I.6.8-9: detail of stove (c') in NE corner of atrium (c); curb at left edge and front wall of 'burner' preserved at right. Stove surface supported by modern iron restoration. Scale 0.50 m.	401
5.60	Casa + Caupona I.6.8-9: detail of possible stove or 'doghouse' in SE corner of peristyle garden (i), with modern iron restoration. Scale 0.50 m.	402
5.61	Taberna I.6.10: view S toward back room and upper floor above, with stair lower right.	402

5.62	Casa di Stallius Eros I.6.13-14: view S from tablinum (6) through atrium to hearth in back right corner, near the entrance to dining room (4).	403
5.63	Casa dei Ceii I.6.15: view S in kitchen (i) at remains of stove of sub-type (3) left under the window, and latrine at right (Michel 1990, Taf. 143).	403
5.64	Casa dei Ceii, I.6.15: view N at small grinding platform in NW corner of kitchen (i). Scale 0.50 m.	404
5.65	Casa dei Ceii, I.6.15: view S from garden (h) into tablinum/ dining room (d). Note <i>opus sectile</i> emblema in center of pavement.	404
5.66	Casa dei Ceii, I.6.15: view S to atrium (b) from within dining room (e), with black ground decoration.	405

Figures for insula I.7

5.67	Casa di P. Paquius Proculus I.7.1: Plan of cryptoporticus reached from kitchen (14) and the secondary entrance at #20, and the wooden outdoor dining couches under a bower in the center of peristyle (9) (Maiuri, NSc 1929 389, Fig. 20).	405
5.68	Casa di P. Paquius Proculus I.7.1: view E of the three-arched stove of kitchen (14) suspended over the passageway down to the cryptoporticus. There is a possible niched shrine above the stove to the right, and a latrine below the floor in the center of the room, reached by the underground passage.	406
5.69	Casa di P. Paquius Proculus I.7.1: view S from dining room (18) to the fountain basin and bower in the center of peristyle (9), where the wooden couches of the outdoor dining area were located. Dining room (11a) is located at the far end of the peristyle.	406
5.70	Casa di P. Paquius Proculus I.7.1: view N into dining room (18).	407
5.71	Casa di M. Fabius Amandus I.7.2-3: view S from atrium (d) to garden (f) and court (g), location of the cooking area.	407
5.72	Casa di M. Fabius Amandus I.7.2-3: view E from court/cooking area (g) towards the stairwell to the upper floor (h) and the latrine underneath the stairs.	408
5.73	Officina vasaria di Corinthus I.7.4: view N from the main room (1). Remains of a hearth are still visible at the left edge, next to the stairway to the upper floor and the entrance to room (2).	408
5.74	Casa di Philippus I.7.5: view N from court (c) to front entrance, with partition for latrine middle left.	409
5.75	Casa di Philippus I.7.5: view SE in court (c) at stove next to stairs to the upper floor, left, and dining room/tablinum (d), right.	409
5.76	Casa di Philippus I.7.5: detail of the stove on the E side of court (c). Scale 0.50 m.	410
5.77	Casa di Philippus I.7.5: view E inside dining room/tablinum (d). Niche for dining couch visible at left at the base of the wall.	410
5.78	Taberna di Primilla I.7.6: view S inside the (work)shop at a storage niche in its S wall.	411

5.79	Casa del Sacerdos Amandus I.7.7: view N from atrium (l) to entranceway (a). The door to dining room (b) is at left, the passage to kitchen (i) and latrine (h) at the left.	411
5.80	Casa del Sacerdos Amandus I.7.7: detail W at solid stove in kitchen (i), with a cistern head just to the left, tucked in a small alcove. Scale 0.50 m.	412
5.81	Casa del Sacerdos Amandus I.7.7: view N in dining room (b).	412
5.82	Casa del Sacerdos Amandus I.7.7: view W through garden (m) at dining hall (n) with the niche shrine in the NW corner of the garden (Maiuri, NSc 1927, Tav. Ib).	413
5.83	Popina I.7.8-9: view S at front serving counter in (a).	413
5.84	Casa dell'Efebo I.7.10-12: reconstruction of 'servants' quarters' in atrium (A'), view W, (Maiuri 1954b, Fig. 7).	414
5.85	Casa dell'Efebo I.7.10-12: detail SE at the solid stove in kitchen/ dining room (7). Scale 0.50 m.	414
5.86	Casa dell'Efebo I.7.10-12: detail NW at a couch niche in kitchen/ dining room (7). Scale 0.50 m.	415
5.87	Casa dell'Efebo I.7.10-12: view E into dinette (16). Note central mosaic emblema.	415
5.88	Casa dell'Efebo I.7.10-12: view N into dining hall (17), with reconstructed couches in niches against the W and N walls.	416
5.89	Casa dell'Efebo I.7.10-12: view S at outdoor dining area under bower in garden (23). An aedicula is located behind the couches, and a fountain in the center of the couches.	416
5.90	Casa dell'Efebo I.7.10-12: view SE in kitchen (21); stove left, sink and drain back center, and latrine, right. Scale 0.50 m.	417
5.91	Casa dell'Efebo I.7.10-12: view N at area (20) across from kitchen (21), with cistern head left, and bench and niche underneath staircase, the base of which is preserved at right.	417
5.92	Caupona di Masculus I.7.13-14: view N in front room (1) over serving counter towards court (3). Storage niche with slots for shelves in room (2) visible at left. Two niched shrines are barely visible in W wall of court (3) at left, above the shelving.	418
5.93	Caupona di Masculus I.7.13-14: view SW from court (3) past semi-circular hearth, lower left, towards the front counter on the street.	418
5.94	Taberna I.7.15: general view E at the (work)shop; note evidence for the second floor.	419
5.95	Taberna I.7.17: general view NE at the (work)shop; note evidence for the second floor.	419
5.96	Officina degli scrittori murali I.7.16: view NW over the outdoor masonry dining couches. There is a niche above the cistern head under the stairs to the upper floor, center left.	420

5.97	Officina degli scrittori murali I.7.16: view SE at the supports for a hearth of sub-type (2), left, with a basin further left against storeroom (8). Masonry dining couches at right.	420
5.98	Officina degli scrittori murali I.7.16: detail E of the supports for the hearth of sub-type (2) against the E wall of garden court (2). Scale 0.50 m.	421
5.99	Taberna di Niraemius I.7.18, Casa I.10.1: view SE during excavation from the street outside the (work)shop-houses. In I.7.18 (left), dining room {g} looks over the street through its large window above the front door. In I.10.1 (right), dining room {6} overlooks the same street corner via a window above the door. A street fountain rests in front of both buildings (Maiuri, NSc 1929, 380, Fig. 12).	421
5.100	Taberna di Niraemius I.7.18: view E in kitchen (e) past stove, left, to work bench, basin and cistern head, right, and latrine, left, in area (f).	422
5.101	Taberna di Niraemius I.7.18: detail N of the stove in kitchen (e). Scale 0.50 m.	422
5.102	Taberna di Niraemius I.7.18: detail N of the painted ritual scene above the stove in kitchen (e), showing a ham on the left and a Genius sacrificing at an altar, holding a cornucopia at center. Scale 0.50 m.	423
5.103	Taberna di Niraemius I.7.18: view E from entry (a) across atrium (b) to dining room/tablinum (c). Entrance to the kitchen (e) is to the right.	423
5.104	Casa annessa alla Casa dell'Efebo I.7.19: view NE in room (m) to the door to kitchen (l). Left of the door is a high counter with a built-in basin. The space in the far lower left is the location of a stair to the upper floor, with a storage space below.	424
5.105	Casa annessa alla Casa dell'Efebo I.7.19: detail S at one of the arches of the stove in kitchen (l). Scale 0.50 m.	424
5.106	Casa annessa alla Casa dell'Efebo I.7.19: view E in atrium (p) at tablinum (c), center with a wide door, and dining hall (b), left, with a narrow door.	425
5.107	Casa annessa alla Casa dell'Efebo I.7.19: view SE within dining hall (b).	425

Figures for insula I.8

5.108	Popina di Stephanus I.8.1: view SW at serving counter, and the former location of a hearth, with a niche shrine behind.	426
5.109	Casa di Stephanus I.8.1-3: view S through dining room (8) towards peristyle garden (10).	426
5.110	Casa della Statuetta Indiana I.8.4-6: detail NE at double-arched stove in corridor (14). Scale 0.50 m.	427
5.111	Casa della Statuetta Indiana I.8.4-6: view SE across atrium (2) towards dining room (3).	427
5.112	Casa della Statuetta Indiana I.8.4-6: view N from dining room (13) across garden (8) to dining room (7) at back right.	428

5.113	Casa della Statuetta Indiana I.8.4-6: detail SW at couch niche in W wall of dining room (13). Scale 0.50 m.	428
5.114	Taberna I.8.7: view S into the (work)shop, with base for stairs in the SW corner. Scale 0.50 m.	429
5.115	Caupona di L. Vetutius Placidus I.8.8: view SE at front serving counter, with painted shrine and entrance to dining room (2) behind (Castiglione Morelli del Franco & Vitale 1989, 193, Fig. 8).	429
5.116	Caupona di L. Vetutius Placidus I.8.8: detail W at hearth (left) and latrine (right) in the NW corner of the front room (1). Scale 0.50 m.	430
5.117	Casa di L. Vetutius Placidus I.8.8-9: view N in dining room (10) with couch niches back left and back right.	430
5.118	Casa di L. Vetutius Placidus I.8.8-9: view S at the masonry couches of the outdoor dining area under a bower in garden (11).	431
5.119	Casa di Pulcinella I.8.10: view NE at the stove in kitchen [9]; two windows open out onto the street above the stove.	431
5.120	Casa di Pulcinella I.8.10: view NE from dining area (3) through the colonnaded garden towards the door to kitchen [9].	432
5.121	Officina di A. Granius Romanus I.8.13: view S at the support for a hearth of sub-type (2) behind the latrine at the SW corner of court (1). Scale 0.50 m.	432
5.122	Officina di A. Granius Romanus I.8.13: view SW across court (1) to the hearth and latrine, left, and the arcuated shrine, right.	433
5.123	Casa di M. Epidius Primus I.8.14: detail N at the partially buried stove in kitchen (11).	433
5.124	Casa di M. Epidius Primus I.8.14: view S within dining room (6).	434
5.125	Caupona di N. Fufidius Successus I.8.15-16: view SE at serving counter with hearth at right and niche shrine in the wall behind (Castiglione Morelli del Franco & Vitale 1989, 209 Fig. 24).	434
5.126	Caupona di N. Fufidius Successus I.8.15-16: detail E at solid stove in kitchen (5), with drain at left and mortar at right.	435
5.127	Caupona di N. Fufidius Successus I.8.15-16: view NW in dining room (6) at the couch niche in that corner. The pile of rubble at left is a modern construction.	435
5.128	Casa dei Quattro Stili I.8.17+11: detail SE at one-arched stove in kitchen (21), used now for modern storage of amphorae and other items.	436
5.129	Casa dei Quattro Stili I.8.17+11: view W at the low remains of a stove podium along the S wall of the former kitchen (5).	436
5.130	Casa dei Quattro Stili I.8.17+11: view E inside the dining hall (9).	437
5.131	Casa dei Quattro Stili I.8.17+11: view W in dining room (14) with a couch niche in the S wall.	437

5.132	Casa dei Quattro Stili I.8.17+11: view W inside dining room (18).	438
5.133	Casa di Balbus I.8.18: detail of painted niche shrine containing ritual figurines, as found at time of excavation, located in the S wall of kitchen (8) (PPM I, 853, #13).	438
5.134	Casa di Balbus I.8.18: view taken in 1977 of the same painted niche shrine as Fig. 5.148, located in the S wall of kitchen (8). The shrine is substantially damaged and no longer contains the figurines (PPM I, 918, #7).	439

Figures for insula I.9

5.135	Casa del Bell'Impluvio I.9.1-2: detail N over stair to underground space (15), into kitchen (6), with hearth against the W wall. Scale 0.50 m.	439
5.136	Casa del Bell'Impluvio I.9.1-2: view SE inside dining room (8), with stucco pilaster defining the division of the room into serving and dining areas.	440
5.137	Casa di Successus I.9.3-4: view N from garden (8) towards the atrium, with dining room (5) at right and dining room (7) far back at center.	440
5.138	Casa di Successus I.9.3-4: view SE in the corner of room (10) at supports for possible stove. Scale 0.50 m.	441
5.139	Caupona di Successus I.9.4: view NW at serving counter of diner attached to the house (PPM I, 965, #1).	441
5.140	Casa dei Cubicoli Floreali I.9.5-7: detail N at latrine in (15), right, and possible cooking area in (16), left. Scale 0.50 m.	442
5.141	Casa dei Cubicoli Floreali I.9.5-7: view NE within dining room (11), with black-ground decoration.	442
5.142	Casa dei Cubicoli Floreali I.9.5-7: view E into dinette (13).	443
5.143	Casa dei Cubicoli Floreali I.9.5-7: view N within room (17) at garden (10).	443
5.144	Casa I.9.8: view SW in kitchen (7) and solid stove. Drain pipe immured in wall at right. Scale 0.50 m.	444
5.145	Casa I.9.9: detail S at masonry support and beam holes for stove in corridor (4), next to a cistern head. Two mortars lie in the area of the stove. Scale 0.50 m.	444
5.146	Casa I.9.10: view S at solid stove, right, and latrine, left, in kitchen (2). Scale 0.50 m.	445
5.147	Casa I.9.10: view W from court (1) to dining room (11), left, and corridor to garden (9), center.	445
5.148	Caupona di Amarantus I.9.11: view SE at serving counter on the street; a ruined hearth remains at the end of the counter (PPM II, 148, #3).	446
5.149	Caupona di Amarantus I.9.11: view SW within room (3) at partially buried masonry benches.	446
5.150	Casa I.9.12: detail S at solid masonry hearth in kitchen (9). Scale 0.50 m.	447

5.151	Casa I.9.12: view E within dining room (11).	447
5.152	Casa di Cerere I.9.13: view SW at collection of cooking and storage wares and cooking grate in that corner of the atrium, next to the masonry bench used for cooking along the W side of the atrium (PPM II, 187, #23).	448
5.153	Casa di Cerere I.9.13: view W at puteal and brazier with amphora legs as cooking supports in the SW corner of court (o) (PPM II, 212, #62).	448
5.154	Casa di Cerere I.9.13: view S within dining room (d); couch niche lower left.	449
5.155	Casa di Cerere I.9.13: Plan of mosaic floor and couch niches of tablinum/ dining room (j). North at top (De Vos 1976, 221, Plate 46, Fig. 21).	449
5.156	Casa di Cerere I.9.13: Plan of 'T' pattern mosaic floor indicating the location of couches in dining room (m). North at top (De Vos 1976, 228, Plate 50, Fig. 26).	450

Figures for insula I.10

5.157	Casa I.10.1: view S at tablinum/ dinette (3) from entrance court (1).	450
5.158	Casa I.10.1: view W at stove, right and latrine, left, in kitchen (5). There is a niched shrine in the N wall at right. Scale 0.50 m.	451
5.159	Casa I.10.1: view SW at niched shrines in S wall of kitchen (5), the nearer containing a terracotta bust of Ceres (Elia, NSc 1934, 268, Fig. 3).	451
5.160	Casa di Coponia I.10.2-3: view N from tablinum/ dinette (6) towards entrance.	452
5.161	Casa di Coponia I.10.2-3: view S from atrium at tablinum/ dinette (6) and corridor to back garden.	452
5.162	Casa del Menandro I.10.4: Plan of the Casa del Menandro and the Popina at I.10.13 (Maiuri 1933, Tav. I).	453
5.163	Casa del Menandro I.10.4: view E into dining hall (18); sondages under the floor reveal earlier phases.	454
5.164	Casa del Menandro I.10.4: View SW at niche shrine and podium in area (25), the niche containing casts of rough figurines.	454
5.165	Casa del Menandro I.10.4: view N within atrium (41) at hearth and niche shrine at back left, near the door to court (44).	455
5.166	Fullonica I.10.5-6: view W at storage niches under the stair at center, and work basins at left.	455
5.167	Casa del Fabbro I.10.7: view W at kitchen area (11) under stairs to the upper floor. Entrance to dining room (8) at right (Conticello 1987, 33).	456
5.168	Casa del Fabbro I.10.7: view N within dining room (8).	456
5.169	Casa del Fabbro I.10.7: view N into dining room (9); niche shrine up in the wall at right.	457

5.170	Casa del Fabbro I.10.7: view NW in dining room (9) at time of excavation. Two skeletons huddled around remains of a dining couch at the couch niche (Elia, NSc 1934 286, Fig. 10).	457
5.171	Tessitoria di Minucius I.10.8: view NE through atrium (1) to dinette (2).	458
5.172	Tessitoria di Minucius I.10.8: view N in corridor (9) at the stove at the time of excavation (Elia NSc 1934, 315, Fig. 27).	458
5.173	Tessitoria di Minucius I.10.8: detail N at present remains (support wall and beam holes) of stove in corridor (9). Scale 0.50 m.	459
5.174	Tessitoria di Minucius I.10.8: view N in dining room (10).	459
5.175	Casa degli Amanti I.10.10-11: view E in kitchen (16) at solid stove and niche shrine in the facing wall.	460
5.176	Casa degli Amanti I.10.10-11: view NW from kitchen (16) into peristyle (9) with cistern head in the foreground.	460
5.177	Casa degli Aufidii I.10.18: view N along street facade, with part of the upper floor dining room {11} hanging over the street like a balcony.	461
5.178	Casa degli Aufidii I.10.18: detail S at stove in kitchen (9). The painted shrine, now nearly faded away, was located up and to the right of the stove. Scale 0.50 m.	461

INTRODUCTION

Sometimes the distance between ourselves and the Romans seems surprisingly short. Consider the following passages, the first from Petronius' *Cena Trimalchionis*, and the second a description of the opening dinner for an American archaeological expedition in Mesopotamia:

"Following the dogs came servants with a tray on which we saw a wild sow of absolutely enormous size. Perched rakishly on the sow's head was the cap of freedom which newly freed slaves wear in token of their liberty, and from her tusks hung two baskets woven from palm leaves: one was filled with dry Egyptian dates, the other held sweet Syrian dates. Clustered around her teats were little suckling pigs made of hard pastry, gifts for the guests to take home as it turned out, but intended to show that ours was a brood-sow. The slave who stepped up to carve, however, was not our old friend Carver who had cut up the capons, but a huge fellow with a big beard, a coarse hunting cape thrown over his shoulders, and his legs bound up in cross-gaiters. He whipped out his knife and gave a savage slash at the sow's flanks. Under the blow the flesh parted, the wound burst open and dozens of thrushes came whirring out!"¹

"One of the most pleasant recollections of those busy days was a Babylonian dinner given by President Morton to the friends of the expedition. The cards at our plates were written in the language of Nebuchadnezzar; the bread was of the shape of Babylonian bricks; the great tray of ice-cream was the colour of the desert sand over which sweet icy camels bore burdens of other sweet ices; and there was a huge cake, like the tower of Babel; about it wandered miniature Arabs with miniature picks, and concealed within its several stages was an art treasure for each of the guests. Then and there, as the Director of the Expedition, I opened the excavations, and from the ruins of the huge cake I rescued and distributed its buried treasures - antiquities fresh from Tiffany's."²

Petronius' description, usually considered to be exaggerated satire, is no more fantastic than the factual banquet of the Americans. Both passages report supreme efforts at dinner presentation that are meant to impress guests, reveal the cleverness of the host, and bring the company together. Simple, routine family meals likewise forged bonds within and amongst Roman households, because meals were occasions to express social relationships. In order to explore mealtime social mechanics in households both large and small, I will analyze the physical environments of kitchens and dining rooms in a cross-section of Pompeian residences.

¹Petr. *Sat.* 40 (trans. W. Arrowsmith).

²E.J. Banks, *Bismaya, or the lost city of Adab*, New York 1912 (quoted by H. Crawford, *Sumer and the Sumerians*, Cambridge 1991, 3).

Roman cooking and dining customs survived the Empire through a combination of continued practice and the textual transmission of recipe books and other works that described meals.³ Scholars have long used such writings to describe the foodstuffs and dinner parties that Romans enjoyed as a part of their daily life.⁴ Illustration of the literary meals (with actual pots, pans, stoves, foodstuffs and dining rooms) became possible with the 18th century discovery and excavation of Pompeii, Herculaneum and surrounding villas.⁵ While these Campanian communities offered an incomparable data-set, archaeological investigations remained concerned with reconciling Latin terms and descriptions with real objects and their functions.⁶ Within the last decade, however, advances in both literary and archaeological studies have separately provided deeper insight into Roman meals at home.

Several socio-cultural historians have recently read the literary sources as more than mere description, and they have addressed the social and cultural meanings of Roman meals.⁷ Notably, J. D'Arms has discussed how social relations were played out at table between host and guests, and between the dining party and the slaves that served them. The symbolism of food in Roman literature, laden with literary, cultural, political and moral values, has been treated in detail by E. Gowers. These literary investigations have demonstrated how tightly food was integrated into social relations and how deeply it was imbued with cultural meanings. However, the sources are unfortunately limited by their perspective: that of elite men based in Rome.

Meanwhile, other historians, archaeologists, and art historians have explored how Roman houses organized household activities, expressed the wealth, status and personal tastes of owners, and structured social relationships between individual families and the community at large.⁸ A. Wallace-Hadrill in particular has clarified not just the social structure of the house; he has also articulated the economic, political, architectural, and decorative connections between households. A few (J. Packer) have explored beyond the traditional limits of evidence (i.e. grand and well-preserved elite houses) in order to understand smaller households.⁹ Furthermore, some

³Cubberley 1988 and forthcoming, Quentin 1926, Schuring 1988 and Whitehouse 1978 have described the survival of Roman cooking wares and practices into the Medieval period. Dosi & Schnell 1986c, Flower & Rosenbaum 1958 and Vehling 1936 have discussed the process by which the book of recipes attributed to Apicius was assembled and passed into its current form, exemplified by the Teubner edition (M. E. Milham, ed., 1969).

⁴See Balsdon 1974, André 1961, Carcopino 1960, 263-276, Friedländer II and Marquardt I-II.

⁵See Mau 1908, Daremberg & Saglio, Dosi & Schnell 1986a-c and Salza Prina Ricotti 1983.

⁶See Salza Prina Ricotti 1987, Tassinari 1979, Annecchino 1977, Carandini 1977 and Hilgers 1969.

⁷See D'Arms 1984, 1986, 1990; Gowers 1993, Goddard 1994, Murray 1990, and Slater (ed.) 1991.

⁸See Wallace-Hadrill (all), Jashemski 1979, 1993; Clarke 1991, Dwyer 1991, 1982; Gazda (ed.) 1991, Watts 1987 and Dunbabin 1991, 1993. Laurence 1994 is an important step forward in studying the whole town of Pompeii. When relevant, I make reference to his work, but due to its recent appearance, I have not been able to integrate it fully into my thesis.

⁹Packer's (1975) single synthetic study of small and irregular residences is often cited and seldom imitated (but see Berry and Wallace-Hadrill). Examples of Pompeian houses that consistently appear in domestic studies: the Casa dei Ceii (I.6.15), Casa del Menandro (I.10.4), Casa di D. Octavius Quartio (II.2), Casa delle

scholars (P. Allison, J. Berry) have considered the full range of material evidence, rather than concentrating solely upon traditional subjects such as painting, sculpture, architecture or finds.¹⁰

To achieve a comprehensive and integrated study of Roman food and society, D'Arms has expressed three wishes:

"...to relate shifts in convivial practices to broader patterns of social and cultural change...to widen conceptions of Roman society and culture to include sub-equestrian behavior and experiences ...[and] to integrate the copious archaeological and art historical evidence with the scattered literary sources."¹¹

The main contribution of this thesis is to fulfill the second wish. I will demonstrate how residents of Pompeii from the smallest (work)shops to the largest houses organized their domestic space for the purpose of making daily meals. In particular, smaller residences of 'sub-equestrians', rarely included in discussions of housing, are here put back on the map. Not enough is known about early domestic arrangements at Pompeii to address problems of historical change systematically; my archaeological study is therefore limited to the third quarter of the first century A.D. I also contribute to D'Arms' third wish, by setting the archaeological examination against a background of literary evidence and recent research on Roman meals and houses. Tying together the various sources, I intend (paraphrasing Gazda) to "expand the definition and the field to include the full range of *culinary* expression through all strata of Roman society."¹²

My work represents the first detailed study of Roman kitchens, utilitarian spaces, and dining areas.¹³ In chapter two, I construct typologies and terminologies for cooking and dining areas, in order to discuss the material in a consistent manner. I analyze the extant Latin terminology, and then establish a working typology based partly on previous archaeological studies and partly on examples from this study. To avoid using Latin terms weighed down with the baggage of uncritical modern usage, I have started over with fresh English terms for these

Nozze d'Argento (V.2.i), Casa di M. Lucretius Fronto (V.4.a), Casa del Chiurgo (VI.1.10), Casa di Sallustius (VI.2.4), Casa del Poeta Tragico (VI.8.5), Casa del Meleagro (VI.9.2), Casa del Labirinto (VI.11.9-10), Casa del Fauno (VI.12), Casa dei Vettii (VI.15.1), Casa di Marcus Lucretius (IX.3.5) and the Casa di Obellius Firmus (IX.14). Recently, the Häuser in Pompeji series has offered detailed studies of smaller atrium houses such as the Casa del Principe di Napoli (VI.15.7-8), Casa del Orso (VII.2.44-46), and soon, the Casa della Caccia Antica (VII.4.48). These houses are making their way into the literature, but like the others cited above, have been studied primarily on the basis of outstanding architecture or painted decoration, not because they are representative of Pompeian housing as a whole.

¹⁰ Allison 1992b has documented the distribution of art, architecture and artifacts towards determining room function and use, though her sample consists solely of medium to large atrium houses. Berry 1993 has examined a wide range of material evidence from *insula* I.9 at Pompeii, addressing small and large households with appropriate attention to the neighborhood context.

¹¹ D'Arms 1986, 64.

¹² Gazda 1991, 15; I have substituted the word "culinary" for "artistic", in her original quote.

¹³ Salza Prina Ricotti 1978/80 (following Fulvio 1879) outlined the basic types of cooking installations and described several outstanding examples of kitchens from Campania, Ostia and Rome, but she considered only architectural evidence in larger houses.

archaeological typologies that are precise, explicit, and consistently employed. The archaeological typology works from a study sample of all cooking and dining areas in ten contiguous *insulae* (I.4, 6-10; VII.1, 14, IX.1-2) at Pompeii (Fig. 2.1).

The Gazetteer and accompanying figures in volume two, based largely on personal autopsy, document the full range of available data: architecture, decoration, and finds. The references, descriptions, measurements, plans, photographs, maps and drawings will be an invaluable resource -- not just for Pompeianists working on buildings from my sample, not just for architects studying the urban fabric of an Early Imperial Roman town, not just for historians of Roman foodways, but for anyone interested in how Romans organized their daily, domestic lives. The Gazetteer is divided into two parts, each offering a different level of detail. The first part (microanalysis) is an exhaustive look at three select *insulae* (I.4, 6-7). This part describes the unique character of each building, offering a comprehensive, case by case assessment of cooking and dining areas. The second part (macroanalysis) provides summary data and descriptions of three more *insulae* (I.8-10), providing a larger sample for the analysis in chapter three.

Chapter three analyzes the trends and anomalies in the data from the six *insulae* in the Gazetteer, and draws conclusions about the cooking and eating facilities that Romans constructed in their urban environment. Such a method of organizing and processing data may serve as a model for domestic studies, at Pompeii or elsewhere, that include both detailed and large-scale analyses. With a sample of buildings from contiguous city-blocks, I can consider the unique arrangements for cooking and dining in each building individually, in the context of its immediate neighborhood, and in the context of its socio-economic peers. The analysis proceeds according to a typology of buildings that corresponds to the social standing of the owners, offering an examination of the physical world of cooking and eating across the socio-economic spectrum (Fig. 2.2).¹⁴ Specific questions are put to the archaeological evidence: How near and accessible are the kitchens to the dining areas and the rest of the house? Are there patterns to their size, proportions, placement and decoration? Is the location of the kitchen visible or detectable by smell from where people ate? What range of practical utilities offering light, air, water, ventilation, heat, and drainage are available in kitchens? Are there any shrines in or near the kitchen, and what connection can we see between food preparation and household religion? Is there any connection between the size of a house and the number or size of kitchens and dining-rooms within? What options do the residents have for eating outside the home?

The fourth chapter summarizes the archaeological data and its implications for the operation of mealtime social relations both within and between households. The preparation and

¹⁴The categories of buildings are: (work)shop, (work)shop-house, commercial eating establishment (lunch counter or diner), small house (*casa piccola*), medium-sized house (*casa media*) and large house (*casa grande*). These are defined at the beginning of chapter three.

consumption of meals in Pompeii and the Roman world acted as a social barometer. Larger households had larger, better decorated, and more numerous dining areas, and a larger cooking capacity, than smaller households. This was not only because larger households had more mouths to feed, but also because their meals were social occasions to which guests were invited, and at which status was evaluated. Owners of larger households, generally wealthier and more involved in the civic life of the community, cultivated social ties over dinner. The number and size of dining areas, the expense given over to their elaboration, the physical distance between dining and cooking areas, and the social distance between free and slave household members, all decreased toward the lower end of the socio-economic spectrum. In the smallest shops, eating and cooking were done informally in the same space, with no contingency for mealtime social interaction with outside guests -- company was enjoyed at neighborhood meeting places, over the snacks and drinks of lunch counters and diners. Within the household, cooking and eating the evening dinner segregated its members -- slaves cooked and, in a separate area of the house, family and guests dined. The act of the slaves serving the food connected those two groups and yet reinforced their separation. Socially proximate individuals tended to eat together, in environments that befit their status. The domestic activities of household slaves are particularly invisible in the literary sources, and have also been invisible in "modern publications, which rarely give more than passing notice to these relatively drab areas."¹⁵ I have begun to remedy the general omission by describing in detail areas of the house where slaves worked, and where outside guests did not go.

To begin my study, chapter one provides a thematically-arranged background of cooking and eating customs for the archaeological evidence. The purpose of this background is twofold. First, it forms a cultural and historical context for the archaeological evidence -- Pompeians built their kitchens and dining areas not within a vacuum, but within a socio-cultural system that set boundaries and norms for their construction and arrangement. Literary evidence for those boundaries and norms may be anecdotal, but they still provide (largely) contemporary attitudes and opinions about why Romans cooked and ate the way they did. Secondly, this chapter offers a brief synthetic summary of modern scholarship about Roman cooking and eating practices. Socio-cultural issues central to the interpretation of the archaeological data are introduced, in the form of five basic questions: What is cooked and eaten? How is cooking and eating done? When is cooking and eating done? Where is cooking and eating done? Who cooks, serves and eats, and with whom?

¹⁵Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 44.

CHAPTER I

THE CONTEXTS OF COOKING AND EATING

"Of the myriad creatures who inhabit this earth, human beings are the only ones to cook their food...Cooking -- the deliberate and systematic manipulation of food -- is as uniquely human a behavior as is art, or religion, or language...Just as any people have a system for producing language or art, so too do they have a system for producing cooked food. The system may not be codified or written down, but it exists in daily practice and is handed down from one generation to the next."¹

"No society exists without manners, and specifically without rules that govern eating behaviour. Table manners are politeness where food is concerned. They comprise the ritual movements which each culture chooses as those most appropriate to handle the mightiest of necessities, the most potent of symbols, the medium through which we repeatedly express our relationships with each other."²

"Far from being frivolous or trivial, the food habits of any society are fundamental aspects of culture, and so are socially expressive: they can be guides to social proximity and social distance; to ritual fraternity and to status; to political superiority and subordination. This becomes clear at once, when it is recognized that biological 'needs', in dietary terms, have little to do with what in fact we consume, or the order, the occasions, the social rituals which come to cluster around our consumption of it."³

At the most basic of levels, eating is simply what each of us must do to stay alive. But beyond the point of simple sustenance lies a complex culinary geography of relationships that helps to define the place and context of each individual within his or her universe. These relationships are with the earth and its plants and animals that provide the raw food material, with the divine entities that sanction or censure the successful collection of food, and with other humans who collaborate or compete for the same resources. These relationships form the pragmatic framework for the socio-cultural systems that regulate how food is produced and consumed. In this chapter I briefly outline these relationships in a thematic series of questions: What is cooked and eaten? How is cooking and eating done? When is cooking and eating done?

¹Rozin 1992, xi.

²Visser 1991, 4.

³D'Arms 1984, 327.

Where is cooking and eating done? Who cooks, serves and eats (and with whom)? The answers are based on modern scholarship and ancient literary texts; they represent the state of current knowledge about issues that overlap in complex ways. Their introduction is necessary to demonstrate the scope of implications that cooking and eating had in the lives of Romans, and to provide a socio-cultural context for the patterns that emerge from the archaeological evidence in chapter three.

Literary sources provide much of the evidence for the reconstruction of this context; E. Gowers warns that the representations of food in Roman literature are primarily symbols, and symbols not easily ascertained:

"...the meaning of food in Roman literature is rarely just social or economic. Roman writers, like the gourmets they despise, choose from a vast repertoire: the significance of the food they use is determined not just by wider cultural codes but also by personal manipulation; the particular connotations evoked are specific to each context."⁴

Much of the literature about food appears in the context of the satirical style. Food or lack of food was a daily experience for everyone, a universally comprehensible medium through which Roman satirists could make moral and poetic statements about current cultural, social and political values. Satirists ridiculed the 'dirty' aspects of society by rearranging or misplacing the food that social individuals ate, literally turning that food into a mess or, 'matter out of place'.⁵ Chaos took the place of an orderly dinner-party, overstuffing or underfeeding the place of a truly satisfying meal. Structural opposites of rich and poor, fresh and rotten, pretentious and humble were juxtaposed and mixed-up. Satirists turned the resulting confusion and contrasts into humor, lesson, or both. The plain, idealized background against which this satire played was the menu of simple bread, cabbage, bacon and cheese of rustic Roman ancestors or barbarian neighbors.⁶ Extolling a standard menu of plain, honest and uncultured foods allowed the satirists to emphasize a stark contrast with the expensive, overly refined, and even ridiculous dishes consumed at the banquets of the wealthy.⁷

Even on an individual level, people's social and moral images are so closely linked to the food they reportedly consume that it is not easy to employ even personal testimony as evidence for their actual eating habits. W. Rathje's recent study in Arizona has clearly demonstrated this

⁴Gowers 1993, 35.

⁵Douglas 1970, 12. Of course, not all satirists treated food in the same way; for a detailed examination of the methods and purposes of Horace, Persius and Juvenal, see Gowers' (1993) chapter on satire, 109-219.

⁶Examples of 'simple, honest peasant fare' are integral parts of the stories of Baucis and Philemon (Ov. *Met.* 8.620-720) or of the city mouse and the country mouse (Hor. *S.* 2.6); see also Ov. *Fast.* 4.679-712, App. Verg. *Moretum*, Sil. 7.162-211 and Sen. *Dial.* 1.3.6.

⁷On opposing rich and poor, see Hudson 1989 and Braund 1989, who quote largely from Petronius, Seneca, Horace and Juvenal. Gowers 1993 cites in addition Plautus, Martial, and the Younger Pliny (esp. 73-76, 189-191, 249-263, 267-279).

point.⁸ When correlating what people said they ate in surveys to what they actually ate as retrieved from their garbage cans, two trends emerged. The first was that people tended to consistently over-report the amount of healthy foods they ate, and under-report the amount of unhealthy foods they ate. Second, people tended to report the eating habits of a relative or acquaintance with "chilling accuracy", especially if the habits connoted a negative image.⁹ The subjects of the Arizona survey took for granted the fact that the food they ate represented their and others' images, and they responded accordingly. One cannot so closely check Roman literary sources by excavating Seneca's garbage pits. But one must be aware of an author's reasons for using food (it is rarely for its own sake): "It is up to the morally and literally attuned reader to spot the exaggeration, symbolism and irony, which signal that the descriptions of food in Roman satire are not to be taken quite at face-value."¹⁰ Fortunately exaggeration, irony, evasions and prejudices are in themselves revealing about Roman attitudes to food, if not as revealing about the food itself.¹¹

What is cooked and eaten?

Foods that humans eat depend first and foremost on the available resource base of the natural environment, whether it be cultivated, hunted, or gathered. The food resources available to the Romans of the early Imperial era were quite extensive, and included both local and imported products. There were cereals (including barley, millet, rye, wheat), vegetables (including asparagus, cabbage, carrots, lettuce, onions, squash, mushrooms, garlic, beans, lentils, peas and chick-peas), nuts, and fruits (including apricots, cherries, figs, lemons, apples, pomegranates, pears, peaches, plums, grapes, and olives). Protein was available in dairy products, meats (including sheep, goats, pigs, chickens, geese, ducks, pigeons, pheasants, hares,

⁸Rathje & Murphy 1992, esp. 53-78.

⁹Rathje & Murphy 1992, 70-71.

¹⁰Hudson 1989, 72. Satirists were perfectly aware of the hypocrisy of their work, as Horace points out in *S. 2.7.22-43*. His slave Davus tells Horace in lines 22-27: "You praise the life and customs of the good old days, but suppose a god appeared right now to take you back? You'd instantly refuse. You don't really believe that stuff you preach, or, anyway, you're not too firm in its defense. Fact is, you're stuck in your own sentimental slush and wish you weren't."; *'Laudas fortunam et mores antiquae plebis, et idem si quis ad illa deus subito te agat, usque recuses, aut quia non sentis quod clamas rectius esse, aut quia non firmus rectum defendis, et haeres nequiquam caeno cupiens evellere plantam'* (OCT text, Fuchs 1977 translation; see also Gowers 1993, 133).

¹¹Gowers 1993, 2; also (p. 7 n. 25): "It is perhaps a mistake...to use literary sources simply as evidence for what the Romans ate." For instance, Goddard 1994 demonstrates that the bile directed by ancient authors at Nero's extravagant eating and drinking stemmed from his rejection of sharing meals with elites such as themselves.

dormice, deer, frogs, snails, and sometimes cattle), and seafood (including all varieties of Mediterranean fish, lobster, squid, clams, oysters, and mussels).¹²

The food resources that people actually choose to exploit depend in part upon their mastery of agricultural sciences, and the level of knowledge and technology which they have to collect those resources most abundantly and efficiently.¹³ Where labor was specialized to the degree that not every household produced their own food (as in first century A.D. Italy), the range of food choices available in the markets and *tabernae* depended also upon economic factors. In urban settings, food prices dictated the amount, quality, kind, and variety of food that a given person could afford to consume. Poorer people ate smaller amounts of less nutritious and cheaper food (cereals, vegetables, some fruit, olive oil and wine), richer folk ate larger amounts of more nutritious and expensive food (adding meats, dairy products and seafood), and the poorest of all ate whatever anyone else gave them (i.e. by begging or the public dole).¹⁴

Foods depicted in the still life paintings of the Campanian cities and villas run the gamut from eel, lobster and desserts to simple bread, cheese and fruit.¹⁵ These pictures can and have been used simply as sources for what foods were consumed, but on display in the context of a house where people eat on a daily basis, they take on much more significance. Gowers says of the simpler painted foods:

"...the meagre and rustic *xenia* of Pompeii -- a bowl of eggs, a brace of birds -- take their meaning from what they exclude. They are not grand or heroic art, and they blot out the corrupt food that the moralists shun. In more senses than one, they are pictures to be lived with; they sustain an illusion of innocent hospitality."¹⁶

They are also pictures to be presented, offering a guest a glimpse of the meal to come, the food always in a perpetually fresh state, free from the processes of rot and decay, and free from criticism like the idealized food the satirist offers at his own house.¹⁷ The artist's concern for the

¹²For the Mediterranean food resources used by the Romans, see Jashemski 1993, 405-407, Gozzini Giacosa 1992, 11-18, Brothwell 1988, Dosi & Schnell 1986a, 39-104, Salza Prina Ricotti 1987, 71-117, Jashemski 1979 *passim*, and André 1961 *passim*, who compile their lists from literary, artistic, and archaeobotanical sources.

¹³See Ragni 1987, Greene 1986, 67-97, and White 1970, who provide numerous references on Roman farming; Ward-Perkins & Claridge 1976, 52-54 briefly summarize the situation around Pompeii.

¹⁴Garnsey 1991b attempts to identify the foods (and their nutritional values) eaten by the poor masses living in Rome. See Purcell 1994, 649 for the connection between status and the dole.

¹⁵The still-life was derived from Hellenistic models, and as a decorative motif akin to a literary technique, it fluctuated in its form and popularity. By the mid first century A.D, it was present throughout the decorative schema of wall painting. See Ling 1991, 153-157, Di Mino 1987 and Flower & Rosenbaum 1958, 9-10; these include references to the basic works on still-lives.

¹⁶Gowers 1993, 34.

¹⁷The Italian term for still-life, 'natura morta' is a oxymoron -- the food never 'dies'. See the unnaturally pure meals of Juv. 11 and Hor. *Epod.* 1.52 (Gowers 1993, 200-202, 228).

food's aesthetic qualities is showcased as he or she carefully depicts the food in baskets, bowls, next to table-silver, on shelves, and hanging from nails. The condition of the food begs anticipation; it is displayed at the moment before its preparation or consumption and consequently whets the appetite of the viewer. Finally, the moral message of the paintings is reassuring: simple and whole foods, not extravagantly or pretentiously prepared dishes that the viewer may not recognize.¹⁸

Romans understood the popular maxim "you are what you eat". Hosting fine banquets could be a means for ambitious individuals or families to express or claim status. Ironically, the luxurious meals of the elite were made possible by the work of freedpersons and slaves who actually grew, sold, and prepared the food. Elite authors scorned those who supported their wealth, because by the Empire, the economic development of freedpersons (e.g. Trimalchio) would allow them to penetrate lofty society and put on lavish dinners.¹⁹ Both to control social climbing by would-be elites and conspicuous consumption by the elites themselves, a series of sumptuary laws were enacted during the Republic to limit the amount that could be spent on the types and amounts of foods allowed for a dinner either on ordinary days or on special days such as holidays, weddings and funerals.²⁰ The frequency with which these laws had to be revived demonstrates how difficult it was in fact for the government to prevent its citizens from using the dining room as a social vehicle, even as the elite used the legislation as a political vehicle.²¹

Sumptuary legislation did not propose only to exert social control; it also tried to resurrect the traditional temporal order of Roman meals:

"It may well be the case, then, that the sumptuary laws were aimed not only at curbing displays of wealth (and of course, canvassing for political control), but also at reinstating symbolically the traditional distinction between weekday food and amplified festival food which was being blurred by increased prosperity and availability."²²

¹⁸Some fancy dishes could not be identified for what they were: peahen's eggs that are really cooked birds in a pastry shell (Petr. 33); a boar stuffed with birds (Petr. 40); a pig stuffed with sausages and puddings (Petr. 49); "anchovy paté without anchovy" (Apicius 4.2.12).

¹⁹See Purcell 1994, 659-673; the Latin verb 'esse' means both 'to be' and 'to eat'.

²⁰Gel. 2.24; Suet. *Jul.* 43.2; see Fisher 1988, 1202-1219, Clemente 1981, Crawford 1978, 79-80, Lewis & Reinhold 1966, vol. I, 461-462, and Dosi & Schnell 1986a, 113-120.

²¹The laws applying to dinners began in the aftermath of the second Punic War, and flourished in the second century B.C.: 182 (Lex Orchia), 161 (Lex Fannia), 143 (Lex Didia), ca. 140 (Lex Licinia). These laws were used by the elite as a way to preserve the status quo of political power by evoking moral standards for conspicuous consumption (even though these standards had already been eclipsed by the economic expansion and foreign wars of that century that brought new and exotic goods into Italy). Later revivals of this legislation in 115 (M. Aemilius Scaurus), 81 (Sulla), 78 (Lex Aemilia), 71 (Lex Antia), and by Julius Caesar and Augustus were political ploys by the 'Big Men' of the Late Republic to claim moral high ground (see Clemente 1981).

²²Gowers 1993, 73.

Special foods were commonly linked to the celebration of particular festivals or occasions. Such celebrations were observed in the civic, religious, family, or personal spheres, and are attested not infrequently in Roman literary sources.²³ On these occasions, food which was not normally consumed (usually for financial reasons) on an everyday basis, such as pork, was introduced in special meals.²⁴ The opposition of holiday feasts to the mundane daily menu helped define the passage of time; special meals were looked forward to or fondly recalled, and their occurrence reassured the participants that they were not condemned to eating the same stuff in perpetuity. At the same time, periodic celebrations involving special foods served to remind people that they should be thankful for that everyday food, and remind the gods to keep providing it. The gods got their portion at these celebrations; the same foods sacrificed before the meal were the foods eaten during the meal.

In general, Roman concern with particular diets seems to have been based on maintaining a harmonious balance between the health of the mind and the body; overindulgence in one led inevitably to the decline of the other. For some, this balance was achieved through dietary preferences. Dietary regimes were an occupational choice for priests, gladiators or athletes.²⁵ Religious, philosophical, or moral beliefs also determined special diets. Martial for instance taunts the self-imposed poverty of the Stoic character Chaeremon ("Oh, what a great man you are, who can do without dregs of red vinegar and straw and black bread") and tempts him with the life he rejects, exemplified by comfortable pillows, fine wine and an attractive serving-boy.²⁶ The social tension between those who eat richly and those who eat poorly is brought out in this one man who has the luxury of choosing his lot, and who ironically chooses poverty because of his philosophy, not because of his actual social options. The ability to control one's own appetite (whether for wealth, power, or food) gave an individual a measure of

²³The special food of a festival day could sometimes be as simple as substituting cheese for yeast and making unleavened bread, as the 2 c. A.D. physician Galen suggests (Per χ Trof χ n Dunāmevw 6 K.486). Several rustic celebrations reported in the *Fasti* of Ovid feature special sacrificial foods; see for example: heifers never subjected to work (1 Jan., *Fast.* 1.83); cakes of spelt and sow's flesh (Day of Sowing (*Sementiva*), *Fast.* 1.672); lamb and a suckling pig (to Terminus, 23 Feb., *Fast.* 2.656).

²⁴Gowers 1993, 26-28, 70-73: the greatest special feast was the Saturnalia, and moralists and satirists exaggerated its temporal extent by remarking that the holiday 'never ended', or 'went on all year round' (Sen. *Ep.* 18.1; Petr. 44.4).

²⁵See Gowers 1993, 14 (the diet of the Flamen Dialis, forbidden to touch flour, yeast, or raw meat); Friedländer II, 56 & Peck 1923, 732 (the special diet of gladiators, *gladiatoria sagina*, was designed to increase their strength); Farb & Armelagos 1980, 112-125; Simoons 1961, 7-12; Harris 1985, 67-87; Grmek 1989, 210-244; Renfrew 1988.

²⁶Mart. 11.56: *O quam magnus homo es qui faece rubentis aceti et stipula et nigro pane carere potes!* (Loeb text and translation). Consider also the '*plebia prandia*' of Persius (Gowers 1993, 184-186).

autonomy outside the jurisdiction of society.²⁷ Chaerephon's autonomic diet fills him fuller than a diet of good food ever could.

Even in special cultural or religious contexts, most foods in their raw state have only latent value. Their true potency lies in the transformation of food to a prepared state by the application of fire or other physical process. It is this act of cooking which separates humans, at the highest level in the food chain, so obviously from other animals. Only humans so utterly transform the nature of their harvest or prey before the meal, that it can become nearly unrecognizable. The violence of preparation induces both feelings of power (cooking) and feelings of fear (being cooked). The power of the metamorphosis of food is one to which the concept of 'civilization' becomes strongly attached, and the cooking fire is the visible symbol of that power. Cannibalism is the hidden fear, the very antithesis of civilization (and thus attributed to non-Roman barbarians). For elite Romans, cannibalism was auto-consumption: eating oneself into financial ruin.²⁸

How is cooking and eating done?

The value of a meal depends as much upon how it is served as what is served. Such is the philosophy of the character Catius in Horace, *Satires* 2.4; his culinary advice comprises courses both rudimentary and rare, from cabbage and sausages to boar and Falernian wine. Gowers notes:

"What seems to unite this miscellany...is a system of decorum based on knowledge, timing, economy, variety, and elegance, where the comfort of the guest, his palate, jaded appetite, digestion, and surroundings are of greatest concern."²⁹

Food preparation and consumption involves many complex but practical matters. Catius' extensive "system of decorum" includes culinary information, food storage, cooking techniques and instruments, serving and eating utensils, and proper table etiquette. These issues are introduced in this section so as to demonstrate the wide range of knowledge and devices necessary to create and consume a meal.

²⁷The Elder Cato and the Younger Seneca are two who paint themselves as models of personal restraint (Gowers 1993, 13-14, with refs.).

²⁸Violence in eating: the butchery of Hor. S. 2.8.85-91 (Gowers 1993, 176-178); the dining room execution of a criminal (Sen. *Con.* 9.2). Cannibalism in Egypt: Juv. 15 (Gowers 1993, 198-200). Auto-consumption: the suicide of Apicius (Sen. *Dial.* 12.10); Juv. 11.38-41 (Gowers 1993, 201-202). See Detienne & Vernant 1989, 21-86 for a discussion of the violence of eating and sacrificing in the Greek context, and Lévi-Strauss 1965 & 1975 for the structuralist theory behind the raw vs. cooked opposition.

²⁹Gowers 1993, 136.

Culinary information

Methods for preparing food may be handed down by word of mouth or transmitted by written recipes. This body of information, this cultural system of food preparation, may fairly be considered the **cuisine** of a society.³⁰ A cuisine explains what ingredients, proportions, procedures, implements and facilities are needed; it is the knowledge of how to turn a mass of raw materials into a meal. Cuisine has always been closely linked to the cultural, geographical and ethnic identity of a group of people. Hellenic culture in particular influenced Romans in cuisine during the third to first centuries B.C. In part because of the military and diplomatic intervention of the Roman state in Eastern politics, generals, soldiers and traders returned with foods native to the East, special cooks and new dining furniture.³¹ Livy marks what must have been a long process with the specific date of 187 B.C., just after Cn. Manlius' conquest of Asia:

Banquets began to be prepared with greater care and expense. The cook, whom the ancients regarded and treated as the lowest type of slave, was rising in value, and what had been a servile task began to be looked on as a fine art.³²

The response of Roman elites (those who could afford the new foods and cooks) to new culinary trends was to impose legal limitations on expenditures for meals. Sumptuary legislation effectively limited the amount of rare imported foods and wine persons could buy, while not restricting produce from the local fields, vineyards and orchards that the same elites owned. The legislation was intended to protect the financial (as well as social and political) interests of the landed aristocracy.³³ These legal restrictions were, however, ineffectual; already in the plays of Plautus, who died shortly after 187 B.C., Roman and Greek cuisine and culture were inextricably mixed.³⁴

One basic difference between Greek and Roman custom was still understood to exist: the Greek *symposium* was a drinking-party with food on the side, while the Roman *cena* was a food party with drinking on the side.³⁵ The recipes and meals of the two cultures were nonetheless

³⁰Rozin 1992, xi.

³¹Examples of foods brought to Rome from the East: the lemon from Persia via Greece, cherries from the Black Sea, the apricot from Armenia, the peach from Persia, dates from Palestine and Africa, and rice from India (Gozzini Giacosa 1992, 12-14; see also Dosi & Schnell 1986a, 24-28 and André 1961, esp. 219-221, for detailed discussions of the origins of every type of food available to the Romans, and the particular influence of Hellenistic civilizations).

³²Liv. 39.6: *Epulae quoque ipsae et cura et sumptu maiore apparari coeptae. Tum coquus, vilissimum antiquis mancipium et aestimatione et usu, in pretio esse, et quod ministerium fuerat, ars haberi coepta* (OCT text, Cubberley et al. 1988 translation). Plin. Nat. 34.14 marks the same date for the introduction of the bronze dining-couch (see Pirzio Biroli Stefanelli 1990, 39-49, 68-79, 162-180, Figs. 118-149).

³³Clemente 1981; see above, p. 10.

³⁴Gowers 1993, 65: " 'Greek' influence was by now so firmly entrenched in Roman culture, or indeed was already *equivalent* to Roman culture, that it was artificial to mark it off as foreign, or to ascribe the excesses of festivals to Greek luxury."

³⁵Paraphrasing Dunbabin 1993, 129 and Gowers 1993, 29. See chapter four, p. 174, n. 16.

similar. We know a good deal about Roman cuisine from descriptions of Latin authors such as Cato the Elder, Varro, Columella and Pliny the Elder. The most complete extant account of ancient cuisine (of mixed Greek and Roman origin) was the cookbook compiled in the fourth to fifth centuries A.D. and traditionally attributed to the Augustan era gourmet M. Gavius Apicius. This work is helpful in reconstructing Roman cuisine to some degree; although measurements are often missing, the ingredients and some directions are always provided.³⁶

Food storage

The safe storage of foodstuffs was essential for the efficient long-term operation of a household. Romans baked cereals into bread and cakes or fermented them into beer; they smoked, dried and salted meats, dried fruits, preserved dairy products in the form of cheeses, pickled olives and squeezed them into oil, and fermented grapes into wine.³⁷ Storage of food might be as simple as piling it on the ground or on a pantry shelf.³⁸ Most food, however, was packed in storage vessels that crowded the Roman house. Small dispensers such as *incitegae* held spices and ready quantities of dry goods. *Lagoenae* and *amphorulae* stored, measured and dispensed liquids such as wine, oil, and sauces.³⁹ Large long-term storage vessels (*dolia*, *amphorae*) held dry or liquid goods, including olive oil, *garum* (fish sauce), wine, grain, olives, dried fruits, preserved fish, or even live animals.⁴⁰

Storage vessels were sometimes stacked in their own space (*cella penaria*, *apotheca*), sometimes placed against the wall of any available room or corridor, and sometimes set into the floor.⁴¹ The corners of atria, gardens and peristyles were favorite locations for amphorae and

³⁶For Apicius, other cookbooks and their Greek predecessors, see Gozzini Giacosa 1992, 5-10, Lazzari 1987, Dosi & Schnell 1986c, 7-70; Salza Prina Ricotti 1983, 207-218, André 1961, 7-11, 219-229 and Flower & Rosenbaum 1958.

³⁷Beer was not a native Italian beverage, but was popular in the provinces, from Gaul to Mesopotamia and Egypt (André 1961, 179-180).

³⁸Such as the poor pile of grain on the floor of a closed storage-space described in App. Verg. *Moretum* 13-18 (used to exaggerate the rustic atmosphere of the poem).

³⁹Annechino 1977, 111-113; Collezioni 1989, 176-177, #18.

⁴⁰Live animals kept for food such as dormice were kept in vessels called *gliraria* (see Annechino 1977, 113-114; Collezioni 1989, 200-201, #191 and Salza Prina Ricotti 1983, Fig. 37 for the actual vessel, and Var. *L.* 3.12-13 for its definition).

⁴¹Jashemski 1979, 226-227 & n. 18 lists three areas (VI.16.26, I.20.5, & II.5) where *dolia* have been found embedded in the ground, used in the process of wine production. *Dolia* and *amphorae* crowded the peristyle and courtyard of the *garum* shop (I.12.8) at Pompeii (Curtis, 1979), and still contained dessicated traces of the sauces that once filled the vessels. Storage-jars built against walls or into the ground are also present on a smaller scale in shops at Herculaneum such as III.6 & V.10; see Maiuri 1958, 432-467.

wooden cupboards; smaller closed rooms tended to contain wooden shelves and chests.⁴² P. Allison and J. Berry have recently made systematic efforts to locate vessels, cabinets and areas used for storage in the house through a study of artifact distributions.⁴³

Working vessels for cooking also had to be stored. Pots and pans were sometimes hung on hooks in the walls of a kitchen above the stove, stacked alongside, simply left on the stove, or (most often) stored in cupboards or on shelving in another room (Figs. 1.1-1.2).⁴⁴ Serving vessels and table wares, including those of precious materials, were also packed away in cabinets and cupboards. Many items were probably kept on top of tables and other furniture, like the *urnarium* described by Varro (Fig. 1.3).⁴⁵

The stored accumulation of goods acts as a measure of wealth in many societies; storage space may have reflected the wealth and status of Roman householders as well.⁴⁶ The number and disposition of storage areas and storage vessels depended on how much fresh food was bought and used daily, and how much was bought in bulk and used over a period of time. Columella's detailed instructions for a bailiff's wife concerning the operation of a villa are enlightening in this regard:

...there can be no doubt that the duties of a bailiff's wife require order and arrangement in the things which she stores away...[describes separating items in the storage-area: religious objects, women's and men's festal and martial apparel, footwear, weapons, and wool-making implements]...After this a place

⁴²Berry 1993, 68-70, a study of insula I.9 at Pompeii. Open areas packed with storage vessels are dramatically revealed in excavation photos of I.9.11 (PPM II, 149, #4) and I.9.12 (PPM II, 151, #1).

⁴³Despite, or perhaps because of, their ubiquity, storage areas at Pompeii have been virtually ignored until now. Mau (1908, 267-268) for instance gives the matter but three paragraphs and Salza Prina Ricotti 1978/80 briefly discusses storage areas in the context of service areas. It is clear, however from Allison 1992b and Berry 1993 that storage was by no means confined to separate 'service areas' of houses, but was an integral component of nearly all rooms.

⁴⁴For instance, pots were found during excavation on the walls and upon the stove of kitchen (m) in the Fullonica di Stephanus (I.6.7), and on the stove of in kitchen (11) of the Casa del Fabbro (I.10.7). Cooking vessels were also found in abundance in the southwest corner of atrium (b) in the Casa di Cerere (I.9.13-14), perhaps fallen from cupboards (Fig. 5.152; PPM II, 187, #23-24).

⁴⁵Var. L. 5.126: "Besides there was a third kind of table for vessels, rectangular like the second kind; it was called an *urnarium*, because it was the piece of furniture in the kitchen on which by preference they set and kept the *urnae* 'urns' filled with water."; *Praeterea erat tertium genus mensae it quadratae vasorum; voca(ba)tur urnarium, quod urnas cum aqua positas ibi potissimum habebant in culina* (Loeb text and translation).

⁴⁶Storage was in fact one of the most important by-products of the shift from nomadism to sedentism in human development; it allowed families to surpass the previous limit of being able to own only what they could carry. Differential accumulation of goods soon emphasized differences in wealth, and by extension, rank and status. Thus, community elite almost always show off their stores as a way of advertising and keeping their preeminence; for instance: Telemachos admiring the large and full store of his father (Hom. *Od.* 2.337-345), or traditional Melanesian chiefs constructing large storage pavillons containing their agricultural wealth for the whole community to see, food which is then consumed in communal feasting (Hayden 1993, 241-256).

was found for the vessels which are generally used for keeping food, and then those connected with washing and the toilet and with ordinary meals and with banquets were set out. Next of the things which we use daily we set apart what would suffice for a month, and what would suffice for a year we divided into two portions; for then there is less likely to be a mistake as to what the outcome might be. After we had separated all these things, we arranged them each in its proper place. Next we handed over to the actual people who are in the habit of using them the things which are used daily by the slaves, namely, those connected with the making of wool and the cooking and preparation of food, and pointed out where they should put them and charged them to keep them safe. As for things which we use on days of festival and on the arrival of guests and on certain rare occasions, these we handed over to the steward...⁴⁷

Several points are clear in this passage: 1) The segregation of goods according to their function is necessary to keep track of where those goods are. 2) There is a clear separation of goods according to the status and rarity of the events for which they are used: vessels used to store food, vessels for everyday dinner use, and vessels for use on the occasion of a formal banquet. 3) Goods are grouped according to the time frame over which they are expected to last. 4) The goods and implements needed for daily cooking are given to the slaves' care; the slaves are responsible for their use, storage and safety. 5) Items of value, used on occasions such as festivals or when guests are invited, are left in the (presumably more secure) care of the steward. 6) A margin of safety is established in estimating long-term use of stored goods, a hedge against running short by year's end.

All of these precepts for storage describe a complex and hierarchical system of household organization. Certain goods are associated with the functions for which they are used, the status of the persons who use them, the occasions upon which they are used, and the places where they are used. Columella creates the expectation that the domestic material culture of the Romans (at least at a large country estate) was highly patterned with respect to those variables. The evidence for storage areas in Pompeian houses bears out those patterns, particularly in the largest households. Spaces in smaller households tend to be multi-functional, not highly specialized.⁴⁸

⁴⁷Col. 12.2.6, 12.3.2-4. This is the most relevant excerpt of a larger passage that would be impractical to quote in full: *nihil dubium est, quin cura villicae ordinem dispositionemque rerum, quas reponit, desideret...Post quibus ad cibum comparandum vasis uti assolent constituebantur: inde quae ad lavationem, quae ad exornationem, quae ad mensam quotidianam, atque expulsiorem pertinent, exponebantur. Postea ex iis quibus quotidie utimur, quod menstruum esset seposuimus, annuum quoque in duas partes divisimus: nam sic minus fallit, qui exitus futurus sit. Haec postquam omnia secrevimus, tum suo quaeque loco disposuimus: diende quibus quotidie servuli utuntur, quae ad lanificia, quae ad cibaria coquenda et conficienda pertinent, haec ipsis, qui his, qui his uti solent, tradidimus, et ubi exponerent, demonstravimus, et ut salva essent, praecepimus. Quibus autem ad dies festos et ad hospitum adventum utimur et ad quaedam rara negotia, haec promo tradidimus...*(Loeb text and translation).

⁴⁸See chapter three, pp. 152-156, for a detailed analysis of storage areas.

Cooking techniques and instruments

Cooking utensils and containers developed as an adaptation to the procedures necessary to prepare food, procedures that involved the use of fire and water.⁴⁹ These vessels were made of terracotta, bronze, iron, pewter and even lead.⁵⁰ Scholars have constructed a basic typology of cooking vessels used at Pompeii, and with some success have connected the various forms with the Latin terminology in order to explain how the pots were used. Pots for frying, boiling, steaming, straining, grinding and mixing have been identified.⁵¹ Some vessels, such as the *olla*, *caccabus* or *urceus*, were general-purpose, made out of terracotta or metal, and could serve many kitchen functions. A frequently found item, the *casseruola*, appears in both bronze and silver; undecorated examples may have been used as a sauce-pan (for cooking), while silver or decorated bronze examples were used as dippers for serving wine (Fig. 1.8).⁵² Other pieces were quite specialized, such as the bronze animal or geometric shaped trays used as pastry moulds or serving trays (Figs. 1.4-1.6, 1.8).⁵³

J.M. Schuring has shown that Roman terracotta cooking vessels used special clay mixes that made the pots resistant to the thermal stress, thermal shock, and thermal fatigue that resulted from cooking directly on or above the fuel, in range of the flame.⁵⁴ The size, shape, and thickness of these vessels were also designed to avoid fatal cracks that would make the pots

⁴⁹Dosi & Schnell 1986b, 84, regard fire and water as the quintessential symbols of the kitchen and of civilized life: "Per esempio, i cittadini puniti con la morte civile non potevano più ricevere acqua e fuoco (*interdictio aquae et ignis*)."

⁵⁰For lead and pewter vessels, see Pirzio Biroli Stefanelli 1990, 30-31; Scobie 1986, 424; Packer 1978, 8, 18, 35, 40, 48 (lead cauldrons found in inns and lunch-counters at Pompeii). For iron and bronze vessels, see Pirzio Biroli Stefanelli 1990, 114-118; Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, 191-194, #89-97; Alimentazione 1987, 156-158, #52-59; Carandini 1977 and the inventory of objects from parts of fifteen insulae at Pompeii in Fiorelli 1873, 170-171.

⁵¹Tassinari (1993) has just produced a comprehensive publication of bronze vessels at Pompeii. The *olla*, a wide-mouthed jug used both for general purpose cooking and for storing dry goods; the *caccabus*, an all-purpose stock-pot for boiling and stewing; the *urceus*, a jug for various types of liquids; the *ahenum*, a medium-large bronze cauldron with handles for suspension over a fire; the *colum*, a container with a perforated base used for steaming food above a larger pot like a *caccabus* or *ahenum* -- sometimes also used to describe a colander; the *sartago*, a skillet or frying pan; the *pelvis*, a large mixing and blending bowl; the *mortarium*, for grinding; the *infundibulum*, a funnel; the *situla*, a water-bucket. See Anecchino 1977, Tassinari 1979, and Morel 1979, Hilgers 1969, Alimentazione 1987, 159-160, #63-65; Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, 187; Dosi & Schnell 1986b, 84-91, Collezioni 1989, 176-179; 200-201, #19-42, 185-190, 192; Flower & Rosenbaum 1958, 31-36. Literary sources that describe kitchen implements include: Cato *Agr.* 10.3, 11.4, 14.2; various jurists, *dig.* 33.7 (*instrumentum domesticum*); Juv. 3.261-263; Mart. 11.56, 12.18, 12.32; Ov. *Met.* 8.620-720; Petr. 135-136; Pl. *Capt.* 843-848, *Cas.* 763-779; Plin. *Nat.* 18.358; App. *Verg. Moretum*.

⁵²The Italian term is commonly used; no Latin equivalent has positively been identified, although Hilgers 1969, 71-72 includes the form under the term *patera*. See also Tassinari 1979, 232, 237-238.

⁵³Alimentazione 1987, 161-162, #68-71; Collezioni 1989, 178-179, #38-40.

⁵⁴Schuring 1988, compares Roman to medieval cooking pots in a scientific analysis of their respective fabrics, construction, and thermal resistance and durability.

useless. However, Roman cooking pots were larger than they should have been if thermal resistance were the only factor determining their construction. Schuring concludes that a close relationship can be demonstrated between cooking technology and custom: large batches of food were prepared in the larger cooking pots and then transferred to separate vessels for serving and eating. Food was not brought directly from the fire to the table in the same container.⁵⁵ This conclusion is supported by the literary sources, and suggests that proper presentation of the food at table was a prime concern. Undecorated, fire-blackened, rough textured cooking pots proved too unsightly to be viewed by guests at a formal dinner. Another class of wares, decorated and often made of more precious material than ceramic, was required for serving. Serving wares needed to complement (or at least not degrade) the quality of the food which they carried.

Most cooking pots (except for the *ahenum*, which was suspended over the fire) sat directly upon the coals, or on tripods or stands of terracotta, masonry, bronze, or iron (Figs. 1.1, 1.4-5). Tripods and stands held the pot above the fire so the cooking temperature could be regulated underneath.⁵⁶ The roasting of meats and vegetables was generally done in an oven, or on grills and spits over a fire (Fig. 1.5). Wood or charcoal was used as fuel; the less-smoky charcoal was probably preferred indoors, where fumes could be ventilated through chimneys, windows, or doors onto open courts or streets.⁵⁷ The placement of the cooking fires depended on the apparatus or installation. Fires were built underneath ceramic baking covers, but on top of the flat surface of braziers, hearths, stoves, and oven chambers. The various portable devices, such as cooking stands, braziers and baking covers, are introduced below. Permanent installations, such as hearths, stoves and ovens, make up the archaeological typology in chapter two.⁵⁸

Cooking stands and braziers

The brazier (in Latin, *foculus* or *foculare*) was a cooking device not unique to the Romans; it had a history of use in Italy and amongst the Greeks since at least the fifth century B.C. Prior to that time grills, spits, cooking supports and cooking stands of clay were commonly used; these more primitive cooking aids continued to be used through the Roman period as well.⁵⁹ C. Scheffer has constructed a schematic typology for portable cooking equipment, which I will follow (Fig. 1.9): (a) a 'cooking support' is a set of detached braces placed around a pot, supporting it over a fire on the ground; (b) a 'cooking stand' is of one piece and carries the pot

⁵⁵Schuring 1988, 201.

⁵⁶Dosi & Schnell 1986b, 87; Salza Prina Ricotti 1987, 117-120.

⁵⁷For fuel and smoke, see Salza Prina Ricotti 1978/80, 252-255; see also chapter two, pp. 76-77.

⁵⁸See pp. 78-84 for the typology of hearths, stoves, ovens and kitchens.

⁵⁹For early Italian and Greek cooking devices, see Scheffer 1981, 92-109 (braziers: 98-103). A spit (*veru*), appears in Acc. trag. 221. See also Sparkes 1962 for a study of Greek cooking equipment.

over a fire built on the ground, with a hole provided for introducing fuel and tending the fire; (c) a 'cooking brazier' is a portable device that contains the fire and has the means to support a pot over that fire; (d) a 'brazier' is a portable device that carries a fire for the sole purpose of heating, and as such has no means to support a pot; (e) a 'stand' is only a support to hold up a pot, and fire is not involved.⁶⁰ The strict division between 'cooking brazier' and 'brazier' is not valid at Pompeii, because they were used for both cooking and heating; I exclusively use the latter term.

Because cooking supports are made of mundane terracotta, they have generally been ignored by Pompeian excavators. In the archaeological sample, the record of only one set of three cooking supports, made up of broken amphorae toes, survives (Fig. 5.153).⁶¹ Cooking stands (*fornelli* in Italian) and braziers (*bracieri*) are slightly better recorded at Pompeii, especially if they are made of metal. In G. Fiorelli's 1873 inventory of the finds in parts of fifteen *insulae*, he records a total of eleven whole or slightly damaged *fornelli*, four of bronze and seven of iron. He also records eighteen *bracieri*, ten of bronze and eight of iron.⁶² Terracotta examples were also in use; one *fornello* and one *braciere* of terracotta have been published from the inventory of the Napoli Museum (Figs. 1.10-1.11).⁶³ The most common metal cooking stand is the simple tripod of ca. 0.15 m. high, which appears *in situ* upon the stoves or hearths in some kitchens (Figs. 1.1, 1.4-5).⁶⁴ A few of the best preserved metal braziers have been published. They are of moderate size, ca. 0.25-0.35 m. high; those of rectangular shape range are ca. 0.30-0.40 m. wide and ca. 0.50-0.60 m. long, and those of circular shape are ca. 0.40-0.50 m. in diameter (Figs. 1.12-13). Both forms have feet, a raised top ridge to hold in the coals, and may be highly decorated on the exterior face.⁶⁵ Both shapes are copied in miniature for portable altars of ca. 0.25-0.20 m. on a side for the rectangular models and ca. 0.15 m. diameter for the circular models.⁶⁶

Baking covers

Baking covers, known as either *clibani* or *testum*, are earthenware vessels of 0.25-0.50 m. in diameter that narrow or are domed at the top (Figs. 1.14-1.15). Baking covers were set over a

⁶⁰See Scheffer 1981, 25-30, fig. 1, developed for her study of cooking in Italy from the Bronze Age to Republican Rome.

⁶¹In the southwest corner of portico (o) in I.9.13 (PPM II, 212, # 62); see the gazetteer entry. Ward-Perkins & Claridge 1976, #295 presents a cooking pot resting on an amphora mouth that serves as a stand.

⁶²Fiorelli 1873, 170. None of these stands or braziers are illustrated; none have a provenance.

⁶³Collezioni 1989, 200-201. The *fornello*: #193, and the *braciere*: #194. Neither have inventory numbers. See also Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, 145, #10, a small terracotta altar or brazier.

⁶⁴I.6.4 (n), I.6.7 (m), I.10.4 (41), I.10.7 (11) (see gazetteer), and the Casa dei Vettii, VI.15.1 (w), not in the sample; see Dosi & Schnell 1986b, 84-85. For tripod stands from museums, see Alimentazione 1987, 158, #58 and Collezioni 1989, 200-201, #189 (also shown in Ward-Perkins & Claridge 1976, #297).

⁶⁵Unprovenanced braziers: Collezioni 1989, 182-183, #68 (Herculaneum); #69 (Pompeii). See also Dosi & Schnell 1986b, 75, 88.

⁶⁶Altars in the shape of miniature braziers: Collezioni 1989, 188-189, #112-113.

fire and used for baking bread, roasting meat, or general cooking; they served as simple, portable ovens.⁶⁷ The *testum* was usually preheated by a cooking fire underneath; the fire was then removed and replaced by dough, and the *testum* was covered over with the hot ashes.⁶⁸ The word *clibanus* appears to have been adopted from the Greek κλίβανος around the turn of the third century B.C. as "a fashionable term to use even for a concept already well-known to the Romans, i.e. *sub testu* cooking".⁶⁹ In general, *testum* seems to have had a slightly more traditional usage as a terracotta baking cover, while *clibanus* was extended to baking covers of iron and bronze, and included the roasting or baking of meats.⁷⁰ The inexpensive ceramic models had a long tradition in Italy, lasting from the prehistoric to the medieval period; some still survive today in Croatia.⁷¹ Only recently have these baking covers been recognized at Pompeii, but no study of the existing inventories of cooking wares has restored provenance to any of these vessels.⁷² It would be useful to know whether the large industrial bakeries found throughout the city were sufficient to supply the majority of bread in Pompeii, or to what extent they were supplemented by small-scale baking at home with a *clibanus* or *testum*.

Serving and eating utensils

Food served in an elegant household did not require an especially large or complicated table service, because food was pre-cut by slaves and eaten with the fingers off of trays, plates or pans (Figs. 1.3, 1.8).⁷³ Forks and table knives were used in the kitchens to handle and cut food, but were not part of the wares at table; soups, when they were served, were consumed with spoons.⁷⁴ Napkins (*mappae*), provided by the host or brought by each invitee, served to clean up

⁶⁷Cubberley et al. 1988 and Cubberley forthcoming; these supercede earlier studies by Frayn 1978 and Quentin 1926. See also Hilgers 1969, 148-149, 287. Another device, the *thermospodium*, seems to have been similar, consisting of two ceramic halves fitted one over the other, as Cubberley et al. 1988, 116 suggests.

⁶⁸Cato Agr. 74, 75: "Pat out a loaf, place on leaves, and bake slowly on a warm hearth under a crock (*sub testu*)"; 76: "When the cakes (*tracta*) are moulded, heat thoroughly the hearth where you are to bake, and the crock (*testum*)" (Loeb translations). See also Sen. Ep. 90.23 (chapter two, p. 66-67, n. 48).

⁶⁹Cubberley et al. 1988, 102.

⁷⁰Cubberley et al. 1988, 101, with refs.

⁷¹On the Dalmatian island of Iz. The bread apparently bakes in approximately thirty minutes under the ceramic cover (Cubberley forthcoming, 4). See also Whitehouse 1978.

⁷²Cubberley et al. 1988, 113.

⁷³"The [Roman] table service (*ministerium*) included vessels for food (*argentum escarium*) and for liquids (*argentum pitorium*). After the [ladle] (*simpulum*), the most commonly found shapes are amphorae and jugs of various sorts, saucepans (*casseruole*) with long horizontal handles, chalices and two-handled cups." (Rediscovering Pompei 1992, 197, #100). The *patera*, a decorated saucer with or without a handle, could be used as a serving tray at table, for holding unguent in the bath, and for ritual libations (Hilgers 1969, 71-71, Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, 193-194, #93).

⁷⁴Forks and knives: Pirzio Biroli Stefanelli 1990, 120; Dosi & Schnell 1986b, 67. Spoons: Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, 157 (#28), 187; Collezione 1989, 174-175, #16-17; Dosi & Schnell 1986b, 68, 89. Larger spoons of wood, bronze or bone were used to stir foods such as sauces as they were heated in the kitchen.

individual spills, and later were used to carry home leftovers which were often eaten for breakfast the next morning.⁷⁵ Table services included ceramic, glass, bronze and silver items, depending upon the financial means of the owner and the appropriateness of the occasion.⁷⁶ Luxurious serving and table wares conspicuously showed off wealth to table guests in an active manner; some guests were able to use precious vessels that they could not afford at home.⁷⁷ The Elder Pliny tells a story of table wares grown to unmanageable extremes (a historical phenomenon fueled by competition amongst elites), and finally too ponderous to serve anything but the function of ostentation:

Under the Emperor Claudius his slave Drusillanus, who bore the name of Rotundus, the Emperor's steward of Nearer Spain, possessed a silver dish weighing five-hundred pounds for the manufacture of which a workshop had first been specially built, and eight others of two-hundred and fifty pounds went with it as side-dishes, so that how many of his fellow-slaves, I ask, were to bring them in or who were to dine off them?⁷⁸

Conspicuous display of the best table wares to create a favorable impression of the host was also a custom common to Victorian England, as Dickens noted:

"Hideous solidity was the characteristic of the Podsnap plate. Everything was made to look as heavy as it could and to take up as much room as possible. Everything said boastfully, 'Here you have as much of me in my ugliness as if I were only lead; but I am so many ounces of precious metal worth so much an ounce -- wouldn't you like to melt me down?'"⁷⁹

No dinner was complete without wine, and as instruments of a dinner-party, drinking vessels were as important as eating wares. In wealthy houses, mixing bowls, jugs, and cups were

⁷⁵These 'doggie-bags' were called *sportulae*. See Catul. 12; Mart. 2.37, 7.20; Plin. *Ep.* 2.14.4; Var. *L.* 9.47. Plin. *Nat.* 19.19 describes fire-proof napkins.

⁷⁶For examples of vessels of silver, bronze, glass, and terracotta used at table, see: Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, 189-213, #87-89, 93, 98, 101-142; Pirzio Biroli Stefanelli 1990, 118-221; Alimentazione 1987, #18-51; Dosi & Schnell 1986b, 62-76; Künzl 1979, Morel 1979, Ward-Perkins & Claridge 1976, #106-117, 263-275; Collezioni 1989, 174-175 (#1-15), 194-197 (#145-171), 204-217 (#15-17, #1a-55), 222-223 (#35-36); Hilgers 1969; Maiuri 1933 (the silver service from the Casa del Menandro, I.10.4), 241-378, 434-452.

⁷⁷See Hudson 1989; Cic. *Ver.* 2.4.62; *Rhet. Her.* 4.64; Ulp. *dig.* 13.6.5.14; Juv. 4; Luc. 10.121; Man. 5.292; Petr. 26-74; Plin. *Nat.* 33.144. The Lex Fannia of 161 B.C. failed to check the amount of silver allowed at table; eventually, an elite was unrefined if he had no silver service (Cic. *Pis.* 67).

⁷⁸Plin. *Nat.* 33.146: *...quingenariam lancem habuit, cui fabricandae officina prius exaedificata fuerat, et comites eius octo ad CCL libras, quaeso, ut quam multi eas conservi eius inferrent, aut quibus cenantibus?* (Loeb text and translation). For elite competition, see Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 143-174.

⁷⁹Charles Dickens, *Our Mutual Friend*, excerpted in Pool 1993, 74.

constructed of precious materials, including crystal, silver, gold and electrum.⁸⁰ In the dining rooms, ladles of silver and bronze (*simpula, cyathi*) mixed measurable amounts of wine and water, and transferred the result from the mixing vessels to the cups (Figs. 1.7-1.8).⁸¹ Elaborately decorated stoves were built for heating the water that was used to cut the wine before drinking (Fig. 1.16-1.17).⁸² These portable stoves were fueled by charcoal, and could be carried into or near the dining room.⁸³ Guests were then able to personally supervise the mixing of their own cups of wine, as K. Dunbabin has recently demonstrated. Rightly stressing the variety of Roman drinking customs, she concludes that the mixing of wine, water and spices appears to have been done according to individual taste, rather than in the large batches for all the guests that were common at Greek *symposia*.⁸⁴ The fact that not all of the guests might drink the same batch of wine meant that some hosts could favor certain guests with better wine, and leave poorer drink for the others. Such preferential behavior was considered to be in poor taste by authors such as the Younger Pliny, because it flaunted accepted etiquette and mocked the atmosphere of conviviality ('living together') expected at a meal.⁸⁵

Table etiquette

Eating and drinking done in company were, above all, social behaviors that had to be regulated in order to preserve social order. One's behavior at table revealed whether one was

⁸⁰ For crystal, see Sen. *Ep.* 123.7; Collezioni 1989, 228-229 (#7). For gold, see Mart. 6.94. See also Dunbabin 1993; Dosi & Schnell 1986b, 62-67, 76-78.

⁸¹ Var. *L.* 5.124 briefly defines the Latin terms and functions for these ladles. For preserved examples, see Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, 192-197, # 92, 99-100; Collezioni 1989, 178-179, #42; Dosi & Schnell 1986b, 82; Carandini 1977, 167. A set of ladles of graded measuring capacity is shown amongst a whole silver table service painted on the tomb of Vestorius Priscus at Pompeii (Dunbabin 1993, Fig. 3).

⁸² Some smaller forms of these stoves are known today as 'samovars'. For a recent study of these water-heaters, see Dunbabin 1993; see also Collezioni 1989, 182-183, #66-67, 70-74; Dosi & Schnell 1986b, 74-75, 86; Ward-Perkins & Claridge 1976, #159; Mau 1908, 376-377.

⁸³ In the study sample at Pompeii, stoves for heating liquids have been found in room (g) of I.6.15, under the stairs of room (20) in I.8.17, and in room (2) of I.9.5 (the latter two published respectively in Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, 173-175, #59 (mislabelled a 'food-warmer'), and 189, #85).

⁸⁴ Dunbabin 1993, 140-141.

⁸⁵ Dunbabin 1993, 128, with refs. to Juv. 5.24-37; Mart. 3.82.22-25, who complain about differential treatment at meals. Cic. *Pis.* 67 pictures L. Calpurnius Piso's bad behavior: entertaining Greeks at dinner, and worse, packing them five to a couch while he keeps a whole couch for himself. Plin. *Ep.* 2.6 contrasts the boorish behavior of his host with his own egalitarian habits: "I serve the same to everyone, for when I invite guests it is for a meal, not to make class distinctions; I have brought them as equals to the same table, so I give them the same treatment in everything." 'Even the freedmen?' 'Of course, for then they are my fellow-diners, not freedmen.' "; *'Eadem omnibus pono; ad cenam enim non ad notam invito cunctisque rebus exaequo, quos mensa et toro aequavi.'* *'Etiamne libertos?'* *'Etiam; convictores enim tunc, non libertos puto.'* (Teubner text, B. Radice translation). D'Arms 1990 argues that this sort of equality at dinners was uncommon, being reserved for the gatherings of literate, cultivated, 'truly civilized' individuals.

sufficiently 'cultured' to belong to the circle of banqueters, and to active society in general. How one ate reflected first upon one's social station and then the degree to which a person was socially active. Those who did not have the social connections to receive regular invitations might not know how to behave at dinner. If they were invited and then caused offense, they then stood a good chance of eating at home thereafter. Martial describes with comic sadness a habitual offender of etiquette named Santra. Santra is pitiable (*miser*) because he spends days fishing for an invitation, and when he finally lands one, he eats too much and tries to bring back the rest in his dinner-napkin, disgusting his companions and probably spoiling his chances for a return.⁸⁶ Santra's motives for dining out are misdirected:

"In the evening, the time set aside for socializing, solitude was harder to bear than frugality. Romans liked to feel that they belonged to a small social circle and they were keen to receive dinner invitations, especially if they had no family of their own. Dinners were what forged bonds between groups of people."⁸⁷

If Santra understood the true meaning of dinners as social occasions, he might eat less, behave better, and increase his chances of dining again sooner. This epigram is both a cautionary tale warning naïve readers how to behave at dinner, and a smug wink at wise readers who could not possibly be as socially inept as the comical Santra.

Written on the walls of *triclinium* (12) in the Casa del Moralista (III.4.2) at Pompeii was a short guide to manners. Three precepts offer a unique insight into one householder's rules for conducting a proper meal:

1. Let the slave wash your feet with water and wipe them dry; let him cover the dining-couch with a napkin; take care with our linens.
2. Put aside lascivious looks and alluring eyes at the wife of another man; let decency reside in your speech.
3. Speak pleasant words and avoid troublesome quarrels if you can; otherwise take steps to your own house.⁸⁸

⁸⁶Mart. 7.20.

⁸⁷Dupont 1992, 273. Another epigrammatic character, Silius, is described in Mart. 2.11 as depressed, and with a cloudy brow (*fronte nubila*); the reason for his melancholy is kept in suspense until the end of the poem: "His sorrow then -- what is the cause of it? He dines at home!"; *Maeroris igitur causa quae? domi cenat* (Loeb text and translation).

⁸⁸CIL IV.7698: *Abluat unda pedes puer ed detergeat udos, mappa torum velet, lintea nostra cave. Lascivos vultus et blandos aufert ocellos coniuge ab alterius, sit tibi in ore pudor. Utere blanditiis odiosaque iurgia differ si potes aut gressus ad tua tecta refer* (author's translation; see also Della Corte 1927, 78; Maiuri 1954a, 77). Other authors also offer pleas for good behavior at a meal: Var. *Men. Ag.* 6 and Mart. 10.48 ("To crown these (fruits and good wine) shall be jests without gall, and a freedom not to be dreaded the next morning, and no word you would wish unsaid"; *Accedent sine felle ioci nec mane timenda libertas et nil quod tacuisse velis* (Loeb text and translation).

Matters of proper hygiene, sexual conduct, language and emotion are all of concern to the owner of this house. At the other end of the spectrum are meals with gastronomic excess, music, dancing, gambling, drunkenness, brawling and dubious virtue.⁸⁹ For the wise host, some happy medium between extremes of sober propriety and wanton excess was necessary both in terms of the actual food and the mood of the gathering.⁹⁰ Good guests in turn demonstrated their cultured wit (*urbanitas*) by supplying the dinner with appropriate humor; obscene jokes were the domain of the lower classes (*humiliter*).⁹¹ Pleasant, erudite conversation was an appetizer (but not a main course); this can be demonstrated generally by food literature, in which there is always a clever triangle of associations between the food, mealtime conversation, and the literary work itself.⁹² A successful dinner balanced the host and the guests, seriousness and levity, simple food and rich food, conversation and consumption. It kept a philosophy of the comfortable status quo 'on the table', even as it was a forum for social mobility 'under the table'.⁹³

So much for the etiquette of physical and social ingestion; what about the digestion and discharge of a meal? Indigestion, vomiting, urination and defecation are all common after-effects of dinner. What options for relieving these pressures were available during a meal of several hours? At elite meals, the more innocuous activities of belching and flatulence were generally considered to be impolite and even 'barbarian' behavior, although they were reportedly acceptable to Stoics.⁹⁴ Hors d'oeuvres in some of Martial's menus are described as laxatives for facilitating bowel movements during the course of the meal.⁹⁵ Vomiting was induced in some cases, allowing the guest to continue ingesting more food than was normally possible.⁹⁶

⁸⁹For example, Petr. 21-24, 30-79. See Balsdon 1974, 45-51, Goddard 1994, 75-76 (Nero's banquets) and below, pp. 49-50.

⁹⁰Gowers 1993, 276: "The smart dinner could be neither completely rustic nor extravagant.", referring to Plin. *Ep.* 1.15; see also 161-162 and 269: "A perfect balance is achieved between intellectual pursuits and the necessary light-heartedness appropriate to the dinner-party (*remissus aliquid et dulcius; comoedis; comitate*)."

⁹¹Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.8, 6.3.16, Cic. *de Orat.* 2.62.252.

⁹²See Gowers 1993, 29, 40-46, 232. She emphasizes the materialism of Roman dining on p. 136, where she contrasts the banquet of Hor. *S.* 2.4 (in which even the conversation boils down to food) with the classic Platonic *symposium*: "the *convivium*, epitome of all social intercourse, now has as its focus food, not conversation, while even conversation, *sermo*, is saturated with gastronomy, not philosophy. Rome is now the centre of a materialist world, and *hospitium* has become a calculated art."

⁹³See the section below on 'rank and status' at dinner, p. 50-56.

⁹⁴Barbarian belching: Sidon. *Carm.* 12.14; acceptable behavior to Stoics: Cic. *Fam.* 9.22.5.

⁹⁵Mart. 10.48, 11.52 (Gowers 1993, 254, n. 154, 257-258).

⁹⁶Gowers 1993, 19: "Vomiting and emetics, which were actually standard medical treatment in the ancient world, became distorted and abused in attacks on luxury because they were ways of extending the body's capacity indefinitely".

Our only long literary description of the options for urination and defecation during dinner comes from the *Satyricon*. The open manner in which Trimalchio speaks of bodily discharges implies the opposite, that the matters were anything but openly discussed in formal dinner company. In fact, his wife and guests (and presumably the reader) find his comments humorous:

'But if any of you has any business that needs attending to, go right ahead; no reason to feel embarrassed. There's not a man been born yet with solid insides. And I don't know any anguish on earth like trying to hold it in. Jupiter himself couldn't stop it from coming. What are you giggling about, Fortunata? You're the one who keeps me awake all night with your trips to the potty. Well, anyone at table who wants to go has my permission, and the doctors tell us not to hold it in. Everything's ready outside -- water and pots and the rest of the stuff. Take my word for it, friends, the vapors go straight to your brain. Poison your whole system. I know of some who've died from being too polite and holding it in.' We thanked him for his kindness and understanding, but we tried to hide our snickers in repeated swallows of wine.⁹⁷

This passage uses general language (allowing the reader to substitute his own scatological specifics) in key portions describing the excretory procedures, so it is difficult to know what was allowed within Trimalchio's dining room and what had to be done outside. It is clear that a chamber-pot, water and other amenities (*aqua, lasani et cetera minutalia*) are ready outside the dining room for any guest who has a serious matter to attend to (*si quid plus*). Scobie reasonably interprets this serious matter as defecation; less pressing matters (*facere quod se iuvet*) such as urination could be handled at table with the help of a slave and a chamber-pot.⁹⁸

It is difficult to locate the designated area for chamber pots outside (*foras*) the dining room. Mygind believed that free family members always used chamber-pots, brought and removed by a slave, and that only slaves used fixed domestic latrines; his opinion was based on Petronius.⁹⁹ Scobie disagrees: "...it (the above passage) hardly constitutes proof that high-status Romans did not use latrines in their own houses. Trimalchio's words *omnia foras parata sunt* are

⁹⁷Petr. 47: '*Itaque si quis vestrum voluerit sua re [causa] facere, non est quod illum pudeatur. Nemo nostrum solide natus est. Ego nullum puto tam magnum tormentum esse quam continere. Hoc solum vetare ne Iovis potest. Rides, Fortunata, quae soles me nocte desomnum facere? Nec tamen in triclinio ullum vetuo facere quod se iuvet, et medici vetant continere. Vel si quid plus venit, omnia foras parata sunt: aqua, lasani et cetera minutalia. Credite mihi, anathymiasis in cerebrum it et in toto corpore fluctum facit. Multos scio sic periisse, dum nolunt sibi verum dicere.*' *Gratias agimus liberalitali indulgentiaeque eius, et subinde castigamus crebris potiunculis risum* (Loeb text, W. Arrowsmith translation).

⁹⁸Scobie 1986, 410 (see also D'Arms 1991, 174, n.23, referring to Sen. *Ben.* 3.26). '*facere quod se iuvet*' may also include belching and flatulation as acceptable responses to food in the liberal dining room of Trimalchio.

⁹⁹Mygind 1921, 318-324, courtesy of Scobie 1986, 409-410; see Petr. 41, wherein a slave brings a silver chamber-pot to Trimalchio as he is playing a ball-game outside. The silver chamberpot is meant to be a humorous oxymoron.

best taken to refer to a domestic latrine."¹⁰⁰ Custom probably varied from household to household -- slaves coming to the guests at table with portable toilets, or guests venturing into the service-area of the house to use a latrine in the kitchen. Where the host and guests relieved themselves during a formal meal must have been based on rules of 'social hygiene'.¹⁰¹ Would a host have wanted to keep his guests away from a latrine, preventing them from witnessing dirty slaves cooking in the kitchen and risking loss of their appetite?

Romans practiced a range and variety of dining practices; fragmentary and anecdotal literary sources depict largely exaggerated behavior, and the precepts from the *Casa del Moralista* are the expressions of an individual. Tastes in food, just as in mixed wine, varied from person to person; Horace assumes as much when he speaks of his poetic audience in terms of guests at a dinner-party:

Besides, not everyone likes and admires the same stuff. Lyric pleases you, another man delights in iambs, still another in Biton's satire and coarse black salt. Any three guests I have seem almost never to agree; their tastes differ and they ask for different things. What should I serve? What not serve? You reject their choices, the other two think yours is bitter, really revolting.¹⁰²

Variety in eating habits is actually prescribed by the medical author Celsus, in accordance with the appropriateness of the occasion:

It is best...not to avoid any particular types of food commonly in use; sometimes to attend banquets, at other times to stay away; sometimes to eat more than sufficient and on other occasions eat no more; to eat twice a day rather than once, and always to eat as much as you need as long as you can digest it.¹⁰³

Etiquette is as relevant to the temporal as the social context of the meal -- knowing when to begin eating, when to stop, how often to eat, and even how quickly or slowly to eat. The hopeless Santra not only eats and drinks too much, but too fast; in hurrying to bring back his haul of goodies home, he leaves behind his opportunity to return. Santra does not appreciate that the timing of meals marks the tempo of orderly society; he cannot keep pace, and is sure to fall back, and out, of proper society as a result.

¹⁰⁰Scobie 1986, 410. See also Salza Prina Ricotti 1978/80.

¹⁰¹For physical health risks in juxtaposing the kitchen and latrine, see chapter two, p. 74-75.

¹⁰²Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.58-64: *denique non omnes eadem mirantur amantque: carmine tu gaudes, hic delectatur iambis, ille Bioneis sermonibus et sale nigro. Tres mihi conviviae prope dissentire videntur, poscentes vario multum diverso palato. Quid dem? Quid non dem? Renuis tu, quod iubet alter; quod petis, id sane est invisum acidumque duobus* (OCT text, Fuchs 1977 translation). See also Plin. *Ep.* 2.5, 3.1 and 7.3 for *variatio* in dining.

¹⁰³Cels. 1.1.1-2 (translation Hudson 1989, 72).

When is cooking and eating done?

The daily routine

Meals in Roman society were important temporal markers that helped to define the passage of a day. Three meals were normal, although the poor and medically advised might be limited to two.¹⁰⁴ Breakfast (*ientaculum*) was taken anywhere from daybreak to the third or fourth hour (i.e. generally not later than 10 a.m.). It consisted basically of bread and cheese, or perhaps some leftovers (olives, fruit or meats) brought home from a dinner the previous night.¹⁰⁵ Lunch (*prandium*) was taken about noon, and was generally no heavier than breakfast.¹⁰⁶ The menu varied from simple bread to meats, vegetables and fruit served cold or warmed up from the night before. Lunch is usually described as being consumed quickly and without ceremony.¹⁰⁷

Meals early in the day were not generally taken in company, although lunch bought at a street-side lunch counter or diner would have offered the opportunity of social interaction.¹⁰⁸ At one of his lunches, Seneca did not even see the need for washing his hands.¹⁰⁹ Interacting with other people over a meal was primarily reserved for the *cena*, the main meal of the day, where the setting and the mixing of the guests could be managed by the host. Individuals who disregarded the customary schedule for meals inconvenienced the host and upset the normal working order of the household. Martial sarcastically recalls an early arrival:

The boy does not yet announce to you the fifth hour, and yet you, Caecilianus, come already as my guest, although the fourth hour, hoarse with pleading, has only just enlarged the bail-bonds, and the arena still wearies the wild beasts at Flora's games. Come, run, Callistus, and call back the unwashed servants; let the couches be spread: Caecilianus, sit down. You ask for warm water: my cold has not yet arrived; my kitchen is closed and chill, its fire unkindled. Come rather at

¹⁰⁴Balsdon 1974, 17-55, Carcopino 1960, 263; Gowers 1993, 17.

¹⁰⁵Gozzini Giacosa 1992, 2; Salza Prina Ricotti 1987, 123-124; Salza Prina Ricotti 1983, 20-21; Carcopino 1960, 263-264; Johnston 1932, 223-224; Marquardt I, 310-316. Ancient sources: Apul. *Met.* 1.18; Gal. *San. Tuend.* 5.332, 6.412; Mart. 13.31, 14.223. Festus reports two other words for breakfast: *prandiculum* (Fest. p.250M), and *silatum* (Fest. p. 346M), but the latter passage is corrupt.

¹⁰⁶Originally the noon meal was called the *cena*, and the evening meal was called the *vesperna* (Fest. 54; Isid. *Orig.* 20.2.11-14). A late lunch served in the afternoon was sometimes called a *merenda* (Non. p. 59; Calp. *Ecl.* 5.60).

¹⁰⁷See Peck 1923, 312. Ancient sources on lunch: Corp. Gloss. Lat. III, pp. 645-647; Hor. *S.* 1.6.127-128; Plin. *Ep.* 3.5.10-11; Plaut. *Pers.* 104-105; Suet. *Aug.* 76.

¹⁰⁸Referring to Republican period practice, Plu. *Moralia* 726E says: "The ancient Romans generally took their early meal alone, but had dinner along with their friends." (καθ' ἑαυτοὺς γὰρ ἡρίστων ἐπειεκῶς οὐ πάλαι Ῥωμαῖοι συνδειπνοῦντες τοῖς φίλοις, Loeb text and translation). For lunch counters (*popinae*) and diners (*cauponiae*), see below, pp. 34-37.

¹⁰⁹Sen. *Ep.* 83.6.

daybreak; for why should the fifth hour keep you waiting? For a breakfast you come late, Caecilianus.¹¹⁰

Martial writes in an annoyed tone; with clipped phrasing he orders the slaves to outfit the dining room and fire up the kitchen on short notice. Upon the arrival, Martial's household is pictured as cold, closed and dormant. Caecilianus is a serious disruption; he has reversed the day's traditional order of business, replacing the work (*negotium*) of morning-time with the leisure (*otium*) of the afternoon.¹¹¹ Nevertheless, the presence of a guest requires that the warmth and life of a physically and socially active house be engineered immediately.

Warm water for washing the host, guests, and servants was a necessary prerequisite to the *cena*. Guests made a trip to the baths in the early to mid afternoon before the start of a proper meal.¹¹² Bath suites in the wealthiest houses were usually placed adjacent to the kitchens themselves, efficiently juxtaposing facilities requiring heat and water.¹¹³ A whiff of the meal being prepared in the kitchen may have whet the appetites of guests as they went in to bathe.

Dinner itself began after the bath towards the end of the eighth hour in winter or ninth hour in summer (i.e. about 1:30-3:30 p.m.).¹¹⁴ At a formal affair, properly attired diners, after being greeted, removed their shoes, took their places on the couches, and washed their hands.¹¹⁵ The number, order and makeup of the courses that followed varied immensely depending on the season, occasion, company, and wealth of the owner. There is no unbiased evidence for a 'typical' or 'normal' Roman *cena*: "Instead, there is usually a split between disgusting or extravagant meals described from a hostile point of view, and innocent meals where food is at its least gross, or is omitted altogether."¹¹⁶ Nevertheless, food depicted in written sources is not completely symbolic; if it were, it would have lost all relevance to the reader.

¹¹⁰Mart. 8.67: *Horas quinque puer nondum tibi nuntiat et tu iam convivium mihi, Caeciliane, venis, cum modo distulerint raucae vadimonia quartae et Floralicias lasset harena feras. Curre, age, et inlotos revoca, Calliste, ministros; sternantur lecti: Caeciliane, sede. Caldam poscis aquam: nondum mihi frigida venit; alget adhuc nudo clusa culina foco. Mane veni potius; nam cur te quinta moretur? ut iantes, sero, Caeciliane, venis* (OCT text, Loeb translation).

¹¹¹See Wallace-Hadrill 1988, 84-86 for the temporal and spatial distinction of *negotium* and *otium* within the Roman house.

¹¹²Salza Prina Ricotti 1987, 124; Balsdon 1974, 26-32. Ancient sources: Apul. *Met.* 5.15; Petr. 26-28; Mart. 10.14, 10.48; Juv. 11.204-205; Plin. *Ep.* 3.1.8, 9.36.3-4; Suet. *Ves.* 21.1.

¹¹³Vitr. 6.6.2 advises placing baths next to kitchens for this very reason. See chapter three, p. 139.

¹¹⁴Cic. *Fam.* 9.26; Plin. *Ep.* 3.1.9; Mart. 10.48, 11.52. To demonstrate the gluttony of Nero and Vitellius, Suetonius depicts them as starting their dinners already at noon (Suet. *Ner.* 27; *Vit.* 13). Mart. 3.36 in turn complains about having to follow his patron to the baths at the tenth hour (as early as two p.m. in winter and late as five p.m. in summer) or later, after which presumably he would finally receive the reward of dinner.

¹¹⁵Carcopino 1960, 266-267, Peck 1923, 313 and Daremberg & Saglio, s.v. "Coena" provide numerous ancient references.

¹¹⁶Gowers 1993, 7, 170. Meals are depicted along a moral, social and economic scale: a poor, plain meal in Ov. *Met.* 8.620-720, or Horace summing up poor fare with a note in *S.* 1.1.73-75: "Don't you know the value of money, what it's used for? It buys bread, vegetables, a pint of wine and whatever else a human being

A full, elite dinner traditionally consisted of three phases, between each of which the hands were washed and dried with the aid of finger bowls and towels. First was the *gustus* or *gustatio*, a series of appetizers such as vegetables, eggs, shell-fish, and olives, and a sweetened wine (*mulsum*) to drink.¹¹⁷ Next came the *cena* proper, itself divided into *prima*, *secunda*, and *tertia* courses, during which main meat courses of fish, goat, or pig would be served, along with other side dishes of seafood, fowl, and vegetables, all washed down with cut wine.¹¹⁸ Last was the *secundae mensae*, or dessert, at which point pastries and fruit were served, and after which the dinner party sometimes turned into a drinking party, or *commissatio*.¹¹⁹

A dinner might last anywhere from a few hours to well into the night. The richer the banquet, the earlier it might begin, and presumably the longer it would last.¹²⁰ The success of a formal dinner depended in some degree upon how well the host had planned the event, and upon the promptness of the service. The temporal burden of a meal thus fell largely upon the household staff; it was their task to bring out food promptly so it was neither too hot to pick up nor too cold to eat. They were required to keep wine goblets filled, periodically clean the table and floor of debris, and sometimes offer timely entertainment. Guests and masters no doubt had speedy expectations of the slave staff that were either confirmed or frustrated during the course of the meal. A Plautine dinner cooked up in 'no time' humorously plays on those expectations in the *Pseudolus*:

BALLIO (to the cook): Don't be so annoying; you clatter too much already; shut up. Okay, that there is where I live. Get inside and cook up dinner -- fast!
PUER (cook's helper): But come, you, recline at table and admit the guests, the dinner is already spoiling!¹²¹

needs to survive and not to suffer." (translation Fuchs 1977). The meal in Hor. *Ep.* 1.5.6 is modest, and Mart. 10.48 modestly describes his numerous and varied dishes as a *cenula*. Hor. *S.* 2.8 depicts a reasonably rich meal, and the *Cena Trimalchionis* of Petr. 26-78 is an affair of sublime and silly extravagance.

¹¹⁷Also called the *promulsis* or *frigida mensa*; see Peck 1923, 313, with refs.

¹¹⁸Juv. 1.94-95 jokes about seven-course meals.

¹¹⁹Balsdon 1974, 32-55, Peck 1923, 313-314; Paoli 1958, 95-96; Jashemski 1979, 92; Salza Prina Ricotti 1987, 124; Gozzini Giacosa 1992, 3; Dupont 1992, 275-277.

¹²⁰Plin. *Ep.* 3.5.12-13 reports that his uncle, *tanta erat parsimonia temporis*, would rise from dinner at dusk in wintertime, and while it was still light in the summer. Trimalchio's dinner, on the other hand, seems to go on endlessly into the night; there the author uses time as well as sheer cost to describe the shameful lengths to which his ex-slave character will go. Catul. 47.5 villifies two individuals in part by emphasizing how early in the day their sumptuous dinners began. Cic. *Pis.* 67 accuses L. Calpurnius Piso of all-night dining and drinking.

¹²¹Pl. *Ps.* 889-892: *BA. Molestus ne sis; nimium iam tinnis; tace. Em illic ego habito. Intro abi et et cenam coque. Propera. PV. Quin tu is accubitus et convivas cedo, corrumpitur iam cena* (OCT text, author's translation). Gowers 1993, 105-106 reads this passage too deeply, seeing the dinner as a metaphor for the central intrigue in the play and missing the plain joke on the surface.

The master gets the dinner he asked for sooner than he or the audience expects, and the fact that it is a diet of wit from the mouth of the boy-slave, not actually the food itself, amplifies the jest. Not only does Ballio not get the real meal right away, he is the butt of a joke based on his own impatience.

Trimalchio shrewdly uses his guests' expectations of time to perform a small illusion at his dinner.¹²² After having presented three pigs of various ages to the company, and asked them which they would prefer to eat, Trimalchio himself orders the cook to prepare the eldest. Shortly thereafter the cooked pig arrives and the guests are amazed at the speed of preparation (*Mirari nos celeritatem coepimus*). They think they understand why the pig was cooked so fast when the trembling cook admits he forgot to gut the pig, but the drama is resolved when the cook slices open the pig's belly right at the table, and numerous prepared sausages and puddings pour out. Trimalchio's trick, of course, was that the pig at the table had long been prepared, and his mock selection of a live pig for slaughter was but a device to fool the company into thinking that Trimalchio's kitchen could cook a dish in record time.

There must have been a host of practical problems in timing a dinner correctly. Larger houses (with kitchens far removed from the dining rooms) presumably had larger service staffs to traverse the distance, communicate orders promptly and prevent the food from losing its heat. Alternatively, hosts could deploy braziers to keep food warm; Seneca remarks that the newest luxury in his day was a portable stove that was brought from the kitchen into the dining room.¹²³ This apparatus required that the cooks themselves, normally located mainly in the kitchen, work at least part-time in the dining room. If they spent dinner-time cooking and serving their master, when did the slaves and servants of a household dine? In better houses they ate the leftovers after the meal had finished and the guests had taken away choice morsels in their napkins.¹²⁴ The social order determined the temporal order, and slaves were the last to eat.

Seasonal considerations

Some meals marked special occasions; religious holidays and private events such as weddings and funerals almost always included a feast.¹²⁵ Columella prescribes different dining practices on festival days for servile members of a (rural) household:

He [the farm bailiff] should accustom the farm labourers always to take their meals at the master's hearth and household fire; and he should

¹²²Petr. 47-49. See the quote heading the Introduction, p. 1.

¹²³Sen. *Ep.* 78.23 See chapter two, p. 73, n. 81 for the text.

¹²⁴See D'Arms 1991, 174 and n.24, referring to Petr. 64 (slave getting scraps during the meal), 67 & 74 (slaves eating after dinner has been cleared), 70 (slaves crowding onto couches with the guests). See also Hor. *S.* 2.6.65-67.

¹²⁵D'Arms 1984, 334-338. Sometimes the religious feasts were public celebrations involving a general distribution of food; see below, pp. 32-34.

himself eat under similar conditions in their presence and be an example to them of frugality. He should not take his meals reclining on a couch except on solemn holidays, and he should celebrate festival days by bestowing largesse on the strongest and most frugal among them, sometimes even admitting them to his own table and showing himself also to confer other honours upon them.¹²⁶

Columella advises that laborers eat in the controlled company of the bailiff at home, not in town, where they might find trouble.¹²⁷ Dinner is central to the character of the household and all of its members. By insisting they eat at home, the master retains control of the workers' social identities, rather than leaving them to shape their own identities at meals elsewhere. The bailiff is occasionally to reward good workers on holidays by giving them social rewards such as the right to recline with him at his table. He has the authority to provide honored slaves with largesse much like a patron would dispense favors to chosen clients, replicating and reinforcing social distinctions through the medium of a meal.

Holidays by definition supersede the rules that apply on normal days; their occasion alters the daily social order that normally determines 'who gets to eat and when'. Holidays provided periodic respite from the normal routine throughout the year, just as the dinner provided a daily respite for the free family (but not for their slaves!) from labor. The most important holiday of the year for Roman slaves was the Saturnalia. At that time, the entire social order was theoretically reversed, temporarily allowing slaves to be 'free', letting them assume the role of master, or allowing them to be served by their masters at dinner.¹²⁸ In practice, not all masters played out the charade to that extent. Some households reversed only the order of eating, letting slaves dine first. Other masters permitted but a modicum of equality, or simply let their servants celebrate alone.¹²⁹

¹²⁶Col. 11.1.19: *consuescatque rusticos circa larem domini focumque familiarem semper epulari atque ipse in conspectu eorum similiter epuletur, sitque frugalitatis exemplum: nec nisi sacris diebus accubans cenet, festosque sic agat, ut fortissimum quemque et frugalissimum largitionibus prosequatur, nonnumquam etiam mensae suae adhibeat, et velit aliis quoque honoribus dignari.* (Loeb text and translation). See also Pomp. Porph. Hor. *Carm.* 3.17.13-16.

¹²⁷Columella advises that neither slaves nor their bailiff venture beyond the grounds of the estate, especially to the town or a market; *non urbem, non ullas nundinas* (11.1.23); his hopes are that after a long day of work, they "will turn their attention to food and rest and sleep, rather than to evil doing"; *cibo quietique potius ac somno quam maleficiis operam dabit* (11.1.27) (Loeb texts and translation). Columella is describing a villa, but his comments should apply as well to large urban households, where servants lived surrounded by opportunities for trouble in the bars and cook shops outside the house.

¹²⁸By the Augustan period, the celebration lasted three days, XIV-XVI Kal. Ian. (Dec. 17-19). See D'Arms 1991, 176 for a discussion of slaves at the Saturnalia, including refs: Macr. *Sat.* 1.7; Lucian *Chronos* 18.

¹²⁹Reversing the order of eating: Macr. *Sat.* 1.24.23; equality: D. C. 60.19; Athen. 14.44; alone: Cic. *Att.* 13.52.2; Plin. *Ep.* 2.17.22.

Environmental conditions (season and climate) also affected the scheduling of meals: when the dinner began and ended, how many people were invited, what sort of entertainment was conducted, whether foods were in season locally or were imported, and where the people ate. Because the Roman daily chronological system was solar, the length of each hour in the day depended on the season and how many hours of daylight were available.¹³⁰ The Elder Pliny's meals ended in summertime daylight, and at dusk during the shorter winter days.¹³¹ Larger houses with multiple dining areas had winter-dining indoors, where a smaller number of guests could enjoy artificial heat and light sources. Summer-dining took place outside or in a room opening wide onto an open garden, where temperate conditions permitted larger gatherings.¹³²

Where is cooking and eating done?

The locations where individuals of a society cook and eat depend upon the organization of the society itself. How often does the community eat together in public? How common are eating clubs for trade guilds and other groups? What eating establishments such as bakeries, lunch counters, diners and inns sell cooked food outside the home? How often do people dine out as opposed to eating in? Where are kitchens and dining rooms located in Roman homes? These issues, which I will address with archaeological evidence in chapter three, are introduced here in two parts: the options available to Romans for eating outside the home, and the places of food preparation and consumption within the Roman house.

Cooking and eating outside the home

Public feasts

Feasts were convivial opportunities that brought the community together and reaffirmed the working social hierarchy. Since the Republic, Romans had at certain times of the year the opportunity to eat at a public banquet. The occasion might be a state holiday, the funeral of a famous individual, a military victory or the initiative of a public official.¹³³ Senatorial families were as much public figures as they were private individuals, and distributed largesse to the

¹³⁰See Laurence 1994, 122-132, Balsdon 1974, 16-26, 56-59 and Carcopino 1960, 143-150.

¹³¹Plin. *Ep.* 3.5.13: *Sugebat aestate a cena luce, hieme intra primam noctis et tamquam aliqua lege cogente.*

¹³²For a detailed discussion of seasonal dining, see chapter two, pp. 101-105.

¹³³Public holidays: In 196 B.C. the *Collegium Epulorum* was created to oversee the *epulum Iovis* and other public festivals that involved dining, including the *Ludi Romani* (Cic. *de Orat.* 3.73), and the *Lectisternium*, at which images of the Roman gods were laid at couches in a public space, and a meal placed before them. People in turn opened their own houses and provided food for any passers-by (Liv. 5.13.6-8, 22.10.9, 33.42.1; see also Peck 1923, 615; Stambaugh 1988, 233 & n. 11; Gowers 1993, 26). Military victory: In honor of his Gallic campaign, Julius Caesar's return to Italy reportedly sparked spontaneous public feasts that filled the *fora* of the towns he passed through (Hirt. *Gal.* 8.51; see also Gowers 1993, 38-39, who describes private banquets as 'triumphal processions' of food on a domestic scale).

public as adjuncts to the state.¹³⁴ Two such public feasts were held at the funerals of two Roman nobles, P. Licinius Crassus and the younger Scipio Africanus in the years 183 and 129 B.C., respectively.¹³⁵ Trimalchio's wishful thinking for this sort of public distinction is perhaps why he orders a public feast to be carved on his own funeral monument. He desires a permanent record of an elite honor he can never have in his own lifetime.¹³⁶ The elite, as elected officials, were the same people responsible for the operation of state-sponsored feasts. Cicero complains that the aediles, in charge of public entertainment, were sponsoring overly extravagant affairs in order to win public support in their future bids for higher office.¹³⁷

The periodic munificence of the elite in public banquets and the public dole can be seen as having served in part as a social safety valve; the *plebs* were tossed a bone for the price of their vote. The allegiance of the *plebs* became more important during the Empire, as the emperor took over public feasting in Rome and limited the banquets organized by other elites.¹³⁸ But the relationship between elites and *plebs* was not completely cynical. Harmony was as important as appeasement when public feasts brought social and communal structures into the open:

"More than was the case in most Hellenistic cities, public feasting in Rome tended to emphasize the importance of the preservation of status distinctions, and the special honor of the individual responsible for the provision of the meal, as well as the creation of the sense of a harmonious community."¹³⁹

At a public feast held by Domitian, Statius saw women and citizens of all ranks participating, but the Emperor was clearly marked out as a figure of majesty presiding over an event that promoted social harmony while reinforcing social stratification.¹⁴⁰ At another feast, the baskets distributed

¹³⁴The phenomenon of euergetism; see Veyne 1990, 220-221.

¹³⁵P. Licinius Crassus: A public distribution of meat was followed by gladiatorial funeral games and a public feast set up on couches in the Forum. Unfortunately, a rain storm compelled people to erect tents over their dining areas (Liv. 39.46.3). The Younger Scipio Africanus: The general's nephew Tubero honored the deceased's Stoicism by placing rough goat skins on the expensive Punic couches, and furnishing plain Samian crockery (Cic. *Mur.* 75; V. *Max.* 7.5.1). The public was disappointed at the cheap production, voting against Tubero in the subsequent election for praetor, and causing Cicero to comment (*Mur.* 76): "The Roman people loathe public luxury, but they love public splendour. They do not like extravagant banquets but much less do they like shabbiness and meanness; they take into account the variety of obligations and circumstances and recognize the alternation of work and pleasure."; *Odit populus Romanus privatam luxuriam, publicam magnificentiam diligit; non amat profusas epulas, sordis et inhumanitatem multo minus; distinguit rationem officiorum ac temporum, vicissitudinem laboris ac voluptatis.* (Loeb text and translation).

¹³⁶Petr. 71.10-11.

¹³⁷Cic. *Off.* 2.16.55-57; see Purcell 1994, 673-688 for elite-*plebs* tension and balance in the Republic.

¹³⁸Veyne 1990, 389-390; Augustus began limiting public banquets (D.C. 44.2).

¹³⁹Fisher 1988, 1204. See also D'Arms 1984, 338-344 and Goddard 69-71.

¹⁴⁰D'Arms 1990, 308-310, quoting Stat. *Silv.* 1.6, 4.2 & Mart. 8.50; see also Gowers 1993, 212.

by the Emperor at one of his public feasts were graded in quality according to whether one was a senator or *eques*, or merely one of the *plebs*.¹⁴¹

Some officials disregarded social harmony and order altogether for the sake of promoting their own social preeminence. While the exploitation of public feasting was common and acceptable, flagrant abuse of the institution could backfire. Verres held extravagant meals in the public forum at public expense without inviting the public. Worse, he forced local civic leaders and Roman *equites* to stand and watch him eat. These were serious insults, and were used by Cicero in his prosecution as evidence against his character.¹⁴² Members of the general public did not rely solely on the euergetism of the elite, however. By the Empire, citizens of low status had formed their own eating clubs based on trade, religious or neighborhood affiliations; these were modeled after exclusive eating clubs that elites established during the Republic.

Eating clubs

Dinners for select groups of individuals were one benefit of Roman social organizations known as *collegia* or *sodalicia*. These were associations of people who shared business, social, civic, or religious interests. These clubs met on a regular basis at homes, taverns or club-houses (*scholae*) where they held sacrifices, shared meals and conducted club business.¹⁴³ Inscriptional evidence at Lanuvium attests to club eating and drinking, and dining rooms with masonry *triclinia* are preserved in *collegium* headquarters at both Pompeii and Ostia (Fig. 1.18).¹⁴⁴ Special dinners provided opportunities for people with common interests to form and reinforce bonds of friendship and community.

¹⁴¹Suet. *Dom.* 5.

¹⁴²Cic. *Ver.* 2.3.61-65. Likewise Tacitus' comments about Nero and his *domus aurea*: "giving private dinners in public places and using the entire city as if it were a private house" (D'Arms 1990, 309 translation of Tac. *Ann.* 15.37).

¹⁴³A central feature of these clubs was the simple guarantee of a decent burial for those who paid their dues. Imperial legislation attempted however to limit the frequency with which these clubs met in order to defuse their potential for subversive political behavior. See Stambaugh 1988, 209-212; Fisher 1988, 1209-1210, 1219-1224; Dill 1905, 251-286, all with references.

¹⁴⁴At Lanuvium, an inscription records the senatorial charter of A.D. 133 authorizing the *collegium* of Diana and Antinous and quotes the club's regulations, including the provision of bread, wine and sardines for the monthly club dinners (Fisher 1988, 1221-1223; Inscr. Dessau 7212). At Pompeii, a guild-house for shippers was found outside the walls which contained five masonry *triclinia* in rooms around a peristyle, each with a wooden screen, perhaps to help ensure privacy during business transactions over meals (Jashemski 1979, 179-180; Elia 1961). Another *collegium* may have been centered at I.7.15-17 in Pompeii (see the Gazetteer). At Ostia, the Caseggiato dei Triclini (I.12.1), the seat of the *collegium* of the *fabri tignuarii* formed ca. A.D. 120, preserves four rooms fit with masonry *triclinia* off of a central court (Pavolini 1989, 31, 108-109).

Eating establishments

On a daily basis, commercial eating establishments offered food and socializing to persons who could not afford to belong to a *collegium*. The businesses at which people could buy cooked food and often a place to eat it were many and varied. In any hotel or inn (*hospitium*, *deversorium*, *stabulum*), food and wine were also available.¹⁴⁵ A 'diner' that combined the features of a restaurant, a tavern and sometimes a brothel was known commonly as a *caupona*; a more disreputable version was a *ganea*, *ganeum* or *gurgustium* (Figs. 1.19, 2.48-49).¹⁴⁶ A 'lunch counter' that offered only food and wine, not lodging, was usually called a *popina* or a *taberna* (Figs. 2.18, 5.46, 5.55, 5.83, 5.108).¹⁴⁷ Finally there were bakeries (*pistrina*) and pastry-shops (*pistrina dulciaria*) where bread and pastries could be purchased directly, and where individuals could have their own items of prepared dough baked in the large ovens.¹⁴⁸

Inns, taverns, diners, and lunch counters all offered food and wine, and sometimes entertainment, lodging, or sex. Most importantly, they provided places in the neighborhood for social interaction, especially for those who were not regularly invited to dinners in private homes. Latin authors, people of privileged rank and status, almost never spoke positively of taverns or diners, but then they rarely seem to have visited them.¹⁴⁹ Elites equated the establishments with their clientele, which stereotypically consisted of cut-throats, sailors, thieves,

¹⁴⁵All three terms refer primarily to a place of lodging with food and drink. A *deversorium* refers further to hostels located on country roads between towns, and a *stabulum* may have additional stables for housing carts and animals (Kleberg 1957 is the primary study of hotels, inns and taverns; he details the evolution of these terms in pp. 6-19. Packer 1978 provides archaeological examples, and Laurence 1994, 78-87 discusses their place in the urban fabric).

¹⁴⁶A *caupona* essentially offered the services of a stand-up food and drink counter, often with benches or chairs at a table, and sometimes private dining rooms with masonry *triclinia* or a garden. Dining benches are present in the *caupona* I.8.15-16 and IX.2.26 of the study sample; proper dining rooms are attached to the *caupona* at I.8.8-9 and I.8.15-16. Kleberg 1957, 1-11 demonstrates that the meaning of *caupona* became more pejorative over time, akin to the terms *ganeum* and *gurgustium*, which are best translated as 'dives' or 'holes' (see also La Torre 1988, 76-78; Stambaugh 1988, 208-209; Jashemski 1979, 167-181).

¹⁴⁷Kleberg 1957, 16-18, 24-25 has shown convincingly that the lunch counter (commonly mislabeled *thermopolium*, a word that does not appear outside of Plautus), is best described by the term *popina*. In the Republican age, the term *taberna* also meant "shop", but this meaning eventually gave way to "tavern, cabaret". A *taberna* which associated itself primarily with the servicing and selling of wine was known as a *taberna vinaria*. See Gassner 1986, esp. 1-45; Kleberg 1957, 18-23; Packer 1978; Dosi & Schnell 1986b, 36-61; Stambaugh 1988, 208-209; La Torre 1988, 76-78 (where *popinae* are unfortunately called *thermopolia*). See chapter three, pp. 122-123 for the architectural definitions of commercial eating establishments used in this thesis.

¹⁴⁸Mayeske 1972; Mayeske 1979; La Torre 1988, 84, Peacock 1989.

¹⁴⁹Kleberg 1957, 1-25; Gowers 1993-15-16 quotes Sen. *de Vit. Beat.* 7.3, a moral mapping of the topography of the city: "Virtue is something high, exalted, and regal, unconquerable and indefatigable; pleasure is something lowly, servile, weak, and perishable, which haunts the brothels and cookshops."; *Altum quiddam est virtus, excelsum, regale, invictum, infatigabile: voluptas humile, servile, imbecillum, caducum, cuius statio ac domicilium fornices et popinae sunt* (OCT text, Gowers translation).

fugitives, hangmen, coffin-makers and eunuch priests, all of them drunk and dangerous.¹⁵⁰ The crowds at these establishments perhaps did include a number of social undesirables, but the majority must have been ordinary citizens and freedmen. Ancient authors exhibit a curious mix of disgust and fascination with diners and cook shops. On the surface, depicting taverns as havens of crime and vice reinforced their own high status by degrading those of lower status. But underneath, elites' self-imposed segregation from taverns inspired vicarious speculation about what the seedy dives were like, and contributed to their numerous and exaggerated descriptions. Authors lambasted the emperor Nero (who submitted to his curiosity) for visiting cook shops in disguise; their criticism was rooted in Nero's refusal to eat with his own social order.¹⁵¹ Social relations in the Roman world were inexorably bound to the company kept at dinner; where one ate clearly indicated who one was in terms of rank and status.

Lunch counters and diners (popular lunch destinations) were not the regular source of dinners for members of society who did not have their own formal kitchens or dining rooms.¹⁵² A visit to a *caupona* did not mean that an individual did not first dine at home. In small shops, apartments or houses where there was no room to host a meal, people still cooked their own food over cooking stands or braziers. Plebs visited the local tavern after dinner for a drink, some snacks, gambling and the conversation and camaraderie that could not be furnished at home.¹⁵³

In the first century A.D. a series of laws were enacted that restricted the types of food that could be sold in Roman diners and lunch counters. These laws originally prohibited baked goods, cooked meat and hot water for diluting wine, and they finally restricted the menu in *popinae* to chick-peas and beans.¹⁵⁴ This legal action seems to have been taken to reduce persons'

¹⁵⁰Paraphrasing Juv. 8.146-182, which mocks the penchant of the consul Lateranus to frequent the mean *popinae* of his humble upbringing. Lateranus' sin is his association as an honored public official with the poor free and slave population, and his consequent rejection of dinner with more elite company. See also Hor. S. 1.14.21-25; Mart. 5.70; Stambaugh 1988, 208-209.

¹⁵¹C.D. 61.8.1, 62.14.2; Suet. *Nero* 26; see Goddard 1994, 74-75; Balsdon 1974, 152-154.

¹⁵²La Torre 1988, 93, n.26 assumes that residents of small shops or houses with no obvious kitchen had no choice but to eat out, but he cites no evidence supporting this assumption. The *gustus* of the meal in Mart. 11.52 (set in his home next to a bath-house) only imitates the sort of menu that might be found in a bath-house *popina*. In this poem, Martial mocks his own 'take-out' hors d'oeuvres, and then constructs fantasy main courses that disguise his comically meager meal from the guests whom he is inviting: "These are enough for starters. Would you like to know the rest? I'll lie, so that you'll come."; *Haec satis in gustu. Cetera nosse cupis? Mentiar, ut venias* (OCT text, author's translation; see Gowers 1993, 264-267).

¹⁵³For example, CIL 4.575 records the inscription outside *caupona* (VII.2.44) of the "Late Drinkers Association" (*Seri bibi*), who are more likely a group of bar 'regulars' than a *collegium*, as has been supposed (Fisher 1988, 1223; Della Corte 1954, #334). See also below, pp. 170-171.

¹⁵⁴Under the reigns of Tiberius, Claudius, Nero and Vespasian: Suet. *Tib.* 34, *Ner.* 16; D.C. 60.6.6-7, 60.10.3, 62.14.2. See Kleberg 1957, 98-123; Stambaugh 1988, 209 and n.11; Salza Prina Ricotti 1987, 121. Packer 1978, 47-49 argues strongly that the *dolia* set into the counters fronting *popinae* and *tabernae* held only dry snacks such as nuts, dried fruit, vegetables and smoked goods, which were in accordance with most of the sumptuary legislation on *popinae* (if the laws applied beyond Rome), and which would not have been nutritionally sufficient to serve as regular meals for the urban poor.

occasion for frequenting taverns. Elites were supposed to dine in their own company, not as tavern customers. In addition, groups of *plebs* lingering for long periods of time had the potential (at least in the eyes of the elite) of spreading dissent and fostering revolt. *Collegia* were similarly subject to restrictions and regulation. Some who were not of sufficient status to receive invitations to private banquets joined *collegia* as a means of eating together and forming the social associations that were the goal of commensality. Others, lacking the money or connections to belong to a *collegium*, used *cauponae* and *popinae* as their own "dinner clubs". Legislation that restricted the ability of the *plebs* to eat together seems clearly to have been an effort to deny them the social power that comes from eating together. Elites attempted to restrict commensality (which had worked so well for themselves) from the lower strata of society, fearing the *plebs* might use it to undermine the traditional patron-client relationship, threaten the social order, or even foment revolt. The laws were as ineffective as they were frequently revived; the principle of dining in chosen company was a right too deeply ingrained in Roman culture to be repressed.

Cooking and eating inside the home

Where people ate represented a daily reckoning of the social order. And nowhere was that reckoning more important than in the houses of the Romans. At the most basic level, individual domestic environments in which people cooked and ate were determined by the physical and social organization of the entire community. Roman communities were complex and structured hierarchically; those towards the top of the hierarchy tended to possess more wealth and relatively more political power than those towards the bottom. One way for the elite to display its greater wealth and prestige was to have more and larger households, or to live in an exclusive area of the city. Neighborhoods in the cosmopolis of Rome were socio-economically stratified in this way; wealthier families lived on hills such as the Palatine, Aventine and Caelian, and poorer families lived in the less-comfortable valleys between the hills, like the Subura, Velabrum and Transtiberinus.¹⁵⁵ In a smaller town like Pompeii, residential space was not segregated by wealth; no one neighborhood within the walls was much richer or poorer than another.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁵The Palatine, long the home of many senatorial families, became even more 'exclusive' with the construction of the imperial palaces. The imperial palace, after all, can be understood as simply the ultimate aristocratic residence, with the whole empire as its 'extended household' (Scobie 1986, 401-405; Carandini 1990; Stambaugh 1988, 90 and n.7.; Wiseman 1987; Wallace-Hadrill 1991a, 261-263). Nero's *Domus Aurea* was a neighborhood made all too exclusive, and it consequently became a source of jokes and resentment for its size and opulence (Tac. *Ann.* 15.42; Suet. *Ner.* 31, 38-39; Plin. *Nat.* 36.111).

¹⁵⁶Demonstrated clearly by Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 1991a-c; Laurence 1994; Raper 1977, 1979.

Whether or not all larger houses at Pompeii indeed sheltered larger and richer households, "Pompeian housing...implies an expectation that households will vary enormously in size".¹⁵⁷ C.M. Watts has demonstrated that "larger, more complex houses have greater number and more variety of dynamic spaces serving various parts of the house."¹⁵⁸ An individual's position along the socio-political spectrum should correlate to the degree of segmentation expressed in that individual's own house. In other words, a larger house should have more rooms and a more complex arrangement of those rooms than a smaller house. Most households included an upper floor, and sometimes a subterranean level. Unfortunately, the state of the evidence at Pompeii does not consistently permit the accurate calculation of upper-floor space for each building, and not all underground rooms have been completely excavated. Land devoted to horticultural use is also a distorting factor; small houses with exceptionally large gardens are less complex and have less living space than properties of the same size with more roofed spaces. A modified theorem therefore reads: 'properties with a larger, non-horticultural, ground area generally had more rooms, were more complex and were more spatially differentiated than similar properties with a smaller ground area.'

Watts has adapted the method of 'pattern language' to describe the design of houses at Pompeii, Herculaneum and Ostia.¹⁵⁹ She divides spaces into two broad categories: 'dynamic' and 'static'. 'Dynamic' spaces include 'connectors' (entryways, corridors and stairways), and 'nodes' (centers of activity and circulation such as atria, courts, gardens and peristyles) (Figs. 5.2-5.7).¹⁶⁰ 'Nodes' almost always include all space open to the sky in a building, except for light-wells, whose functions are practical: to provide light, collect water, and circulate air, but not to allow the circulation of persons. Nodes are usually centrally located within the house, and are a focus of at least three other spaces. Nodes are multi-purpose -- they are centers of work and administration within the house.¹⁶¹ 'Static' spaces include all other rooms in the house which are each likely to have a specialized function (such as kitchens, dining areas, *tablina*, bedrooms and

¹⁵⁷Wallace-Hadrill 1991b, 213.

¹⁵⁸Watts 1987, 128. Kent 1990, 7 has stated a similar theorem on a larger scale: "there should be increasing architectural partitioning and functionally restricted activity areas at later sites as the sociopolitical system becomes more hierarchical and segmented or stratified."

¹⁵⁹'Pattern language' is a programmatic language that C. Alexander (*A Pattern language*, New York, 1977) and other researchers developed at Berkeley to generate built environments. It is a systemization of rules applied to patterns and principles of architectural design, that defines and describes actual buildings (see Watts 1987, 1-13).

¹⁶⁰See the introduction to the Gazetteer in chapter five for further definition of these terms, and Watts 1987, 124-131.

¹⁶¹Berry 1994 has emphasized the multi-purpose and administrative role of nodes such as atria and peristyles.

sitting rooms). Static spaces are usually arranged around nodes, which are in turn linked by connectors.¹⁶²

Larger houses should have more static spaces and therefore, more dining areas and kitchens. Rank, status, and wealth were, after all, closely tied to the ability to host a dinner-party. The size and elaboration of a dinner party should be proportional to the number, size and decoration of the dining rooms, as well as the sufficiency of the kitchen facilities. The archaeological analysis in chapter three (pp. 116-126) will confirm that larger, more complex houses tend to contain more spaces, and more and larger dining and cooking areas.

Roman society, households, houses and *cenae* were hierarchically organized. The social distance between guests and servants was expressed in part through the spatial interrelationships of dining and cooking areas. The following measurable factors describe these interrelationships: *proximity*, *accessibility*, *perceptibility*, *amenities*, and *sanctity*.¹⁶³

P r o x i m i t y

Proximity is the physical distance crossed by walking from one point in the house to another, measured in meters between thresholds. The physical distance determines the actual energy and time required to move along the shortest path. Ramifications for smoothly conducting a dinner include: how far and fast servers carry in food and remove dishes, the time necessary to communicate information and orders between kitchen and dining room, and the chances of food cooling off.

A c c e s s i b i l i t y

Accessibility is the perceived distance between two points, the number of spaces one must enter or pass through by the shortest route. A 'space' is defined as any distinct architecturally contained area, whether a static space, connector, or node.¹⁶⁴ The perceived distance measures how much mental energy is committed to recognizing the different architectural spaces encountered and to remembering the path taken. For household members, accessibility is simply the availability of the cooking and dining areas: how many spaces a server has to pass through between kitchen and dining room, risking collision with people or furniture, and avoiding areas where traffic is not allowed. Accessibility is also the difficulty in importing

¹⁶²For some houses in the Gazetteer, the room in the traditionally-identified place of the *tablinum* (centered at the back of the atrium facing the entrance) is the only passage between the atrium and the back peristyle or garden. In these cases (I.8.1-3, I.8.4-6, I.9.1-2, I.9.3-4, I.10.7), its obvious role as a connector between the two most important nodes of the house is considered to outweigh its traditional role as a static space.

¹⁶³These factors are defined again in the introduction to the Gazetteer, pp. 181-183.

¹⁶⁴Each portico of a peristyle or colonnaded garden counts as one 'space'.

raw foodstuffs into the kitchen, through the main door or subsidiary entrances. For those living inside the house, accessibility is the marginalization of the slaves and their service quarters:

"One dominant imperative in a slave-owning society was to contrast adequately the servile and 'seigniorial' areas of the house...It is only in the richest houses that the slave/master distinction could and needed to be fully expressed. An important architectural feature of the houses is the way in which service areas are marginalised, thrust out to the edge of the imposing and often studiously symmetrical 'master's' quarters..."¹⁶⁵

Slave quarters are commonly described as 'marginal' in large houses. Yet slaves were everywhere; they were involved in all aspects of internal household life. Wallace-Hadrill explains: "The aim of such marginalization...was to render the low-status areas 'invisible' to the visitor".¹⁶⁶ Servile areas are best defined not as 'where the slaves are', but as 'where the outside guests cannot be'. Limits of access were set upon the visitor, and not upon the household members.¹⁶⁷ The contrast was highlighted on occasions that involved visitors, such as a formal evening dinner, when the dining room was the 'seigniorial' area, and the kitchen the 'servile' area. Dining and cooking areas can be identified in houses of nearly all socio-economic means at Pompeii, but it is more difficult to understand their social implications in poorer houses, where the number or even presence of slaves is in doubt.¹⁶⁸

From the point of view of a visitor to the house, accessibility is permeability: how deep one progresses into the house until one encounters a dining room or kitchen. Visitor accessibility is the degree of penetration into parts of the house open to outsiders upon invitation only.¹⁶⁹ Accessibility is linked to the social status of an invitee:

"...the Roman could carefully grade the degree of intimacy to which he admitted his *amici* -- whether he received them promiscuously in the atrium, or entertained them in a large group in his grandest room, in a small group in his triclinium, or in ones and twos in his cubiculum."¹⁷⁰

Dinner-guests in houses with dining rooms far away from the entrance vestibule or the front atrium experienced the social distinction afforded them by their penetration. Dinner guests to houses with dining rooms easily gained from the front of the house could not claim such

¹⁶⁵Wallace-Hadrill 1988, 78-79.

¹⁶⁶Wallace-Hadrill, 1988, 81 (my emphasis).

¹⁶⁷Nevett 1993 has identified a similar pattern in Greek houses of the Classical and Hellenistic periods, where outside male guests come to dinner are restricted from meeting women of the family elsewhere in the house.

¹⁶⁸Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 44: "What is more elusive is the articulation of servile and free in more modest houses...There is still much more to be learnt on this front." See the results of the archaeological analysis throughout chapter three.

¹⁶⁹Vitr. 6.5.1-2; Wallace-Hadrill 1988, 55-56, 81-96.

¹⁷⁰Wallace-Hadrill 1988, 94.

distinction, because the front of the house was traditionally accessible to uninvited visitors (e.g. during the morning *salutatio*). The threshold of each space crossed on the way to the dining room marked another barrier of social distinction surmounted by the visitor.

Perceptibility

Perceptibility is the ability of banqueters to perceive cooking from their place in a dining room. Perceptibility is measured through the three long-range senses of **sight**, **sound**, and **smell**. T. M. Ciolek, an experimental psychologist, has determined the theoretical limits of perception for each of these senses: unobstructed sight has a range of 91.4 m., sound at the level of conversation (60-70 decibels) has a maximum range of 30.2 m., and smell, even through doors which are not completely sealed, has a limit of 9.1 m.¹⁷¹ Perceiving the preparation of a meal through sight, sound and smell, without actually eating it, creates anticipation for the meal and begins physiological processes (such as salivation) needed to digest the food. Perceptions are part of the sensory pleasure experienced during a meal.

A single house at Pompeii, the Casa del Fauno (VI.12.2+5), approaches the visual limit of perceptibility; the distance from its front door at entrance #2 to the back of *exedra* (50) is ca. 90 meters.¹⁷² I will therefore consider sight-lines for houses in my sample not in terms of their distance, but in terms of their visibility. I will categorize the **sight**-line from a dining area to a cooking area in one of three ways: 1) the cooking area is not visible at all, 2) only the entry to the cooking area is visible (where cooks and servers could be seen going in and out), 3) some part of the interior of the cooking area is visible.

In determining the limit of **sound**, I categorize dining rooms simply according to whether they are within the theoretical sound range (30.2 m.) of cooking.¹⁷³ Kitchens beyond this range may indicate an owner's desire to prevent the sound of cooks and cooking from reaching the banqueters' ears. In Plautus' *Casina*, the master is heard hurrying up the cooks in the kitchen.

¹⁷¹Ciolek 1980, in a study of proxemics (the limits of one person being attentive to the presence, movement and activity of another), found that "the total amount of space within which one individual is aware of another's presence is rarely greater than 182 meters in diameter." (Sanders 1990, 59, who uses this data in an archaeological context). This range breaks down harmonically into smaller concentric circles based on the radial range of the human senses, each one roughly one-ninth the area of the previous: vision (91.4 m.), hearing (30.2 m.), smell (9.1 m.), reach-with-a-tool (2.7 m.), and personal contact (0.9 m.). The range of smell has been verified in a 'blind test' conducted by the author in which an uninformed subject was able to smell a covered pot of chicken soup cooking 9 meters away through a closed apartment door.

¹⁷²The Casa del Fauno covers an entire insula; see the 1:1000 plan of Pompeii in CTP III.

¹⁷³Fine distinctions in the range of sound depend on how loud the preparation of food was and the particular acoustics of each building.

The cooks in turn delay dinner by upsetting pots and pouring water on the fire; the resulting risible racket may have been audible offstage during the performance.¹⁷⁴ In the *Pseudolus*, the master tells his cook to "shut up, you talk too much"; his exact words (*nimum iam tinnis*) evoke the clatter and clang of cooking pots.¹⁷⁵

The range of **smell** is sufficiently short to differentiate dining rooms on the basis of whether the cooking meal could be smelled. I measure the shortest distance (whether through windows, doors, or across courts) from the stove or hearth to the center of a dining room. Odors (good and bad) of cooking had emotive properties. A favorable cooking smell possessed the power of enslaving clients to their patrons, according to Juvenal: "You think yourself a free man, and guest of a grandee; he thinks -- and he is not far wrong -- that you have been captured by the savoury odours of his kitchen."¹⁷⁶ Bad smells are also associated with kitchens and their slaves. Seneca for instance complains of the rank pollution from the city's collective kitchens.¹⁷⁷ Petronius compares professors to cooks when he says: "People who are fed on this diet [of schooling] can no more be sensible than people who live in the kitchen can smell good."¹⁷⁸

Amenities

The placement of kitchens and dining areas depends to some degree on the availability of amenities such as a water-source, drainage, heat, light, ventilation, storage and proximity to latrines and baths (which require similar utilities). For dining rooms, environmental amenities were primarily conveniences to make dining more pleasant and comfortable: light, heat in winter, a kind breeze, a view. Wall, floor and ceiling decoration presented additional social, cultural and artistic messages. In kitchens, amenities of a more practical nature supported the

¹⁷⁴Gowers 1993, 90-91, referring to Pl. *Cas.* 759-779 which include the lines: "the old man is shouting in the kitchen, urging on the cooks"; *senex in culina clamat, hortatur coquos*, and "In order that the old man not dine, the cooks overturn the cook-pots, they quench the fire with water"; *ne cenet senex, aulas pervortunt, ignem restinguunt aqua* (OCT text, author's translation).

¹⁷⁵Pl. *Ps.* 889-892; see above, p. 29, n. 121. See also Juv. 6.438-442 below, p. 49, n. 227.

¹⁷⁶Juv. 5.161-162: *Tu tibi liber homo et regis conviva videris: captum te nidore suae putat ille culinae*. Earlier, Juv. 5.149-150 makes the smell stand for the whole meal: "To himself and the rest of the Virros he [the patron] will order fruits to be served whose scent alone would be a feast"; *Virro sibi et reliquis Virronibus illa iubebit poma dari, quorum solo pascaris odore* (Loeb texts and translations). Gowers 1993, 216 rightly notes that the miserable client can only feed off smells from his patron's dinner. Similarly, Mart. 7.27 wishes his household gods to grow fat off the smells of a mythical boar he has killed, but he cannot afford the spices to cook the beast. Ironically, he must not eat the boar, lest he starve afterwards. The fact that the gods can feed from the smells of sacrifice and man cannot makes the lot of the client in Juvenal's poem seem all the more pitiable.

¹⁷⁷Sen. *Ep.* 104.6 (see chapter two, p. 77, n. 101 for the text). Col. 1.6.11 also remarks generally upon the bad smells that habitually emanate from baths, ovens, and manure piles.

¹⁷⁸Petr. 2: *Qui inter haec nutriuntur, non magis sapere possunt, quam bene olere, qui in culina habitant* (Loeb text and translation). A slave at the start of the *Mostellaria* calls another slave, hiding in the kitchen, a "stinker" (*nidor*). See Gowers 1993, 231-241, 290-291 for smells as symbols at meals.

water and fire which were required for food preparation. These amenities get detailed treatment in chapter two.¹⁷⁹

S a n c t i t y

'Sanctity' is the domestic ritual topography: the specific places in the house where religion was practiced. Sacrifices were often performed where cooking was done; in most cultures the cooking and eating of food includes a measure of thanks to the earth or the gods for the privilege of surviving another day. Sacrifices were, among other things, a kind of insurance against not having any food to sacrifice, much less eat.

Roman household religion was diverse; various domestic deities were called upon to protect the house, the household, its productive capacity and its reproductive capacity. The goddess **Vesta** guarded the hearth, and her representation in the living flame was a reminder that the household was alive and active. The burning hearth proved that the householders led a civilized life, exemplified by their control of heat, light and cooked food.¹⁸⁰ The *Penates* oversaw the family storeroom: "By preserving the grain supply in the *penus* [larder], they powerfully personified the continuity of the household's means of subsistence".¹⁸¹ The *Lares* were essentially protective gods of place, and two of their aspects, *domestici* and *familiae*, watched over hearth and home. They were offered first fruits, particularly products of grain and vine, and were occasionally described as dark with smoke because of their association with the hearth.¹⁸² Finally, the *Genius* represented the procreative force of the family and was closely linked to the *paterfamilias* himself. The *Genius* also protected places such as the hearth; its associated symbol of the serpent can be found painted or stuccoed on many a domestic shrine.¹⁸³

The household shrines found in Roman houses and shops are termed *lararia* or *sacraria*. At Pompeii several different types of shrines have been identified.¹⁸⁴ Simplest is a scene of wall-painting, usually showing *Lares* and a togate *Genius* sacrificing at an altar flanked by serpents (Fig. 1.20). An actual altar or a hearth is sometimes found below the painting. Sometimes a small shelf of marble or tile is built into the wall below the painting, perhaps to hold a lamp, offerings, or a figurine. Some of these paintings (all of them in kitchens) depict items of prepared food, such as hog heads, ham shanks, cuts of meat on spits, skewered eel, hares, game birds and wine-

¹⁷⁹See pp. 74-77 for kitchen amenities and pp. 94-105 for dining room amenities.

¹⁸⁰Orr 1978, 1560-1561; Orr 1973, 34-37.

¹⁸¹Orr 1978, 1563. See also Orr 1973, 38-44.

¹⁸²Orr 1978, 1563-1569 & n. 60; Orr 1973, 4-33.

¹⁸³Orr 1978, 1569-1575; Orr 1973, 45-83.

¹⁸⁴The following typology is owed to the major studies of Pompeian shrines: Boyce 1937; Orr 1973 & 1978, 1575-1585; Fröhlich 1991.

skins (Fig. 5.102).¹⁸⁵ A second type is an arcuated niche set into a wall, usually plastered, painted, or architecturally elaborated with stucco or an articulated shelf (Fig. 1.21). The grandest shrines are *aediculae* built of masonry, decorated with marble and/or stucco and paint, appearing as miniature temples resting on high podia (Fig. 1.22). Bronze, terracotta and marble statuettes of household and other gods have been found in association with all three types.¹⁸⁶

Did the free family and slaves use different household shrines? As the Italian economy became more reliant on slave labor in the second century B.C., houses in Pompeii expanded, in part to include the new servile members of the household.¹⁸⁷ Larger households and houses required more rooms, and the rooms tended to serve a specific function. E. Salza Prina Ricotti has argued that as houses expanded and the kitchen moved out of the atrium into its own space, the *lararium*:

"far from remaining in the noble part of the house, followed the kitchen and was established there, recognizing the sacred character of the flame that cooked the food of the entire family."¹⁸⁸

Neither the literary or archaeological evidence supports the hypothesis that cooking was originally and exclusively done in the atrium.¹⁸⁹ Moreover, later household shrines do not always appear in a kitchen; they also appear often in peristyles or gardens.¹⁹⁰ Some are installed in the atrium even in the last period of Pompeian history.¹⁹¹ The distribution of ritual in the Roman house was complex, depending on the size of the household and the nature of their

¹⁸⁵Orr 1978, 1584; Boyce 1937: I.10.18, I.13.2, VI.6.1, VII.15.12, IX.9.3. See I.7.18 in the Gazetteer.

¹⁸⁶See the list compiled in Fröhlich 1991, 356-358.

¹⁸⁷After the army returned from the wars in the East (ca. 187 B.C.), the art of cooking and specialized slaves to serve as cooks are both reported to have debuted in Rome (Liv. 39.6; see above, pp. 13).

¹⁸⁸Salza Prina Ricotti 1978/80, 247-249 (from which the excerpted quote is translated): "Se non si fossero trovate Pompei ed Ercolano probabilmente sarebbe venuto spontaneo pensare che, spostata la cucina negli ambienti servili, il culto dei lari e del fuoco sacro, quel fuoco tanto importante per la famiglia, sarebbe rimasto nella parte padronale della casa dove i familiari riuniti avrebbero potuto degnamente onorarlo. È in fondo difficile per noi e per il nostro senso religioso capire che quando la cucina, più o meno nel II a.C. si spostò dall'atrio per localizzarsi in un ambiente staccato e posto nei quartieri servili, il larario lungi dal restare nell'area nobile della casa, la seguì e con lei si insediò, riconoscendo il carattere sacro della fiamma che cuoceva i pasti della famiglia tutta."

¹⁸⁹For a discussion of the literary evidence for the location of the cooking fire in the early and middle Republican periods, see chapter two, pp. 69-73. Nappo 1994 has demonstrated that houses constructed at the end of the third century B.C. in Regio I at Pompeii were originally outfitted with a separate kitchen next to, but not within, the atrium.

¹⁹⁰The kitchen (86 examples), atrium (56), peristyle (58) or viridarium (47) are the four parts of the house where according to Boyce's (1937, 105) sample a household shrine most often occurs. Orr's (1973, 98-99) sample is somewhat different, but the kitchen (8), atrium (11), peristyle (2), and viridarium (19) still make up the vast majority of locations for shrines, which are rarely found in dining rooms. Jashemski 1979, 115-140 discusses religion in garden contexts.

¹⁹¹The *sacella* in atrium (b) of I.10.4 and atrium (d) of IX. 2.26 were fourth style (i.e. ca. post A.D. 45) installations according to Allison 1992b, 159 and Fröhlich 1991, 294 respectively.

personal beliefs. Only in larger houses (with multiple shrines) does domestic ritual seem to have been divided according to rank and status. In smaller houses, single shrines must have served the entire household.¹⁹²

Who cooks, serves and eats (and with whom)?

'You are what, how, when and where you eat'. Everyone must eat, but not everyone cooks, and not everyone serves. The role that each individual plays in their own and others' nutrition depends on variables which measure their social identity: age, gender, rank and status.¹⁹³ The company with whom one eats also depends upon these same factors.

Age

Age strongly determined one's participation at meals. Mothers (or nurses in households with slaves or freedwomen) commonly breast-fed their infants for six months to two or three years, and then provided premasticated food for a time after their weaning.¹⁹⁴ Infants were then fed plain food like baby's gruel and bread soup.¹⁹⁵ Salza Prina Ricotti compares the food of older children to that of the poor:

"Naturalmente bambini e poveri, che non si coricavano sui letti tricliniarii per consumare i loro pasti e sedevano attorno ad un tavolo semplice ma abbastanza ampio sul quale potevano poggiare il loro cibo, i loro bicchieri ed i loro piatti di terracotta, potevano permettersi zuppe fumanti, poletine, legumi di vario tipo e sugosi stufatini."¹⁹⁶

Posidonius, writing at the turn of the first century B.C., agrees that children of wealthy Romans ate simple foods and drank largely water.¹⁹⁷ Information about the nutrition of children who have been weaned is, however, sparse.

Children seem to have commonly eaten in the same room as their parents.¹⁹⁸ Imperial children are reported reclining on the *lectus imus* below their father, seated at the ends of the

¹⁹²See the analysis of archaeological evidence for the association of ritual with cooking and eating areas in chapter three, pp. 157-165.

¹⁹³The "*sexus, aetas ordo omnis*" of Wallace-Hadrill's axes of differentiation within the Roman house; he claims that gender and age distinctions were irrelevant in the shaping of social space (Wallace-Hadrill 1988, 52). Berry 1994 agrees, stating that there is no lasting and immutable correlation between spatial activities and gender, a conclusion supported by the results of this investigation (see chapter four).

¹⁹⁴Bradley 1986, 219. See also Bradley 1991; Garnsey 1991a, 56-64; Néraudau 1984, 77-78, 281-287, referring to Sor. *Gyn.* 2.17-46.

¹⁹⁵See Juv. 14.166-172. Pers. 3.17-18 uses the figure of a wealthy and spoiled child who asks to have his food cut up into very small pieces.

¹⁹⁶Salza Prina Ricotti 1983, 10, following others such as Mau 1908, 264 and Carcopino 1960, 265.

¹⁹⁷As stated in Athen. 6.275A (Friedländer II, 146-147). But see Juv. 14.10-14 below, n. 202.

¹⁹⁸Caligula, in grief at Drusilla's death, reportedly forbid anyone on pain of death from eating with their parents, wife, or children during the period of public mourning, which assumes that communal family meals were the normal state of affairs (Suet. *Cal.* 24).

couches, or seated at a separate and more rustic table with other young nobles.¹⁹⁹ Imperial children were of course of the highest rank, and therefore would have been socially acceptable company at imperial dinners. Their status as children however compelled them sometimes to eat together and slightly separate from the adults. The point at which free youths would be allowed to dine formally as an adult at table is not entirely clear, but it was probably marriage for girls, and the assumption of the *toga virilis* for boys. Both were considered marks of adulthood, and were celebrated by feasts.²⁰⁰

Dinners at which morally unacceptable language and behavior were expressed were not considered suitable by some authors for children or young adults to attend.²⁰¹ Furthermore, Juvenal warns that bad habits such as gluttony are passed on from parents to children:

As soon as he has passed his seventh year, before he has cut all his second teeth, though you put a thousand bearded preceptors on his right hand, and as many on his left, he will always long to fare sumptuously, and not fall below the high standard of his cookery.²⁰²

The 'child' in this passage is satiric shorthand for persons who are not mature enough to control their own physical desires.²⁰³ So Seneca moralizes about the decline of youths in terms of their dining habits:

You need not wonder that diseases are beyond counting: count the cooks!...The halls of the professor and the philosopher are deserted: but what a crowd there is in the cafés! How many young fellows besiege the kitchens of their gluttonous friends! I shall not mention the troops of luckless boys who must put up with other shameful treatment after the banquet is over.²⁰⁴

¹⁹⁹Reclining on the lowest couch: Suet. *Aug.* 64 (echoed by Plu. *Moralia* 619D); sitting at the ends of the couches: Suet. *Cl.* 32; sitting at a separate table: Tac. *Ann.* 13.16.

²⁰⁰Dixon 1992, 101-102. Feast for the assumption of the *toga virilis*: Plin. *Ep.* 10.16; Cic. *Att.* 9.6. The wedding feast (*cena nuptialis*): Catul. 62.3; D.C. 48.44.

²⁰¹Var. *Men. Ag.* 6 advises maidens to avoid the banquet lest they learn too much of the speech of love (Salza Prina Ricotti 1983, 23).

²⁰²Juv. 14.10-14: *Cum septimus annus transierit puerum, nondum omni dente renato, barbato licet admoveas mille inde magistros, hinc totidem, cupiet lauto cenare paratu semper et a magna non degenerare culina* (Loeb text and translation).

²⁰³Gowers 1993, 24: "...the sorts of people depicted relishing food in Roman literature are children, slaves, parasites, cooks, gluttons, and gourmets; in other words, uncontrolled people who cannot be identified with the author or his accomplice the reader." In pp. 181-182, Gowers opposes "raw", or "uncooked" youth (who cannot get enough) to the "overcooked" elderly (who have had far too much).

²⁰⁴Sen. *Ep.* 95.23: *Innumerabiles esse morbos non mirabis: cocos numera...In rhetorum ac philosophorum scholis solitudo est: at quam celebres culinae sunt, quanta circa nepotum focos <se> iuventus premit! Transeo puerorum infelicitum greges quos post transacta convivia aliae cubiculi contumeliae expectant* (Loeb text and translation).

"Boys" (*pueri*) here describe children who were attendants at meals; the term *puer* contains inherent ambiguity in its meanings of "boy" and "slave". For families in which free children were expected to wait at table as part of their daily chores, the meanings overlapped slightly (Figs. 1.23-1.25).²⁰⁵ In the context of meals, *puer* usually means "slave"; young and handsome slave boys were particularly favored to be the dispensers of wine at dinner, and were sometimes subject to sexual service as a result.²⁰⁶

Gender

A consistent division in family food preparation according to gender does not appear in the sources. Most authors describe poor, rustic or archaic households, in which simple foodstuffs prepared by matrons exemplify the moral soundness of households according to literary convention.²⁰⁷ Columella claims that in the past, men worked outdoors and in public, and domestic chores fell to women until they became 'lazy' and these duties fell to the housekeeper; part of Columella's intent is to decry the current laxity in work and morals.²⁰⁸ From the quasi-historical past of Rome, Plutarch cites a treaty with the Sabines that forbade the new wives of the Romans from grinding grain or baking bread. According to Pliny, however, women at Rome baked their own bread until 174 B.C.²⁰⁹ Juvenal sketches a picture of a veteran's pregnant wife in the mid-second century B.C. making porridge (*puls*) for her children.²¹⁰

²⁰⁵According to Varro (Non. 156); Dixon 1992, 117 & n.95; Wiedemann 1991, 154; Fröhlich 1991, 222-229. In the majority of sculpted or painted scenes of banquet from the Roman world that include children, they seem to be slaves. See the tomb of Iulia Velva from York, Dixon 1992, Pl.15; painted panels of *triclinium* scenes from the Casa del Triclinio (V.2.4) at Pompeii. One panel depicts a (perhaps free-born, as identified by the *angustus clavus* along his tunic) boy serving the adults in the company of slave-boys (Figs. 1.23); two others show only slave-boys (Figs. 1.24-1.25). See also the painted panel depicting two male diners, a young woman and a child from room (d) of VI.14.29 at Pompeii, Collezione 1989, 170-171, #341; sarcophagus showing children playing with a dog underneath the funerary banquet couch of the deceased, Salza Prina Ricotti 1983, Fig. 106; funerary relief of C. G. Materno from Cologne, Dosi & Schnell 1986a, 113; a painted panel showing women and men at banquet being served wine by a boy, Fröhlich 1991, Taf. 21.2.

²⁰⁶D'Arms 1991, 173, with refs.

²⁰⁷For example, Ov. *Med.* 16-17 and Hor. *Epod.* 2. 39-48 describe Sabine matrons of old preparing the cooking fire, among other chores; Ov. *Fast.* 4.697-698 describes the varied household tasks of an archaic country home; Mart. 12.18 travels to the countryside (and hence back to an idyllic, rustic time) to witness his bailiff's wife putting pots on the fire. See also Hudson 1989, 70-77.

²⁰⁸Col. 12.praef. Columella in this passage is stressing what he thought women were not suited to do (i.e. work outdoors and engaging in public business). Maurin 1983 agrees, claiming that female work traditionally included the baking of bread, the preparation of meals, and the maintenance of the house. Berry 1994 has emphasized the administrative role of the woman of the house, particularly over the slaves who actually operated the household.

²⁰⁹Plu. *Moralia* 284F, Plin. *Nat.* 18.107. Hor. *S.* 1.4.36-38 pictures old women or slave-boys making trips to get bread from the bakery or water from a fountain. Purcell 1994, 664 describes this point as a change between high status baking bread at home, and baking as a low-status trade.

²¹⁰Juv. 14.166-172.

Not only women cooked meals; men appear as 'cooks' in the course of giving professional advice. Cato, Columella, and Varro all provide recipes in their agricultural treatises, and the most famous cook of antiquity was the wealthy M. Gavius Apicius.²¹¹ Male cooks are depicted as professionals, experts in fine cuisine. Other solitary males, such as the mythological Falernus or the hero Manius Curius, cook basic fare for themselves -- a mark of their solid, honest and 'traditional' character.²¹² Women's professional cooking expertise is considerably more sinister: the arts of poison-making or witchcraft, performed by characters such as Medea, Canidia or Locusta (the imperial poisoner of choice).²¹³

Cooperation between the sexes in cooking was another literary ideal; the stories of Baucis and Philemon, and Simylus and Scybale depict country-women and men working harmoniously together in the preparation of a meal.²¹⁴ Varro claims that the barbarian Illyrian men and women were equally able to herd flocks, gather wood, keep house, or cook food.²¹⁵ In a more urban context, Fortunata is portrayed as an equal to her husband Trimalchio for most of the dinner-party (although she participates only briefly in the meal proper); she is 'put in her place' only near its end.²¹⁶ All of these passages depict households outside the mainstream of Roman elite society, outside the actual experience of the author or reader. Heroes, mythical couples, rustic folk, foreign barbarians, and *nouveau riche* freedpersons appear to have domestic gender equity. Nowhere are men and women of the Roman elite shown working together to prepare a meal, because slaves did the job for them.

There were apparently no strict gender divisions among servile cooks in wealthier families. Apuleius depicts slave cooks of both sexes in his novel.²¹⁷ The celebrated cook in the *Cena Trimalchionis*, or the comic cooks of early Roman theater were, however, male.²¹⁸ The only traditionally female servile household job that involved food was the management position of *vilica*, or housekeeper. Cato and Columella both describe similar duties for the bailiff's wife: keeping adequate stores of food safe in places where they will not go bad, cleaning the kitchen,

²¹¹See Salza Prina Ricotti 1983 and Gozzini Giacosa 1992 for the recipes of Cato, Columella & Varro, and Flower & Rosenbaum 1958 for Apicius.

²¹²Falernus: Sil. 7.174-185; Manius Curius: Plin. *Nat.* 19.87; Juv. 11.77-89; Sen. *Dial.* 12.10.8.

²¹³The literary reversal of the honest and honorable wife is the witch, who cooks up poisons instead of nourishing meals (Gowers 1993, 92, 287-291, 299-310). See Hor. *Epod.* 3 for Canidia and Tac. *Ann.* 12.66, 13.15 for Locusta.

²¹⁴Baucis and Philemon: Ov. *Met.* 8.620-720; Simylus and Scybale: App. Verg. *Moretum*.

²¹⁵Var. *R.* 2.10.7.

²¹⁶Fortunata as equal or superior to Trimalchio: Petr. 37, 52, 67; Fortunata 'put in her place' by Trimalchio: Petr. 74-75.

²¹⁷The female cook, who makes love to the hero and then turns him into an ass: Apul. *Met.* 2.7; the male cook, who nearly kills the hero while he is an ass (Apul. *Met.* 7.20). Ulp. *dig.* 33.7.12 and Pompon. *dig.* 33.7.15 speak of *focariae* (kitchen-maids or female cooks) in the context of their inclusion in the *instrumentum domesticum* of inheritances.

²¹⁸Petr. 49-50; for Roman comic cooks, see Giannini 1960, 192-203 & Gowers 1993, 76-107.

and putting all the utensils in their proper places.²¹⁹ Columella's housekeeper does not actually have to cook the meals herself; she has only to inspect those who do prepare the family food.²²⁰ The woman's role at the hearth in poorer families (or even larger families that had slaves to cook) consistently involves managerial duties. The model is Lucretia, who is shown in a central position of authority (*in medio aedium*), surrounded by her servants; they are all busy with spinning wool even late at night.²²¹ Women valued this administrative role highly; when Pomponia, the wife of Quintus Cicero, is not given the responsibility of organizing a meal at an estate where they were to spend the night, she complains that she is 'just a guest' (*Ego ipsa sum...hic hospitium*) in her own household.²²² Later, she refuses to eat the meal in her husband's and brother-in-law's company. Cicero does not understand her anger because he underestimates the importance of the managerial power that she expects to wield in her house.

Roman women and men commonly dined together (Figs. 1.24-1.26). Not all dinners included women (several banquets described by the literary sources list only male participants).²²³ However, Richardson's recent suggestion that women regularly dined separately from men (based on the identification of 'ladies' dining rooms' in the houses and villas of Vesuvius) is insupportable.²²⁴ In the early Republican period, women are said to have been seated at dinner, but by the Empire custom dictated that both sexes recline.²²⁵

To what extent did women participate in the meal? Salza Prina Ricotti has conservatively stated that women were thought to be a distraction at dinner, and that they did not make invitations, receive guests, or conduct conversation during the meal.²²⁶ Juvenal disagrees in the sixth satire, rebuking the erudite woman who belittles rhetors and grammarians in her dinner table remarks.²²⁷ He exaggerates, but no less than to imagine that women took absolutely no part in dinner socializing. Catullus did not consider a dinner good without wine, wit, laughter,

²¹⁹Cato, *Agr.* 143; Col. 12.1-3.

²²⁰Col. 12.3.8: *eos qui cibum familiae conficiunt, invisere* (Loeb text).

²²¹Liv. 1.57; Ov. *Fast.* 2.742-747.

²²²Cic. *Att.* 5.1.3-4 (Gardner & Wiedemann 1991, 55-56); see also Gardner 1986, 70-71.

²²³All-male banquets: Hor. *Sat.* 2.8; Mart. 10.48; Plu. *Quaestiones Conviviales*.

²²⁴Richardson 1983, Richardson 1988a, 389-399. Wallace-Hadrill 1988, 93 & n.147 and Ling 1991a, 251-252, refute Richardson's argument, providing a number of literary references that support mixed dining. Similar efforts (Maiuri 1954b) to identify whole separate female areas of the Roman house (*gynaecaea*) which included their own dining rooms have also failed (Wallace-Hadrill 1988, 50-52). It was Greek custom, however, for men and women to dine separately (Cic. *Ver.* 2.66; Vitruvius 6.7.4; Nep. *praef.* 6-7).

²²⁵V. Max. 2.1.2, Isid. *Orig.* 20.11.9.

²²⁶Salza Prina Ricotti 1983, 23: "...non era lei che faceva gli inviti, non era lei riceveva gli ospiti, non era lei che conduceva la conversazione: se assisteva era soltanto come appendice."

²²⁷Juv. 6.434-456: "The grammarians make way before her; the rhetoricians give in; the whole crowd is silenced: no lawyer, no auctioneer will get a word in, no, nor any other woman; so torrential is her speech that you would think that all the pots and bells were being clashed together."; *cedunt grammatici, vincuntur rhetores, omnis turba tacet, nec caudicus nec praeco loquetur, altera nec mulier; verborum tanta cadit vis, tot pariter pelves ac tintinnabula dicas pulsari* (Loeb text and translation).

and the company of a lovely girl.²²⁸ Judging by the (male) literature, men's reasons for female company at banquets primarily concerned the opportunity of love, or at least sexual relations.²²⁹ Women of both high and low status were depicted as prizes at the table, taken by powerful figures like emperors sometimes even from their own husbands.²³⁰ Thus the precepts written on the dining room walls of the Casa del Moralista at Pompeii advise guests not to make eyes at other men's wives.²³¹ There was a clear connection between food and sex; one course at some dinners was the women themselves.²³² Women were also known to entertain banqueters in the roles of mimes, dancers, singers and musicians.²³³ Despite the few and biased sources, there is no doubt that many women enjoyed formal dinners in the company of men. Only the nature and degree of their participation seems to have differed, according to their rank and status.

Rank and status

Rank was socio-political standing, given initially by birthright. In the Imperial Roman world, rank ranged from the emperor, to senators, to equestrians, to free citizens, freedpersons, and finally down to slaves. Promotion in rank was possible through emancipation, election to office, or acclamation as emperor. Rank was largely a matter of ascribed prestige. Status on the other hand was a measure of power, based on achievement or influence with others of higher rank.²³⁴ Social standing was a complex combination of these factors combined with wealth.

Wallace-Hadrill has remarked: "Roman domestic architecture is obsessively concerned with distinctions of social rank."²³⁵ The social relations played out between people at an elite dinner always involved aspects of rank or status. A standard satirical character is the social parasite who angles for dinner invitations in the hope of gaining a standing invitation and

²²⁸Catul. 13; see Gowers 1993, 229-244 for a detailed analysis of this poem.

²²⁹For love affairs in the context of *convivia*, see Yardley 1991.

²³⁰Suet. *Aug.* 69, *Cal.* 36.

²³¹CIL IV.7698; see above, p. 23.

²³²Mart. 9.2, 5.78; *Historia Augusta, Gallieni Duo*, 17.7; see Gowers 1993, 252-255, 258-259. Cooks as well as servers could be connected to sex. In *Apul. Met.* 2.7, the female cook-slave refers to her sexual being as a brazier (*foculus*). See DuBois 1988, 110-129 for Greek literary depictions of women as 'ovens'. See also Mart. 4.66.

²³³Cic. *Fam.* 9.26; Plin. *Ep.* 1.15. See also Gardner 1986, 245-246.

²³⁴Definitions for rank and status follow Finley 1985, 45-61. Emperors had high rank and high status, freedpersons of the imperial court low rank but high status, and common slaves both low rank and status. The structure of social ordering was essentially pyramidal, with the few of highest status supported by an ever increasing number of ever lower status individuals. See Alföldy 1985, 146, Fig. 1 for a diagram of this social pyramid.

²³⁵Wallace-Hadrill 1988, 52.

thereby eventual access to a patron.²³⁶ One parasite, Charopinus, is depicted as potentially violent, even murderous, when he is denied invitation:

As many times as I dine at home, if I have not invited you, Charopinus, straightway the hostilities become immense, and you would run me through the middle with a drawn sword if you perceive that my hearth has been heated up without you. Will I not even once be allowed to play a trick? Nothing is as insatiable, Charopinus, as this your gluttony. Now quit watching over my kitchen, I pray, and let my cook at last give you words [instead of a meal].²³⁷

The Charopinus character underlines the importance of dining-out to one's social reputation and worth. Charopinus the client is forced to eat his patron's poem instead of his food. Issues of patronage were at work in every invitation to dinner from a social superior to a social inferior:

"In Roman satire some people invite important guests to dinner seeking social advancement (Nasidienus in Hor. S. 2.8). Others eat well or entertain those lower in the social hierarchy to assert or confirm their own superiority (Virro in Juv. 5) or attend dinners in the hope of social advancement (Trebius in Juv. 5)."²³⁸

There was considerable tension for all parties involved in the staging of a banquet. Prospective invitees risked being uninvited. Potential hosts risked both rejection of their invitations, and the chance that their social occasion might be a failure.²³⁹ Refusal to dine on the part of a guest was a sign of that guest's advancement in society, and of the host's reduced clout. Martial complains of one Dento, who has four times refused his dinner invitation:

So it is: you have been captured by a richer dinner, and a bigger kitchen has carried off the dog! Presently -- and that soon -- when you are known and discarded, and the wealthy eating-house (*popina*) is sick of you, to the bones of the old dinner you will return.²⁴⁰

Calling the house where Dento now dines a *popina* is a particularly malicious insult; it implies that Dento has no real status whatsoever. Gowers characterizes dining in Horace's first book of

²³⁶The banquet-hunter Silius is actually depicted as a man 'fishing' for food and social opportunity (Mart. 2.27; see also 2.14; 7.20 [above, p. 23]). The usage of *patronus*, *cliens*, and *amicus* follows the definitions of Saller 1982, 8-15.

²³⁷Mart. 5.50: *Ceno domi quotiens, nisi te, Charopine, vocavi, protinus ingentes sunt inimicitiae, meque potes stricto medium transfigure ferro, si nostrum sine te scis caluisse focum. Nec semel ergo mihi furtum fecisse licebit? Inprobus nihil est hac, Charopine, gula. Desine iam nostram, precor, observare culinam, atque aliquando meus det tibi verba cocus* (OCT text, author's translation).

²³⁸Hudson 1989, 83. D'Arms 1990, 311 further stresses the importance at banquets of the ties of *clientela*, "which linked together and integrated the disparate elements of the Roman social fabric". See Gowers 1993, 220-279 for an analysis of the symbolism of food in invitation poems.

²³⁹A failed banquet as that described in Hor. S. 2.8, where the host is mocked and the guests flee.

²⁴⁰Mart. 5.44.7-11: *Sic est, captus es unctiore mensa et maior rapuit canem culina. Iam te, sed cito, cognitum et relictum cum fastidierit popina dives, antiquae venies ad ossa cenae* (Loeb text and translation). See also Juv. 11 and Plin. Ep. 1.15.

Satires as a social weapon: "...the fashionable science of gastronomy has taken over the lives of the élite and become a sinister instrument of power and exclusion."²⁴¹ Dinners and dinner invitations were an exclusive currency; they regulated status and measured social obligations. These obligations did not cease with the end of the dinner-party; the *hospes* as guest was obliged by reciprocity to play the *hospes* as host, and return the favor of a meal. Dinners were a kind of gift-exchange.²⁴²

The host's personal stake in a dinner depended partly on the quality of his guests; the guest's stake hinged upon the host and company with whom the meal was shared. The host attempted above all to construct a dining atmosphere that complimented his socio-economic world:

"This [private] kind of meal was more of a licensed reorganization, the host's choice of his own world, and this cherished right was summed up in a well-known Pompeian graffito: 'The man with whom I do not dine is a barbarian to me' (*at quem non ceno, barbarus ille mihi est*)."²⁴³

The order of reclining at table encapsulated this world-building (Fig. 1.27). The guests' positions carried such inherent connotations of social differentiation that not even a meal of *amici* was necessarily free of social gamesmanship. The guest of honor (*locus consularis*) traditionally had the choice location at table, with proximity and primary access to the host. All other guests were placed at the discretion of the host, usually according to their rank and status from the *lectus summus* on down (Figs. 1.23-1.26). Members of the host's *familia*, such as his wife or freedpersons, would lie on his couch (*lectus imus*) in the places of lowest status (if they were present at the meal).²⁴⁴ Slaves were not normally allowed to recline at dinner or eat during dinner because they were busy cooking and serving the meal, and were not of adequate rank to join the company regardless.²⁴⁵

²⁴¹Gowers 1993, 131.

²⁴²D'Arms 1984, 331-334; see Gowers 1993, 8 and 225, where invitation poems are considered payment for the dinner itself. Mart. 5.50 (see above, p. 51) is an anti-invitation poem that offers the prospective guest lines of verse in lieu of courses of a meal.

²⁴³Gowers 1993, 26. This exclusive world is in contrast to the freedman's dinner in the *Satyricon*, as Gowers 1993, 46 notes: "The grotesquely hybrid dishes of Petronius' *Cena Trimalchionis*... remind us that the book itself is a bogus pastiche, as well as the society it depicts."

²⁴⁴Plu. *Moralia* 619B-619F is our primary source on the proper arrangement of guests at dinner.

²⁴⁵Petr. 70 provides the amusing picture of slaves crowding on to the guests' couches towards the end of the meal, and the exaggeration of the passage underlines the fact that such a breach of standard social boundaries was not normal behavior. Pl. *Capt.* 471 in fact describes slaves as "low bench-sitters" (*unisubsellii*), which suggests that slaves sometimes sat on separate furniture for their meals.

"Whether the host should arrange the placing of his guests or leave it to the guests themselves" is the subject of a dialogue in Plutarch's *Quaestiones Conviviales*.²⁴⁶ Participants debate how to arrange the guests at table so as to obtain the most pleasant and satisfactory dining experience without offending anyone's social pride. Plutarch's father is in favor of dinners as strictly ordered as an army, while his brother Timon argues that dinners should not be contests for social pre-eminence (and thereby shows himself to be naïvely idealistic).²⁴⁷ Plutarch himself pleads for order. But in cases where rivals attended the same dinner, he argues that the place of honor should harmlessly be afforded to relatives with special personal connection to the host. The guest Lamprias finally declares that the individual character of each diner must be carefully considered, and guests should be placed next to others of opposite demeanor, so that each might learn from the other. None of these procedures is proclaimed preferable in the end. The point of the dialogue is to show diverse possibilities, and to discuss the difficulties in pleasing all the participants when their couch positions inherently carry so much social weight. The end goal of all is to foster a relaxed atmosphere of conviviality and friendship; ironically they cannot agree on how to go about it.²⁴⁸ Hosts of formal dinners in nineteenth century England faced strikingly similar problems:

"The host and hostess circulated discreetly to make sure that the appropriate gentlemen were paired off with ladies of appropriate status and then arranged in order of precedence for purposes of the formal promenade in to dinner. This, since it often involved very tricky questions of status and rank, was probably in many cases the hostess's most nerve-racking moment during the whole evening, and, if she were uncertain, she would be well advised to consult Debrett's or Burke's [published guides to peerages] at this point to get her ranks straight."²⁴⁹

Knowledge of proper social ordering at banquets was a necessary and powerful tool to run a successful affair, and if properly wielded, could advance or solidify the status of the host himself.

Slaves cooked and served the free family and guests of wealthy households. Slaves have been called "the human props essential to the support of upper-class Roman convivial

²⁴⁶Plu. *Moralia* 615C-619A: Πότερον αὐτὸν δεῖ κατακλίνειν τοὺς ἐστιωμένους τὸν ὑποδεχόμενον ἢ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἐκείνοις ποιεῖσθαι (Loeb translation of the title of the dialogue).

²⁴⁷Timon does not seem to realize that paying strict attention to rank and person in the order of a dinner-party (as Augustus did, Suet. *Aug.* 74) contributed to the social stability of the state by reminding all the participants that they should know their place and be content with it (D'Arms 1990, 308). For if (as Plin. *Ep.* 9.5.3 notes) 'the distinctions of orders and dignity become confused, nothing is more unequal than the resulting equality.' (paraphrasing D'Arms' 1990, 312 translation). See also D'Arms 1984, 344-348.

²⁴⁸See D'Arms 1990 for the difficulty in reconstructing a canonical attitude to issues of equality, freedom and pleasure at a Roman dinner.

²⁴⁹Pool 1993, 73. The stress of hosting is revealed by Cicero in *Att.* 13.52 when he concludes, after hosting Caesar and his retinue at dinner: "But my guest was not the kind of person to whom one says 'Do come again when you are next in the neighborhood.' Once is enough." (Shackleton Bailey translation).

comforts".²⁵⁰ Consider Seneca's comment: "Look at our kitchens, and the cooks, who bustle about over so many fires; is it, think you, for a single belly that all this bustle and preparation of food takes place?"²⁵¹ The larger and more elaborate a dinner affair, the more and more specialized slaves were needed. Household slaves had their own social hierarchy, and this hierarchy was expressed nowhere as clearly as in a formal dinner.²⁵² *Vocatores* and *nomenclatores* worked on invitations and overall management; store-masters (*cellarii*) made sure that groceries had been purchased. Kitchen slaves (*focarii* and *focariae*) and specialized cooks proceeded to transform dirty, raw food into clean, cooked food, which they then served in the dining room. Their cooking might be compared in jest to poison in the *Pseudolus*, but the danger of poisoning in the imperial household was ever-present, requiring a special food-tasting slave for the emperor.²⁵³ Cicero ridicules L. Calpurnius Piso for (among other things) not having a full-service dinner staff:

"The servants who wait are filthy and some of them decrepit; one man doubles the parts of cook and steward. He does not keep a baker or a properly stocked larder, and sends out for his bread and his wine (from the barrel)."²⁵⁴

Slaves provided 'dinner-theater' entertainment for the guests while they served: singing, playing musical instruments, reciting verse, dancing, acrobatics, and playing farce.²⁵⁵ Serving boys or girls dispensed the wine and offered sexually attractive appearances.²⁵⁶ While slaves were accepted as part of the banquet's course and (sometimes) admired for their entertainment, they were simultaneously segregated from the real camaraderie of the meal. In a sense, they were performing puppets, subject to derision, degradation, abuse and punishment.²⁵⁷

The hard work of slaves in the smooth operation of the meal was not often noticed, and their proximity to the bathed and relaxed guests was not always appreciated. Trimalchio says as much at the start of his *cena*:

²⁵⁰D'Arms 1991, 171.

²⁵¹Sen. Ep. 114.26: *Aspice culinas nostras et concursantis inter tot ignes cocos: unum videri putas ventrem cui tanto tumultu comparatur cibus?* (Loeb text and translation).

²⁵²See Wallace-Hadrill 1988, 78-79; D'Arms 1991, 172-174; Marquardt I, 171-172 for discussions of the specialty positions of household slaves in general and at banquet-slaves in particular.

²⁵³Gowers 1993, 102-103 discusses the ambiguity of *venenum* (poison, potion) in Pl. Ps. 870. The taster for Claudius, the eunuch Halotus, was implicated in the poisoning death of the emperor (Tac. *Ann.* 12.66; Suet. *Cl.* 44).

²⁵⁴Cic. Pis. 67: *servi sordidati ministrant, non nulli etiam senes; idem coquus, idem atriensis; pistor domi nullus, nulla cella; panis et vinum a propola atque de cupa* (Loeb text, Balsdon 1974, 53 translation).

²⁵⁵Jones 1991 speaks of private dinner entertainment in the context of the larger theater of urban social relationships.

²⁵⁶Mart. 10.66 laments the fact that a kitchen-slave who also blends and serves wine has his handsome appearance marred by smoke and grease from the stove.

²⁵⁷D'Arms 1991, 174-176.

We complimented our host on his arrangements. 'Mars loves a fair field,' said he [Trimalchio], 'and so I gave orders that every one should have a separate table. In that way these filthy slaves will not make us so hot by crowding past us.'²⁵⁸

Slaves were filthy because they had to 'slave' over a burning stove in ill-lit kitchens filled with smoke, blood and food remains, sweat to keep the meal in proper synchronization, and periodically clear the table of dirty dishes and clean the floor of trash.²⁵⁹ Horace gives a graphic sermon on the virtues of hosting a clean dinner through the mouth of the philosopher Catus:

It really makes you sick to see a slave with greasy paws, from licking at some food he thieved, pick up a cup, or to find a coating of old filth inside an antique bowl. Plain brooms, place mats, sawdust -- just how expensive are these simple things? Not to have them is a great disgrace. Do you scrape mosaic floors with a muddy palm whisk and throw dirty wraps on couches covered with fine cloth? You forget that since neatness is both cheap and easy, you're more justly blamed for lacking that one quality than any fancy item found only on the tables of the rich.²⁶⁰

Slaves were socially as well as physically dirty. Except for the Saturnalia, they tended not to dine in a well-decorated room with nice furnishings and service of their own; they are pictured instead snacking in the kitchen.²⁶¹ Some slaves were allowed only the leftovers of the leftovers of the meal, taking what the guests left behind after filling their own napkins. Slaves on some country estates are shown receiving rations from the bailiff and eating them around a fire.²⁶²

Slaves, the original 'nobodies' and lacking social identity, were not allowed to eat what, how or when they liked. That picture is given by their masters; how true is it? Were slaves scavengers, eating off the plates as they cleaned them, fighting for scraps? Or did slaves have

²⁵⁸Petr. 34: *Laudatus propter elegantias dominus "Aequum" inquit "Mars amat. Itaque iussi suam cuique mensam assignari. Obiter et putidissimi servi minorem nobis aestum frequentia sua facient."* (Loeb text and translation). See above, the filthy servants of L. Calpurnius Piso, n. 254.

²⁵⁹Plin. *Nat.* 36.184 describes the famous "unswept hall" (*asaroton oecon*) mosaic of Hellenistic origin that depicts the sort of food remains (fish skeletons, shells, bones, nutshells, pits etc...) that get tossed on the floor of the dining room during the meal (see chapter two, p. 90, n. 167 for the text). Vit. 7.4.4 describes the wine tossed and spit by guests onto the floor (see chapter two, p. 103, n. 229 for the text). See also Quint. *Inst.* 8.3.66 and Col. 2.14.7, 12.3.8 for descriptions of dining room dirt and instructions for cleaning up a kitchen.

²⁶⁰Hor. *S.* 2.4.78-87 (from Gowers 1993, 147-149): *'Magna movet stomacho fastidia, seu puer unctis tractavit calicem manibus dum furta ligurrit; sive gravis veteri craterae limus adhaesit. Vilibus in scopis, in mappis, in scobe quantus consistit sumptus? Neglectis flagitium ingens. Ten lapides varios lutulenta radere palma et Tyrias dare circum illuta toralia vestis, oblitum quanto curam sumptumque minorem haec habeant, tanto reprehendi iustius illis quae nisi divitibus nequeant contingere mensis?'* (OCT text, Fuchs 1977 translation).

²⁶¹Pl. *Pers.* 633 speaks of the treats to be found in a kitchen (*ubi rerum omnium bonarum copias saepissime*) and the cooks in Pl. *Cas.* 775-779 scheme to get the master out of the house so they can have the meal to themselves.

²⁶²Mart. 12.18; Col. 11.1.19 (see above, p. 30-31, n. 126).

their own place and time for rations during which they could enjoy the social interaction of their peers? Did slaves of differing status within a household eat differently?

There must have been considerable variation in domestic arrangements, depending upon the mind and resources of their master, the size of the house and the size of the staff. Customs and attitudes changed continually over time, and from place to place. Households and their houses fluctuated in size, in the makeup of their families, and in their fortunes. Literary sources offer anecdotal evidence from the point of view of Roman elites, evidence that does not often cut across rank, status, age and gender. Fortunately, the archaeological evidence at Pompeii in the first century A.D. represents a broad band of the socio-economic spectrum. A systematic exploration of cooking and eating arrangements, from the one-room shop to urban mansions, follows. I will show that the archaeological evidence confirms and complements the picture of a hierarchical society outlined above. I begin with definitions and typologies for cooking and dining areas in chapter two.

CHAPTER II

DEFINING COOKING AND DINING AREAS

The terminology assigned to various rooms of the Roman house has always been based on the reconciliation of archaeological and textual sources. Terms used in modern scholarship for 'dining room' such as *cenatio*, *triclinium*, *oecus*, *exedra*, and *basilica*, are all borrowed from ancient authors.¹ Since the earliest excavations at Pompeii, scholars have used these Latin terms to describe the functions of rooms, often without precise definition: "As a consequence, the impression given is that we are well-informed, not only as to the name ascribed to each room in a Pompeian house, but also as to its function."² As Allison has shown, the functions that these terms imply for rooms cannot always be corroborated by archaeology. In order to refine the debate, I will construct clearly defined typologies and terminologies based on the archaeological evidence. These may serve as new standards for categorizing kitchen installations and dining rooms both at Pompeii and elsewhere. I also systematically sort through the Latin terminology and point out where it is appropriate, and where it is not, to make connections between archaeological types and traditional literary terms.

The areas where Romans cooked and dined are described and defined in three parts. First, **parameters** define the boundaries of inquiry: the samples of buildings chosen for analysis, the objects, monuments and materials from those samples that comprise the body of evidence, and the chronological limits of the study. The second part offers a **terminology and typology** for cooking areas, and the third part a **terminology and typology** for dining areas. **Terminology** discusses the names for cooking and dining areas in Latin literature, and how those ancient terms have been used in modern scholarship. **Typology** presents a new classification of cooking and dining areas according to their measurable physical characteristics and assigns to them a neutral English terminology that can be connected to, but does not rely upon, the Latin terminology.

¹Vitruvius discusses the proper placement, aspect, proportions, and decoration for Roman dining areas in 6.3.2, 8-11 and 6.4-5; see also Var. *L.* 5.161-162.

²Allison 1992b, 14. She points out the basic problems in harnessing literary terminology to interpret room functions in excavated houses, but does not investigate the literature in detail (p. 12, n. 2). See also Allison 1992a, 235-236; Gozzini Giacosa 1992, 21-23; Dunbabin 1991, 123-126; Salza Prina Ricotti 1987, 124-129; Dosi & Schnell 1986b, 16-25; Adam 1984, 333-336; Richardson 1983, Salza Prina Ricotti 1979, Mau 1908, 262-266; Overbeck 1884, 244-270.

Parameters

A study such as this is only possible at Pompeii, where the greater part of a town has been excavated with exceptional preservation of architecture and finds. The cessation of occupation in A.D. 79 also reduced the overlay and compression of chronological layers that muddle other sites. Because of its unique condition, Pompeii offers an opportunity to examine the social character of an 'ordinary' Roman town. Pompeii housed no senatorial families, none of the dense apartment housing of Ostia, nor (at the other end of the spectrum) any of the urban slums present in a metropolis like Rome. It is missing the extreme top and bottom of the socio-economic scale, yet (as the successful synthesis of a local Samnite center and the Roman colony of 80 B.C.) it would probably have been skewed more towards the prosperous end of that scale. Pompeii presents an 'average' urban character: a mid-sized town with agricultural and market functions, interaction with both the hinterland and the coast, and a center both of consumption and production.³

The samples

I sampled every building from ten *insulae* near the center of Pompeii (I.4, 6-10; VII.1, 14; IX.1-2) in order to construct a typology for cooking installations and dining areas. From this sample, six (I.4, 6-10) are documented in the Gazetteer and analyzed in chapter three (Figs. 2.1-2.2). Figs. 2.3-2.12 show plans of individual *insulae*, on which all cooking and dining areas are marked. Contiguous *insulae* allowed for the study of each building in its neighborhood context.⁴

The ten *insulae* together make up ca. six percent of the total walled area of the city (both excavated and unexcavated). They are located in the center of the city around the intersection of two major streets (the east-west Via dell'Abbondanza and the north-south Via Stabiana). Included is one major public building (the Stabian baths at VII.1), and the theater-odeon complex in *insula* (VIII.7) is nearby. The sample consists largely of residential blocks with (work)shops lining the major thoroughfares. I visited, identified, recorded, and photographed all kitchen and dining areas in all buildings from the sample except one, which remained closed off due to the lack of a key (I.7.13-14). I have nevertheless included this building in the Gazetteer.

The information available for each *insula* depends largely upon the care with which the buildings and finds were excavated, recorded and published. There is consequently unavoidable variation in the quality and quantity of data. *Insula* (VII.14) was excavated largely during the years 1838-1841, with portions of its northeast corner uncovered in 1863.⁵ Excavation of *insulae*

³See Laurence 1994, 51-69, Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 65, Frier 1991, Jongman 1988, esp. 55-57.

⁴Samples, quantification and statistical analysis, essential for any large scale study, have only recently been employed at Pompeii. The rationale for samples is simple: "...without statistical study we have the greatest difficulty in rising above the level of the anecdotal." (Wallace-Hadrill 1991b, 192). See also Raper 1977, 1979; La Torre 1988.

⁵See CTP V, 499-500; excavation reports for VII.14 appear in PAH II and the BdI of 1841.

(I.4, VII.1, IX.1-2) began with their street frontage along the Via Stabiana in 1846-1849, continued from 1851-1859, and was completed under the eyes of Fiorelli in 1861-1872.⁶ Excavations completed by Spinazzola, Elia, Della Corte and Maiuri in the period ca. 1911-1918, 1923-1935 (*insulae* I.6-7, 10) generally provide the highest quality data available.⁷ Good records of finds from these latter *insulae* allowed Allison to study assemblages from many of the houses. The *insulae* (I.8), excavated by Maiuri from 1937-1941, and (I.9), also under Maiuri from 1951-1954, were never properly published. However, Castiglione Morelli del Franco & Vitale (I.8) and Berry (I.9) have recently begun to resolve this gap with their own works on the architecture and finds. The six *insulae* in Regio I were selected for inclusion in the Gazetteer and analysis in chapter three because of the higher degree of care and detail with which they were excavated and published.

At Pompeii (and also Herculaneum), I visited and studied other buildings outside the sample areas, to check if the sample seemed reasonably representative of the Campanian evidence (Fig. 2.1). These buildings are not included in the Gazetteer, but some are referred to in the main text.⁸ The cooking and dining areas in the *comparanda* did follow the general patterns seen in the sample houses, and I have concluded that the sample is fairly representative of Pompeii. I do not claim any statistical significance to the sample, for three reasons: 1) the sample was not selected at random, 2) the excavated area of the towns (the available body of data) is not a random sample, and 3) the evidence from the buildings at the time of excavation was not recorded in a consistent or thorough manner. Nonetheless, patterns emerging from the sample will offer interesting hypotheses to test in future investigations of larger urban environments.

The Pompeian evidence

Recent comprehensive publications of domestic architecture, decoration, inscriptions, and finds have made synthetic studies of Pompeii possible. An ideal example is the *Häuser in Pompeji* series, which brings together all classes of evidence for individual houses.⁹ A separate computerized reconstitution of architecture, finds, and decoration in select Pompeian houses was part of a recent Italian project, and the premise holds great promise for non-destructive archaeology of the future.¹⁰ On a larger scale, the ongoing publication of an encyclopedic series

⁶Records of these excavations appear in the PAH II, the BdI and BAN for the relevant years, and Fiorelli's own *Giornale*, summed up in his work of 1873.

⁷Notices in the NSc and monographs (Spinazzola I-III and Maiuri 1933) were the publications.

⁸At Pompeii, these *comparanda* included: I.2.6, I.11.10-14, I.13.2, II.2.2, II.3.1-3, II.4, III.4.2-3, III.2.1, V.4.B, V.3.10, V.2.1, V.2.10, V.1.2, V.1.7, VI.1.10, VI.2.4, VI.8.5, VI.8.22, VI.8.23, VI.9.2, VI.9.6-7, VI.10.7, VI.11.9-10, VI.12.2+5, VI.15.1, VII.4.48, IX.9.2, IX.9.6, IX.13.1-3, and IX.14.A-C. At Herculaneum the *comparanda* included all but those buildings too unsafe to enter (V.14-16, V.8).

⁹Six volumes have so far been published in the *Häuser* series, and several more volumes are in progress; see Ling 1993 for a review of Bds. 2-3.

¹⁰The project is entitled the Consorzio Neapolis; see *Rediscovering Pompeii* 1990, 3-25, 63-77, 105-127, *Pompei* - L'Informatica 1988 (the official publication), and Allison 1992b, 22-23.

offers a comprehensive, *insula by insula* photographic record of nearly all frescoes and pavements, and is becoming the definitive reference work to the city.¹¹

All classes of evidence at Pompeii are considered in this thesis: architecture, art and decoration, graffiti, and finds. Architecture survives best; all buildings at the time of my inspection had been largely cleared of vegetation and some of their architecture had been consolidated.¹² Other types of evidence are problematic. The brilliant frescoes which once adorned many walls are gone; some were removed at the time of excavation to the Naples Museum, and others have since faded from sight. Many floors have been covered over with a layer of gray lava chips, and are not visible. Statuary and furniture have, in most cases, been removed from the buildings. Graffiti and dipinti give tantalizing but largely unreliable clues to the identities and social status of the owners or occupants of some buildings.¹³ Finds for approximately 30% of the sample houses have been published in detail.¹⁴

Connecting patterns in the archaeological data with patterns of domestic behavior is a challenge; Pompeian households and their houses were messy, continuously being rebuilt, and reorganized or reused according to the many variables outlined in chapter one. As Berry has stated, "...change is a normal part of domestic life and...the use of space in the home is always a developing phenomenon."¹⁵ She argues that "rebuilding is renewing the environment", and that the A.D. 62 earthquake did not prevent most Pompeians from continuing their domestic lives.¹⁶

Allison has offered an opposing view, stressing the widespread abandonment and dilapidation of residences in the years between A.D. 62-79. She assumes that kitchens lacking cooking vessels were not operating in A.D. 79, and that such houses were abandoned or reduced in occupation.¹⁷ Allison argues that cooking wares were not valuable enough to have been either saved by fleeing householders, or recovered later by survivors. If kitchens were being used, then

¹¹*Pompeii: Pitture e Mosaici* (PPM I-IV); Regiones I-VI are available. This series is the partial publication of a comprehensive list of photographic evidence for all regions of Pompeii published in the three volumes of: *Pitture e Pavimenti di Pompei* (PPP I-III).

¹²This process of cleaning and restoration began in the mid-1980s as a result of the 1980 earthquake and continues today, with the inevitable but necessary alteration of the monuments themselves. See *Rediscovering Pompeii* 1990, 11 and *Progetto Pompei* 1988.

¹³Common names for houses in the samples rely largely on Della Corte's (1954) assignation of individuals and families to various buildings, but I have avoided using epigraphic evidence as positive proof of residents' identities. Castrèn (1975) and Mouritsen (1988) have shown that neither Della Corte's methods nor his results can be substantiated. See also Lepore 1950.

¹⁴Finds were available from twenty-two of the seventy-five sample houses: I.4.5+25 (Dwyer 1982); I.6.4, I.6.8-9; I.6.11, I.6.13, I.6.15, I.7.7, I.7.10-12, I.7.19, I.10.4, I.10.7, I.10.8, I.10.11 (Allison 1992b); the nine houses of I.9 (Berry 1993). Allison (1992b) and Berry (1993) have pioneered the reconstruction of domestic contexts for artifactual assemblages. Allison (pp. 12-39) gives an account of the problems in such reconstructions.

¹⁵Berry 1993, 4.

¹⁶Berry 1994.

¹⁷Allison 1992b, 92-93. But see Berry 1993, 80-83.

they should have been full of pots and pans. This is not the case. In many houses, cooking wares were found in separate cabinets or storage areas. Kitchens were generally small rooms; culinary storage was often elsewhere, and utensils were brought in to cook as needed.¹⁸ Because the eruption apparently was in full force by noon (before dinner needed to be prepared), pots and pans were never brought into most kitchens.¹⁹ Survivors (the great majority of the population) fled in time, never fired up their kitchens, and moreover, took some cooking wares along with them.²⁰ Allison noticed that the small number of houses with cookwares in the kitchens tended to correlate with houses containing skeletons; she took this to indicate occupancy at the time of the eruption.²¹ I offer an alternate hypothesis: the few individuals who remained over the two to three days of the eruption needed to eat -- clearly using their kitchens at least once -- and eventually died because of their delay, leaving skeletons and cookwares behind.

Thus for the surviving refugees, cooking wares and food were highly valuable and worth saving because these goods enabled them to eat in the days and weeks following the eruption. Firsthand reports of the 1937 eruption of volcanoes around the town of Rabaul (Papua New Guinea) reveal that both those who fled and those who stayed in town during the eruption made preparations to feed themselves. Ash fall lasted nearly four days; those who remained through the first evening made their meals, while those who left packed personal possessions, clothes, food, portable stoves, lamps, pets, and money.²² Food for the refugee population became an immediate concern; in fact, starvation and disease have been the largest causes of death in historically documented eruptions.²³ The aftermath of the Vesuvian eruption was probably more deadly than the event itself.

¹⁸Col. 12.3 implies that particular areas of a house were used for particular types of storage so that objects could easily be found and kept secure (see chapter one, pp. 15-16 and chapter three, pp. 153-157).

¹⁹Plin. *Ep.* 6.16: "Towards the seventh hour [i.e. noon] on the 24th of August, my mother pointed out to him [Pliny the Elder] a cloud of unusual size and shape"; *Nonum Kal. Septembres hora fere septima mater mea indicat ei apparere nubem inusitata et magnitudine et specie* (Teubner text, author's translation). Étienne 1979 describes the eruption as having begun about 10 a.m. on 24 August and ended on 26 August or the following night. See Allison 1992b, 10-12 for doubts about the traditional sequence of the eruption.

²⁰Perhaps as Juv. 3.249-253 (p. 73, n. 83) and Mart. 12.32.11-14 (p. 66, n. 44) respectively describe a slave and a poor family carrying braziers and pots on their backs.

²¹Allison 1992b, 93.

²²The eruption that struck Rabaul was of the same ('Plinian') type as the A.D. 79 Vesuvian eruption. See Johnson & Threlfall 1985, 59-78; pp. 68-72: "The assembled refugees 'were a motley sight' said Mr. Stewart, 'some maimed and crippled -- some carrying their baskets, parrots, dogs, primus stoves, hurricane lamps, camphor boxes, etc.'; and with 'a bundle of clothes, or a little suitcase, or a kit-bag, or something with them - or a baby', listed Brett Hilder. An elderly Chinaman carried a very heavy bucket, apparently full of potatoes, but the potatoes were only a top layer covering a hoard of coins."

²³Blong 1984, 72-73, 126-131, for the period A.D. 1600-1982. Starvation and disease have become relatively minor factors in the mortality rates of twentieth century eruptions, due to modern methods of transporting food, medical, and sanitation supplies. See also Johnson & Threlfall 1985, 79-94.

Chronology

Pompeii did not perfectly preserve a frozen moment in the domestic lives of the inhabitants. The A.D. 62 earthquake (with subsequent tremors, repairs and abandonment), the A.D. 79 eruption (with items saved, salvaged or stolen during or after the eruption), and the incomplete recording of the excavations combine to provide a flawed and partial body of evidence.²⁴ Yet this evidence is still more vivid and more complete than at any other site -- the amount of information about cooking and dining areas is unparalleled. I will consider the problems of preservation for each building in the sample individually (see the Gazetteer), and use only the evidence that seems secure in building up data to analyze in chapter three. In general, it seems that the great majority of buildings in the study sample were being used in A.D. 79.

Pompeii was the result of centuries of urban development, and consequently, many alterations in the form of the *insulae*, buildings and streets had been carried out.²⁵ To date, a limited number of sondages have been made below the preserved floor levels.²⁶ Studies of the building history of Pompeii have instead relied upon studies of wall painting styles, manners of construction, and sequences of wall phasing. I will consider the *Baugeschichte* of individual buildings in the Gazetteer when it elucidates the arrangement and understanding of cooking and dining areas. Otherwise, this study is a 'synchronic' view of Pompeii in its last years, between the major earthquake of A.D. 62 and the final eruption of A.D. 79.

Terminology and typology: cooking areas

Literary sources provide a number of references to kitchens or cooking areas, but rarely describe their physical attributes in any detail. Fortunately, it is relatively easy to identify kitchens on the ground. The presence of braziers, cooking stands, hearths, stoves or ovens, especially with evidence of burning, confirm that cooking took place or was intended to take place in an area. Cooking pots or utensils in association with kitchen appliances also reinforce the identification. The literary sources tend to be vague and the archaeological sources are specific, yet a reconciliation of the two will be attempted in the archaeological typology.

Literary sources for cooking areas and installations

Several words in Latin describe the place of a cooking fire, but only one (*culina*) applies to a discrete room in which cooking was the primary activity. Various terms for a cooking area or

²⁴Allison 1992b, 8-12, 86-97.

²⁵See Laurence 1994, Nappo 1994, Parslow 1990, Zanker 1987, Hoffman 1979, Lauter 1975, and Eschebach 1970.

²⁶For this study's sample only the House of Menander sondages are relevant (Ling 1983); but see also Laurence 1994, 4; Richardson 1991, 1988; Sogliano 1937; Maiuri 1973.

installation are listed below, along with a summary definition. Some terms overlap; *focus* can stand for an entire *culina*, as both Martial and Columella demonstrate, and the terms *furnus*, *fornax*, and *caminus* are interchangeable.²⁷ A full treatment of each term follows, plus a brief section that discusses features of the cooking environment, i.e. water, drainage, fires and smoke.

<i>focus</i> <i>foculus</i> / <i>foculare</i>	The hearth. The general term for the place of a cooking fire, whether on the bare ground, an altar, a prepared platform, a portable brazier (the common meaning of the diminutives), or a proper upright masonry stove. A symbol of the house, the family, and the household gods (the <i>Lares</i> , <i>Penates</i> and particularly Vesta, goddess of home and hearth).
<i>furnus</i> / <i>fornax</i> <i>fornacula</i> can	Oven, furnace, kiln, forge. A structure that can normally be closed completely, and in which strong fires were built to attain high temperatures. <i>Furnus</i> tends to describe a domestic or bakery oven, and <i>fornax</i> often means a lime or pottery kiln, or a metal-forge. Either describe a bath-furnace. The diminutive has no special usage.
<i>caminus</i> fire	Fire-place, stove, furnace, forge. A general term adopted from the Greek, it describes an installation which can pottery, smelt metals, heat a bath, and perhaps cook food.
<i>culina</i>	Kitchen. A spatially distinct area or room in which any of the above cooking apparatus or installations are present, and where the whole process of preparing and cooking food was carried out. It can also refer to the cuisine, the food that is being cooked.

Focus, foculus/foculare

Varro, as reported by the late scholars Servius and Isidorus, provides the clearest definition of a *focus* in its functional role as the recipient of a fire:

Fire is the flame itself: but whatever fosters the fire is called the *focus*, whether it be an altar, or something else in which fire is fostered.²⁸

Fostering the fire on the hearth is emphasized in Varro's definition; elsewhere he claims that the word *focus* itself derived from *fotu*, the participle of *fovere* 'to keep warm, to foster', just as the

²⁷Mart. 5.50 (see chapter one for the text, p. 51, n.237), 7.27; Col. 8.3.1. Plin. *Nat.* 33.69 uses the terms *fornax* and *caminus* to describe the same metal-working furnace; Vitruvius 7.8.2 equates the terms *fornax* and *furnus*, also in the context of describing a forge.

²⁸Serv. A. 12.118 (Isid., *Orig.* XX.10): *Focos quidquid ignem fovet 'focus' vocatur, sive ara sit, sive quid aliud in quo ignis fovetur* (Thilo & Hagen 1961 text, author's translation). See also Serv. A. 11.211: *adnotandum sane quod 'focos' dixerit pyras, cum focus ara sit deorum penatium. An quod focum dicat ubicumque ignis est et fovetur: unde et Varro focum dici vult*, and Ov. *Fast.* 6.301; Daremberg-Saglio, s.v. "Focus".

word for kitchen, *culina*, is derived from *colere*, meaning 'to cultivate, foster and revere'.²⁹ Varro's etymologies stress starting and keeping alight the family fire; it was not always easy in practical terms to restart a dead hearth.³⁰ More importantly, a controlled live fire in the house symbolized the civilized occupation of the house by a living family. Other authors apply the same emphasis to a constantly burning hearth, especially the one in the Temple of Vesta in the Forum Romanum which represented the domestic spirit of the entire Roman state.³¹ Cicero in his speeches commonly calls for the defense of the state with the metaphor of guarding one's own domestic shrines and altars. His rhetoric is designed to strike home to each Roman citizen. For instance, when questioning Pompey's decision to abandon Rome in the war against Caesar, Cicero asserts that whereas the Republic is not made up of house walls, it is indeed made up of citizens' altars and hearths.³²

The *focus* stood for the essence of a house and its family members: all those sheltered under its roof, warmed and fed by its fire, and protected by its gods. Ovid notes: "Vesta is the same as the Earth; under both of them is a perpetual fire; the Earth and the hearth are symbols of the home."³³ The life of hearth and home was also symbolized by the token of a green and living wreath (*corona*) afforded a hearth at periodic intervals and on days of celebration.³⁴ Cakes, spelt and incense were other common solid offerings upon the hearth at public and private occasions such as birthdays.³⁵ The introduction of life-bearing liquids such as blood (or its substitute, wine) onto the fire was done in accordance with established procedures of cooking or sacrifice. Hearths were defiled when ill-omened blood (from execution, suicide, or cannibalism) threatened

²⁹Serv. A. 3.134: *Focum autem dictum a fotu, ut colinam ab eo quod ibi ignis colatur* (Thilo & Hagen 1961 text).

³⁰Frayn 1978, 29. Hearths were lit either with flint (Sil. 2.444-445; Verg. A. 1.176), another source of fire such as a lamp: "I take up the lantern, carry it to the hearth, blow, and the fire returns to life"; *noctilucam tollo, ad focum fero, inflo, anima reviviscit* (Var. Men. 292, Ibycus text, author's translation), a neighbor's hearth (Pl. Aul. 91-92), a coal (Ov. Fast. 2.645), or from sparks still alive in the ashes (App. Verg. Moretum 6-14).

³¹A constant flame in homes: C. Bas. *De Metris* 6.255-256; Mart. 10.47; Tib. 1.1.5-6. A constant flame in the Temple of Vesta and other temples: Prop. 4.4.44-45, 4.11.53-54; Sil. 3.28-29; Stat. Theb. 2.739.

³²In 49 B.C.: Cic. Att. 7.11.3: '*Non est*' inquit '*in parietibus res publica.*' At *in aris et focus* (OCT text).

³³Ov. Fast. 6.267-268: *Vesta eadem est et terra: subest vigil ignis utrique: significant sedem terra focusque suam* (Loeb text and translation). Similar sentiments are expressed in Cic. N.D. 2.67.11-14, and Cic. Leg. 2.454.2-5 (quoting Plato Lg. 12.955E-956B).

³⁴Juv. 12.83-88; Prop. 4.3.53-58; Cato Agr. 143 advises that a wreath be hung over the hearth on every Kalends, Ides, and Nones of a month, as well as on holidays. Garlands are in fact found painted on many household shrines in Pompeii; they are perpetually verdant ornaments (Jashemski 1979, 118; Orr 1973, 120-121).

³⁵Private birthdays: Mart. 10.24; Tib. 2.2, 3.12; public holidays: Ov. Fast. 4.08-411, 6. 307-318; Var. L. 6.14 describes priestesses of Liber selling cakes to be sacrificed at their portable braziers located throughout the city on the festival of the Liberalia.

to extinguish the living flame.³⁶ Cold or ruined hearths completely devoid of a spark meant empty, lifeless houses with dead or absent family members.³⁷ On the day of the dead when the spirits of ancestors were honored, no fires on hearths were allowed because fire equaled life, and the dead could not 'coexist' with the living. The dead ate their food cold and in perpetual shadow, not in the warm light of a crackling hearth.³⁸

Active hearths and braziers furnished constant heat during the cold months of winter. Tibullus depicts a rustic individual "piling large logs upon the blazing hearth", providing welcome warmth for dinner on a winter day short of light.³⁹ Varro claims that in times past, winter meals were taken around the hearth and summer meals were taken in the open:

In winter and on cold (days), people used to eat at the hearth; in summer-time they would eat in an uncovered place: the *chorte* (enclosed yard) in the country, and the *tabulinum* in the city, which we are able to understand was a verandah constructed of planks.⁴⁰

Wood on a winter hearth provided more ambient heat than charcoal could.⁴¹ However, charcoal (whether on a fixed stove or portable brazier) was better for cooking because it gave off less smoke, and the temperature of the fire was more easily controlled.⁴²

³⁶Juv. 15.72-93; Luc. 2.126-129; Sen. *Thy.* 60-62, 145-146, 767-770. Liv. 45.16.5 reports an incident in which blood was said to have seeped from a hearth for a number of days. The portent was deemed so horrible that the entire city of Rome had to be purified.

³⁷Ov. *Tr.* 1.3.40-45: On Ovid's night of exile from Italy, his hearth is *extinctus*, and the Lares and Penates cannot aid him; the fire is out, and the Genius of the household is gone. [Quint] *Decl.* 12.13.16-18 describes terrible, widespread death (from famine) in terms of hearth fires being injured and extinguished by fallen cadavers.

³⁸Ov. *Fast.* 2.563-566, referring to Feb. 21st: *Di quoque templorum foribus celentur opertis, ture vacent arae, stentque sine igne foci. Nunc animae tenues et corpora functa sepulchris errant, nunc posito pascitur umbra cibo* (Teubner text).

³⁹Tib. 2.1.22: *ingeret ardenti grandia ligna foco* (Loeb text). See also Hor. *Carm.* 1.9; Pers. 6.1.

⁴⁰Var. *Vita Populi Romani*, frg. 29 (Non. p. 83M): *ad focum hieme ac frigoribus cenitabant; aestivo tempore in loco propatulo: rure in chorte; in urbe in tabulino, quod maenianum possumus intellegere tabulis fabricatum* (Lindsay 1964 text, author's translation). See Marquardt I, 258, n.3 for an assessment of the etymology of *tablinum* given in this passage, and also Mau 1908, 257. Pomp. Porph. Hor. *Carm.* 3.17.13-16 agrees that country folk took their winter meals around the hearth after their work was done, citing Verg. *G.* 1.371, *Ecl.* 5.70 as supporting evidence.

⁴¹For wood as the fuel for a *focus*, see: Mart. 1.49, 3.58, 8.40, 9.61; Ov. *Fast.* 4.741; Ov. *Nux* 177; Plin. *Nat.* 12.81; Tib. 2.1.21; Var. *L.* 6.66; Var. *R.* 1.15; Verg. *Ecl.* 7.48, *G.* 1.174, 3.377. Stoves and ovens also used wood, often in the form of branches and sticks (*cremia*): Cato, *Agr.* 37; Col. 12.19.3. Plin. *Nat.* 19.18 also claims that the discarded hulls of flax make good tinder for ovens.

⁴²Plin. *Nat.* 35.89.6 is the only written source that describes the type of fuel on a *foculus*; it is *extincto carbo*, or charcoal. However, Cato, *Agr.* 38.4 and Plin. *Nat.* 16.23 both discuss the production of charcoal as fuel for larger stoves and kilns. Archaeological sources are clear; braziers and stoves at Pompeii were often found with charcoal intact on their top surface, signs of their recent use (Salza Prina Ricotti 1978/80, 240).

The brazier was generally smaller and more convenient than a fixed hearth.⁴³ It was portable and could be carried wherever it was needed. Braziers or cooking stands were the most common cooking devices in small or poor households without kitchens, but were also found in larger, more elite residences with their own fixed kitchens. Martial describes the move of a poor family, thrown out of their apartment for not paying rent:

There went along a three-legged truckle bed and a two-legged table, and, alongside a lantern and bowl of cornel, a cracked chamberpot was making water through its broken side; the neck of a flagon was lying under a brazier (*focus*) green with verdigris.⁴⁴

Martial uses *focus* to describe a bronze brazier, but the diminutives *foculus* and *foculare* were more common.⁴⁵ A *foculus* may also describe a portable altar, akin to a miniature brazier, on which offerings and libations were consumed during public (and perhaps private) ritual.⁴⁶

Furnus / fornax, fornacula

These words are etymologically related, and refer to a structure constructed for the purpose of attaining high temperatures that can be sustained for an extended period of time. It was generally cylindrical in shape with a domed or conical roof, and closed off except for small openings. The openings are used to insert raw material and fuel, to remove the cooked product and ashes, and to allow smoke to escape.⁴⁷ Any of these terms may mean oven, furnace, forge, bath furnace or kiln (the latter two are sometimes called *prae-furnium*). The meaning of each varies according to the nature of the different materials (e.g. dough, limestone or metals), cooked in the structure.

Furnus tends to designate an oven used to bake bread and bakery goods, whether in a commercial bakery or a private house. According to Seneca, quoting Posidonius, the baking of bread was originally done simply in a fire or under a ceramic baking cover (such as the *clibanus*

⁴³Literary sources say little about the material, form or construction of hearths, with the exception of the "grassy" or "turf-built" hearths (*graminei foci*) in the army camps of Luc. 4.199.

⁴⁴Mart. 12.32.11-14: *Ibat tripes grabatus et bipes mensa et cum lucerna corneoque cratere matella curto rupta latere meiebat; foco virenti suberat amphorae cervix* (Loeb text and translation). See also Juv. 3.261-263, in which poor folk puff on the *foculus* to start the fire.

⁴⁵See Cat. Agr. 10.3 & 11.4 for inventories of proper equipment needed to run an oliveyard and a vineyard respectively; each list contains two braziers (*foculos*), on which the slaves and overseers presumably cook their daily meals.

⁴⁶Cic. Dom. 123-125; Var. L. 6.14; Plin. Nat. 22.11. For miniature braziers used as altars, see chapter one, p. 19, n. 66).

⁴⁷Fulvio 1879, Daremberg & Saglio, s.v. "Furnus" and "Fornax", Mayeske 1972, 23-25 and Frayn 1978 are the primary sources that discuss these terms and their archaeological manifestations. A lime-kiln is built in room (s) of the Casa del Sacello Iliaco, I.6.4; see Fig. 5.52.

or *testum*, see chapter one, p. 19-20). Eventually the development of built masonry structures allowed more consistent temperatures and a greater volume of baked bread to be achieved:

At first bread was cooked by warm ashes and a hot tile; then ovens (*furni*) were gradually developed along with other devices, whose heat could be subject to regulation.⁴⁸

Ovid sets the evolution of baking technology in a ritual context connected to the celebration of the *Fornacalia*, the Roman baking festival held in early February:

Taught by experience they (the ancients) toasted the spelt on the fire, and many losses they incurred through their own fault. For at one time they would sweep up the black ashes instead of spelt, and at another time the fire caught the huts themselves. So they made the oven into a goddess of that name (*Fornax*); delighted with her, the farmers prayed that she would temper the heat to the corn committed to her charge.⁴⁹

Frayn claims the *fornax* was "the large oven used for baking the grain after it had been harvested, to improve its keeping qualities and to dry it so that it was easier to grind", but this definition is too narrow.⁵⁰ A drying oven was needed only in the case of husked varieties of wheat such as *triticum dicoccum* and *triticum spelta*, and these products were generally not baked into bread, but made into porridge.⁵¹ It was naked wheat such as *triticum vulgare* and *triticum durum* that were ground into fine flour and baked into breads.⁵² Ovens were suitable for drying as well as cooking foods; no simple dichotomy that assigns 'drying' to *fornax* and 'cooking' to *furnus* can be supported.⁵³ By the first century A.D., *furnus* was the primary term for an oven and *fornax* was a suitable synonym.

Other foods besides bread were cooked in a *furnus*; it is in fact the term most commonly used for a heating appliance in the cookbook attributed to Apicius. Peas, sweet cakes, chicken, various sorts of birds, sow's udder, kidneys, ham, boar, kid, lamb, piglet, hare and fish can all be

⁴⁸Sen. Ep. 90.23: ...panem, quem primo cinis calidus et fervens testa percoxit, deinde furni paulatim reperti et alia genera quorum fervor serviret arbitrio (Loeb text, Cubberley et al. 1988 translation).

⁴⁹Ov. Fast. 2.521-526: Usibus admoniti flammis torrenda dederunt multaque peccato damna tulere suo. Nam modo verrebant nigras pro farre favillas, nunc ipsas ignes corripuere casas; facta dea est Fornax: laeti Fornace coloni orant, ut fruges temperet illa suas (Loeb text and translation). The jurist Labeo, as quoted in Fest. p. 253M, defines the Fornacalia as a holiday universal to all Romans, and not attributable to certain important families. The common need for bread by all citizens might have precluded the control of the festival by any single elite group.

⁵⁰Frayn 1978, 30.

⁵¹Mayeske 1972, 31-33.

⁵²Mayeske 1972, 34-42.

⁵³Columella, in his discussion of preserving wine, uses the term *furnus* to describe the drying of herbs and spices that will be used to flavor and preserve the wine (Col. 12.21.3, 12.28.1) and the term *fornax* to describe the process of boiling down the must (Col. 12.19.3, 12.20.2).

baked or roasted in a *furnus*, according to the instructions.⁵⁴ The variety of foods implies that *furnus* may also have been applied to a stove of the simple counter type, on top of which cooking fires were built. The diminutive *fornacula*, appearing rarely in the sources, has no association with cooking food. It is twice used to describe a bath-furnace, and another time a cremation chamber.⁵⁵ Sources do not describe in any detail the location of a cooking oven or furnace in the house. Columella advises only to place a villa wine-cellar far away from the baths, oven (*furnus*), manure pile, cistern, and other places that ruin wine with smell, moisture, or excessive heat.⁵⁶

C a m i n u s

No source explicitly connects the *caminus* to the cooking of food, despite Frayn's opinion to the contrary.⁵⁷ *Caminus*, derived from the Greek *kāminow*, is in fact most often used to describe a place to heat metal, and thus is a synonym for *fornax*.⁵⁸ In a domestic context, the term is commonly translated as "stove", primarily in the sense that a stove provides heat.⁵⁹ Food preparation is merely implied in three passages. In the first instance, Horace and his companions are brought to tears by the smoke from a *caminus* in a farmstead where they are housed (and presumably fed). Secondly, a *caminus* sets fire to Vitellius' army camp dining room in the January cold of Germany.⁶⁰ Finally, a "vaulted fireplace" (*arcuatili camino*) is described in a winter dining room by Sidonius, but there is no specific mention of any cooking.⁶¹ *Caminus* cannot, in sum, be accepted as a common Roman term for a cooking installation.

⁵⁴Furnus appears twenty-five times in Apicius: 5.3.2, 5.4.6, 6.5.6, 7.2.1, 7.4.1-2, 7.5.1, 7.9.1, 7.10, 7.13.2, 8.1.1, 8.1.3, 8.6.8-10, 8.7.1, 8.7.5, 8.7.7-9, 8.7.14, 8.8.1, 8.8.3, 8.8.12, 10.1.4.

⁵⁵Char. *Ars Grammatica* I.92.95 defines *fornacula* merely as the diminutive of *fornax*. It is a bath furnace in Fro. *Aur.* 1.3.5 and Vit. 7.10.2, and Juv. 10.82 cleverly remarks that a *magna fornacula* is ready for all those who are about to be killed at the Games.

⁵⁶Col. 1.6.11.

⁵⁷Frayn 1978, 28: "*Caminus* could also in some contexts indicate a closed-flame stove with one aperture on the top for the cooking-vessel, and one at the side for stoking the fire. This must have developed from the raised hearth, but is quite different from it." There is absolutely no evidence for such a definition. See Daremberg & Saglio, s.v. "*Caminus*" for a more realistic assessment for the meaning and use of the term.

⁵⁸Serv. A. 3.580 defines the term simply: *Caminus fornacibus graece dixit* (Thilo & Hagen 1961 text). Man. 4.250-251 opposes *caminus* (to describe a metal forge) and *focus* (to describe a cooking-fire) when he speaks of the powers of fire that Vesta possesses: *Quod ferrum calidi solvant atque aera camini consummentque foci Cererem, tua munera surgent* (Loeb text).

⁵⁹Cic. *Fam.* 7.10.2; Cato, *Agr.* 37.5 advises bundling vines and sticks for use as fuel in the *caminus* as work to be done in wintertime, when a heat source was necessary in the home. See also Hor. *Ep.* 1.11.11-20.

⁶⁰Hor. *S.* 1.5.79-81; Suet. *Vit.* 8.2. The use of *oleum* in the metaphor "to add fuel to the fire" (*oleum adde camino*) of Hor. *S.* 2.3.321 cannot necessarily be taken to mean that a cooking context is understood.

⁶¹Sidon. *Ep.* 2.2.11.

Culina

In an architectural sense, *culina* can be defined as the kitchen, a specific room or area of the house where cooking was meant to be carried out on a regular basis. A Roman kitchen could have contained any of the stoves, hearths, ovens and baking covers listed above. Kitchens usually appear as a separate room only in houses large enough to be subdivided into functionally-defined spaces (see chapter one above, pp. 38-39).⁶² In smaller homes, general-purpose living areas included cooking amongst their other activities. Literary evidence for the location of cooking areas is scarce and often fragmentary. The sources describe traditions of all periods, and it is clear that no single location in the house was customary or even proper for a hearth or a kitchen. The locations in the Roman house where written sources do mention cooking (whether at a *focus* or in a *culina*) fall into four basic categories: 1) the entrance or threshold to the house from the street (the *vestibulum* or *limen*), 2) the court of the *atrium*, 3) the back part of the house (*posticum*) next to the latrine, storage and stable areas, 4) inside a dining room.

In vestibulo Ovid states that the hearth (the location where meals were eaten) was once in the front part (*in primis aedibus*) of the house:

Formerly it [the hearth] stood in the first room of the house. Hence too, I am of the opinion that the vestibule took its name; it is from there that in praying we begin by addressing Vesta, who occupies the first place: it used to be the custom of old to sit on long benches in front of the hearth and to suppose that the gods were present at table.⁶³

In the architecture of Roman atrium-houses, the *vestibulum* generally means the space directly in front of the actual threshold of the house, sometimes sheltered by a porch or provided with masonry benches for those waiting to be invited inside the house.⁶⁴ We cannot assume that

⁶²For the Mediterranean in general, Scheffer 1981, 94 claims: "Before this time [5th-4th centuries B.C.], it cannot have been at all usual to adapt a specific room in the house as the kitchen". Salza Prina Ricotti 1978/80, 247-248 posits a second century B.C. date for the appearance of the Roman kitchen. This date may be pushed back to perhaps the turn of the third century on the evidence of the word *culina* appearing in the Plautine plays *Cas.* 764, *Mos.* 1, *Per.* 631 and *Truc.* 615, in which the word has a clear sense of its own defined space within a house. It is possible, of course, that those mentions of kitchens were simply translations from the original Greek versions of the plays. Fixed kitchens were a feature of some houses in Classical and Hellenistic cities such as Olynthus, Halieis, Eretria and Morgantina, although fixed hearths are not necessarily present in those kitchens. Most Greek cooking appears to have been done with portable braziers and cooking stands (Sparkes 1962; Scheffer 1981, 92-96; Robinson & Graham 1938, 185-197; Ault 1993, 10-11; Ducrey 1991, 27; Tsakirgis 1984, 385-386).

⁶³Ov. *Fast.* 6.302-306: *...qui tamen in primis aedibus ante fuit. Hinc quoque vestibulum dici reor, inde precando praefamur Vestam, quae loca prima tenet. Ante focus olim scamnis considerare longis mos erat et mensae credere adesse deos* (Tuebner text, Loeb translation).

⁶⁴Masonry benches flanking the entrances of houses are present in the following examples from the archaeological sample: I.6.15, I.7.10-12, I.8.17+11, I.10.4, I.10.7, I.10.8, I.10.11, I.10.18. See Förtsch 1993, 127-134; Allison 1992b, 41; Adam 1984, 318-321; McKay 1975, 271. Serv. A. 2.469 defines the *vestibulum* as the first part of the door (*prima ianuae pars*), and offers two etymologies: 1) the vestibule "clothes" (*vestiat*) the door with its two supporting columns (for the porch), or 2) the vestibule is sacred to Vesta (goddess of the hearth) and that is why married girls cannot touch the threshold upon entering the house.

Ovid, in referring to an ill-defined past, had in mind an atrium house type. But the idea that a hearth was located at the entrance of the house makes sense in light of a passage in the *Eclogues*: "Here is the hearth and thick pieces of pine, here ever a roaring fire, and the doorposts constantly black with soot."⁶⁵ Cooking in one's doorway was evidently thought an ancient custom. It was probably common enough amongst the poorer residents of (work)shops in the Imperial period, where the only ventilation available for a cooking-fire was the front door, upon which smoke traces would have been left. Cooking on the street is still practiced in parts of the Mediterranean such as Tunisia, where terracotta and metal braziers contain the fire.⁶⁶ Varro, immediately after describing the porter's lodge next to the front door of a country villa, gives reasons for placing the kitchen at the front of the house (*in primis [aedibus]*):

It should be seen to that the kitchen be moved to the front part of the house, because in wintertime several things must be done there before dawn; food must be prepared and eaten.⁶⁷

Collecting, preparing and eating food requires a convenient location; those leaving the villa in the morning to work in the fields are able to pick up their breakfast as they walk out the door.

In atrio Servius claims that in times past, Romans ate and cooked their meals in the atrium, and the effect of the kitchen-fire smoke lent its name to that space:

For as Cato said, the ancients used to feast on two courses in the atrium, whence Juvenal remarked: "what ancestor of ours ate seven courses in solitude?"...And the kitchen was there, whence the atrium was so-called, because it was black (*atrum*) from the smoke.⁶⁸

⁶⁵Verg. *Ecl.* 7.49-50: *Hic focus et taedae pingues, hic plurimus ignis semper, et adsidua postes fuligine nigri* (Loeb text, author's translation).

⁶⁶Modern terracotta braziers in Tunisia retain the basic form of types documented for the Hellenistic and Roman periods (see Scheffer 1981, 84-89). Jashemski 1993b and Scheffer 1981, 96-103 have argued strongly for the importance of cooking outside one's doors in the Mediterranean.

⁶⁷Var. *R.* 1.13.2: *in primis culina videnda ut sit admota, quod ibi hieme antelucanis temporibus aliquot res conficiuntur, cibus paratur ac capitur* (Loeb text, author's translation).

⁶⁸Serv. *A.* 1.726: *Nam ut ait Cato et in atrio et duobus ferculis epulabantur antiqui: unde ait Iuvenalis [1.94-95] quis fercula septem secreto cenavit avus?...Ibi et culina erat: unde et atrium dictum est; atrum enim erat ex fumo* (Thilo & Hagen 1961 text, author's translation).

This fourth century A.D. quote is the only specific evidence for cooking in the atrium, and its reasoning is based upon a contested etymology.⁶⁹ Most modern scholars have nevertheless assumed that the hearth of the archaic Roman house was commonly located in the atrium.⁷⁰ L. Richardson, Jr. has expressed a different view: "the latrine, like the kitchen and stables, had no place in the atrium complex" at Pompeii or elsewhere.⁷¹

Allison has taken the presence of a hearth in the atrium of I.6.13 and a brazier in the peristyle of I.10.11 to mean that both of these areas had been 'downgraded' in terms of their presentation and consequently their importance (presumably because slaves were doing the cooking).⁷² She presumes that atria and peristyles intended for formal display were devoid of utilitarian objects and installations. Berry has demonstrated, however, that these areas were in fact the centers of domestic (as well as social) life, and that in some houses, cooking was an integral part of that life.⁷³ The atria of some houses did contain hearths or kitchens, as the archaeological data will affirm, but the atrium was by no means the only or most common location for the hearth in either the Republican or Imperial periods.

In postico Varro, as quoted by Nonius, reports that the kitchen was located in the back part of the house (*in postica parte*):

At either end would be the front and the back [parts of the house]. In the back part was the kitchen (*culina*), so-called because people were fostering (*colebant*) the fire there. Houses of the wealthy will have been crowded more than poor, cramped properties, the authorities themselves explain.⁷⁴

The location of the kitchen is clear, but the meaning of the last, difficult sentence is not. It may imply that the kitchen was placed in the back of the house because the front parts (of rich houses) were particularly crowded with free and slave members of the household, or with clients and

⁶⁹Var. L. 5.161 (reported also by Serv. A. 1.726) argues that atrium takes its name from the Etruscan town of Atria, whence the architectural model supposedly came: *Atrium appellatum ab Atriatibus Tuscis: illinc enim exemplum sumptum* (Loeb text).

⁷⁰Marquardt I, 256-259; McKay 1975, 21; Salza Prina Ricotti 1978/80, 248. Carandini 1990 reconstructs a hearth in one ala of a fragmentary 6th-3rd c. B.C. house on the slopes of the Palatine on the basis of an actual hearth found in analogous position in an adjacent house. Scheffer 1981, 94-95 argues that hearths found in the atria of Etruscan houses at Acquarossa and Veii cannot securely be identified as having been used for cooking rather than heating, but these two functions are not mutually exclusive.

⁷¹Richardson 1988a, 384.

⁷²Allison 1992b, 253-254, 259 (I.6.13); 227-228 (I.10.11).

⁷³Berry 1994, based on the concentrations of domestic utensils and goods found in the atria, courts, and peristyles of insula I.9 (as documented in Berry 1993).

⁷⁴Var. *Vita Populi Romani*, frg. 28 (Non. p. 55M): *qua fini sit antica et postica. In postica parte erat culina, dicta ab eo quod ibi colebant ignem. Locupletiorum domus quam fuerint angustis paupertinis coactae, ipsa nomina declarant* (Lindsay 1964 text, author's translation).

friends come for business. Elsewhere, Varro places the kitchen at the front of a country villa (see above, p. 70). The apparent contradiction may indicate the variety of locations allowed a kitchen, depending on the season, the location (town or country), or size of the house. The *culina* is understood not as a fixed area in the house, but merely wherever the cooking is done (*quod ibi colebant ignem*).

The association of the kitchen with other service areas of the house is a better indication of where cooking is done. Lucilius states: "Situated nearby is a mill, a *posticum*, a storeroom and a kitchen".⁷⁵ In this fragmentary context, *posticum* may mean the 'back part of a house', the 'back door' or the 'back-house' (latrine). Varro implies that the kitchen is proximate to the latrine when he mentions the gutter that drains kitchen water into the privy.⁷⁶ Writers who describe country steadings (*villae rusticae*) explain the location of the kitchen relevant to other parts of the farm such as stables, chicken coops, storage cellars, oil-presses and baths.⁷⁷

Sources mention both cooking and eating in the *atrium* or *vestibulum*, but rarely associate eating with kitchens at the back of the house.⁷⁸ Columella suggests, however, that a kitchen in a *villa rustica* should be spacious, in order that it "may offer a convenient stopping-place for the slave household at every season of the year".⁷⁹ One reason for slaves to gather in the kitchen may have been eating. So Plautus implies when he has a slave dryly describe a kitchen as a good place to get tasty treats. In the *Persa*, a pimp questions a young woman whom he is intent on purchasing for prostitution:

DORDALUS the pimp: Where were you born?
 VIRGO, the maiden: As my mother told me, in the kitchen, the left-hand corner.
 TOXILUS, the slave: (to the pimp) She will be a lucky harlot for you; she was
 born in a warm place, where there are usually plenty of all good things (to eat)!⁸⁰

⁷⁵Lucil. 8.326 (Non. p. 217M): *pistrinum adpositum, posticum, cella, culina* (Loeb text, author's translation).

⁷⁶Var. L. 5.118. See below, p. 74, n. 89.

⁷⁷Var. R. 1.13.6: "In those days, a steading was praised if it had a good kitchen, roomy stables, and cellars for wine and oil in proportion to the size of the farm"; *Illic laudabatur villa, si habebat culinam rusticam bonam, praesepe laxas, cellam vinariam et oleariam ad modum agri aptam* (Loeb text and translation). Col. 8.3.1-2 and Vitruv. 6.6.1-2, 6.6.4 explain the beneficial or detrimental effects of kitchen heat and smoke on cattle, horses and chickens.

⁷⁸The archaeological evidence offers examples of cooking and dining in a back garden or court of a house, particularly around a set of outdoor dining couches. See I.10.7 in the study sample. See also the houses I.13.2 (CTP IIIA, 24-25, Fröhlich 1991, 261, with refs.); I.14.2 (CTP IIIA, 26-27, Jashemski 1979, 94-97).

⁷⁹Col. 1.6.3: *At in rustica parte magna et alta culina ponetur, ut et contignatio careat incendii periculo et in ea commode familiares omni tempore anni morari queant* (Loeb text and translation).

⁸⁰Pl. *Per.* 630-635: *DO. Ubi ubi tu nata es? VI. Ut mihi mater dixit, in culina, in angulo ad laevam manum. TO. Haec erit tibi fausta meretrix: natast in calido loco, ubi rerum omnium bonarum copias saepissima* (OCT text, author's translation). Var. *Men.* frg. 260 (Non. 237M) describes someone eating in a kitchen, but the context is unclear: "having nourishment set before him/her, sitting high at another's expense, neither looking behind nor looking forward, but [looking] sidelong within the limits of the kitchen"; *habens antepositam alimoniam, sedens altus alieno sumptu, neque post respiciens neque ante prospiciens, sed limus intra limites culinae* (Ibycus text, author's translation).

Rustics and Romans of the past are said to have both cooked and eaten in common areas (*vestibulum* and *atrium*) near the front of the house. When spatially distinct kitchens appear (ca. the turn of the second century B.C.), only slaves are mentioned eating there; masters and guests dine in a dining room. Cooking and eating are re-acquainted for masters and guests only in the Imperial period, when cooking is reported in dining rooms.

In the dining room Seneca reports that it was current fashion to move the kitchen (consisting of the kitchen staff, the cooking equipment and the cooking itself) right into the dining room. In describing a friend who is sick and cannot attend his customary dinners, he remarks:

'Such an unfortunate sickness,' people say. Why?... Because there is no bustling of cooks about the dining room, bringing in the very fire-places along with the food? For these days, this is considered luxury: the kitchen accompanies the dinner so that no food cools off and becomes insufficiently scalding for today's callused palates. 'Such an unfortunate sickness,' they say. Well, he'll be eating just as much as he digests.⁸¹

Seneca is referring to portable metal braziers, normally called *foculi* or *foculares*, that could be carried into a dining room to cook the food or keep it warm.⁸² Seneca uses the word *focus* (normally used to describe a fixed hearth), perhaps because he is arguing against excess at table, and the image of tearing up a fixed hearth and carrying it into the dining room is more shocking and vivid than a common scene of bringing in a brazier.

Juvenal describes the throng of clients that visit the houses of their patrons every day, each with his own portable kitchen on the back of a slave:

Surely you see with how much smoke the give-away is being practiced? There are a hundred guests; a personal kitchen follows each one. Even Corbulo could hardly carry so many huge vessels, so much stuff laid upon the head, as that which a miserable little slave bears with head straight, fanning the flame as he trots behind.⁸³

By using the word *culina* to describe the portable brazier that the slave carries to heat the daily *sportula* offered by patron to client, Juvenal comically exaggerates the load of the slave, and

⁸¹Sen. Ep. 78.23: 'O infelicem aegrum!' Quare?...Quia non circa cenationem eius tumultus cocorum est ipsos cum opsoniis focus transferentium? Hoc enim iam luxuria commenta est: ne quis intepescat cibus, ne quid palato iam calloso parum ferveat, cenam culina prosequitur 'O infelicem aegrum!' Edet quantum concoquat (Loeb text, author's translation).

⁸²Suet. Vit. 8.2 repeats a story that a stove (*caminus*) set fire to Vitellius' dining room at his camp headquarters. It is not clear if the stove was intended for cooking, heating or both, because the scene of this passage takes place in Germany at the beginning of January.

⁸³Juv. 3.249-253: Nonne vides quanto celebretur sportula fumo? Centum convivae, sequitur sua quemque culina. Corbulo vix ferret tot vasa ingentia, tot res inpositas capiti, quas recto vertice portat servulus infelix et cursu ventilat ignem (Loeb text, author's translation).

ridicules the social system that encourages patrons to act like kings, clients to act like slaves, and slaves to act like mules. The literary sources may be biased against picturing cooking in the dining room because cooking in elite households was done by slaves, and slaves were generally not worth discussing unless they were part of a philosophical, moral, social or political point.

Water, drainage, fires and smoke

Cooking procedures required substantial quantities of water for cooking, cleaning, and cutting the wine served at table. Water sources for Pompeian houses fall into four categories: 1) a private well, 2) water gathered from the roof and stored in cisterns underneath the house, 3) water piped into the house via a public aqueduct, and 4) water carried by hand from a local public fountain (itself supplied by the aqueduct).⁸⁴ Houses with atria and peristyles had a greater opportunity to gather water from their roofs, while small shop-houses used public fountains. Private water lines from the city's water-towers were not necessarily restricted to the richest households, but were usually unavailable to the poorest, unless they were attached illegally. Frontinus speaks of illegal aqueduct connections to the smallest and poorest of homes: "We have found irrigated fields, shops, garrets even, and lastly all disorderly houses fitted up with fixtures through which a constant supply of flowing water might be assured."⁸⁵ At Herculaneum, twelve houses had conduit pipes connected to the aqueduct; these include large houses like the Casa dell'Atrio a Mosaico (IV.1-2), but no shop-houses or houses smaller than the Casa Sannitica (V.1-2).⁸⁶ The situation at Pompeii is not as well-known because no consistent excavation and publication of private water lines has been carried out. It is therefore not possible to draw any firm connections between a private piped water supply and the socio-economic status of households at Pompeii.

For the disposal of waste water, some kitchens with paved floors were equipped with holes in the base of a wall that served as drains. Sometimes the floor itself was sloped so as to channel waste water over the floor to wash it at the end of the day.⁸⁷ The drain itself led either directly to the open street outside or to a small sewer under the sidewalk.⁸⁸ Kitchen drains

⁸⁴Wells were not common at Pompeii because of the great depth (20-35 m.) of the watertable. Water collected in cisterns from the roof was the most common method of water retrieval until construction of the Augustan aqueduct. For water systems at Pompeii, see Laurence 1994, 42-50; Crouch 1993, 176-189; Jansen 1991; Andersson 1990; Scobie 1986, 422-424; Larsen 1982; Eschebach 1979b, c, 1982; Mygind 1917.

⁸⁵Fron. Aq. 1.76.2: *inriguos agros, tabernas, cenacula etiam, corruptelas denique omnes perpetius salientibus instructas invenimus* (Loeb text and translation).

⁸⁶Jansen 1991, 154-155.

⁸⁷Salza Prina Ricotti 1978/80, 244-246.

⁸⁸The nature and extent of the city-wide drainage and sewer system of Pompeii has not been thoroughly investigated (Mygind 1921, 270; Scobie 1986, 400 n. 4 with refs.), but see Crouch 1993, 186-188 for a useful general summary.

(*trueae*) at Pompeii were rarely routed through the latrine to 'flush' it out on the way to the street.⁸⁹ Most Pompeian latrines consisted of cesspits dug into the tufa bedrock, and were not connected to the house or municipal sewer systems.⁹⁰ A cesspit could serve as a kitchen drain because the tufa was porous and allowed liquids to drain, leaving the solid waste to be cleaned out periodically. Romans had a legal right to connect their private sewer system to the municipal system, provided that they obtained proper permission and acted responsibly in keeping their connection to the municipal system clean.⁹¹ Few households, however, took advantage of this right for a number of possible reasons. First, human waste was valuable as fertilizer (it was collected by individuals called *stercorarii*), and urine was recycled for use in fulleries. Second, without proper traps, dangerous gases could build up in the municipal system and be forced into private homes. Finally, sewage and any vermin that lived therein could wash back up into a house through its private line.⁹² In small houses, apartments and (work)shops that had neither a sewer connection nor a private cesspit/latrine, waste water was simply collected in basins or pots and tossed into the street.⁹³

Householders took precautions to safely control their cooking fires. The tile covering of stoves, hearths and ovens or the use of metal braziers served to contain heat and reduce the risk of a dangerous blaze. Fire was an ever-present threat not just to single homes, but to the whole urban area.⁹⁴ The early third century A.D. jurist Ulpian considers liability in such cases:

If you have an oven (*furnus*) against a party wall will you be liable for wrongful damage? Proculus says there can be no action because there is no similar liability on the part of a man who has a fireplace (*focus*), but I think it would be fairer for an *actio in factum* to be given if perchance the wall were burned down. On the other hand, if you have not yet done me any damage, but you have such a fire

⁸⁹Var. L. 5.118: "A gutter is that by which they pour the water from the kitchen into the privy." *truea[e] qu<a>e culina in lavatrinam aquam fundunt* (Loeb text and translation).

⁹⁰Scobie 1986, 407-412 and Jansen 1991 detail the problem of latrines in Roman houses.

⁹¹Ulp. and Ven. dig. 43.23 (see Scobie 1986, 408-409). See Rodger 1972, 141-166 for a discussion of the problems of one property's drainage damaging another property.

⁹²Scobie 1986, 411-414 discusses the hazards of drainage systems.

⁹³Juv. 3.276-277 complains of being drenched with waste water from upper-story apartments; various jurists (dig. 9.3) address legal recourse for victims of such unfortunate circumstance.

⁹⁴Col. 1.6.3 instructs the reader to build a kitchen with high ceilings, in order to keep the rafters far from the risk of fire; Hor. S. 1.5.71-76 humorously describes the panic that might ensue when a kitchen fire happens: "Then we go straight to Beneventum, where a diligent host nearly burns his place down while cooking bony thrushes. For through his old kitchen, a vagrant flame veered, from a fallen volcano of logs, mounting high to lick the roof. Hungry guests, terrified slaves snatch the food to safety, everyone tries to put the fire out - quite a scene."; *Tendimus hinc recta Beneventum, ubi sedulus hospes paene macros arsit dum turdos versat in igni. Nam vaga per veterem dilapso flamma culinam Vulcano summum properabat lambere tectum. Convivas avidos cenam servosque timentis tum rapere atque omnis restinguere velle videres* (OCT text, Fuchs 1977 translation).

that I fear that you will cause me damage, I think your giving security against threatened damage should suffice.⁹⁵

The mere potential of a fire, based on the location of a person's oven (it is not clear if the *furnus* is for bath, industrial, or kitchen use, but it presumably does not matter) is enough to warrant security against damage. In addition, Ulpian makes a distinction between a *furnus* and a *focus*. While Proculus' original opinion legally equates a *focus* and a *furnus* as simply being locations where a live fire is kept, Ulpian seems to think that a *furnus*, with its larger size and greater heat output, offers a greater danger that deserves additional security.

Fire produced smoke, and smoke was an inconvenience for both residents and neighbors. The use of charcoal reduced, but did not eliminate, the need for ventilation. Windows and doors provided some venting, especially if a kitchen was adjacent to the street or an open area such as a peristyle or garden. A few kitchens were provided with built chimneys or pierced tiles to allow smoke to escape through the roof.⁹⁶ The fumes had simply to be endured; there were no legal precepts regulating smoke from private property:

A doubt is raised by Pomponius in the forty-first book of his *Readings*, as to whether a man can bring an action alleging that he has a right or that another has no right to create a moderate amount of smoke on his own premises, for example, smoke from a hearth (*ex foco*). He says that the better opinion is that such an action cannot be brought, just as an action cannot be brought to maintain that one has a right to light a fire or wash on one's own land.⁹⁷

⁹⁵Ulp. dig. 9.2.27.10: *Si furnum secundum parietem communem haberes, an damni iniuria tenearis? Et ait Proculus agi non posse, quia nec cum eo qui focum haberet: et ideo aequius puto in factum actionem dandam, scilicet si paries exustus sit: sin autem nondum mihi damnum dederis, sed ita ignem habeas, ut metuam, ne mihi damnum des, damni infecti puto sufficere cautionem* (Watson 1985 text and translation).

⁹⁶Salza Prina Ricotti 1978/80, 253-256. For example, perforated roof-tiles were found stored in garden (23) of the Casa del Efebo (I.7.10-12)(PPM I, 712, fig. 163). A pierced roof tile probably belonged to the small shed roof over the stove of kitchen (5) in Casa I.10.1. The roof tile now rests on top of the stove.

⁹⁷Ulp. dig. 8.5.8.6: *Apud Pomponium dubitatur libro quadragensimo primo lectionum, an quis possit ita agere licere fumum non gravem, puta ex foco, in suo facere aut non licere. Et ait magis non posse agi, sicut agi non potest ius esse in suo ignem facere aut sedere aut lavere* (Watson 1985 text and translation).

Authors constantly complain about smoke from kitchens and hearths, and a favorite epithet for a kitchen is "black with soot" (*nigram*).⁹⁸ Smoke was useful only when it preserved and flavored meat or cheese hung in the rafters above the fire.⁹⁹

Smoke was a visible symbol of an active home. For Seneca, the amount of smoke coming from a kitchen was a moral metaphor for the status of the owner, and a sign of whether guests were present for dinner:

(Yesterday) certain friends happened along, on account of whom a greater volume of smoke was made, not the kind of fumes which customarily belch from the kitchens of grand persons and frighten the fire brigades, but the kind of moderate smoke which signifies that guests have arrived.¹⁰⁰

Seneca admits to producing more smoke on certain dinner occasions, but ironically distances himself from persons of "grand status" (of whom he is surely one) who produce entirely too much smoke, enough even to scare the *vigiles* into thinking there might be a city-wide fire. Seneca complains in another letter about the detrimental health effects of smoke pollution in the city of Rome, which he appreciates only as he leaves the city:

I expect you're keen to hear what effect it had on my health, this decision of mine to leave? Well, no sooner had I left behind the oppressive atmosphere of the city and that reek of smoking cookers which pour out, along with a cloud of ashes, all the poisonous fumes they've accumulated in their interiors whenever they're started up, then I noticed the change in my condition at once.¹⁰¹

Roman cities must often have seemed to be burning. Their kitchen, bath and industrial fires created a constant smoke-signal that marked their viability and prosperity, while at the same time threatening the population with smoke and potential urban disaster.

⁹⁸Smoke from a *focus*: Col. 11.3.60; Fro. Ver. 2.6.1; Mart. 2.90.7; Ov. *Nux* 178; Petr. 135-136; Pl. *Per.* 104; [Quint] *Decl.* 13.4.13-14; Stat. *Silv.* 4.5.13-15. Smoke in a *culina*: Mart. 1.92.9, 3.2.3, 10.66.3-4. For a *furnus*, Pomp. Porph., Hor. *Ep.* 1.11.13 remarks: "That is, we call ovens black from their black color, on account either of the soot or darkness which they have within"; *Furnos, hoc est, nigros, a nigro colore dicimus propter fuliginem vel obscuritatem, quam intus habent* (Hauthal 1864 text, author's translation). See also Hor. *S.* 1.5.80-81.

⁹⁹Smoke flavoring cheese (Mart. 13.32); smoke curing ham, bacon or sausage (Cato *Agr.* 162.3; App. Verg. *Moretum* 56-59); smoke flavoring grapes and wine (Plin. *Nat.* 14.160).

¹⁰⁰Sen. *Ep.* 64.1: *Intervenerant quidam amici propter quos maior fumus fieret, non hic qui erumpere ex lautorum culinis et terrere vigiles solet, sed hic modicus qui hospites venisse significet* (Loeb text, author's translation).

¹⁰¹Sen. *Ep.* 104.6.1-5: *Quaeris ergo quomodo mihi consilium perfectionis cesserit? Ut primum gravitatem urbis excessi et illum odorem culinarum fumantium quae motae quidquid pestiferi vaporis sorbuerunt cum pulvere effundunt, protinus mutatam valetudinem sensi* (Loeb text, R. Campbell translation).

An archaeological typology of kitchen installations

A clear picture of how cooking areas for households of all sizes were arranged and what installations they contained can come only from archaeological evidence. This typology is concerned with specific cooking installations that have been found at Pompeii, not with portable cooking equipment or the architectural spaces *per se* in which they were used. Cooking areas are too irregular in form and location to be categorized solely in terms of their architecture.

A cooking area is defined as any place where people prepare food, regardless of whether that place is architecturally defined by walls or screens. A cooking area can be permanent or transient; it may be used at certain times of the day or year, and moved around from place to place within the house. A kitchen on the other hand is defined as a specific, architecturally defined space, a room in which cooking is meant to be carried out on a regular and permanent basis. A cooking area or kitchen may be outfitted with any combination of the various types of installations listed below. The codes for the types are used on the plans of individual buildings, and in their Gazetteer entries.

Type HE	"Hearth"	Type LO	"Large Oven"
Type ST	"Stove"	Type SO	"Small Oven"

Type HE, "Hearth"

A hearth is a fixed fireplace within the house, used for cooking and/or heat. The Latin term *focus* best describes a hearth, but *focus* also has a much broader meaning and is not restricted to a fireplace. Scheffer has defined three kinds of hearths used in pre-Roman Italy: a pit dug in the ground, an area defined by a built raised edge of a material such as stone, or a low platform built of stones, ceramics and clay.¹⁰² Only the last kind of hearth is found at Pompeii. I have isolated four basic sub-types of built hearths:

Sub-type (1) The first and most common kind of hearth is a flat masonry platform 0.20-0.45 m. high, topped with a layer of tiles. The shape varies from a square to a rectangle, quarter-circle or a triangle (Figs. 2.13-2.15).¹⁰³ Fire was built directly on top of the tile surface, and pots were set directly on the coals or on cooking stands over the coals.

Sub-type (2) The second sub-type, not as common, consists of two low parallel supports of brick or masonry, 0.30-0.55 m. high and 0.40-0.75 m. apart (Fig. 2.16). A tripod was found on this kind of hearth (presumably resting on a tile that spanned the supports) in kitchen (8) of the

¹⁰²Scheffer 1981, 94 n. 298.

¹⁰³Salza Prina Ricotti 1978/80, 241-242, and figs. 6-7. Good examples from the study sample (room numbers in parentheses follow the street address) include: I.4.2 (b); I.4.5+25 (64); I.4.11 (a); I.6.13 (b) [quarter-circle]; I.7.13 (1) [quarter-circle]; I.9.12 (9); I.10.4 (41); VII.1.25+47 (12) [rectangular]; VII.14.15 (2) [triangular]; IX.2.16 (r); IX.2.17 (d).

Casa dell'Efebo (I.7.10-12).¹⁰⁴ No other cooking devices have been recovered from other examples of this sub-type in the study sample.¹⁰⁵ These hearths were generally of feeble construction and have not survived well. Flat tiles (e.g. *bipedales*) were probably laid across the supports to provide a cooking surface. Alternatively, metal spits or a grill could have been laid across the supports and food roasted over a fire built in between the supports. This type of hearth is similar to the larger stoves of sub-type (3), and the smaller 'burners' found on top of some stoves (see below, p. 81-82).

Sub-type (3) Examples of the third sub-type of hearth appear in rooms (3, 20, 34 and 54) of the Casa del Menandro (I.10.4), and nowhere else in the sample. This kind of hearth is built of masonry with exterior plaster facing in the shape of a high-backed 'chair' ca. 0.80 m. high (Fig. 2.17). The high back is connected at right angles to two 'arms' ca. 0.50 m. apart that taper down on either side of a low platform (ca. 0.10 m. high). The platform, with access left open on the front, extends forward past the arms and acts as the burning surface. Traces of burning were found on the top of the platform and the inside of the sides of these hearths; a large quantity of carbonized organic material, presumably fuel, was recovered next to the hearth in room (54). A large kitchen, several braziers and another hearth exist elsewhere in the Casa del Menandro, so it is doubtful that sub-type (3) hearths were ever used for cooking. Maiuri believed they were destined for industrial purposes; Allison sees them as a kind of makeshift heating system.¹⁰⁶

Sub-type (4) Hearths that were built into the ends of the serving counters in lunch counters and diners fall into this category. The hearth measures ca. 0.80-1.50 m. wide and 0.90-1.30 m. deep (Fig. 2.18). While there are many variations, the basic form is of horseshoe shape.¹⁰⁷ Low supports are built against the end of the serving counter and over two sides of the hearth platform. Space is therefore reserved between the supports for a fire, and the supports help keep the cooking pots or jars in place. The hearth platform (ca. 0.30-0.70 m. high) sometimes extends out from the supports to provide an additional work surface.

Type ST, "Stove"

The most common cooking installation in Pompeii is the masonry stove, always built up against a wall in the kitchen. Stoves come in a variety of sizes and manners of construction which can be divided into three basic sub-types: (1) the solid stove, (2) stove with arched under-

¹⁰⁴Allison 1992b, 274. The hearth has since disintegrated and is no longer visible.

¹⁰⁵Other examples from the study sample include: I.4.11 (a); I.6.15 (i); I.7.16 (2); I.8.13 (2); possibly also IX.1.18 (e).

¹⁰⁶See Maiuri 1958, 38, 215, figs. 88, 90; Allison 1992b, 160-161, 176-177, 183-184.

¹⁰⁷Packer 1978 illustrates a number of hearths attached to serving counters. In this study sample, extant examples include: I.4.27, I.7.8-9, I.8.15-16, I.9.4, I.9.11, I.10.2, I.10.13.

space, (3) stove with squared under-space.¹⁰⁸ All stoves were used in the same way: cooking fires were built on the top tiled surface amongst the ashes and pots, alone or on cooking stands or tripods, sat over the flames. In some houses, the features of two different sub-types of stove appear together, e.g. a stove with an arched or squared under-space combined with a stove or counter of solid masonry (Figs. 2.25-2.26).¹⁰⁹ There does not appear to be a specific Latin term for a stove; no author describes the tile-topped counter upon which cooking fires were laid. *Focus* may have been used, and perhaps *furnus* as well.

Sub-type (1) The solid stove is simply a tile-topped block-like mass of masonry, usually of a rectangular shape, ca. 1.22-3.00 m. long, 0.32-1.16 m. deep, and 0.50-0.90 m. high (Fig. 2.19).¹¹⁰

Sub-type (2) This kind of stove has its top tiled cooking surface supported by one or more masonry or brick arches. It measures ca. 0.85-3.70 m. long, 0.42-1.29 m. deep, and 0.50-0.90 m. high. The arches range from a perfect semicircle to being nearly flat, and some are even pointed or triangular in shape (Figs. 2.20-2.22, 2.27-2.28).¹¹¹ It is generally accepted that the open spaces formed by the arches beneath the stove were used for the storage of fuel.¹¹²

Sub-type (3) The third sort of stove measures ca. 0.97-2.76 m. long, 0.70-1.22 m. deep, and 0.50-0.90 m. high. It consists of a masonry, tile-topped cooking surface which is supported by two stub walls on either end, or one stub wall with the other end built into and supported by a house wall (Figs. 2.23-2.24).¹¹³ Wooden (and sometimes stone) beams span the space between the stub walls and act as architraves to hold the cooking surface up from underneath. Most stoves of this type are in a poor state of preservation, because the wooden support beams have

¹⁰⁸These types were recognized first by Fulvio 1879, 275-277, and followed by Salza Prina Ricotti 1978/80, 241-243. See also Dosi & Schnell 1986b, 84-90; Salza Prina Ricotti 1987, 118-119.

¹⁰⁹I.7.18 (e) originally had a stove with two square under-spaces side by side; the easternmost space was later blocked up solid, perhaps because the stove-surface was not being sufficiently supported on that side. IX.1.4 (b) has a single peaked arch next to a small solid stove, and I.10.4 (52) has a double-arched stove next to a large solid stove or counter space.

¹¹⁰Examples include: I.4.5+25 (42); I.4.9 (o); I.4.22 (h); I.6.4 (n); I.6.11 (8); I.7.7 (i); I.7.10-12 (7); I.8.10 (9); I.9.8 (7); I.9.10 (2); I.10.11 (16); I.10.18 (9); VII.1.38 (d); VII.1.40 (14); IX.1.6 (a); IX.1.22 (l', t); IX.1.31-32 (b); IX.2.10 (o); IX.2.17 (m); IX.2.26 (b); IX.2.27 (g).

¹¹¹Examples include [one arch]: I.4.4 (b); I.6.2 (16); I.6.7 (m); I.7.5 (c); I.8.17 (21); I.10.1 (5); I.10.7 (11); VII.1.32 (1); VII.14.9 (6); IX.1.27 (1); IX.2.18 (n); IX.2.25 (a); [two arches]: I.8.5 (13); VII.14.5 (20); IX.1.20 (x); [three arches]: I.7.1 (14); [four arches]: I.7.10.19 (l). Two triangular 'arches' support a stove in room (55) of VI.9.7, which is not in the study sample.

¹¹²Mau 1908, 266-267; Dosi & Schnell 1986b, 86; Salza Prina Ricotti 1987, 118.

¹¹³Examples include: I.6.8-9 (c); I.6.15 (i); I.7.10-12 (21); I.9.9 (4); I.10.8 (9); VII.1.27 (4); IX.2.4 (g); IX.2.7-8 (e); IX.2.19-21 (q) [three stub walls, creating an extra long stove]. See also stove (c) in the hallway of the upstairs apartment in the Casa a Graticcio (III.13) in Herculaneum.

disintegrated, leaving the top surfaces to collapse. Often only the two stub walls, or one stub wall and a slot in a nearby wall indicating the insertion of the stove surface, are preserved. Again, the rectangular space underneath the stove surface was probably used for the storage of fuel. This kind of stove is similar to, but larger than, hearths of sub-type (2).

Three additional features are found on many stoves: a tiled 'curb' that lines the edges of the stove, small 'burners' built of masonry at the back of the stove against the wall, and a vaulted 'hood' which overhangs the surface of the stove. The 'curb' that follows the front and side edges of the stove away from the walls is usually constructed of *imbrices* (the curved tiles that capped the peak of a roof) set end to end over a ridge of mortar that holds the tiles in place (Figs. 2.20-2.21, 2.23, 2.27).¹¹⁴ Curbs on the front edge are also made of the short lip of a *tegula* (flat roof tile); curbs on the side of the stove are sometimes built out of masonry (Fig. 2.23).¹¹⁵ The front curb keeps coals and ashes that accumulate on the stove surface from spilling out and sully the floor or burning the cooks. Another curb is commonly built against the side and back edges of a stove tangent to the kitchen walls. This curb is made of flat tiles set end to end on their edges, constructed of masonry, or formed by the lip of a *tegula*, so as to provide an upright buffer for the wall against spills and heat damage from the stove surface (Figs. 2.19-2.21, 2.23, 2.26-2.27).¹¹⁶ The heat-resistant tiles act to contain the cooking process and prevent fire damage.

Not all stoves have well-preserved curbs. Salza Prina Ricotti has suggested that solid masonry stoves lacking curbs on the front edge were simply tables for food preparation, but traces of burning on the tiled surfaces of even these stoves argues for cooking activity.¹¹⁷ There were doubtless portable wooden tables in the kitchen (e.g. Varro's *urnarium*) upon which much of the food preparation was done, but these do not survive, even at Pompeii.¹¹⁸

'Burners' appear even more infrequently than curbs, and are often poorly preserved. A burner consists of short, thin supports of masonry, brick or tile built in the shape of the letter 'C'; two burners next to each other share the middle support, and so form the shape of an 'E' (Fig. 2.27). The open sides of the burners face the front of the stove, and the burners are always

¹¹⁴Examples of a curb constructed of *imbrices* include: I.6.4 (n); I.6.7 (m); I.6.8-9 (c); I.7.10-12 (21); I.7.18 (e); I.8.17 (21); I.9.10 (2); I.10.1 (5); I.10.7 (11); IX.1.20 (x).

¹¹⁵A *tegula* lip for a curb: I.7.10-12 (7); I.10.18 (9). Curbs of masonry: I.6.8-9 (c); I.7.10-12 (21); IX.1.4 (b); IX.1.6 (a); IX.1.22 (t); IX.2.18 (n).

¹¹⁶Examples include [upright flat tiles]: I.4.5+25 (42); I.6.11 (8); I.7.7 (i); I.7.10-12 (21); I.9.10 (2); I.9.12 (9); I.10.4 (52); I.10.7 (11); I.10.11 (16); VII.14.5 (20); IX.1.20 (x); IX.2.26 (b); [masonry]: I.7.18 (e); I.8.17 (21); I.10.18 (9); IX.2.10 (o); [tegula lip]: I.6.7 (m).

¹¹⁷Salza Prina Ricotti 1987, 118-119. Traces of burning appear on the following tiled stove-tops that are not outfitted with curbs on the front edge: I.8.5 (13); I.9.8 (7); I.10.4 (52), both upon the arched stove and the solid counter; IX.2.17 (m).

¹¹⁸Var. L. 5.126; see chapter one, p. 15, n. 45.

located at the back of the stove.¹¹⁹ Charcoal or small pieces of wood were burned between the supports of the burners, which held pots, grills or spits for cooking the food.¹²⁰ These burners are similar to, but smaller than, hearths of sub-type (2).

The 'hood' is a brick vault that overhangs the stove surface. In the two cases from the sample, the hood repeats the arch that supports the stove top. In kitchen I.10.7 (11), the arch is the result of the stove's installation beneath a masonry staircase; it serves to relieve the weight of the stair (Fig. 5.167). The hood over the stove in *caupona* IX.2.25 (a) directs the smoke away from the stove top and into the street via a flue in the wall just underneath the top of the vault (Fig. 2.28).¹²¹

Stoves are the most common permanent cooking installation at Pompeii; it is unclear how common the type was throughout the rest of the Roman world. At many sites, kitchens are either not well-enough preserved, or little attention has been paid to their publication. Outside of Campania, several examples appear in Ostia (in apartments, inns and taverns), Rome, Sperlonga (the villa of Tiberius), and in Roman houses at Dion in Macedonia and Ephesus in Asia Minor, in contexts from the first to the fifth centuries A.D.¹²² To understand how factors such as climate, resources and local traditions affect the construction of kitchen installations, a broader study than this will be needed, one that takes into account variation across the Empire.

Type LO, "Large Oven"

A large oven is a domed structure whose primary function is to bake bread. The oven was circular, two to three meters in diameter, and constructed of brick-faced masonry, usually with large blocks of stone framing the opening to the baking chamber.¹²³ Mayeske identifies two basic sub-types of large ovens:

Sub-type (1). This is a simple structure of beehive shape, with a single opening at the front into which the fuel was placed to warm up the baking chamber, and a chimney in front of or behind the peak of the dome to release the smoke (Fig. 2.29). When the fire had burned out,

¹¹⁹The best preserved burners are those in kitchen (11) of I.10.7 at Pompeii, where pots, grills and spits were found *in situ*. Other examples include: I.7.5 (c), built of *imbrices*; VII.14.9 (6), and perhaps IX.1.4 (b) (see Fig. 2.25).

¹²⁰See Salza Prina Ricotti 1978/80, 242-243. Fulvio 1879, 276-277 is of the opinion that these burners burned wood only, but there is no evidence to support this hypothesis.

¹²¹Fulvio 1879, 276 lists two other buildings in which 'hoods' for stoves appear that are not in this sample (VI.7.19; I.3.31).

¹²²For kitchens in Herculaneum, see Maiuri 1958; for Campanian villas, Ostia and Rome, see Salza Prina Ricotti 1978/80, and also Salza Prina Ricotti 1987, 117-123. For recent excavations at Dion, see Pandermalis 1989, and for the terrace houses at Ephesus, see Erdemgil et al., n.d., 47-53.

¹²³Fulvio 1879, 285.

the ashes and coals were raked out, the loaves of dough were placed inside, and the baking chamber opening was closed off with a screen.¹²⁴

Sub-type (2). This more complex type of oven is most common at Pompeii. Its baking chamber was encased in masonry, below another dome which better retained the heat of the fire; smoke again escaped through ceiling vents (Figs. 2.30-2.31). A stone slab was usually built in front of the baking chamber to serve as a work table. Openings in the frame of the oven at either side of the work table allowed fresh dough to be passed from a preparation room to the oven, and baked bread passed from the oven to a storage area.¹²⁵ Beneath the baking chamber was a repository for used ashes or fuel. On some ovens a phallus was affixed near the top of the arch above the opening to the baking chamber, as a symbol of the life-giving staple of bread, and a complement to the womb-like oven.¹²⁶

No ovens of the first, beehive sub-type appear in this study sample. However, ovens of the second sub-type do appear in the three bakeries and two of the large houses in the sample.¹²⁷ All of the large ovens in the sample, whether in a bakery or a house, are accompanied by at least one mill, counter space for preparing the dough, and a storage room for the baked loaves. Large ovens are best described by the literary terms *furnus* and *fornax*. Their form persists in the *pizza al forno* ovens still found today throughout central and southern Italy, in which a fire is kept burning on one side of the baking chamber while the food cooks on the side opposite.

Type SO, "Small Oven"

This type is smaller than the large ovens, but constructed similarly in brick and masonry. In form it closely resembles the large beehive oven, sub-type (1), because it lacks a separate space above the baking chamber, and the opening into the baking chamber is not recessed, but at the front face of the oven (Fig. 2.32).¹²⁸ A miniature version may rest on top of a stove.¹²⁹ Frayn argues that the small oven was "a stationary model of the *testu* stage on the way to the development of the larger ovens", but this is doubtful; there is no chronological evidence for

¹²⁴Mayeske 1979, 40-41; Mayeske 1972, 23; see also Fulvio 1879, 286-287 & Tav. II, figs. 4-5. This type of oven is shown on the frieze of the tomb of the baker Eurysaces at the Porta Maggiore in Rome (Mayeske 1979, 55, fig. 9; Mayeske 1972, 27-29).

¹²⁵Mayeske 1979, 41 & 55, fig. 8; Mayeske 1972, 24-25; Fulvio 1879, 287-290 & Tav. II, figs. 7 & 9; Mau 1908, 391.

¹²⁶Mayeske 1979, 41; Mayeske 1972, 26. A phallus is attached to the front of the oven in kitchen (12) of VII.1.25+47.

¹²⁷Large ovens in bakeries I.4.12+17 (Mayeske 1972, 84-86); VII.1.36-37 (Mayeske 1972, 107-110); IX.1.2+33 (Mayeske 1972, 127-129). Large ovens in houses: VII.1.25+47 (12) and IX.1.22 (1').

¹²⁸See Mayeske 1979, 41; Mayeske 1972, 25; Fulvio 1879, 282-283.

¹²⁹A small oven rests on the stove in kitchen (1) of the Casa dei Due Atri (VI.29) at Herculaneum (Maiuri 1958, 277-278, fig. 221).

small ovens preceding large ones.¹³⁰ Different foods were probably cooked in small versus large ovens. In bakeries, small ovens are thought to have been used for pastries; the same ovens in houses however must have had a more diverse role that included baking bread and pastries, roasting meat, and cooking vegetables.¹³¹

One bakery and three houses of the study sample have small ovens.¹³² In two houses (VII.14. 5+17-19 (20); VII.14.9 (21)), hand mills for grinding grain are associated with the oven (Figs. 2.32-2.33). In the latter house, the oven is located on the side of the house opposite the main kitchen with its stove. There is no Latin term that unequivocally applies to small ovens. *Furnus* or *fornax*, the general terms for ovens, may have been used. The tempting diminutive *fornacula*, as we saw above (p. 68), is never used in the context of cooking food.

Terminology and typology: dining areas

There is no one-to-one correspondence between the Latin terminology and the archaeological evidence for dining areas. Literary sources do not precisely and consistently characterize the architecture, decoration, and furnishings of dining areas. The archaeological evidence does fit into categories definable by specific architectural or decorative characteristics, but these categories do not correlate easily or precisely with the literary terms. Each will be discussed separately; Latin terms that reasonably relate to specific archaeological types will be suggested in the discussion of those types.

Literary sources for dining rooms

Several different words in Latin describe an area in which dining is carried out. A summary definition for each of those words is listed below; a fuller explanation follows.¹³³

¹³⁰Frayn 1978, 30.

¹³¹Maiuri 1958, 278, followed by Mayeske 1979, 41. The roasting of meat and vegetables in a *furnus* is attested by Apicius (see above, p. 67-68, n. 54).

¹³²Small ovens in the bakery I.4.13-16 and houses I.4.5+25 (42); VII.14.5+17-19 (20); VII.14.9 (21).

¹³³The term *exedra* has been taken by some scholars as another place where dining was done (e.g. Salza Prina Ricotti 1987, 125), due to Vitruvius' use of the word in the context of his discussion of *triclinia* and *oeci* (Vitruvius VI.3.8). Nevertheless, a search through Ibycus and the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae revealed not a single example in the literature of either eating or dining in an *exedra*. Rather, these rooms appear to have been used for siestas, conversation, or simple relaxation, and they have no precise position or form in the house, as P. Paris has noted: "le mot *exedra* avait à peu près perdu pour les Latins toute signification bien précise; il signifiait simplement une chambre avec des sièges." (Daremberg-Saglio, s.v. "Exedra"). Schmidt-Colinet 1991 argues that dining took place in the majestic *exedrae* of Hellenistic palaces. When he extends his discussion of the *exedra duplex* (facing, pendant *exedrae*) to the Roman house, he suggests that the *alae* that appear on either side of the atrium in front of the *tablinum* essentially form an *exedra duplex*, but does not proceed to imply that dining went on in those *alae*. The term *exedra* is therefore not used in this typology.

<i>cenatio</i> , <i>cenatiuncula</i>	Dining room. A general term for a room that is used for the purposes of dining, that is taking the <i>cena</i> , the main meal of the day.
<i>cenaculum</i>	Dining room. Referred early on to a dining room on the upper floor of a house, and later was extended to designate the whole upper floor.
<i>oecus</i>	Hall for reception or dining which is generally more spacious and elaborately decorated than a <i>cenatio</i> , <i>cenaculum</i> , or <i>triclinium</i> .
<i>triclinium</i>	Dining room or dining-hall in which three dining-couches for three people each have been arranged for the meal. The term may also refer to the three-couch arrangement itself, within a room or outside in the open air.

A comprehensive look at the literary sources reveals the flexibility with which these terms were employed. This linguistic plasticity brings up three important points:

The same room can be described by more than one term. In the description of his Laurentine villa, Pliny seems to use *cenatio* as a synonym for *triclinium*, mentioning the same room with both words:

(Below a store-room and granary within a tower) there is a *triclinium*, in which one never hears any noise from the sea even when it is stormy except a subdued echo. It overlooks the garden and the walk around it. [description of the walk and the garden]...This *cenatio* has as fine a view as if it looked out on the sea.¹³⁴

Cenatio is the more general term which refers only to function of the room, and the activity of eating that defines that function. A *triclinium*, however, implies the furnishing of three couches. In first century A.D. literature, all *triclinia* are *cenationes*, but not all *cenationes* are *triclinia*. Clearly, terminology for rooms of a house was not indelibly fixed, but rather overlapped.

The meaning of terms can change over time. By the fourth century A.D., the word *triclinium* seems to have appropriated the general meaning of "dining room", at a time when the three couch arrangement was no longer in common use.¹³⁵ By late antiquity, most dining was done on a semi-circular couch large enough for six to seven people, called a *sigma*-couch or a *stibadium*. The 4th c. A.D. scholiast Servius Honoratus explains:

¹³⁴Plin. Ep. 2.17.13-15: ...*sub hoc triclinium, quod turbati maris non nisi fragorem et sonum patitur eumque iam languidum ac desinentem; hortum et gestationem videt, qua hortus includitur...Hac non deteriore quam maris facie cenatio remota a mari fruitur.* (Teubner text, author's translation).

¹³⁵Mosaic evidence for the three-couch arrangement of a dining room continues into the second and third centuries, in Ostia, Antioch, and North Africa; the custom even survives to the late 4th-early 5th c. A.D. at the Casa de Baco in Complutum, Spain (Dunbabin 1991, 125-128).

The ancients did not have *stibadia*, but feasted upon three couches laid out with coverlets, whence the expression 'to lay out a *triclinium*'. Thus Cicero says: 'he was ordering the *triclinia* to be laid out, and laid out in the forum'. Whence it is clear that those people are in error, who say that their *basilica* or *cenatio* is a '*triclinium*'.¹³⁶

Servius implies that *cenatio* and *basilica* are terms which people commonly use to denote their dining rooms in late antiquity. He also declares that people are using the term *triclinium* in an incorrect or archaic manner, because the three-couch arrangement has gone out of fashion.

Replacing the three-couch arrangement with semicircular seating was a gradual process that began with the introduction of the *stibadium* in the first century A.D. The earliest sources that use the term *stibadium* are Martial, who makes its curved form quite clear, and the Younger Pliny.¹³⁷ One curved dining-couch does appear as a permanent masonry fixture outdoors in Pompeii, in the peristyle of VII.3.15, and several are depicted in painted scenes.¹³⁸ No *stibadia* are present in this study sample, except for those painted on the inside faces of the open air masonry dining couches in garden (23) of the Casa dell'Efebo (I.7.10-12).

The function of a room can be flexible. Pliny describes a room in his Laurentine villa which can serve either as a place to sleep or a place to dine:

On the other side (of a *cavaedium*) is a most elegant *cubiculum*, then either a large *cubiculum* or a modest *cenatio* which is lit strongly by the sun and by its reflection off the sea.¹³⁹

Householders had rooms which were of dimensions, proportions, and location such that they could serve several different uses (e.g. a *cubiculum* or a *cenatio*).¹⁴⁰ Because a *cubiculum* is a room

¹³⁶Serv. A. 1.698: *Antiqui stibadia non habebant, sed stratis tribus lectis epulabantur, unde et triclinium sterni dicitur. Sic Cicero 'sterni triclinia, et in foro sterni iubebat'. Unde apparet errare eos, qui triclinium dicunt ipsam basilicam vel cenationem* (Thilo & Hagen 1961 text, author's translation).

¹³⁷Mart. 14.87: "Receive a *sigma* couch inlaid with crescent lines of tortoise-shell. It takes eight: let everyone come who shall be my friend"; *Stibadia. Accipe lunata scriptum testudine sigma. Octo capit; veniat quisquis amicus erit* (Loeb text and translation); see also Mart. 10.48; Plin. *Ep.* 5.6.36-37.

¹³⁸Soprano 1950, 291, fig. 28.7 & 306-310 and Jashemski 1979, 90. The painted evidence for *stibadia* at Pompeii is summarized by Dunbabin 1991, 133-134. See also Rossiter 1991, Förtsch 1993, 93-100, Salza Prina Ricotti 1979.

¹³⁹Plin. *Ep.* 2.17.10: *Ex alio latere cubiculum est politissimum; diende vel cubiculum grande vel modica cenatio, quae plurimo sole, plurimo mari lucet.* (Teubner text, author's translation). The same room is apparently mentioned earlier in the letter, again as a large *cubiculum* (2.17.6): *Huius a laeva retractius paulo cubiculum est amplum.* See Förtsch 1993, esp. p.101 & Taf. 42, for a discussion of the arrangement of the rooms in this text and their hypothetical disposition on the ground.

¹⁴⁰The term *cubiculum* is commonly translated as "bedroom", and equated by many scholars with a sleeping area (e.g. Elia 1932, Clarke 1991, 12). Allison (1992b, 14, 46-52, 80-85) however has thrown doubt on this equation, noting the wide range of finds found in rooms traditionally labeled *cubicula* in her study houses, and questioning the assumption that niches in the walls of these small, closed rooms always indicate the location of beds. A more careful Latin term for rooms with direct evidence for sleeping (beds, bedding, rectangular raised platforms at one end of the rooms, and sometimes niches) would be *dormitorium cubiculum* (Adam 1984, 327-330, Förtsch 1993, 54-55).

which is normally much smaller on average than a *cenatio*, Pliny must add the qualifications that the room is large for a *cubiculum*, and small for a *cenatio*.¹⁴¹ In a fourth century A.D. letter, Sidonius describes a room in his house which is both a living or sitting-room (*diaetam*), and a small dining room (*cenatiunculam*).¹⁴² Like Pliny, Sidonius explains the double function of the room by using the diminutive for the dining room. The primary role of the room seems to be dining; it contains the semicircular dining-couch (*stibadium*) customary in late antiquity.

I suspect that the function of a room is largely determined not by what the room is called, but by who is in the room and what they are doing there.¹⁴³ In the *Satyricon*, Eumolpos and his young charge fall asleep in the dining room because they are too tired to retire properly after a long day.¹⁴⁴ Dining-couches were larger on average than sleeping-couches, and could easily have served as makeshift beds.¹⁴⁵ In another instance, the Younger Pliny sets his friends down in chairs in front of dining room couches and presents a literary reading that lasts for two days; he turns a dining room into a recital hall.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴¹ M. C. Van Binnebeke has calculated the size of rooms she identifies as *cubicula* from insula V at Herculaneum; they seem to have been at smallest 5.1 m², at largest 14.4 m², and on average 8.3 m². (Van Binnebeke 1991, 141). From the study sample at Pompeii, the twenty-two rooms which can securely be defined as 'dining rooms' (for the archaeological criteria of which see below, pp. 106-115) were at smallest 11.8 m², at largest 33.4 m², and on average 18.5 m². The size ranges of dining rooms and sleeping rooms barely overlap, and dining rooms are on the average more than twice as spacious as sleeping rooms.

¹⁴² Sidon. *Ep.* 2.2.11: "From this dining room, we pass to a living-room or small dining room, all of which lies open to the lake and to which almost the whole lake lies open. In this room are a semicircular dining-couch and a glittering sideboard...Reclining in this place, you are engrossed by the pleasures of the view whenever you are not busy with the meal"; *ex hoc triclinio fit in diaetam sive cenatiunculam transitus, cui fere totus lacus quaeque tota lacui patet. In hac stibadium et nitens abacus...Quo loci recumbens, si quid inter edendum vacas, prospiciendi voluptatibus occuparis* (Loeb text and translation).

¹⁴³ A dining room can hold a large party or a small gathering in Plin. *Ep.* 1.3.1: *quid triclinia illa popularia illa paucorum* (Teubner text).

¹⁴⁴ Petr. 85.4: *Forte cum in triclinio iaceremus, quia dies sollemnis ludum artaverat pigritiamque recedendi imposuerat hilaritas longior* (Loeb text).

¹⁴⁵ A survey of sleeping beds from the furniture of Herculaneum reveals that they measured ca. 1 by 2 m. (Van Binnebeke 1991, 141). Wallace-Hadrill (1994, 113-114) measured thirty-five niches for sleeping beds, and found a range of measurements from 0.70-1.60 m. in width, with a mean between 1.20-1.30 m. His sample probably included double beds as well as single beds. The author's survey of niches for dining couches at Pompeii reveals an average couch size of 1.23 by 2.44 m. (see below, p. 111). For literary sources on couch sizes, see Varro, *L.* 8.32 (below, p. 92, n. 179).

¹⁴⁶ Plin. *Ep.* 8.21.2: "so I chose the most suitable time and place, and to accustom them from now onwards to being received by a leisured audience in a dining room, I gathered my friends together in the month of July (which is usually a quiet time in the law-courts) and settled them in chairs in front of the couches."; *tempus et locum opportunissimum elegi, utque iam nunc adsuescerent et ab otiosis et in triclinio audiri, Iulio mense, quo maxime lites interquiescunt, positos ante lectos cathedris amicos collocavi* (Loeb text, B. Radice translation).

Cenatio, cenatiuncula

Cenatio is derived from *cena*, the main meal of the day, and indicates the space reserved in the house for dinner.¹⁴⁷ It is not the most common word for a dining area, appearing only 24 times in Latin literature, half of those in the works of Pliny the Younger and the younger Seneca.¹⁴⁸ A *cenatio* has no prescribed limits on its size or quality of decoration. It may be *modica* (modest), *cotidiana* (everyday), or may even be described as a *mica* (morsel, crumb).¹⁴⁹ *Cenationes* are also described as possessing lofty marble columns, a hypocaust heating system, a high and elaborately decorated ceiling (perhaps with sliding panels to allow perfume or flowers to rain down upon the guests), or even a revolving roof.¹⁵⁰ Any dining room may be a *cenatio*, regardless of its size, description, or accoutrements.

The diminutive *cenatiuncula* appears twice, once in reference (by Pliny) to a small artificial grotto used for picnics near Lake Como, and once referring to a double function dining room/living-room in a letter of Sidonius.¹⁵¹ It is not clear whether *cenatiuncula* was in common parlance in the 1st century A.D. at Pompeii, but its meaning as a dining area is unequivocal. Small versions of dining rooms with evidence for couches (but not large enough to hold a proper set of three couches) do appear in the archaeological record. I categorize such small dining rooms under the term "dinette".

Cenaculum

The term *cenaculum* originally described the house dining room, and particularly connoted an upper-floor dining room. *Cenaculum* was eventually extended to include any upper floors of a house or tenement block.¹⁵² Varro describes the evolution of its meaning:

They called where they dined the *cenaculum*, just as such rooms are called even today at Lanuvium in the Temple of Juno, in the rest of Latium, at Falerii, and at Cordoba [Spain]. Later, when they began to dine in the upper part of the house, all rooms of the upper part of the house were called *cenacula*.¹⁵³

¹⁴⁷Bek 1983, 105 n.2. The room is named and defined by the function for which it is used.

¹⁴⁸Based on a search through all Latin authors using Ibycus, for the string "cenati". Suetonius and Columella are the only other authors who use the word more than once. The earliest occurrence of the word is in the first half of the 1 c. A.D.

¹⁴⁹*modica*: Plin. Ep. 2.17.10; *cotidiana*: Plin. Ep. 5.6.21; *mica*: Mart. 2.59

¹⁵⁰Lofty marble columns: Juv. *Sat.* 7.182-183; Sen. *Ep.* 115.9; hypocaust heating: Sen. *Dial.* 1.4.9; high and elaborate ceilings: Sen. *Dial.* 12.9.2, *Ep.* 90.9, 90.15; Suet. *Ner.* 31.2; revolving roof: Suet. *Ner.* 31.2. Hor. *S.* 2.8 describes hangings on the walls or ceiling of a dining room which crash down inopportunely during a meal.

¹⁵¹Plin. *Ep.* 4.30.2; Sidon. *Ep.* 2.2.11 (see above, p. 87, n. 142).

¹⁵²Sutherland 1990, 3-7; Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 108; Dosi & Schnell 1986b, 12-15.

¹⁵³Var. *L.* 5.162: *Ubi cenabant cenaculum vocitabant, ut etiam nunc Lanuvi apud aedem Iunonis et in cetero Latio ac Faleris et Cordubae dicuntur. Posteaquam in superiore parte cenitare coeperunt, superioris domus universa cenacula dicta* (Loeb text, author's translation).

Varro mentions places at home and abroad where the archaic meaning of *cenaculum* as 'dining room' survived in his day. But by the first century B.C. in most of Italy, the word no longer commonly meant dining room. The 3 c. A.D. scholiast Pomponius Porphyrio states that *cenaculum* had been replaced by *triclinium* as the common term for dining room:

He says that new Latin words are able to merit greater authority if they have been derived from the Greek, just as we have adopted *triclinium* (whereas previously we called it a *cenaculum*, because the dining was done there).¹⁵⁴

One of the earliest instances of *cenaculum* appears in a fragment of Ennius (early 2 c. B.C.), who describes the "most mighty *cenacula* of heaven".¹⁵⁵ Tertullian, the 2-3 c. A.D. source of this quote, is still aware of both meanings for *cenaculum* when he tries to explain the passage. Tertullian postulates that Ennius might have described these chambers either on account of their lofty nature (*cenacula* as upper story rooms), or because Ennius had read a passage of Homer in which Jupiter feasts there (*cenacula* as dining rooms). Plautus, a contemporary of Ennius, uses the term to describe an upper-story room. He describes Jupiter residing in the 'attic' of Amphytrio's house, whence he is able to have access to Amphytrio's wife.¹⁵⁶ Upper story apartments housed all sorts from the wealthy to the indigent, but they are most commonly associated with the middle and lower classes.¹⁵⁷ *Cenacula* could either be attached to a larger ground-floor house or be separate flats altogether, with their own entrances off the street.¹⁵⁸ Imperial jurists always used *cenaculum* in its sense as an apartment.¹⁵⁹

The urban fabric and the economic conditions of Pompeii and Herculaneum differed greatly from Ostia and Rome. This is no doubt due in great measure to the earlier date of the archaeological evidence from the Campanian towns and their much smaller size. Many scholars have assumed that if Pompeii and Herculaneum had survived, the process of urban evolution would have made these towns look much like Ostia and Rome.¹⁶⁰ However, the multistory

¹⁵⁴Pomp. Porph. Hor. Ars 52-53: *Magis, inquit, auctoritatem mereri possunt nova verba, si a Graeco fuerint in Latinum derivata, ut transtulimus triclinium (antea cenaculum illud vocabamus, qui ibi cenabatur)*, (text: Hauthal 1864, Vol. II, 652, author's translation).

¹⁵⁵Enn. Ann. 1.57 (Tert. adv. Valent. 7): *Ennius poeta - "cenacula maxima caeli" - simpliciter pronuntiavit de elati situs nomine vel quia Iovem illic epulantem legerat apud Homerum* (Loeb text and translation).

¹⁵⁶Pl. Am. 861-864: (IV.) *Ego sum ille Amphitruo, quod est servos Sosia, idem Mercurius qui fit quando commodumst, in superiore qui habito cenaculo, qui interdum fio Iuppiter quando lubet*; (OCT text).

¹⁵⁷*Cenacula* of some merit: Suet. Aug. 45.1, 78.2, Suet. Vit. 7.2, Var. Men. 589, Vit. 2.8.17, Petr. 38.10, Mart. 1.108; *cenacula* of lesser quality: Cic. Agr. 2.96, Fron. Aq. 1.76.2, Hor. Epod. 1.1.90, Juv. 10.18, Quint. Inst. 6.3.64.

¹⁵⁸Liv. 39.14.2 uses the term *cenaculum* to describe an apartment above the house (of a consul's mother) with its own entrance onto the street in 186 B.C.

¹⁵⁹Frier 1980, 4-20 has demonstrated how legal sources describe the archaeological evidence for apartment housing in Ostia and Rome.

¹⁶⁰Sutherland 1990, 2-3; Watts 1987, 21-22; McKay 1975, 81; Harsh 1935, 9-21; Boëthius 1934; Carrington 1933, 133-136. Richardson 1988a, 310 and Dwyer 1991, 30-31, however, disagree.

apartments which are visible in Ostia and which the legal sources call *cenacula* did not actually appear in Pompeii before its destruction. A *cenaculum* therefore has a slightly different definition in Pompeii than it does in those larger, later cities. Sutherland suggests the following:

"any room in the second storey of a house, other than an intermediate level (mezzanine), which forms part of the living quarters and is intended to accommodate a regular traffic of people in the fulfillment of its designated function"¹⁶¹

This definition includes areas used for living, eating, and sleeping, and excludes areas used for storage, such as the *pergulae*, or mezzanines which sat over most of the shops at Pompeii, and were reached by a staircase or ladder.¹⁶² The number of dining rooms on upper floors which I have been able to identify with any certainty is few; *cenaculum* is an imperfect but serviceable term to use to describe them.¹⁶³

Oecus

Oecus rarely appears in Latin; it is adopted from the Greek οἶκος, in which language the word has a broad range of meaning.¹⁶⁴ The *Thesaurus Lingua Latinae* defines the word as "part of a house, a room, primarily destined for the holding of dinners", and scholars have long accepted *oecus* as an alternative term for a dining room.¹⁶⁵ Nearly all occurrences of the word in Latin appear in Vitruvius, in the context of both Roman and Greek houses.¹⁶⁶ The exception is the Elder Pliny's description of the "unswept hall" mosaic, in which he merely transliterates the Greek.¹⁶⁷ Twice in his description of the Greek house, Vitruvius explicitly states that dining takes place in the rooms he calls *oeci*.¹⁶⁸ In his discussion of special architectural types in the

¹⁶¹Sutherland 1990, 6.

¹⁶²Sutherland 1990, 3-4, where he makes good use of an inscription (CIL 4.138) from the Casa di Pansa (VI.6.1) that advertises the rent of both *pergulae* and *cenacula*.

¹⁶³Pompeii: I.6.7 {r}, I.6.8-9 {k}, I.7.18 {g}; I.10.1 {6}; I.10.11 {20}; I.10.18 {11}; IX.2.27 {1}. See also Herculaneum, upstairs rooms (2, 5) in the Casa a Graticcio (III.14-15), Maiuri 1958, 416-420.

¹⁶⁴In Greek, an οἶκος can mean a house, part of a house, household goods, the members of a household or the house of a god (i.e. a temple).

¹⁶⁵*domus pars, camera, imprimis ad cenas habendas destinata*. See also Dunababin 1991, 124; De Albentis 1990, 152-157; Salza Prina Ricotti 1987, 124-126; Mau 1908, 265-266; Overbeck 1884.

¹⁶⁶Vitr. 6.3.8-10 (Roman houses); 6.7.2-5 (Greek houses).

¹⁶⁷Plin. *Nat.* 1.36.60 (table of contents), 36.184: "the most famous exponent (of mosaics) was Sosus, who at Pergamum laid the floor of what is known in Greek as "the Unswept Room", because, by means of small cubes tinted in various shades, he represented on the floor refuse from the dinner table and other sweepings, making them appear as if they had been left there"; *celeberrimus fuit in hoc genere Sosus, qui Pergami stravit quem vocant asaroton oecon, quoniam purgamenta cenae in pavimentis quaeque everri solent velut relicta fecerat parvis e tessellis tinctisque in varios colores* (Loeb text and translation).

¹⁶⁸Vitr. 6.7.4: "In these halls are the men's banquets"; *In his oecis fiunt virilia convivium*. Vitr. 6.7.5: "For the Greeks call the *andron* the hall where men's banquets are supposed to be, because women cannot approach there"; *Graeci enim andronas appellant oecus, ubi convivium virilia solent esse, quod eo mulieres non accedunt* (Loeb texts, author's translations).

Roman house, Vitruvius mentions how *oeci* are in general more spacious (*spatiosiores*) than *triclinia*. Furthermore, an *oecus Cyzicenus* is large enough to fit two sets of three dining-couches with room to spare.¹⁶⁹ When dining-couches are arranged for a banquet in this sort of room, the *oecus* becomes in effect a *triclinium*. In sum, an *oecus* appears to be a room of larger dimensions and of greater architectural elaboration than a *triclinium*.

Triclinium

Triclinium is by far the most common term for a dining area; it appears primarily in the works of Petronius, Suetonius, and Vitruvius.¹⁷⁰ The word was derived from the Greek τρῖκλινος, "three couches" (κλίνειν), that described the customary number of dining-couches at a dinner.¹⁷¹ The sign advertising the Hospitium di P. Sittius at Pompeii (VII.1.44-45) clearly details the furniture (three couches) in that establishment's dining room:

HOSPITIVM·HIC·LOCATVR
TRICLINIVM·CVM·TRIBVS·LECTIS
ET·COMM(ODIS)¹⁷²

Romans adopted the practice of reclining at table from the Greeks, perhaps through the Etruscans, who seem to have sat at table until ca. the 6th c. B.C., when they themselves reclined like the Greeks.¹⁷³ Only one person (or at best, two) reclined on Greek κλίνειν, which measured ca. 0.90 m. wide and 1.70-1.90 m. long.¹⁷⁴ The Romans adapted reclining at table to a larger couch (*lectus tricliniaris*) which held up to three people. Three of these couches would be fit in a horseshoe pattern around a central table, where the dinner courses were placed (Figs. 1.23-1.27).¹⁷⁵

The earliest occurrence of the word *triclinium* dates to the late 3 c. B.C., in a fragment of Cn. Naevius.¹⁷⁶ It appears again in a late 2 c. B.C. fragment of Lucilius, in which the term means not just an arrangement of three couches, but a room in which the couches lie.¹⁷⁷ Pliny the Elder

¹⁶⁹Vitr. 6.3.8; *oecus Cyzicenus*: Vitr. 6.3.10, 6.7.3. For the texts, see below, pp. 94-96.

¹⁷⁰Other authors or works which use the word several times include Cicero, the Younger Pliny and Elder Pliny, the *Historia Augusta*, the Elder Seneca, and Varro.

¹⁷¹Pomp.Porph. Hor. Ars. 52-53; Serv. A. 1.698. See also Marquardt I, 354-355 and Daremberg-Saglio, s.v. "lectus" and "triclinium".

¹⁷²Niccolini II, 41; Della Corte 1954, 171 (#402): "This hospitium is available for rent: a dining room with three couches and other conveniences" (author's translation).

¹⁷³Bonfante 1986, 233-235 gives a clear account of the change in Etruscan custom from sitting to reclining at banquet, based primarily on a series of tomb paintings beginning in the 7th c. B.C.

¹⁷⁴Dunbabin 1991, 121-122.

¹⁷⁵Johnston 1932, 226-229; Mau 1908, 262-264.

¹⁷⁶Naev. *palliatae*, 81: "Where are you all about to dine, here or in the dining room?"; *utrubi cenaturi estis, hicne an in triclinio?* (Ibycus text, author's translation).

¹⁷⁷Lucil. frag. 1107 (quoted in Donat. *ad Ter. Eun.* 2.3.45): "But some Tiresias, full of years, a lost soul, was groaning with coughs before the door and the threshold of the dining room"; *ante fores autem et triclini limina quidam perditus Tiresia tussi grandaevo gemebat* (Loeb text, 5.228-229 and translation).

remarks that dining-couches with feet and *fulcri* of bronze were first introduced to Rome in 187 B.C. by Cn. Manlius after his conquest of Asia; the 2 c. B.C. appears to be the period in which *triclinia* became adopted generally.¹⁷⁸ By the 1 c. B.C., *triclinium* was in common literary use as a term for dining-couches or dining rooms.

In three passages, Varro describes how couches are commonly used in the house. The first passage confirms that different couches were used for eating than were used for sleeping. The second and third passages speak of conformity in the size and shape of a set of three dining-couches.

Identical rooms are often ornamented in unlike manner, and couches are not all made the same in size and shape. But if Regularity were to be sought in furniture, we should have all the couches in the house made in one fashion, and either with posts or without them, and when we had a couch suited for use beside the dining-table, we should not fail to have just the same for bedroom use; nor should we rather be delighted with furniture which was decorated with varying figures of ivory or other materials, any more than in camp-beds, which with Regularity are almost always made of the same material and in the same shape.¹⁷⁹

For if those who have arranged the dining room have among the three couches set one that is of a different size, or among couches that match have brought one too far forward, or not far enough, we join in making the correction according to common usage and to the analogies of other dining rooms...¹⁸⁰

They ask why, if Likeness is to be followed, we prefer to have some couches inlaid with ivory, others with tortoise-shell, and so on with some other kind of material. To which I say that Unlikenesses are not the only thing which we follow, but often we follow Likenesses. And this may be seen from the same piece of furniture; for no one makes the three couches of the dining room other than alike in material and in height and in shape. Who makes the table-napkins not like each other? Or the cushions?¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁸Plin. *Nat.* 34.9. See also Liv. 39.6 and chapter one above, p. 13.

¹⁷⁹Var. *L.* 8.32: *quo nomine et gemina conclavia dissimiliter poliunt et lectos non omnis paris magnitudine ac figura faciunt. quod <si> esse[n]t analogia petenda suppellectili, omnis lectos haberemus domi ad unam formam et aut cum fulcro aut sine eo, nec cum ad tricliniarem gradum, non item ad cubicularem; neque potius delectaremur suppellectile distincta quae esset ex ebore <aliisve> rebus disparibus figuris quam grabatis, qui ἀνὰ λόγον ad similem formam plerumque eadem materia fiunt* (Loeb text and translation). The 4th c. A.D. author of the *Historia Augusta* (*Antonius Heliogabus* 20.4) understood there were still different couches for dining and sleeping: "He had both dining and sleeping couches made out of solid silver"; *Hic solido argento factos habuit letos et tricliniaries et cubiculares* (Loeb text, author's translation).

¹⁸⁰Var. *L.* 9.9: *Nam ut, qui triclinium constrarunt, si quem lectum de tribus unum impari posuerunt aut de paribus nimium aut parum produxerunt, una corrigimus et ad consuetudinem co[m]munem et ad aliorum tricliniorum analogias* (Loeb text and translation).

¹⁸¹Varro, *L.* 9.47: *Rogant, si similitudo sit sequenda, cur malimus habere lectos alios ex ebore, alios ex testudine, sic item genere aliquo alio. ad quae dico non dis[similitudines] solum nos, sed> similitudines quoque sequi saepe. Itaque ex eadem suppellectili licet videre: nam nemo facit triclinii lectos nisi paris et materia et altitudine et figura. Qui<s> facit mappas triclinaris non similis inter se? quis pulvinos?* (Loeb text and translation).

Varro's comments reveal a concern with keeping a proper matching set of furniture that can be verified merely by comparison with other dining rooms. Guests expected a similar and familiar arrangement of couches, so they might know their proper 'place' at table. Varro says that couches are alike in material, height, and shape, but he does discuss differences in their applied decoration. It was in the decoration that the owner could demonstrate his financial power or particular decorative taste, whether in ivory, tortoise-shell, or precious metal inlays for couches, couch coverings colored by expensive purple dyes, or table settings of silver and gold.¹⁸²

The quality of a *triclinium* in literary descriptions ranged from the 'everyday' to the extremely elaborate. A *triclinia cotidiana* is mentioned by Vitruvius in his essay on the Greek house.¹⁸³ The Younger Pliny, in a letter to Caninus Rufus at Comum, speaks of his friend's *triclinia* which include rooms for holding a small gathering of a few friends and rooms for a large dinner-party.¹⁸⁴ Most descriptions of *triclinia* are phrased in terms of their magnificence. Manilius compares carved paneled ceilings in temples to ceilings in dining rooms:

Such ornamentation was once reserved for the gods; today it is one of our extravagances: dining rooms rival temples in splendour, and under a roof of gold we now take our meals off gold.¹⁸⁵

Triclinia are also described as *satis pulcrum* (quite lovely), installed on board the pleasure-galleys of an emperor, set in the shadow of a large plane tree, combined with an aviary, set up in a fruit-house amongst natural produce, or fitted with sliding ceilings for showers of flowers during the

¹⁸²Precious couches: Plin. *Nat.* 33.144, 33.146, 34.9, 34.14, 37.12-14; *Historia Augusta*, *Antonius Heliogabus* 20.4; Var. *L.* 9.47. Precious couch-coverings: Luc. 10.122-124; Petr. 40.2; Nep. frag. 27 (Plin. *Nat.* 9.137); Plin. *Nat.* 8.196. Precious table-settings: Cic. *Ver.* 2.4.33, 2.4.62; *Rhet. Her.* 4.64; Ulp. *dig.* 13.6.5.14; Petr. 22.3; Petr. 73.5. Among other set-pieces described in dining rooms, Petr. 26.9 mentions a *horologium* in Trimalchio's *triclinium* and Petr. 30.1-5 describes a notice at the doorposts of Trimalchio's *triclinium* that advertises when the master is not dining at home. The younger Seneca, *Dial.* 9.9.5, decries the use of books as decorations in a *cenatio* instead of as devices for learning. See also Ransom 1905, 54-61; Richter 1966, 105-109; Pirzio Biroli Stefanelli 1990, 68-79 for expensive materials and decoration on dining-couches.

¹⁸³Vitr. 6.7.2: "Round the colonnades are the ordinary dining rooms, the bedrooms and servants' rooms. This part of the building is called the women's quarter."; *Circum autem in porticibus triclinia cotidiana, cubacula, etiam cellae familiariae constituuntur. Haec pars aedificii gynaeconitis appellatur* (Loeb text and translation).

¹⁸⁴Plin. *Ep.* 1.3.1: "Your baths which are full of sunshine all day, the dining rooms for general or private use, the bedrooms for night or the day's siesta -- are you there and enjoying them all in turn, or are you as usual forever being called away to look after your affairs?; *Quid balineum illud quod plurimus sol implet et circumit, quid triclinia illa popularia illa paucorum, quid cubacula diurna nocturna? Possident te et per vices partiuntur? An, ut solebas, intentione rei familiaris obeundae crebris excursionibus avocaris?* (Loeb text and translation).

¹⁸⁵Man. 5.288-292: *Haec fuerat quondam divis concessa figura, nunc iam luxuriae pars est: triclinia templis concertant, tectique auro iam vescimur auro* (Loeb text and translation).

meal.¹⁸⁶ Ancient authors described and judged dining room luxury on the basis of interior architecture and decoration, and environmental setting. I will discuss each in turn.

Interior architectural elaboration Proper proportions allowed a traditional set of dining furniture to be arranged inside, and dictated the division of interior space (for the dining party in back and the servants and entertainers in front). Vitruvius is the only ancient source on proper proportions for dining areas, and his advice is brief, even simple:

As wide as *triclinia* are, their length should be twice as great. The elevations of all chambers that are oblong should have the following scheme, that the measures of length and width be added together and from that sum, half is taken, and that is the height of the room. But should the rooms be *exedrae* or square *oeci*, their height should be raised up to one and a half times their width. *Pinacothecae*, like *exedrae*, should be drawn up with ample dimensions. *Oeci corinthii*, *oeci tetrastyli* and those that are called *oeci aegyptii* should have the same measure of proportion in their widths and lengths as are described above for the *triclinia*, but on account of the insertion of columns, they should be more spacious.¹⁸⁷

Other halls in a foreign manner are those which the Greeks call Cyzicene. These are situated with a north aspect, and especially with an outlook upon gardens; they have folding windows in the middle. The halls themselves are broad and long enough to have two *triclinia* facing each other, with room to pass around; and these, on both hands, have garden windows with folding lights, so that the guests, under cover, may have a view of the garden. The height of the hall must be one and a half times its width.¹⁸⁸

The proportions of 2:1 laid out above by Vitruvius for *triclinia* seem rather precise; in fact, identifiable *triclinia* at Pompeii and Herculaneum rarely reach such elongated dimensions.¹⁸⁹ In

¹⁸⁶*Satis pulchrum*: Plin. *Ep.* 2.17.5; aboard the galleys of Caligula: Suet. *Cal.* 37.2 (ref. to the ships found and raised from Lake Nemi); in a plane tree: Plin. *Nat.* 12.10; combined with an aviary: Var. *R.* 3.4.3; in a fruit-house: Var. *R.* 1.59.1-2.; sliding ceilings or flowers: Petr. 54.4, 60.2; Historia Augusta, *Antonius Heliogabus* 19.7, 21.5, *Carus, Carinus et Numerian* 17.4.

¹⁸⁷Vitr. 6.3.8: *Tricliniorum quanta latitudo fuerit, bis tanta longitudo fieri debet. Altitudines omnium conclaviorum, quae oblonga fuerint, sic habere debent rationem, uti longitudinis et latitudinis mensura componatur et ex ea summa dimidium sumatur, et quantum fuerit, tantum altitudini detur. Sin autem exhedrae aut oeci quadrati fuerint, latitudinis dimidia addita altitudines educantur. Pinacothecae uti exhedrae amplis magnitudinibus sunt constituendae. Oeci corinthii tetrastylisque quique aegyptii vocantur latitudinis et longitudinis, uti supra tricliniorum symmetriae scriptae sunt, ita habent rationem, sed propter columnarum interpositiones spatiosiores constituentur.* (Loeb text, author's translation).

¹⁸⁸Vitr. 6.3.10: *Fiunt autem etiam non italicae consuetudinis oeci, quos Graeci cyzicenos appellant. hi conlocantur spectantes ad septentrionem et maxime viridia prospicientes, valvasque habent in medio. Ipsi autem sunt ita longi et lati, uti duo triclinia cum circumitionibus inter se spectantia possint esse conlocata, habentque dextra ac sinistra lumina fenestrarum valvata, uti de lectis per spatia fenestrarum viridia prospiciantur. Altitudines eorum dimidia latitudinis addita constituuntur* (Loeb text and translation).

¹⁸⁹Mau 1908, 262-263, and confirmed by the sample in this study; only five dining rooms (I.6.2 (22); I.10.4 (12); I.7.10-12 (4); I.7.10-12 (10); VII.1.40 (20)) were longer than the prescribed 2:1 ratio, and none fit the ratio exactly (see Fig. 2.45).

a survey of 73 *triclinia* from the grander villas and houses throughout the Roman world, Förtsch finds only three examples of dining rooms with exact 2:1 proportions.¹⁹⁰

Proper proportion for the height of a room is just as important as its length and breadth. Vitruvius states that oblong *triclinia* should have proportionally lower ceilings than the more spacious *oeci*. The height of a room has a profound impact upon one's impression of its spaciousness. Low ceilings tend to force an occupant's attention out of the room through doors or windows. High ceilings on the other hand allow one's attention to linger in the room itself and to focus on its architectural elaboration. The grander style of decoration in *oeci* (as Vitruvius describes them) goes hand in hand with their greater height and increased spaciousness.

It is doubtful that Vitruvius ever considered these proportions as anything other than ideals, and ideals not often realized. Immediately after his discussion of *oeci*, Vitruvius provides leeway for modifying the proportions of rooms:

In these kinds of buildings, all the rules of symmetry must be followed which can be made without hindrance on the part of the site, and the windows will be easily arranged, as long as they are not obscured by the heights of walls beyond. But if they are impeded by narrow spots or other inalterable factors, then, by cleverness and cunning, additions or subtractions must be made in the proportions so that similarly attractive spaces may be achieved with the right proportions.¹⁹¹

The key phrase states that the rules of proportion should be followed only as far as the site allows. In Pompeii, building options were restricted by neighboring properties in most areas of the city, and property lines were constantly being re-drawn as real estate changed hands.¹⁹² Pompeians chose to arrange the size and proportions of their rooms as they best fit the available space; the result was a variety of dining room shapes and sizes.

There is a close relationship between the proportions of a room and its architectural decoration. To this point, Vitruvius provides some ornamental and structural details on four different variations of *oeci*: *tetrastylus*, *Corinthius*, *Aegyptius*, and *Cyzicenus*. Because of Vitruvius' descriptions, it has been possible for scholars to identify, with reasonable certainty, examples of these dining room variations on the ground.¹⁹³

¹⁹⁰Förtsch 1993, 102, n.1280: the villa at Settefinestre, room (2), the Villa dei Papyri at Herculaneum, room (8), and the villa at Stabia, loc. Sassola, room (16).

¹⁹¹Vitr. 6.3.11: *In his aedificorum generibus omnes sunt faciendae earum symmetriarum rationes, quae sine impeditone loci fieri poterunt, luminaque, parietum altitudinibus si non obscurabuntur, faciliter erunt explicata; sin autem impediuntur ab angustis aut aliis necessitatibus, tunc erit ut ingenio et acumine de symmetriis detractationes aut adiectiones fiant, uti non dissimiles veris symmetriis perficiantur venustates.* (Loeb text, author's translation). This is Vitruvius' *utilitas* (1.3.2); see Clarke 1991, 369.

¹⁹²See for example Ling's 1983 study of the Insula del Menandro (I.10).

¹⁹³Vitr. 6.3.8-10. Maiuri 1952 is the prime source for these dining room types, including excellent photographs, plans, and reconstructed elevations. Other sources which discuss these types of *oeci* in relation

Vitruvius no more than mentions the *oecus tetrastylus*, but on analogy to the tetrastyle atria which he describes earlier, four columns can be reconstructed, one in each corner of the room.¹⁹⁴ Room (4) in the Casa delle Nozze d'Argento (V.2.i) at Pompeii is probably an example of this variation. The room, of nearly 2:1 proportions, is divided into two parts.¹⁹⁵ The forepart, for service and entertainment, is exceptionally high and has a flat ceiling. The back section, where the dining-couches would have been arranged, has four octagonal columns on high bases holding up a cornice from which a vaulted ceiling springs (Fig. 2.34).

Vitruvius provides a more detailed description of the *oecus Corinthius* and *oecus Aegyptius*:

There is this difference between a Corinthian and an Egyptian oecus. The Corinthian has one row of columns placed either upon a stylobate or upon the ground. Above, it is to have architraves and cornices either of fine joinery or plaster, and above the cornices, curved ceilings rounded to a circular section. In the Egyptian saloons, however, architraves are placed above the columns, and floor joists are to be carried from the architraves to the walls opposite. On the floor boards a pavement is to be laid that there may be a balcony in the open. Then above the architrave, and perpendicularly above the lower columns, columns one-fourth shorter are to be placed. Above their architraves and ornaments they have paneled ceilings, and windows are placed between the upper columns. Thus the Egyptian halls resemble basilicas rather than Corinthian apartments.¹⁹⁶

The squarish Corinthian hall contains a row of columns which runs around the inside of the room, leaving aisles free between the columns and the walls, and supporting a cornice that holds the vaulted ceiling. The arrangement is very similar to the *oecus tetrastylus*, except there are more columns, and the room is not divided into two parts. Two probable examples of this variation have been located in Pompeii, room (24) in the Casa del Meleagro (VI.9.2) and room (43) in the Casa del Labirinto (VI.11.10). Each has ten columns around the room and had a vaulted ceiling, but have various differences in decoration (Figs. 2.35).¹⁹⁷

to extant archaeological remains of dining rooms include: Adam 1984, 335-336; De Albentis 1990, 153-158; Salza Prina Ricotti 1987, 125-126; Dunbabin 1991, 124; Förtsch 1993, 102-104; Bek 1983, 84-88.

¹⁹⁴*Cava aedium tetrastyla*: Vit. 6.3.1.

¹⁹⁵Maiuri 1952, 2-3: 10.75 m. long and 5.28 m. wide.

¹⁹⁶Vitr. 6.3.9: *Inter corinthios autem et aegyptios hoc erit discrimen corinthii simplices habent columnas aut in podio positas aut aut in imo; supraque habeant epistylia et coronas aut ex intestino opere aut albario, praeterea supra coronas curva lacunaria ad circumum delumbata. In aegyptiis autem supra columnas epistylia et ab epistyliis ad parietes, qui sunt circa, inponenda est contignatio, supra coactionem pavimentum, subdiu ut sit circumitus. Diende supra epistylium ad perpendiculum inferiorum columnarum inponendae sunt minores quarta parte columnae. Supra earum epistylia et ornamenta lacunariis ornantur, et inter columnas superiores fenestrae conlocantur; ita basilicarum ea similitudo, non corinthiorum tricliniorum videtur esse* (Loeb text and translation).

¹⁹⁷Maiuri 1952, 3-6; the Casa del Meleagro *oecus* measures 5.82 m. long by 6.57 m. wide; the Casa del Labirinto *oecus* measures 6.7 m. long by 6.8 m. wide.

In the Egyptian hall, the columns that run along each side of the room support open-air balconies which cover the side aisles. Directly above the lower colonnades at the second story balcony level are secondary colonnades of reduced size; the open spaces between their columns essentially form clerestory windows that illuminate the room. At Herculaneum, room (5) of the Casa dell'Atrio a Mosaico (IV.2) fits the description of an Egyptian hall very closely, except that pillars are substituted for columns (Fig. 2.36).¹⁹⁸

Servius implies that, in the fourth century A.D., *basilica* was considered to be a synonym for *cenatio* and *triclinium*.¹⁹⁹ The word *basilica* is usually understood as a spacious multi-story public building with a double colonnade forming a nave and two aisles on the interior. It is this formal similarity, and perhaps the relatively large size of such a room in the house, that lead Vitruvius to compare an Egyptian *oecus* to a *basilica*. Vitruvius' observation was not only insightful, but prophetic. By the late 4th-mid 6th c. A.D., as Ellis points out, "The most important movement in Roman housing ... is the absorption of a variety of public functions into the houses of the aristocracy".²⁰⁰ Ellis locates a number of large rooms in those late houses which he calls "audience chambers", which appear to have served the function of *basilicae* by holding public affairs within the private house. It is reasonable to postulate that large dinner-parties were held in these chambers, and that they were known colloquially as "basilicas"; this would explain Servius' comment. There is no evidence that *triclinia* or *oeci* were known as *basilicae* in the 1 c. A.D., but some Pompeian houses possess particularly spacious halls which some scholars have considered 'basilical' because they could have contained large banquets, receptions, or meetings.²⁰¹ Vitruvius speaks elsewhere of the need for lofty and spacious spaces (comparable to public buildings) in the private houses of officials and magistrates, because public hearings and trials are held there. He calls these spaces *basilicae*:

And those of the highest status, who are involved in politics and the struggle for office and have to appear in public, must have high and impressive vestibules, wide courtyards and wide porticoes lined with trees to show off visibly how important they are. Furthermore, their libraries and basilicas should be built as magnificently as public ones, since these men often need to preside over public meetings and cases requiring arbitration or legal judgments in their homes.²⁰²

¹⁹⁸Maiuri 1952, 5-8; Maiuri 1958, 280-290.

¹⁹⁹Serv. A. 1.698. See above, p. 86, n. 136.

²⁰⁰Ellis 1988, 569. See also Ellis 1991.

²⁰¹An example is room (18) in the Casa del Menandro at Pompeii (I.10.4) (Fig. 5.163); see Dunbabin 1991, 124, and Tamm 1963, 144.

²⁰²Vitr. 6.5.2-3: *nobilibus vero, qui honores magistratusque gerundo praestare debent officia civibus, faciunda sunt vestibula regalia alta et peristylia amplissima, silvae ambulationesque laxiores ad decorem maiestatis perfectae; praeterea bybliothecas, basilicas non dissimili modo quam publicorum operum magnificentia comparatas, quod in domibus eorum saepius et publica consilia et privata iudicia arbitriaque conficiuntur* (Loeb text, author's translation).

Wallace-Hadrill argues that the 'Egyptian' *oecus* (5) in the Casa dell'Atrio a Mosaico (IV.2) at Herculaneum was used primarily for quasi-public business such as public receptions.²⁰³ He unsuccessfully claims, however, that dining would not often have taken place there because the room is too large for a set of *triclinia*. Especially large *oeci* could have served admirably as both small basilicas and large dining rooms with a simple change of furniture.

The largest of all the special *oeci* which Vitruvius mentions is the *oecus Cyzicenus*.²⁰⁴ This dining room is outfitted with folding windows and doors, that offer framed vistas out on to the house gardens.²⁰⁵ Its aspect should be northerly, suitable for summertime use, and the many windows and doors should allow cooling breezes as well as light and a pleasant view. Vitruvius describes the *oecus Cyzicenus* as spacious enough in length and breadth to be able to hold two sets of *triclinia* couches facing each other (a banquet of ca. eighteen people), with room yet to pass around the couches.²⁰⁶ Large banquets are not unattested in the literature, so large dining rooms should not be a surprising find in large houses.²⁰⁷ No archaeological examples of the Cyzicene hall have been positively identified, despite the suggestions of several scholars.²⁰⁸ Regardless, dining rooms of extraordinary size must have been common enough to merit a distinct architectural 'type'. There are halls in Pompeian houses large enough to hold two sets of dining-couches with room left over; they are the *basilicae* described above.

In some cases, large dinner-parties were held in multiple dining rooms at the same time, as Cicero reports for a visit of Julius Caesar in 45 B.C.:

But when he [Caesar] arrived at Phillipus' place on the evening of the Saturnalia [18 December], there was hardly a dining room vacant for Caesar himself to dine in. Two thousand men, no less...his entourage moreover were lavishly entertained in three other dining rooms. The humbler freedmen and slaves had

²⁰³Wallace-Hadrill 1988, 59-64, where he demolishes Maiuri's argument that *oecus* (5) in (IV.2) was the 'family' dining room.

²⁰⁴Vitr. 6.3.10; see text and translation above, p. 94, n. 188.

²⁰⁵Plin. *Ep.* 2.17.5, 5.6.29. See Förtsch 1993, 103-104.

²⁰⁶In Vitruvius' discussion of the Greek house, he mentions a Cyzicene *triclinium* as part of an ensemble of rooms around a peristyle court which combined can fit four sets of dining-couches (6.7.3). The Cyzicene dining room would probably have contained two by itself. The other rooms around the court are a library, a picture-gallery, *exedrae*, a square *oecus*, and a large entranceway. Of these, certainly the *oecus*, probably the picture-gallery, and perhaps an *exedra* could have supplied the space necessary for the other two sets of dining-couches. There is no reason to believe that any single room held four *triclinia* by itself, contra Dunbabin 1991, 124.

²⁰⁷Dunbabin 1991, 124 & n.21: Suet. *Aug.* 70.1 (twelve guests); Petr. 31 (fourteen guests).

²⁰⁸De Albentis 1990, 154. Maiuri 1952, 5-8 suggests room (91) in the Praedia di Julia Felix (II.4) at Pompeii (disputed by Parslow 1989, who identifies the room as a *biclinium*); Richardson 1955, 63-65 prefers room (46) in the Casa dei Dioscuri (VI.9.6) at Pompeii. Förtsch 1993, 104 lists other candidates.

all they wanted -- the smarter ones I entertained in style. In a word, I showed I knew how to live.²⁰⁹

Multiple dining rooms in large houses allowed flexibility in the patron's dinner plans: whether to combine dining rooms for large events, to select one for a certain occasion, or use them according to season.

Environmental setting Clever dining room elaboration exhibited the skills and imagination of a man's made environment. Equally important was the capture and presentation of the natural environment, synthesizing the artificial and the natural into a *bella vista* backdrop for the meal. The environmental context of a *triclinium* included its view, its ability to catch fresh breezes, and any natural lighting and heating provided by its seasonal aspect or orientation.

B. Bergmann summarizes the metaphor of landscape in both the late 1 c. A.D. poems of Statius and domestic wall-painting: "His (Statius') poem, like the paintings, typifies and exalts a domestic context in which architecture imposes order on the land and nature is shaped into perfect views."²¹⁰ Pliny is well-known for carefully placing his dining rooms to take fullest advantage of the natural siting of his villas.²¹¹ In his Laurentine villa, he describes a dining room set between a small court and the sea:

(There is) then a dining room which really is rather fine: it runs out towards the shore, and whenever the sea is driven inland by the south-west wind, it is lightly washed by the spray of the spent breakers. It has folding doors or windows as large as the doors all round, so that at the front and sides it seems to look out on to three seas, and at the back has a view through the inner hall, the courtyard with the two colonnades, and the entrance-hall to the woods and mountains in the distance.²¹²

Dining rooms in his Tuscan villa have similarly impressive perspectives:

²⁰⁹Cic. Att. 13.52.1-2: *Sed cum secundis Saturnalibus ad Phillipum vesperi venisset, villa ita completa a militibus est ut vix triclinium ubi cenaturus ipse Caesar esset vacaret; quippe hominum CIO CIO ...praeterea tribus tricliniis accepti oí περι αὐτὸν valde copiose. Libertis minus lautis servisque nihil defuit. nam lautiores eleganter accepi. quid multa? homines visi sumus* (OCT text, D. R. Shackleton Bailey translation).

²¹⁰Bergmann 1991, 66. See also Bek 1983, 99.

²¹¹Plin. Ep. 2.17, 5.6. See Förtsch 1993 for a detailed and thorough analysis of the villa architecture presented in the letters; see also Laurentine 1982 and Brockmeyer 1975.

²¹²Plin. Ep. 2.17.5: *Est contra medias cavaedium hilare, mox triclinium satis pulchrum, quod in litus excurrit ac, si quando Africo mare impulsus est, fractis iam et novissimis fluctibus leviter adluitur. Undique valvas aut fenestras non minores valvis habet atque ita a lateribus, a fronte quasi tria maria prospectat; a tergo cavaedium, porticum, aream, porticum rursus, mox atrium, silvas et longinquos respicit montes* (Tuebner text, B. Radice translation). A *cenatio* can have a similar view, in Plin. Ep. 2.17.12, Pliny describes an upper-story dining room which has a lovely view across the sea, a long stretch of shore, and seaside villas: *praeterea cenatio, quae latissimum mare, longissimum litus, villas amoenissimas possidet* (Teubner text).

From the end of the colonnade projects a dining room; through its folding doors it looks on to the end of the terrace, the adjacent meadow, and the stretch of open country beyond, while from its windows on one side can be seen part of the terrace and the projecting wing of the house, on the other the tree-tops in the enclosure of the adjoining riding-ground.²¹³

Down the side is a covered arcade for summer use which is built on higher ground and seems not to look down on but be actually touching the vineyard below; halfway along is a dining room which receives the fresh breezes blowing down the Apennine valleys. Its broad windows at the back look on to the vineyard, and so do its folding doors...²¹⁴

The views to the sea, forest or mountains are framed by large windows or folding doors that present slightly different pictures to each of the banquet participants as they recline in their appropriate positions.²¹⁵ Wealthy Romans artificially created natural landscapes for their urban dining rooms, using statuary, fountains, trees and flowers as substitutes for natural topography, bodies of water, and forests.²¹⁶ L. Bek argues that dining rooms were designed so that the most advantageous view out of the room came from the back corner where the host and guest of honor reclined:

"...the dinner-party and especially its two chief persons became the decisive factor in the composition of the architectonic ensemble, hence the placing of the couches as crucial to its design. As the balance of the composition had to take account, primarily, of the host and guest of honour, its axis was directed along their -- approximately parallel -- lines of vision, taking its departure from the left-hand corner of the *triclinium* and oriented towards the left from there."²¹⁷

²¹³Plin. *Ep.* 5.6.19: *A capite porticus triclinium excurrit; valvis xystum desinentem et protinus pratum multumque ruris videt, fenestris hac latus xysti et quod prosilit villae, hac adiacentis hippodromi nemus comasque prospectat* (Teubner text, B. Radice translation).

²¹⁴Plin. *Ep.* 5.6.29: *A latere aestiva cryptoporticus in edito posita, quae non adspicere vineas, sed tangere videtur. In media triclinium saluberrimum adflatum ex Apenninis vallibus recipit; post latissimis fenestris vineas, valvis aequae vineas* (Teubner text, B. Radice translation).

²¹⁵See Förtsch 1993, 104-105; Clarke 1991, 19-23; Mielsch 1987, 45-9; Bek 1983, 99-101; Lafon 1981 for discussions of the visual impact of framed natural views upon people in rooms of a villa. Bergmann 1991, 65 comments further: "The principle of structuring views in parts through windows and columns and over the forms and edges of buildings was based on prevailing spatial concepts. The Romans had no inclusive terms like the modern *landscape*. Ancient authors conceived of *landscape* in the plural, as the sum of natural and man-made objects whose association forms one segment of the visual world. In the ancient concept of landscape, the parts take precedence over the unified arrangement because each part has its *topos*, or physical envelope, and it is the relation of one *topos* to another that creates a *choros*, or area." (author's emphasis).

²¹⁶For artificial displays of water generated for dining, see Andersson 1990; Salza Prina Ricotti 1984; Salza Prina Ricotti 1979; Jashemski 1979, 41-48. For examples in the archaeological sample, see dining rooms I.4.5+25 (18), I.6.15 (d) and I.7.10-12 (17, 23).

²¹⁷Bek 1983, 86, and in general 82-88; see also Clarke 1991, 16-19; Wallace-Hadrill 1988, 75-77.

Bek succeeds in showing that views were constructed for the benefit of those inside the dining room. However, it is not true that tableaux were especially constructed for the benefit of the host and guest of honor. The traditional arrangement of diners (Fig. 1.27) clearly shows that the faces of the entire company were crowded near the center of the room. Any pleasantries visible to the host or guest of honor were also enjoyed by the others (at least on the *lectus medius* and *lectus imus*; guests on the *lectus summus* had a difficult view out of the room).²¹⁸

Bek describes the scene set for dinner guests as one that evolves (by the Imperial period) into a kind of 'theatrical stage' or 'picture show' which all guests can simply observe and enjoy:

"...the panorama or tableau of the *triclinium* is evoked by means of natural or naturalistic, figurative and associative, or even literary components. The motifs cherished are those related to the cult of nature and fertility or to the realms of gods of love, hunting, agriculture and wine. ...The scene of imagination is so to speak drawn in the guise of a picture in front of the room, a tableau to behold, not a level of reality in which to participate."²¹⁹

Dinner was not simply a voyeuristic pleasure. It was an experiential pleasure marked by sounds of conversation and music, the smells of food and other diners, the feel of a cool breeze in summer and a warm brazier in winter, and interesting sights.²²⁰ At a well-planned event, guests were physically comfortable with all aspects of the meal.

A dining room's environment involves not only the view at hand, but also the degree of light and heat which the room receives according to the season and the path of the sun. Several authors stress the importance of arranging rooms in a house according to the season in which they can be used to greatest advantage. Vitruvius provides us with the most detailed information about seasonal architecture. His concern has largely to do with available light sources:

Now then, there is the greatest need of light in *triclinia* and other chambers....²²¹

These (Displuviate atria) are outstandingly useful for winter chambers because their high *compluvia* do not obstruct the windows of the *triclinia*.²²²

²¹⁸The sample of dining rooms in this thesis failed to reveal a pattern of special vistas designed solely for the host and guest of honor (see chapter three, pp. 147-149).

²¹⁹Bek 1983, 87; see also Jones 1991 for the theatrical experience of dining.

²²⁰Pliny emphasizes the ability of a dining room to catch fresh breezes, especially in the summertime (see pp. 100, n. 214).

²²¹Vitr. 6.6.7, on "farm buildings": *Cum autem in tricliniis ceterisque conclavibus maximus est usus luminum...* (Loeb text, author's translation).

²²²Vitr. 6.3.2: *Haec hibernaculis maxime praestant utilitates, quod compluvia eorum erecta non obstant luminibus tricliniorum.* (Loeb text, author's translation).

Owners and renters of urban buildings had a legal right to unobstructed windows: "If a neighbor builds and the windows of an apartment are darkened, [a jurist held that] the lessor is liable to the urban tenant".²²³

The principal means of regulating heat and light in a dining room without the aid of portable heaters was windows and doors. Varro, in the context of a philosophical discussion about how uniformity is not always best, remarks:

In the case of buildings, while we do not perceive the atrium bearing resemblance to the peristyle nor the *cubiculum* bearing resemblance to the stable, yet due to their [different] function we follow their dissimilarities rather than their similarities: thus we do not make the same windows and doors for winter dining rooms as for summer dining rooms.²²⁴

Varro links the use of different windows and doors to different seasonal climates. Window-panes, doors and drapery were required to moderate the temperature during wintertime. So the younger Seneca demonstrates in his tirade against gluttons who are addicted to ice and snow in their drinks, even in winter:

And so, although people protect the dining-hall with draperies and window-panes, and they control the winter temperature with a huge fire, nonetheless the stomach, debilitated and languid from its own burning, seeks something [e.g. an ice-cooled drink] by which it may be revived.²²⁵

Covering the windows and doors was not enough to protect a dining room from the cold of winter. A winter *triclinium* also required the heat of portable braziers.²²⁶ Due to the resulting smoke, Vitruvius advises plain decoration:

But in rooms where there is fire or many lamps are to be placed, (the cornices) ought to be plain, so that they may be more easily wiped clean; in summer rooms

²²³Gaius *dig.* 19.2.25.2: *Si vicino aedificante obscurentur lumina cenaculi, teneri locatorem inquilino* (Watson 1985 text and translation). See Rodger 1972, 38-89 and Frier 1980, 38-39. See also Watts 1987, 239-242 for an assessment of lighting conditions in Roman houses.

²²⁴Var. *L.* 8.29: *In <a>edificiis, quom non videamus habere <ad> atrium περιστῦλον similitudinem et cubiculum ad equile, [quod] tamen propter utilitatem in his dissimilitudines potius quam similitudines sequimur: itaque et hiberna triclinia et <a>estiva non item valvata ac fenestrata facimus* (Loeb text, author's translation).

²²⁵Sen. *Con.* 4b.13.7: *Itaque quamvis cenationem velis ac specularibus muniant et igne multo doment hiemam, nihilominus stomachus ille solutus et aestu suo languidus quaerit aliquid quo erigatur* (Loeb text and translation).

²²⁶Suet. *Vit.* 8.2 mentions a fire caused by an overturned hearth in the newly-acclaimed emperor's dining room in Lower Germany in early January. The same author, *Tib.* 74.1, describes a brazier in the emperor's dining room on Capri during the month of March. Sidon. *Ep.* 2.2.11 specifically describes a winter dining room (*hiemale ticlinium*) stained with the soot of a vaulted fireplace (*arcuatili camino*).

and *exedrae* where there is minimal smoke, soot cannot do any harm; there carving may be carried out.²²⁷

The craftsmen, again, in the stucco-work, must keep the designs in accordance with 'decor', that they may have a character fitted to their place and adjusted to the differences of style. In winter dining rooms, painting of detail is not useful in the composition, nor fine mouldings in the cornice under the vault, because they are damaged by the smoke from the fire and the frequent soot from the lamps. In these rooms, immediately above the dado, panels of black are to be worked up and finished with strips of yellow ochre or vermilion intervening. The arched ceilings have a plain finish.²²⁸

Vitruvius clearly believed that seasonal ramifications must be considered with regard to the quality and nature of wall and ceiling decoration. His advice for the construction of pavements in winter-dining rooms reveals similar concerns:

As to the pavements, it will not be unsatisfactory if we observe the arrangement of Greek winter apartments. A useful construction is not at all expensive. For inside the leveled surface of the *triclinium*, a depth of about two feet is dug. The ground is well-rammed and a pavement of rubble or pounded brick is laid with a fall towards the gutter and its outlets. Then charcoal is collected and crushed by treading, and a mixture six inches thick of ashes, sand and lime is laid. The top surface is then rubbed with stone to rule and level, and has the appearance of a black pavement. At banquets, therefore, the wine which is thrown from the cups or spit out after tasting dries as it falls. And although the servants who are employed there are barefooted, their feet are not stained by the wine-less on this kind of pavement.²²⁹

In order to minimize the need for portable heat, some authors argue for architectural designs that moderate the existing environmental conditions and maximize the naturally available light and heat. Columella gives directions, but no explicit reasons, for arranging the

²²⁷Vitr. 7.3.4: *Conclavibus aute, ubi ignis aut plura lumina sunt ponenda, pura fieri debent, ut ea facilius extergeantur; in aestivis et exhedris, ubi minime fumus est nec fuligo potest nocere, ibi calatae sunt faciendae.* (Loeb text, author's translation); see also Salza Prina Ricotti 1987, 127.

²²⁸Vitr. 7.4.4: *Ipsi autem politionibus eorum ornatus proprios debent habere ad decoris rationes, uti et ex locis aptas et generum discriminibus non alienas habeant dignitates. tricliniis hibernis non est utilis compositione nec megalographia nec camerarum coronario opere subtilis ornatus, quod ea et ab ignis fumo et ab luminum crebris fuligini- bus corrumpuntur. in his vero supra podia abaci ex atramento sunt subigendi et poliendi cuneis silaceis seu miniaceis interpositis; explicatae camerae pure politae* (Loeb text and translation).

²²⁹Vitr. 7.4.4-5: *etiam pavimentorum non erit displicens, si qui animadvertere voluerit Graecorum hibernaculorum usum, minime sumptuosus et utilis apparatus. foditur enim infra libramentum triclinii altitudo circiter pedum binum, et solo festucato inducitur aut rudus aut testaceum pavimentum ita fastigatum, ut in canali habeat nares. Deinde congestis et spisse calcatis carbonibus inducitur e sabulone et calce et favilla mixta materias crassitudine semipedali. Ad regulam et libellam summo libramento cote despumato redditur species nigri pavimenti. Ita conviviis eorum et, quod poculis et pytismatis effundetur, simul cadit siccescitque, quique versantur ibi ministrantes, etsi nudis pedibus fuerint, non recipiunt fraces ab eius modi genere pavimenti* (Loeb text and translation).

dining rooms of a villa according to season and the direction of the sun: winter (oriented west), and summer (oriented south-east):

The *villa urbana* should be in turn divided into winter apartments and summer apartments, in such a way that the winter bedrooms may face the sunrise at the winter solstice, and the winter dining rooms may face the sunset at the equinox. The summer bedrooms, on the other hand, should look towards the midday sun at the time of the equinox but the dining rooms of that season should look towards the rising sun of winter.²³⁰

Vitruvius elaborates on why light and temperature are linked to the three seasonal types of dining rooms which can be present in a house. His advice for seasonal orientations varies from Columella's, but it makes somewhat more sense: winter (oriented southwest), spring-autumn (oriented east), and summer (oriented north).²³¹

Now we will explain by what properties the variety of constructions ought to look out suitably upon the quarters of the sky according to their purpose. Winter *triclinia* and baths should look towards the winter setting sun, because there is need of using the evening light; besides which, the facing setting sun still possesses brilliance, and throwing back heat it renders this quarter warmer in the evening-time...

Spring and autumnal *triclinia* ought to face towards the east; for placed in front of the rays, the facing force of the sun progressing westward renders these rooms temperate at the time when the need for their use is customary. Summer *triclinia* ought to face towards the north because that quarter, unlike the others that are rendered sweltering at the solstice due to the heat, is always cool and remains healthy and enjoyable in its use, because it is turned away from the course of the sun.²³²

²³⁰Col. 1.6.1-2: *Urbana rursus in hibernacula et aestiua sic digeratur, ut spectent hiemalis temporis cubacula brumalem orientem, cenationes aequinoctialem occidentem. rursus aestiua cubacula spectent meridiem aequinoctialem, sed cenationes eiusdem temporis prospectent hibernum orientem* (Loeb text and translation).

²³¹In the northern hemisphere, a winter dining room would gather much more light and heat by facing south-west than by facing west (as Columella suggests). Columella's south-east orientation for a summer dining room would heat up the room for most of the morning, although the room would have time to cool before the *cena* in the late afternoon. A summer dining room with northerly aspect would remain cool throughout the day.

²³²Vitr. 6.4: *Nunc explicabimus, quibus proprietatibus genera aedificorum ad usum et caeli regiones apte debeant exspectare. Hiberna triclinia et balnearia uti occidentem hibernum spectent, ideo quod vespertino lumine opus est uti, praeterea quod etiam sol occidens adversus habens splendorem, calorem remittens efficit vespertino tempore regionem tepidiorem...*

Triclinia verna et autumnalia ad orientem; tum enim praetenta luminibus adversus solis impetus progrediens ad occidentem efficit ea temperata ad id tempus, quo opus solitum est uti. Aestiva ad septentrionem, quod ea regio, non ut reliquae per solstitium propter clorem efficiuntur aestuosae, ea quod est aversa a solis cursu, semper refrigerata et salubritatem et voluptatem in usu praestat. (Loeb text, author's translation). Vitr. 6.7.3 discusses seasonal dining rooms in Greek houses.

Vitruvius stresses the need to make rooms as comfortable as possible while they are being used. His prescriptions are based on the length of time and what time of day a given room would be under the stare of the sun; both factors depend directly upon the season of the year.

The aspect of a dining room onto an open space such as an atrium or peristyle may have been as important as the direction it faced in determining its seasonal role. In some early atrium houses, two dining rooms flanked the *tablinum* at the back of the atrium.²³³ The winter dining room faced back onto the atrium, largely sheltered from inclement weather. The summer dining room faced onto the *hortus* or peristyle at the back of the house through a broad doorway or window. As the "canonical" atrium-peristyle house developed, dining rooms came to be placed around the peristyle or viridarium, taking advantage of light and breezes, especially in the summer. Because the largely enclosed atrium offered more protection against the weather than did garden porticos, dining rooms that faced onto the atrium may have been designated for winter use.²³⁴ Dining rooms at either side of the *tablinum* that faced both ways could have been used for the intervening seasons of spring and autumn; temporary shutters or doors could have determined the aspect of the room depending on the weather.²³⁵

An archaeological typology of dining areas

In a broad sense, a dining area is any place at all where people eat. There is a large difference, however, between taking lunch alone on a chair in a random room, and eating formally with guests in a dining room. The former is taking food solely for sustenance; the latter is institutionalized and ritualized group consumption. The former is eating, and the latter is dining, as Plutarch knew: "The Romans are fond of quoting a clever and gregarious man who said, after eating alone, 'I have eaten, but not dined today,' implying that a dinner always needs the company of friends for its seasonings".²³⁶

Dining areas are identified by their architectural form, decoration, and sometimes artifacts found within (see below, pp. 106-110). This typology sorts out dining areas based on simple, measurable criteria: dimensions, proportions and dining furniture. Fig. 2.44 shows the distribution of dining area dimensions (length and width) for the complete sample. Fig. 2.45 shows the same distribution, with the dining areas categorized according to the definitions that follow below. The 'dining room' (as the archetype) is defined first; it is the basis for defining the 'dining hall' and 'dinette'. All of these contained wooden dining couches that no longer survive. Permanent masonry dining furniture defines the 'outdoor dining area' and 'dining benches'. The

²³³For example, rooms (34, 35) flanking the *tablinum* (33) in (VI.12.2); see Richardson 1983, 61-62, and rooms (11, 12) flanking *tablinum* (8) in the Casa del Menandro (I.10.4); see Ling 1983.

²³⁴See Vit. 6.3.2 (see above, p. 101, n.222).

²³⁵Richardson 1983, 62-64. See also Mau 1908, 266.

²³⁶Plu. *Moralia* 69C (translation Gowers 1993, 279).

typology is a common basis for comparing dining areas in residences across the socio-economic spectrum (see chapter three, pp. 140-145). The English terminology for the types breaks away from the conventional Latin terms discussed above. After defining each type, I will suggest Latin terms that correlate most closely to each, offering a link between the literary and archaeological evidence.²³⁷ The codes are used on the individual building plans and in the Gazetteer entries:

Type DR	"Dining room"	Type DO	"Dining area (Open-Air)"
Type DH	"Dining-Hall"	Type DB	"Dining Benches"
Type DI	"Dinette"		

Type DR, "Dining room"

The primary attribute of a 'dining room' is a set of three three-person dining couches. The Latin term that best describes this type is *triclinium*, which assumes the presence of the three couches. Dining areas have been found with only one or two couches *in situ* (although there was usually room for three). Traditionally, two couch dining areas have been called *biclinia*. A *biclinium* technically refers to a smaller couch that holds only two people, just as the term *lectus tricliniaris* refers to a three-person couch, but the term has gained wide acceptance as referring to a two-couch dining area.²³⁸ *Cenatio* is also a suitable equivalent, although *cenatio* may also be applied to other types of dining areas.

Decorative patterns in the pavement or division of the wall decoration can indicate where the couches were placed:

"Both wall-paintings and pavement design often distinguish clearly between the forepart of the room, for reception of the guests, service, and entertainment, and the inner part for the couches; and the pavement of this inner part may be divided into a more highly decorated center and a plainer surround."²³⁹

This functional differentiation of space is achieved by a synchronized bipartite division of wall, ceiling, and floor decoration. Stucco or painted pilasters or a change in the base color of the paint

²³⁷Allison (1992a, 1992b) calls for a break from conventional nomenclature, and yet follows it herself, for the obvious advantage of convenience. Bek's typology (1983, 83) is based solely on literary evidence. She derives the "three main types of *triclinia*" from Vitruvius: winter, summer, and open-air garden *triclinia*, none of which are distinguished from larger rooms like *oeci*. As a result, she lumps all of the types together and treats them as equals (which they are not).

²³⁸Dining room (19) of the Casa dell'Alcova (IV.4) at Herculaneum had only two couches found within, although there was room for three. *Biclinium* clearly refers to a two person couch in Pl. *Bac.* 714-760, and the word is scarce in Latin; it appears elsewhere only once (Quint. *Inst.* 1.5.68). Modern definitions of *biclinium* as a dining area with two couches: Clarke 1991, 374, 194-199, Jashemski 1979, 45, Dunbabin 1991, 124; all primarily refer to the two masonry open-air couches in II.2.2 (k) except Soprano 1950, 305-306, who lists other instances of two-couch ensembles in masonry at Pompeii.

²³⁹Dunbabin 1991, 123. See also Watts 1987, 236-237, 325-328.

mark the division between service and dining areas (Fig. 5.136).²⁴⁰ In some cases, the height of the ceiling changes, or a vault is installed over the back dining area, leaving a flat ceiling in front (Fig. 2.34).²⁴¹ A mosaic band across the floor can act as a 'threshold', accentuated by a mosaic panel in the center of the dining area (Figs. 5.50, 5.54, 5.87, 5.156). A few dining rooms at Pompeii have that particular 'T+U'-shaped mosaic pattern:

"a central rectangular panel is surrounded on three sides by a rectilinear area for the couches...(and) the entrance to the room is marked by the addition of a horizontal bar to the central panel, to provide more space here for service and entertainment."²⁴²

Most rooms contain only the central rectangular panel (emblema) of mosaic or *opus sectile* to suggest that couches were placed around it.²⁴³ An emblema by itself is not a sure indication of a dining room; central mosaic panels also appear in other rooms too small to be used for dining, such as bedrooms or sitting-rooms. Bipartite decoration was not always in fashion. It appears as a strong feature of the second style at Pompeii (ca. 80-15 B.C.), progressively loses the synchronization between floor and walls during the third style (ca. 20 B.C.-A.D. 45/50), and finally disappears altogether in the fourth style (ca. A.D. 45-79).²⁴⁴

Certain colors and decorative schemes have been associated with dining rooms.

Vitruvius advised making the decoration of winter dining rooms plain and dark, because fine decoration would be masked by soot from lamps and hearths.²⁴⁵ In the second style, there are several dining rooms with a southern aspect and black ground wall decoration; by the third style, black-based decoration is common in all manner of rooms.²⁴⁶ Identifying room function based on decorative style and subjects has not been wholly successful, falling foul of the sheer variety of decorative schemes. A few generalities have emerged, however, as Ling points out:

"...the choice of subjects within a given decoration often unmistakably reflects the function of the room. Bacchic pictures and motifs, not to mention still-life

²⁴⁰Examples of painted bipartition from the study sample are I.9.5 (11); VII.1.25+47 (8); IX.1.22 (t'), and I.6.4 (p); I.6.7 (h); I.9.1-2 (8), where pilasters define the fore and back parts of the room.

²⁴¹An example of a change in ceiling height from the study sample is I.7.10-12 (4).

²⁴²Dunbabin 1991, 125-126. Examples of mosaic bipartition from the study sample include I.6.4 (p); I.9.13-14 (m); I.7.10-12 (16, 17).

²⁴³Examples of mosaic emblemata from the sample include: I.4.9 (m); I.6.13 (4); I.6.15 (d, e); I.7.1 (16, 18); I.7.2-3 (c); I.7.7 (b); I.9.5-7 (11, 13); I.10.4 (11); IX.2.15-16 (e); IX.2.27 (d).

²⁴⁴Dates for the styles at Pompeii come from Ling 1991. Ling 1991, 48-51, 69-70, 98, 135-136 and Barbet 1985, 66-72, 130-135 discuss the chronological appearance and disappearance of bipartition, and the salient features of this bipartition, with examples from Pompeii, Herculaneum, and the villas of Campania.

²⁴⁵Vitr. 7.3.4-7.4.4; see above, pp. 102-103, n. 227-228.

²⁴⁶Ling 1991, 51, 69; Allison 1992a, 247. 'Winter' dining rooms with black ground decoration identified in the study sample: I.6.15 (e); I.7.5 (d); I.7.10-12 (10); I.9.5 (11); I.9.8 (9).

paintings of food, are frequently found in saloons [i.e. dining-halls] and dining rooms."²⁴⁷

In terms of theme, he continues: "Even where subject-matter was less specifically related to room function, it is a general rule that reception rooms were decorated with grand and heroic themes, bedrooms with more intimate ones."²⁴⁸ Grand themes also went hand-in-hand with "elaborate architectural decoration" in the more public reception rooms that included dining rooms and dining-halls.²⁴⁹ On the point of composition, Clarke speaks of the difference between 'dynamic' areas through which one passed, and 'static' areas such as dining areas, in which one rested:

"Dynamic, or walking, spaces announced the goal of the walk from the point of entrance, employing arranged views of the terminus to prompt the visitor as he or she progressed through the spaces. Decoration in these spaces, as we will see, was tailored to quick recognition of simple patterns rather than long, tarrying analysis. In static, or resting, spaces, the view *out* was of primary importance. Decoration within this kind of space tended to be complex, requiring the viewer's prolonged attention."²⁵⁰

Because guests would occupy dining rooms for hours, dining rooms were the consummate 'static' spaces (even as they were 'dynamic' vortices of serving, eating, and entertainment). The combination of large-scale, detailed decorative schemes and spacious dimensions in dining rooms encouraged the occupants of the room to focus on the interior space, where the artistic taste and financial wherewithal of the host was on display.

The most secure evidence for a dining room is the presence of actual dining couches. Because of their perishable frames of wood, and covers and cushions of cloth, actual couches rarely survive even at Pompeii and Herculaneum. The wooden frames of two couches each are preserved in dining room (19) of the Casa dell'Alcova (IV.4) and the upper floor rooms (2, 5) of the Casa a Graticcio (III.13) in Herculaneum (Figs. 2.37-2.39). These couches vary in size; in the Casa dell'Alcova, the frames measure ca. 2.60 x 1.15 m. and 2.20 x 1.15 m respectively. The narrower frames in room (2) of the back upstairs apartment in the Casa a Graticcio measure ca. 2.40 x 0.55 m., and in room (5) of the front upstairs apartment, the larger 'adult' couch measures

²⁴⁷Ling 1991, 135.

²⁴⁸Ling 1991, 136.

²⁴⁹Allison 1992a, 247, in reference to her case study of the Casa della Caccia Antica at Pompeii (VII.4.48). Both Ling and Allison follow Barbet 1985, 72, who says about second style decoration: "Le décor des salles de réception comprend très souvent des thèmes gradioses, des architectures de grande ampleur, des mégalographies mises en valeur par les proportions souvent imposantes des salles. Un jeu de portes réelles ou feintes, générateur de symétries, contrebalance la tendance à centrer l'attention sur le mur de fond." This distinct style in dining rooms does not last through the third style (Barbet 1985, 132).

²⁵⁰Clarke 1991, 16.

ca. 2.12 x 1.10 m., and the small 'child' couch 1.20 x 0.70 m.²⁵¹ The bronze frame found in a dining room in the villa of Boscoreale, partially reconstructed, measures ca. 2.30 x 1.20 m (Fig. 2.40).²⁵² These dimensions fall close to the average couch measurements derived from couch niches in dining rooms from the study sample (see below, Table 2.1). Fragments of a dining couch (insufficient to reconstruct the dimensions) were found in a couch-niche in room (9) of the Casa del Fabbro (I.10.7) (Fig. 5.170).²⁵³ In lieu of whole couches, metal feet and couch attachments can suggest the presence of dining furniture. Fragmentary fittings may, however, also belong to sleeping couches, chairs, benches, or other sorts of furniture.²⁵⁴

The most common indication of dining is the presence of niches, cuttings into the bases of walls that aided in the placement of couches, sometimes even allowing couches to be fit in a room which would otherwise have been too narrow.²⁵⁵ They continue the plaster and decoration of the rest of the wall, so as not to leave decorative gaps if the couches were ever removed from the room. In cross-section, niches may be squared off or curved; often the imprint of the couch legs or headboard is articulated (Figs. 2.41-2.42). Dining room (e) in the small Casa di Paccius Alexander (Pompeii IX.1.7) has the relatively rare privilege of possessing niches for all three couches (Figs. 1.27, 2.42). The niche for the *lectus medius* is squared-off with a slot to receive the couch frame, the niche for the *lectus imus* curves gently into the wall from the top of the couch to the floor, and the squared niche for the *lectus summus* preserves the position of the legs at either end, as well as a slot for the headboard. The *lectus medius* niche is most commonly present, the

²⁵¹Maiuri 1958, 392 & 417-419 respectively. Measurements in his text do not match measurements taken from the scale drawings of the Casa a Graticcio. Maiuri calls both upstairs rooms (2, 5) in that house *biclinia*. The identification of these rooms for dining is not secure, but it is likely, considering that no other rooms in the apartments are more suitable for dining. In addition, we might expect that poorer families with smaller living quarters like these apartments would have smaller dining areas with couches of non-canonical dimensions. Finally, Maiuri's suggestion that the different size couches in (5) reflect their use by individuals of different ages is intriguing, but not verifiable.

²⁵²Richter 1966, 106 & fig. 530; the couch is in the Staatliche Museum in Berlin. Another dining couch from Pompeii in the National Archaeological Museum in Naples has been reconstructed to identical dimensions (Collezioni 1989, 186-187, #97). See also Pirzio Biroli Stefanelli 1990, 68-79, 162-180, Figs. 118-149; Engelmann 1904, Fig. 87.

²⁵³A unique example of a dining couch *in situ*: Allison 1992b, 205, Elia NSc 1934, 286-287.

²⁵⁴Couch fittings were found in I.4.5+25 (35); I.6.4 (c); I.6.8-9 (d); I.7.2-3 (c); I.7.10-12 (17); I.7.18 (c); I.9.13 (d); I.10.4 (15, 18); I.10.7 (8). See the gazetteer for details.

²⁵⁵Allison 1992b, 80-84 questions the assumption that niches (or recesses) consistently marked the position of beds or couches. However, she does not take into account that the different position of each couch in a *triclinium* arrangement requires niches of different shapes and sizes, even as the function of these niches remains exactly the same. No niches identified for dining couches from the study sample (and listed in Table 2.1 below) are invalidated by her arguments.

lectus summus niche is sometimes present, and the *lectus imus* niche is rarely present. Couch niches are secure indications that dining was carried out or intended to be carried out.²⁵⁶

The size of couch niches reveals the approximate size of the couches that fit in them. Couch sizes are the basis of the dimensional parameters that define a 'dining room'. A dining room is defined as: 'a room designed to hold three dining-couches in the standard π -shaped arrangement'. The width of the *lectus summus* and the length of the *lectus medius* together take up the width of the room, perhaps with a little room to spare between the couches. Because there are upper and lower limits to the size of a three-person dining-couch, there are therefore upper and lower limits to the width of a dining room. I assume that dining rooms with niches were just large enough to contain their couches, and no more. Dining rooms without niches were presumably wide enough to hold the couches as they were, without architectural modification.

Some leeway (in this study, up to 0.15 m. is allowed) must have been available for adjusting the position of the couches slightly. However, the 'dining room' type does not allow for enough space (as narrow as 0.20-0.25 m.) between the couches and walls for people to walk through. Whether servants could walk around behind the couches to serve food, wine, or attend to personal needs of the guests (such as urination) must have affected the service and experience of a meal.²⁵⁷ Circumambulation draws the line of definition between the dimensions of the 'dining room' and the 'dining-hall'.

I measured twenty-two dining room couch niches from the study sample in order to make a proxy calculation of couch sizes. In dining rooms with niches for both the short and long sides of couches, retrieving the dimensions of the couches was straightforward. Most dining rooms, however, had a single niche for the short end of the *lectus medius*. In these cases, the width of the *lectus medius* (presumably equal to the width of the *lectus summus*), was subtracted from the total width of the room to provide the length of the *lectus medius*. In this way, the width of one couch niche provided the dimensions for all of the couches, assuming that all couches were the same size.²⁵⁸ The reconstructed couch dimensions are presented in Table 2.1 below:

²⁵⁶Niches for beds also sometimes appear in *cubicula*, but those rooms are much too small to hold an arrangement of three couches. See above, pp. 86-87, n. 141, 145.

²⁵⁷Vitr. 6.3.10 specifically mentions being able to walk around dining couches in the more spacious *oeci Cyziceni*; see above, p. 94, n. 188.

²⁵⁸Varro *L.* 9.9, 9.47 takes for granted that dining couches come as a set and are of the same size (see pp. 92-93, n. 179-181).

<u>House, Room Address</u>	<u>Width</u>	<u>Length</u>	<u>House, Room Address</u>	<u>Width</u>	<u>Length</u>
I.6.7 (g) [lm]	1.38	2.39	I.9.8 (9) [lm]	1.20	2.27
I.7.1 (16) [lm]	1.30	2.71	I.9.13-14 (d) [lm]	1.08	2.20
I.7.5 (d) [lm]	1.26	2.64	I.9.13-14 (j) [ls, lm]	1.29	2.68
I.7.10-12 (7) [ls, lm, li]	1.14	2.22	I.10.7 (9) [lm]	1.24	2.55
I.7.10-12 (10) [lm]	1.45	2.31	VII.1.27 (5) [ls, lm]	1.47	2.30
I.8.4-6 (3) [lm]	1.11	2.78	IX.1.7 (e) [ls, lm, li]	1.42	2.34
I.8.4-6 (13) [ls]	1.01	2.39	IX.1.7 (h) [lm]	1.32	2.24
I.8.8-9 (10) [ls, lm]	1.39	2.29	IX.1.12 (g) [lm, li]	1.08	2.62
I.8.15-16 (6) [lm]	1.26	2.50	IX.1.12 (n) [lm, li]	1.12	2.51
I.8.17+11 (14) [ls]	1.11	2.52	IX.1.22 (r) [lm]	1.00	2.25
I.8.18 (6) [lm]	1.06	2.62	IX.1.22 (i') [lm]	1.29	2.33
Means:	1.23	2.44	Standard Deviations:	0.14	0.18
Ranges:	1.00-1.47	2.20-2.78	(n=22):		

Table 2.1: Lengths and widths of couches in study sample dining areas as reconstructed from the measurements of their couch niches (in meters). Square brackets contain the identity of the couch niches that were preserved and that allow the reconstruction:

ls = *lectus summus*; lm = *lectus medius*; li = *lectus imus*

The dimensions fall into two broad groups of about equal numbers, which show up clearly on both a scatterplot and a cluster analysis (Fig. 2.43). Group 'A' includes couches shorter than ca. 2.40 m. in length, and highly variable in width (ca. 1.00-1.50 m.). Group 'B' includes couches longer than ca. 2.50 m., and more tightly defined in width (ca. 1.05-1.30 m). The division into two groups of couches does not correlate to either dining room size or house size. Perhaps these groups are the result of different standards for furniture construction, i.e. different 'types' of dining couches. A survey that takes into account the heights of the couch niches as well as their particular shapes (i.e. impressions for couch legs, head-boards and foot-boards) will be needed to address the question of what determines the groupings.

The widest dining area that contained couch niches was I.7.1 (16), at 4.22 m. wide.²⁵⁹ The smallest dining room containing niches was IX.1.22 (r), at 3.25 m. wide (including the extra width that the niches provide). These numbers could be used as upper and lower limits for the size of a 'dining room', but the definitive parameters must take into account the smallest and largest possible combinations of dining-couch sizes. A dining couch can be as small as 1.00 m. wide and 2.20 m. long, and as large as 1.47 m. wide and 2.78 m. long. Combining the minimum

²⁵⁹One set of couch niches was excluded from the list in Table 2.1. Room I.7.10-12 (17), a 'dining hall' of 5.39 m. in width, contained two particularly long couch niches: 4.36 m. long along the west wall from the north end, and 3.95 m. long along the north wall from the west end. After a 'gap' in the north wall of 0.39 m. where no recess exists, an additional short niche of 1.05 m. is cut in the east end of the north wall. The niches and the mosaic pattern of the floor both suggest the placement of three couches ca. 1.05 m. wide and 3.31 m. long around a central mosaic emblema. These are couches of exceptional size, so this room is treated as a special case; see the gazetteer.

measurements results in a smallest possible dining room of 3.20 m. in width. The upper limit for dining room width is the sum of the largest couch dimensions (4.25 m.) plus an additional allowance of 0.15 m. for space between the couches (see above). A dining room does not therefore exceed 4.40 m. in width.

The length of the dining room must be at least 3.20 m. long to accommodate the smallest possible set of couches. An additional 0.40 m. is required to allow persons entering the room to access the couches, for a total minimum length of 3.60 m. No upper limit has been set on the length of a dining room because dining couches constrain only the maximum width of a room. The definition of a 'dining room' also requires that its length exceed its width (i.e. it may not be square or less than square); the arrangement of dining couches carries an inherent longitudinal axis that should be repeated in the proportions of the room.

In sum, the 'dining room' is defined as: at least 3.20 by 3.60 m., and at most 4.40 m. wide and no limit in length. These parameters are sufficient for the entire size-range of a three dining-couch set to fit snugly. Even by this seemingly narrow definition, 57% of dining areas from the study sample fall into 'dining room' type, attesting to its validity. No other single type exceeds 20% of the total (see Table 2.2 below):

<u>Dining area type</u>	<u># of examples</u>	<u>% of the total</u>
DR, Dining room	96	57.1%
DH, Dining hall	31	18.4%
DI, Dinette	26	15.5%
DO, Outdoor dining area	9	5.4%
DB, Dining benches	6	3.6%

Table 2.2: Frequency of dining area types from the study sample, (168 dining areas total).

Type DH, "Dining-Hall"

The 'dining-hall' is defined as any room of greater width than a dining room, i.e. more than 4.40 m. wide, and at least as long (3.60 m.) as a dining room (Figs. 2.44-2.45, 5.32, 5.36, 5.163).²⁶⁰ Space for moving behind the couches was a basic feature of the dining-hall. The extra space would have allowed servants to see to the personal needs of the guests, and permitted guests to leave the table or return to it without disturbing any other guests. There was also more space for entertainment to be conducted in front of the couches during the meal.

The dining-hall has the largest floor space of any of the types defined in the study, and is amongst the largest of the rooms that appear in a house (excluding *atria*, gardens and peristyles). A dining-hall may be greater in width than in length; it is assumed that the hall was not only

²⁶⁰Examples in the study sample include: I.4.5+25 (18, 19, 35, 53, 57); I.4.9 (m); I.6.4 (p); I.7.7 (n); I.7.10-12 (17); I.7.19 (b); I.8.17+11 (9); I.9.1-2 (14); I.9.5-7 (17); I.10.4 (18, 19); I.10.11 (8, 20); VII.1.25+47 (10); VII.1.40 (21, 23); VII.14.5 (12); VII.14.9 (12); VII.14.14-16 (8, 13); IX.1.20 (s); IX.1.22 (a', t'); IX.2.10+14 (d); IX.2.15-16 (e); IX.2.26 (p).

designed to hold dinners, but also other sorts of gatherings and receptions where dining-couches were not needed. A dining-hall is a large multi-purpose reception room, a salon, a *basilica*, in which dining can take place when couches are set up inside. Consistent with this description is the Latin term *oecus* or *oecus tricliniaris*.²⁶¹ Dining-halls of square shape or of greater width than length are perhaps the *oeci quadrati* to which Vitruvius refers in his discussion of proper room proportions. Particularly large dining-halls could have accommodated more than one set of three dining-couches, like *oeci Cyziceni*.²⁶²

Type DI, "Dinette"

There are a number of rooms in the study sample that are not large enough to contain a full set of even the smallest three dining couches within their walls. The 'dinette' has no proportional restrictions; it can be either particularly wide or particularly long, but not both wide and long enough (more than 3.20 m. wide and 3.60 m. long) to hold a set of couches (Figs. 2.45, 5.87, 5.142, 5.161).²⁶³ This type appears largely in small to medium sized houses and (work)shop-houses. Sometimes they are the largest and only well-decorated room in the house, and can be considered a dining area by default. Most of these appear in the traditional position of the *tablinum*.²⁶⁴ In these cases, it seems likely that one particularly well-equipped room on a small property served as a multi-functional eating, sitting, and reception room.

Because three standard couches cannot fit in a 'dinette', it must have accommodated either smaller couches for one or two people (a *biclinium*), only one or two couches, or even chairs or benches around a table.²⁶⁵ Dining couches were used in some dinettes; a couch niche was found in IX.2.4 (c), and dining-couch fittings were found in I.7.2-3 (c). The dinette is best described by *cenatiuncula*, diminutive of the general term *cenatio*. In a 4th century A.D. letter of Sidonius, a *cenatiuncula* is depicted as comparable in size and appearance to a *diaeta* (a small daytime sitting and resting room, usually with a view).²⁶⁶ The term does not appear in literary sources with any regularity, but it clearly implies a room with a dining function, and of a size smaller than the average dining room.

²⁶¹A traditional definition for *oecus* comes from Ling 1991, xi: "saloon; large living-room used frequently for entertainments and dining"; likewise Clarke 1991, 376.

²⁶²Square *oeci*: Vitr. 6.3.8; Cyzicean *oeci*: Vitr. 6.3.10; see above, p. 94, n. 187.

²⁶³Examples in the study sample (see the gazetteer) include: I.4.11 (b); I.6.4 (i); I.7.2-3 (c); I.7.10-12 (16); I.7.19 (e); I.8.10 (3); I.9.5-7 (13); I.10.2-3 (6); I.10.8 (2); I.10.18 (3); VII.1.32 (4); VII.1.36-37 (h); VII.14.5 (4, 10); IX.1.8 (b); IX.1.31-32 (c); IX.2.4 (c); IX.2.5 (c); IX.2.6 (b); IX.2.7-8 (k); IX.2.12 (e).

²⁶⁴Examples in the study sample include: I.10.2-3 (6); IX.2.4 (c); IX.2.5 (c); IX.2.6 (b); IX.2.12 (e).

²⁶⁵See Marquardt I, 358-359 for literary evidence of less than three people on a dining couch, and Maiuri 1958, 419 for couches of different size possibly used by adults and children in the Casa a Graticcio (III.14) at Herculaneum (see also above, p. 109, n. 251).

²⁶⁶Sidon. *Ep.* 2.2.11, (p. 87, n. 142). Definition for a *diaeta*: Förtsch 1993, 48-58; Clarke 1991, 374.

Type D O, "Dining area (Open Air)"

'Open air dining areas' are easily identified. They consist of couches (often constructed of masonry) set up outside or partially sheltered under porticos, porches or bowers in gardens and peristyles. Three masonry couches are built together at clean right angles to each other in the horseshoe pattern; they are not offset like couches of perishable materials (Figs. 2.44, 2.46-2.48). The ensemble varies greatly in total size, in this sample from 2.9-5.0 m. long and 4.2-5.4 m. wide.²⁶⁷ Several sets of outdoor couches in the sample were built of perishable materials. These have been reconstructed in their garden locations on the basis of actual wooden frames and metal fittings, or from the presence of four columns that supported a bower over the couches.²⁶⁸

Masonry dining couches have surfaces that slant slightly downward from the inside to outside edge. This incline naturally elevated the diners' heads above their feet more easily than if they were supporting their weight on their left elbow, as was the custom on perishable dining-couches. Cushions and covers were of course laid across the masonry to make them comfortable. Masonry couches can have several extra features, as two dining areas in the study sample exhibit (see I.6.2 (16); I.7.10-12 (23), Figs. 2.46-2.47, 5.89). A circular or square table of masonry always sits in the center of the ensemble. Sometimes a ledge runs along the front of the inside of the couches, on which goblets or food might be set. Podia are attached at the side of the couches, on top of which dishes or a wine service might be placed; these podia sometimes contain storage cabinets. Built in benches attached to the ends of the couches allow a place for other diners to sit. Finally, water play from fountains, cascades or canals can supply special ambiance.²⁶⁹

Open-air dining areas appear for rent in inns or diners, for group meals in *collegia*, or associated with religious feasting; the minority are associated with private housing.²⁷⁰ No Latin term describes these open air dining areas; *triclinium* or *cenatio* are as applicable as any, because both are applied to outdoor dining facilities. Finally, Soprano notes that the 'uncovered place' (*in*

²⁶⁷The sizes of these couches cannot be used to calculate the size of perishable couches; masonry couches are interconnected and their joined edges are not squared off, but slanted. Examples from the study sample include: I.6.2 (16); I.7.10-12 (23); I.7.16 (2); I.8.8-9 (11). In Soprano's (1950) seminal study of these outdoor dining couches, their measurements as a whole have a broader range, 2.5-5.0 m. long and 3.0-5.0 m. wide. See also Dunbabin 1991, 123-125 & n. 14-16, 23-31, who cites Jashemski 1979 (esp. 89-97), Salza Prina Ricotti 1979 and Zanker 1979.

²⁶⁸Soprano 1950, 307-308 lists perishable dining couches (from the study sample) in the outdoor areas I.4.22 (l); I.7.1 (9); I.10.4 (c); I.10.7 (12); VII.1.25+47 (19).

²⁶⁹I.7.10-12 (23) in this sample has a nymphaeum fountain; other good examples of water play include II.2.2 (k), a masonry dining area with two couches, one on either side of a basin, and II.4.2-3 (83), in which a cascade falls behind the *lectus medius* (see Dunbabin 1991, 124-125, with refs, and Andersson 1990).

²⁷⁰Dunbabin 1991, 125, with references. Religious feasting on masonry *triclinia* flanking the temple of Dionysos just outside Pompeii: Jashemski 1979, 157-158. See Elia 1961 for masonry dining couches found in a *collegium* headquarters outside the walls of Pompeii (Fig. 1.15). I.7.16 (2) seems also to have been a dining area in a *collegium*. It has been argued that I.6.2 (16) was for rent as a formal dining facility (Guida Laterza 1982, 106).

propatulo) mentioned by Varro as a place where Romans used to eat in summer may have been a tradition that was eventually articulated in the form of these outdoor masonry couches.²⁷¹

Type DB, "Dining Benches"

This type is a simple bench that seated people for a meal, either in a house or (more frequently) a diner.²⁷² The best example (not in the sample) is the open-air tavern at II.4.7 (3) where three sets of masonry benches, two around masonry tables, served customers in the same room as a larger masonry *triclinium* (Fig. 2.48; see also Fig. 2.46 for benches in I.6.2 (16)).²⁷³ The basic form is a solid masonry bench 0.30-0.60 m. wide (Figs. 2.44, 2.49), or masonry supports of comparable width that supported wooden bench tops set across them; wooden bench tops are reconstructed in IX.2.25 (a). Benches in the corners of houses or attached to masonry dining-couches may have served as eating places for slaves and children.²⁷⁴ The Latin term for bench, *subsellium*, appears once in the literary context of dining, as the location where slaves ate.²⁷⁵

Degrees of confidence in dining room identification

This typology attributes functions to rooms, so it is prudent to assign degrees of confidence to their identifications. Degrees of confidence specify the degree to which dining could have taken place in a given room. Any of these rooms, especially dining-halls and dinettes, may have had multiple uses. See Fig. 5.1 for a summary of these codes.

A **secure** identification requires actual couch remains, the presence of niches in walls for couches, or strong mosaic paving evidence (a 'T' or 'U' shape where plain or no mosaic is left underneath the hypothetical couch positions). No special qualifying code accompanies the room number or letter on the building plans or in the Gazetteer.

A **probable** identification requires two out of three more circumstantial pieces of evidence: 1) a central mosaic emblema suggesting couch placement, 2) a prominent primary aspect onto an open space, and 3) evidence for decorated walls and flooring. A qualifying code of "•" accompanies the room number or letter.

A **possible** identification requires at least one of the three circumstantial pieces of evidence listed above. A qualifying code of "◇" accompanies the room number or letter.

²⁷¹Soprano 1950, 288, referring to Var. *Vita Populi Romani* frg. 29 (Non. p. 83M); see p. 65, n. 40.

²⁷²Examples from the study sample include: IX.1.12 (l) and IX.2.15-16 (q), houses; I.6.2 (16), a house or dining area for rent; I.8.15-16 (4), IX.2.25 (a) and perhaps I.9.11 (3), all diners.

²⁷³See Parslow 1989.

²⁷⁴The benches attached to the masonry couches of I.6.2 (16) are assumed to be for "children or other inferior persons" by Dunbabin 1991, 123; likewise the seats attached to the masonry couches of IX.5.11 (n) are taken to be for children by Mau 1908, 264.

²⁷⁵Pl. *Capt.* 471; likewise, Col. 11.1.19 presumes that farm workers do not recline for a meal except on holidays (see chapter one, p. 52, n. 245 and p. 31, n. 126, respectively); see also D. C. 59.29.5.

CHAPTER III

AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF COOKING AND DINING AREAS AT POMPEII

Larger households in Pompeii had more spacious, more numerous and more elaborate cooking and dining areas than smaller households. Greater capacity and increased flexibility to make dinners reflected and reinforced their socio-economic position within the community. In chapter two, I defined an archaeological typology and terminology for cooking and dining areas from a sample of ten *insulae* (I.4, 6-10; VII.1, 14; IX.1-2). Here, I use those definitions to analyze and compare culinary conditions in seventy-five buildings from six *insulae* (I.4, I.6-10) (Figs. 2.1-2.2).¹ The analysis is supported by evidence documented for each building in the Gazetteer.

Each *insula* includes domestic, commercial, and industrial space, as well as buildings that are combinations thereof. In order to compare cooking and dining arrangements along the socio-economic scale, I sort the sample of buildings into discrete groups, defined according to their size, layout, and functions: (work)shops, (work)shop-houses, commercial eating establishments, and houses. These building categories are the units of comparison in the analysis.

The issues are discussed in the following order: How are cooking areas supplied with heat, light, ventilation, water, drainage and decoration? What are the types, sizes and number of dining areas, and how are they furnished with light, air, views and decoration? What storage arrangements are made for food, cooking apparatus and dining services? What physical connections exist between the practices of ritual and the procedures of cooking or eating? What patterns emerge in the proximity, accessibility and perceptibility of cooking and dining areas? Chapter one introduced these issues; they are addressed in detail on a building by building basis in the Gazetteer.

I used the program Data Desk^{4®} for exploratory data analysis. This program facilitated finding trends and patterns by looking at the data in numerous ways, exploring possible correlations, and by testing specific hypotheses. The analysis of trends and patterns is based on

¹Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 77: "(the method of sampling contiguous *insulae*) confirms that a sample of as few as 52 houses in adjacent blocks will give a reasonable cross-section of house sizes at least, and that this cross-section is not likely to be radically different in different areas of the city, or even within two neighboring Campanian towns [i.e. Pompeii and Herculaneum]."

simple quantification and percentages; it does not rely on determining 'statistically significant' results. Statistical significance demands a truly random sample, which is impossible at Pompeii.² I am concerned with whether the trends and patterns were socially or culturally significant.

Building categories for comparison

Wallace-Hadrill's work at Pompeii is the only large-scale urban analysis, based on samples of contiguous *insulae*, that is comparable to this thesis. He has successfully tracked features of architecture, decoration and luxury through households of all socio-economic status. Wallace-Hadrill has categorized buildings in his samples based on the quartile of the size ranking in which they happened to fall.³ He has assumed, rightly, that ground area is a rough measure of a building's function and the wealth of its occupants. However, quartiles based on ground area are unwieldy analytic tools; they can only mark out the most general trends, because they are based on an arbitrary, not a natural division of the data (see Table 3.1):⁴

Quartile	No. of buildings	Area (m ²)
1	58	10.0 - 45.0
2	61	50.0 - 170.0
3	57	175.0 - 345.0
4	58	350.0 - 3000.0

Table 3.1: Wallace-Hadrill's (1994, from Table 4.2) building categories for urban analysis, based on ground area. Total sample: 234 buildings.

The problem is that all buildings (houses, (work)shops, etc...) are included in a large pool and categorized only on the basis of ground area. A (work)shop of ca. 60.0 m² has far more in common with a smaller (work)shop of ca. 30.0 m² than it does with a small house of ca. 150.0 m². It is possible to create more coherent categories by using more precise criteria to define sub-groups in the data. The definitions for the classification which I offer rely on several factors: function (based on features and finds), plan, ground area, and number of rooms.

This sample is first divided into the following categories, based on function and ground plan: 1) (work)shops; 2) (work)shop-houses; 3) commercial establishments offering food such as lunch counters, diners and bakeries (whether independent units or attached to residences); 4) houses, with or without (work)shops (Table 3.2). Some overlap is inevitable; for instance, a house

²See chapter two above, pp. 58-59.

³Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 81, Table 4.2, Fig. 4.11. See also 118-131; Wallace-Hadrill 1991a, 249-264; Wallace-Hadrill 1991b; Wallace-Hadrill 1991c, 145-170. A 'quartile' is one-fourth the total sample, arranged in order from smallest building to largest, e.g. the smallest 25% of the sample fall into the lowest quartile.

⁴Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 124. He has relied on an extremely objective measure, i.e. ground area, in part as a reaction against Maiuri's (1958) classification scheme, which was saturated with assumptions about the social position of the residents in the different classes of houses.

with a lunch counter built into its facade will have its address appear in both categories (3) and (4). Categories are further subdivided on the basis of physical features, number of rooms or ground area, e.g. differentiating between lunch-counters and diners, or breaking down the broad spectrum of houses into small, medium and large:

<u>Category</u>	<u>No. of buildings</u>	<u>Area (m²)</u>
1. (work)shops, 1 room	7	9.6 - 30.1
(work)shops, 2 rooms	7	38.6 - 56.1
(work)shops, 3 or more rooms	7	45.0 - 69.7
2. (work)shop-houses	13	85.4 - 356.9
3. commercial eating establishments (lunch counters)	7	19.4 - 45.7
commercial eating establishments (diners)	7	72.9 - 190.9
commercial eating establishments (bakery)	1	383.7
4. small houses (<i>case piccole</i>)	9	88.3 - 274.9
medium houses (<i>case medie</i>)	18	259.1 - 614.0
large houses (<i>case grandi</i>)	5	709.3 - 2502.8

Table 3.2: Ground areas and counts for building categories in this thesis
Total sample: 81 functionally distinct units, within 75 buildings.

While the ground areas for categories overlap, the buildings that belong to each category and sub-category have more in common with each other than with buildings outside their category. It is essentially a multivariate cluster analysis. The criteria for defining each category follows; see Fig. 2.2 for a distribution map of the building categories, and Fig. 3.1 for a histogram of the categories according to ground area.

(1) (Work)shops⁵

It is not often possible to know whether a building was used for retail, production or both. Thus, shops (*tabernae*) and workshops (*officinae*) are considered together under a single heading. A wide variety of items or services were produced and/or sold at these locations, including metal wares, pottery and the cleaning of cloth.⁶ Shops that handled the preparation, production, and sale of foodstuffs are excluded from this category; because of their special role in nourishing the populace, they are considered separately as: 'commercial eating establishments'.

(Work)shops are the smallest and simplest buildings. They take up 28% of the number of buildings in the sample while covering only 4% of the total ground area (Table 3.2, Fig. 3.1). As a whole, they average 40.4 m² and 2.7 spaces. They can be sub-divided into three groups of equal

⁵Examples of (work)shops from the study sample include: I.4.4, I.4.7, I.4.8, I.4.10, I.4.18, I.4.19, I.4.20-21, I.4.23-24, I.4.26, I.6.1, I.6.3, I.6.10, I.6.12, I.7.4, I.7.6, I.7.15, I.7.17, I.8.7, I.10.5-6, I.10.9, I.10.12.

⁶Metal wares seem to have been produced and sold at I.6.1, I.6.3 and I.6.12, pottery may have been sold at I.7.4, and small fullonicae operated at I.4.7, I.4.26 and I.10.5-6.

numbers (see Table 3.2). At smallest, they are a single room (the node) off the street.⁷ The second group has a node fronting the street and a single room behind.⁸ The third group is slightly larger, with a node and up to three other rooms behind.⁹

Buildings in this category possess a single independent entrance and are not directly connected to a larger building. I do not consider issues of ownership, only of habitation; it is impossible to know whether an architecturally independent (work)shop was in fact owned by the proprietor of an adjacent, larger building. Architecturally independent units are therefore assumed to be separate units of habitation.¹⁰ Shops directly accessible from larger houses that have their own street entrance are treated as parts of the houses.

(Work)shops have a single node, the space with a wide door onto the street suitable for producing and displaying wares, and transacting business. They often, but not always, have staircases to lofts above, presumably for storage and/or habitation. There are no spaces open to the sky; all light and air must come from via the front entrance, or from windows onto the street or into neighboring properties. Consequently these properties may be described as small, dark and cramped. Habitation seems likely in units with back rooms (some possess a bed niche) or with lofts. In the sample, only I.4.10 and I.10.9 lack either an extra room or a stair, unless they had wooden ladders to lofts that did not survive the eruption. I assume that the remaining (work)shops housed persons on a regular basis. Wallace-Hadrill's method of estimating one person per ground-floor living space (not counting connectors, latrines or storage spaces) suggests 1-4 persons per (work)shop.¹¹

The distribution of (work)shops is enlightening. Both independent (work)shops and those attached to houses are almost exclusively clustered along major thoroughfares (Fig. 2.2). 76% of all the independent (work)shops and 80% of the houses with (work)shops or eating establishments in their facades fall along the Via Stabiana or Via dell'Abbondanza, two of the three major arteries of the city. Their location obviously takes advantage of the heavy traffic along those routes, which connect directly to four city gates, the forum, two public baths, and the theater-odeon complex. Location determined function; few houses could afford to pass up the

⁷One-room (work)shops from the study sample: I.4.10, I.10.9 (without stairs); I.4.8, I.4.20-21, I.7.6, I.8.7, I.10.12 (with stairs); mean 21.3 m², range 9.6-30.1 m²

⁸Two-room (work)shops from the study sample: I.4.4 (without stairs), I.4.18, I.4.19, I.6.3, I.6.10, I.6.12, I.10.5-6 (with stairs); mean 43.8 m², range 38.6-56.1 m²

⁹Multiple-room (work)shops from the study sample: I.4.7, I.4.23-24, I.4.26, I.7.15, I.7.17 (without stairs); I.6.1, I.7.4 (with stairs); mean 56.3 m², range 45.0-69.7 m²

¹⁰Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 103-108 draws a strict distinction between habitation and ownership. He is aware that the latter question cannot be answered, particularly via Della Corte's (1954) method of fabricating owners and residents from inscriptions found in or near the house, as both Castren 1975 and Mouritsen 1988 have proved.

¹¹Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 91-117. It is extremely difficult to calculate populations of buildings; I follow his method because it is simple and gives reasonable results.

valuable commercial opportunities offered by frontage on a major avenue.¹² Maiuri's vision of a low-ranking commercial class invading the city during the mid first century A.D. and gutting the facades of once-noble houses with humble shops has been shown a fallacy. Wallace-Hadrill has convincingly demonstrated that the urban elite, if not themselves thoroughly engaged in commerce, were at least not segregated from the commercial activity of others. The elite and merchants or craftsmen were mutually dependent in social, economic, and political terms.¹³

(2) (Work)shop-houses¹⁴

This category consists of buildings in which commercial, industrial and residential activities are architecturally intertwined.¹⁵ They may be defined either as (work)shops with a clear residential component, or houses with a significant industrial or commercial component. These properties have no standard architectural form, no limits on their size or number of rooms, and have been described as 'irregular' or 'non canonical'.¹⁶

(Work)shop-houses do have, however, two distinguishing features. First, a single entrance serves both the (work)shop and house; this entrance is generally wide, like the (work)shops of the preceding category. If the entrance is narrow, it opens directly into a node in the form of a court or garden; (work)shop-houses rarely have *fauces*.¹⁷ The form of the entrance is a strong clue to the form and function of the building:

¹²Only houses I.6.4, I.7.1, I.7.2-3 along these major streets do not have part of their width taken up by (work)shops or eating establishments along the street; furthermore, the double entrance of I.7.2-3 puts in doubt whether some small commercial activity did not take place at entrance #2.

¹³Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 125-142, 175-186; Wallace-Hadrill 1991a. Recent work (Pirson 1994) has confirmed that the (work)shops built into the facades of even the grandest houses of Pompeii such as the *Insula Arriana Polliana* (VI.6) were planned into its second century B.C construction.

¹⁴Examples of (work)shop-houses from the study sample include: I.6.7, I.6.8-9, I.7.5, I.7.16, I.7.18, I.8.10, I.8.12, I.8.13, I.9.9, I.9.10, I.10.1. Two properties are nominally included in this category but are not included in the statistical summary because they lack an identifiable residential component. I.8.19 (an *officina tinctoria*) and I.9.15 are properties located underneath the peristyle space of large houses I.8.1-3 and I.9.1-2 respectively. Neither building has been completely excavated, and neither has shown any evidence for cooking or eating facilities. These properties seem to have been used solely for manufacturing purposes, not for habitation. Neither will be considered in any analyses in this chapter.

¹⁵Wallace-Hadrill warns: "Modern boundaries of work versus residence, business versus leisure, dissolve...in the Roman house. Any analysis that attempts to distinguish the residential units of Pompeii from commercial or industrial ones must founder on this objection." I do not deny the interrelationship between residential and non-residential activities in almost any building in Pompeii, but I do believe that in most cases it is possible to distinguish architecturally between buildings dedicated primarily to residence, and those significantly and publically dedicated to commerce or industry.

¹⁶Pompei - L'Informatica 1988 lists these types of buildings in its gazetteer under the heading: "Abitazione di tipo non codificato. Impianto commerciale a destinazione incerta."

¹⁷The exception is the *officina scriptoria* at I.7.16, which possesses a *fauces*.

"The symbolic contrast between "noble" patronage and "sordid" trade was made visible even in the nature of the openings that linked the house to the street outside: the narrow opening, artificially emphasized by the long corridor of the *fauces*, that leads to the atrium is designed to exclude and to mark the privilege of one who approaches for dignified purposes; whereas the wide opening of the *taberna* throws open the space inside and vulgarly displays its contents, promiscuously accessible except when the shutters are drawn against thieves at night."¹⁸

Entrances broadcast critical information that allowed people to distinguish shops that could be entered freely from houses that required invitation. A link between entrance type and building category is confirmed by houses that were transformed into (work)shop-houses in their last period of use. The original *fauces* and side room(s) of both I.6.7 (converted into a *fullonica*) and I.6.8-9 (converted probably into a diner) were completely removed, in favor of open shop frontages along the street. Both buildings retained the atrium and colonnaded garden that help identify their original role as houses.

A second feature of (work)shop-houses is that (like houses) some part of their interior space is left open to the sky. Simple (work)shops have no interior open space. The larger size of these buildings doubtless required an additional lighting source for rooms far from the street.

(Work)shop-houses do not fall into a neat statistical group; the very terms of their definition ensure that they do not conform to architectural or dimensional templates (Table 3.2, Figs. 2.2, 3.1). For the record, they average 196.6 m² (range 85.4-356.9 m²), and 10.9 spaces (range 6-18). There are four smaller examples (mean 115.9 m²) whose domestic components are more obvious than their commercial functions.¹⁹ Nearly twice as large on average (mean 228.6 m²) are three *officinae* that all have identifiable cooking spaces and sleeping quarters.²⁰ Of the three largest (mean 301.7 m²), two were converted from medium-sized houses.²¹ (Work)shop-houses had an estimated population of 3-8 persons (see above, n. 11). There is little pattern to their distribution; I.6.7, I.6.8-9 and I.7.5 front the Via dell'Abbondanza, and there is a small commercial concentration at the northeast corner of *insula* I.10 (I.7.16, I.7.18, I.10.1). The remainder line minor streets in *insulae* I.8-9.

¹⁸Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 118, drawing upon the work of Laurence 1994, esp. 88-121.

¹⁹ I.7.5, I.7.18, I.9.9, I.10.1. Finds of bowls of pigments in I.9.9 suggest that this was an *officina pigmentaria*, producing paints for *scriptores* such as those headquartered at I.7.16.

²⁰ I.7.16 is an *officina scriptoria*, I.8.10 was an *officina vasaria* before the A.D. 62 earthquake, and I.8.13 is an *officina* of uncertain production. All three are centered on large gardens with porticos located immediately inside the entrance to the property.

²¹ I.6.7 and I.6.8-9. The third largest (work)shop-house, I.9.10, expanded between A.D. 62-79, adding a formal dining-room and service wing with kitchen and latrine (Berry 1993, Figs. 5-7).

(3) Commercial eating establishments²²

This category includes both independent eating establishments and those attached to the front of a house. Food is prepared and sold for persons both 'dining in' and 'taking out'. Eating establishments, like (work)shops, are distributed primarily off major thoroughfares; 67% lie along the Via Stabiana or Via dell'Abbondanza. The remainder are concentrated along or near the Via di Castricio, an avenue of importance because of its direct access to the amphitheater towards the east, and (after being split by *insula* I.10), to the theater-odeon complex to the west (Figs. 2.1-2.2). The Via di Castricio was not as heavily traveled as the two major avenues, so eating establishments in this sector are placed at intersections in order to serve additional traffic from the cross-streets. This sample includes seven 'lunch counters' (*popinae*), seven 'diners' (*cauponae*), and a single bakery (see Table 3.2 and Fig. 3.1 for the size range of these buildings).²³

L u n c h c o u n t e r s

'Lunch counters' are small cook-shops that sell food to passersby, or persons seated or standing near the front counter; *popinae* is the closest Latin equivalent. The counter in the front room is where food and drink are stored, prepared and distributed. Storage jars containing food or liquids are immured in its top surface, and a hearth is usually built into its end. Sometimes there are additional rooms: a latrine for customers behind the counter, a bedroom or living space, or a stair to an upper loft with living and storage space.²⁴ As a group, lunch counters average 33.2 m² and 2.6 spaces. Those connected to larger houses are slightly smaller (28.5 m²), presumably because they could draw on the resources and extra space from their houses. Larger independent shops average 38.1 m², with an estimated population of 2-3 individuals.

D i n e r s

'Diners' are lunch counters with additional space for customers to take meals seated or reclining; *cauponae* is the closest Latin equivalent. By comparison, diners are approximately four times larger; they average 125.6 m² and 6.6 spaces. Those connected to houses are slightly smaller (103.8 m²) than the larger, independent diners (141.9 m², with an estimated population of 4-7 persons). Diners contain a serving counter with storage jars and a built-in hearth from which they can serve persons off the street. They also have a separate dining area where couches for

²²Examples of commercial eating establishments from the study sample include: I.4.3, I.4.11, I.4.12-17, I.4.27, I.6.5-6, I.6.8-9, I.7.8-9, I.7.13-14, I.8.1, I.8.8-9, I.8.15-16, I.9.4, I.9.11, I.10.2, I.10.13.

²³The bakery is: I.4.12-17. Inns or taverns (*hospitia*) are not represented in the gazetteer, but one is identified by an inscription at VII.1.44-45; see chapter two, p. 91. Parslow 1989 distinguishes between a *popina* (no fixed dining area) and a *caupona* (containing a fixed dining area). See above, pp. 35-37 for a discussion of the Latin terminology for commercial eating establishments, and also Laurence 1994, 55-59 (bakeries) and 78-87 (lunch counters and diners) for city-wide distributions.

²⁴I.6.5-6, I.8.1, I.10.2, I.7.8-9 and I.4.27 have rooms behind the counter; the latter two have latrines.

formal dining, or benches, tables and chairs for more casual meals could be laid out. Often a separate kitchen, garden, court or latrine is part of the complex.²⁵

(4) Houses with²⁶ or without²⁷ (work)shops

Houses comprise 42.7% of the number of buildings in the sample, but 79% of the total ground area (and nearly half of that belongs to the five largest houses). Shelter and sustenance of the household are their primary functions. Commercial, industrial or horticultural areas are integral to some houses, but non-residential components are not an important criterion in distinguishing between houses. Houses that have (work)shops and houses that lack them show no significant differences in house size, the number or size of rooms, or layout; they differ only in location. For commercial reasons, (work)shops appear in houses that front major streets.

Houses are distributed fairly evenly throughout the sample. Those located along the Via Stabiana and the Via dell'Abbondanza tend to have long, narrow *fauces*, leaving space along their facades for (work)shops. It is common to see (work)shops, (work)shop-houses or eating establishments (building categories 1-3) at intersections, as they depend on location to exploit the heaviest flow of potential customers. Houses, being more selective in choosing clients and guests to invite within, gain some relief from the indiscriminate bustle by avoiding the placement of entrances at street corners.

All houses retain common features: a narrow entrance corridor (*fauces*), an atrium, and a secondary open area, either a court, garden, colonnaded garden, or peristyle.²⁸ Despite a basic similarity in plan, houses appear in an exceptionally wide range of sizes (88.3-2502.8 m² and 10-

²⁵I.4.11 has two back rooms (b, c), the latter of which may have been used for dining, a separate kitchen off of (a), and a back garden (d) with a latrine. I.6.8-9 has extra storage jars and a stove in the NE corner of atrium (c), and dining areas on the ground floor at (d) and on the second floor {k}. In I.7.13-14, a small bedroom (2) flanks the counter; behind is a court (3) with a hearth, and a room (4) probably used for dining. A stair leads to another possible dining room on the upper floor, and a latrine (7) and perhaps another kitchen (6) take up the back of the building. A dining room (2) and another room (3) serve I.8.8, which has a hearth against its W wall and a latrine in the NW corner. In I.8.15-16, there is a small bedroom (3) behind the counter, a room (4) with benches for seating customers, a kitchen (5), a dining-room (6), bedroom (8) and court (7). I.9.4 is attached to a small room (13) and a dining room (7) behind the counter. Behind the counter of I.9.11 is a bedroom (2), a small room with supports for benches (for cooking or eating, it is not clear); a large room (4) lies to the side and in back there is a large court (5) with a latrine (7).

²⁶Examples of houses with (work)shops from the study sample include: I.4.1-3, I.4.5-6+25+28, I.8.1-3, I.8.4-6, I.8.8-9, I.9.1-2, I.9.3-4, I.9.5-7, I.10.2-3, I.10.10-11.

²⁷Examples of houses without (work)shops from the study sample include: I.4.9, I.4.22, I.6.2+16, I.6.4, I.6.11, I.6.13-14, I.6.15, I.7.1+20, I.7.2-3, I.7.7, I.7.10-12, I.7.19, I.8.14, I.8.17+11, I.8.18, I.9.8, I.9.12, I.9.13, I.10.4+14-17, I.10.7, I.10.8, I.10.18.

²⁸All houses except for I.9.3-4 have an impluvium in the atrium, and all have a secondary open area except for I.8.18.

88 spaces), implying a correspondingly broad economic spectrum of households.²⁹ In order to focus more closely on physical (and socio-economic) differences within the spectrum, I will subdivide the category. The three subdivisions are defined primarily on the basis of their ground area, but also upon the number of spaces in the house, the number of nodes, the number of connectors that link nodes and link the ground floor to subterranean levels or upper floors, and the extent of the architectural development of their plans. They are labeled, from smallest and least developed to largest and most developed, as: *casa piccola*, *casa media* and *casa grande* (Table 3.2, Figs. 2.2, 3.1).

C a s a p i c c o l a

In the *casa piccola*, the majority of rooms, as well as the largest, are centered around the atrium (the primary node of the house).³⁰ Any secondary node is usually a garden or court, generally too small to serve as a focus for reception rooms.³¹ All have clear evidence for staircases to an upper floor.³² The nine small houses average 198.2 m² and 12.9 spaces (range 88.3-274.9 m², 10-16 spaces), with estimated populations of 4-10 persons.

C a s a m e d i a

The *casa media* is about twice as large on average as the *casa piccola* (mean 426.8 m², 20 spaces, range 259.1-614.0 m², 12-26 spaces), with an estimated population of 5-15 persons. All eighteen examples have a sizable node behind their atrium. This node takes most often the form of a garden colonnaded or pilastered on one to three sides; only two houses have a full peristyle garden. Almost all have evidence for some rooms on an upper floor.³³ The larger garden area is important because the largest and best decorated reception rooms are consequently oriented towards the garden rather than towards the atrium.

C a s a g r a n d e

The *casa grande* dominates its *insula* due to sheer size and a complex layout. The five examples in this group average 1476.4 m² and 48.8 spaces, 2-3 times as large as the *casa media* group (range 709.3-2502.8 m², 26-88 spaces); estimated populations are 15-45 persons. All have

²⁹Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 95: "...in a society in which production was based on the household, there must have been a...correlation between wealth and size of household." and p. 102: "The essential point about Pompeian housing is that it implies an expectation that households will vary enormously in size."

³⁰The *piccola casa* subdivision includes: I.4.1-3, I.4.9, I.4.22, I.7.2-3, I.8.14, I.8.18, I.9.8, I.10.2-3, I.10.18.

³¹I.4.1-3, I.7.2-3 and I.8.14 have garden courts. Only I.4.1-3 is formalized with columns and engaged columns. I.4.9, I.4.22, I.9.8, I.10.2-3, I.10.18 have very small irregularly-shaped courts, akin to light wells, and I.8.18 has no secondary open space at all.

³²The exception is I.9.8, which has evidence for an upper floor, but no trace of a stairway.

³³I.8.1-3 and I.10.10-11 have full peristyle gardens. I.9.13-14 has no upper floor.

evidence for suites of upper-floor rooms. These houses are so few and their own differences so great, that their vital statistics are essentially meaningless except in contrasting their size to smaller subgroups (Fig. 3.1). A *casa grande* develops in one of two ways: it is built as a single unit that expands over time, retaining its architectural coherence, or it is formed through the combination of several smaller pre-existing houses. Both possibilities are represented in this sample; given their small number and dominance of the archaeological record, their composition warrants brief review.

I.4.5-6+25+28, the largest house in the sample, is composed of two atrium-peristyle houses (at #5, 25) and one small house (at #28); the house is consequently concentrated around the series of three parallel peristyle gardens that step down the sloping topography of the *insula* (Fig. 5.10). I.6.2 was once an extremely large house when joined with I.6.4, with suites of rooms gathered along the length of the cryptoporticus beneath its spacious garden (Fig. 5.15). Even in its reduced condition after A.D. 62, its sheer size and series of atrium, porticoed garden and large open garden justify its inclusion in this subgroup. I.7.1 has one of the largest peristyle gardens in the city, beneath which was an extensive cryptoporticus connected to the Vicolo del Paquio Proculo, which was a private alley controlled and used by this house alone (Fig. 5.19). The other *casa grande* in this *insula*, I.7.10-12, is a combination of at least two distinct atrium houses, one with a sizable garden (Fig. 5.21). Moreover, a connection between this house and I.7.19 to the south (a *casa media*) probably indicates a third house owned (although not necessarily occupied) by the same person, further increasing the size of the property (Fig. 2.5). The residential core of I.10.4+14-17 is centered on a spacious peristyle garden, with an open garden to the west and a stable and small atrium house (at #16) added on to the east side (Fig. 2.8).

All *case grandi* have multiple nodes upon which suites of rooms are focused, often more than one atrium, and either multiple gardens or a single garden or peristyle of monumental size. The combined ground area of the nodes in these five houses more than equals the combined ground area of the nodes of the eighteen *case medie*.³⁴ The combined ground area open to the sky of the *case grandi* exceeds that of the *case piccole* and *case medie* put together.³⁵ The owners of *case grandi* could afford to maintain a good deal of clear space. Their gardens were not only decorated with plantings, fountains and statuary, but in some cases were horticultural plots, growing produce for household use.³⁶

³⁴Total ground area of nodes for five *case grandi*: 3988.2 m²; for eighteen *case medie*: 3977.1 m²; for nine *case piccole*: 668.6 m².

³⁵Total ground area open to the sky for five *case grandi*: 1908.1 m²; for eighteen *case medie*: 1244.5 m²; for nine *case piccole*: 108.1 m².

³⁶Jashemski 1993, 34, 40, 47 mentions vegetable cultivation in the gardens of these large houses: I.6.2 (30), I.7.10-12 (23), I.10.4 (50). I.7.1 (9), I.7.10-12 (23) and I.10.4 (c) had outdoor dining couches placed in association with fountains in the centers of their peristyle gardens.

The building categories serve as discrete groups for the large-scale analysis of cooking and dining in the sample area. Patterns of distribution, and practical and decorative features of cooking and dining areas are characterized within, and compared across individual categories. The goal of the analysis is to understand how groups of people living in different categories of buildings arranged to feed themselves. Thereby I address the social implications of prandial patterns within individual homes and the urban society at large. Table 3.3 groups buildings into their respective categories and lists the cooking and dining areas that appear in each.

Key: HE1 = hearth, sub-type (1), HE = hearth, sub-type (2), etc...; ST1 = stove, sub-type (1), ST2 = stove, sub-type (2), etc...; LO = large oven; SO = small oven; BZ = brazier;
 CS = cooking support, cooking stand; WH = water heater; KI = kitchen; DR = dining room;
 DH = dining hall; DI = dinette; DO = outdoor dining area; DB = dining benches;
 'old' = identifiable area not in use after A.D. 62;
 <no code> = secure identification; • = probable identification; ◇ = possible identification;
 () = ground floor room; { } = upper floor room; [] = underground room.

<u>Building type</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Cooking areas</u>	<u>Dining areas</u>
(Work)shop, 1 room	I.4.8	-	-
	I.4.10	-	-
	I.4.20-21	-	-
	I.7.6	-	-
	I.8.7	-	-
	I.10.9	-	-
	I.10.12	-	-
(Work)shop, 2 rooms	I.4.4	ST2 in (b)	-
	I.4.18	CS in (a)	serving wares in (a)
	I.4.19	cookwares in (a)	serving wares in (a)
	I.6.3	cookwares in (a)	serving wares in (a)
	I.6.10	cookwares, tripods in (n)	serving wares in (n)
	I.6.12	-	-
	I.10.5-6	cookwares in (b)	serving wares in (b)
(Work)shop, 3 or more rooms	I.4.7	-	DR◇(b)
	I.4.23-24	-	-
	I.4.26	HE2	-
	I.6.1	HE2, HE1 in (1, 3)	-
	I.7.4	HE1, tripod in (1)	serving wares in loft
	I.7.15	-	-
	I.7.17	-	-
(Work)shop-house	I.6.7	ST2, tripod in KI(m)	DR◇(g), DR (h)
	I.6.8-9	ST3 in (c), ST3 in (i)	DH•(d), DH◇{k}
	I.7.5	ST2, BZ in (c)	DR (d)
	I.7.16	HE2 in (2)	DO in (2)
	I.7.18	ST1/ST3 in KI(e)	DR•(c), DR◇{g}
	I.8.10	ST1 in KI(9)	DI◇(3)
	I.8.12	cookwares	-
	I.8.13	HE2 in (1)	DR◇(3)
	I.8.19	-	-
	I.9.9	ST3 in (4)	DI◇(3)

(Work)shop-house	I.9.10	ST1 in KI(2)	DR•(11)
	I.9.15	-	-
	I.10.1	ST2 in (5)	DI◊(3), DR◊{6}
Eating establ., lunch counter	I.4.3	HE1 in I.4.2 (b)	-
	I.4.27	HE4	-
	I.6.5-6	HE4 in (1)	-
	I.7.8-9	HE4 in (a)	-
	I.8.1	HE4 in (12)	-
	I.10.2	HE4 in (2)	-
	I.10.13	HE4, tripod	-
Eating establ., diner	I.4.11	HE1/HE2 in (a)	DI◊(c)
	I.6.8-9	ST3 in (c), ST3 in (i)	DH•(d), DH◊{k}
	I.7.13-14	HE1 in (3), HE◊1 in (6)	DR•(4)
	I.8.8	HE1 in (1)	DR•(2)
	I.8.15-16	HE4 in (1), ST1 in (5)	DB (4), DR (6)
	I.9.4	HE4 in (1)	DR◊(7)
	I.9.11	HE4 in (1), tripod in (4)	DB◊(3)
Eating establ., bakery	I.4.12-17	SO, LO	-
House, <i>casa piccola</i>	I.4.1-3	HE1 in (b)	DR•(g)
	I.4.9	ST1 in KI(o)	DH•(m)
	I.4.22	ST1 in KI(h)	DI◊(d), DO◊(l)
	I.7.2-3	cookwares, tripod in (g)	DI•(c)
	I.8.14	ST1 in KI(11)	DR•(6)
	I.8.18	ST◊ in KI◊(8)	DR (6)
	I.9.8	ST1 in KI(7), BZ in (2)	DR (9)
	I.10.2-3	HE4 in (2)	DI◊(6)
	I.10.18	ST1 in KI(9)	DI◊(3), DR◊{11}
House, <i>casa media</i>	I.6.4	ST1, tripod in KI(n)	DR (c), DI◊(i), DH•(p)
	I.6.11	ST1 in KI(8)	DR◊(11), DR•(15)
	I.6.13-14	HE1 in (b)	DR•(4)
	I.6.15	ST3, HE2 in KI(i), WH in (g), BZ in (l)	DR•(d), DR•(e)
	I.7.7	ST1, tripod in KI(i)	DR•(b), DH◊(n)
	I.7.19	ST2 in KI(l), cookwares in (i)	DH•(b), DI•(e)
	I.8.1-3	HE4 in (12)	DR•(8)
	I.8.4-6	ST2 in KI(14)	DR (3), DR•(7), DR (13)
	I.8.8-9	HE1 in (1)	DR (10), DO in (11)
	I.8.17+11	ST2 in KI(21), WH in (19)	DH•(9), DR (14), DR•(18)
		ST1 in old KI(5-6)	
	I.9.1-2	HE1 in KI(6), tripod in (2)	DR•(8), DI◊(10), DH◊(14)
	I.9.3-4	HE4 in (14), ST◊ in (10)	DR•(5)
	I.9.5-7	KI◊(16), BZ in (2), WH, tripod, cookwares in (9)	DR•(11), DI•(13), DH•(17)
	I.9.12	HE1 in KI(9)	DR•(11)
	I.9.13-14	ST1, cookwares in (b), BZ, CS in (o)	DR (d), DR (j), DR (m)

House, <i>casa media</i>	I.10.7	ST2, BZ in KI(11), BZ in (3)	DR•(8), DR (9), DO• in (12)
	I.10.8	ST3 in (9)	DI◊(2), DR◊(10)
	I.10.10-11	ST1 in KI(16), BZ in (9)	DH•(9), DH◊[20]
House, <i>casa grande</i>	I.4.5+25	ST1 in KI(42), HE1 in KI(64), BZ in (21)	DH•(18), DH•(19), DR•(20), DH•(35), DR•(37), DH◊(53), DH•(57), DR•(58)
	I.6.2+16	ST2 in (16), ST1 in old KI [F]	DR◊(5), old DR•[22], DO, DB in (16)
	I.7.1+20	ST2 in KI(14), BZ in (15)	DO in (9), DR◊(11a), DR (16), DR•(18)
	I.7.10-12	ST1 in (7), HE2 in KI(8), ST3 in KI(21), BZ in (18)	DR◊(4), DR (7), DR (10), DI•(16), DH (17), DO in (23)
	I.10.4	ST1 / ST2 in KI(52), HE1, tripod in (41), BZ in [A], BZ in (c), HE3s in (3), (20), (34), (54)	DR•(11), DR•(12), DR◊(15), DH (18), DH◊(19), DO in (c)

Table 3.3: List of building categories and the locations and types of cooking and dining areas that appear in each building, according to the typologies in chapter two, pp. 78-84 (cooking areas), and pp. 105-115 (dining areas).

Key: HE1 = hearth, sub-type (1), HE = hearth, sub-type (2), etc...; ST1 = stove, sub-type (1), ST2 = stove, sub-type (2), etc...; LO = large oven; SO = small oven; BZ = brazier;
CS = cooking support, cooking stand; WH = water heater; KI = kitchen; DR = dining room;
DH = dining hall; DI = dinette; DO = outdoor dining area; DB = dining benches;
'old' = identifiable area not in use after A.D. 62;
<no code> = secure identification; • = probable identification; ◊ = possible identification;
() = ground floor room; { } = upper floor room; [] = underground room.

Summaries, correlations and patterns

This section characterizes the cooking and dining arrangements for each of the building categories and subgroups defined above. Typologies follow the definitions in chapter two, pp. 78-84 (cooking) and pp. 105-115 (dining). Evidence that supports the trends outlined for each issue appears in entries for individual buildings in the Gazetteer.

Cooking area amenities

H e a t

This section analyzes the nature and distribution of cooking installations and appliances across the sample. It is a summary of hearths, stoves, ovens, braziers, water heaters, tripods, cooking stands and cooking supports, the apparatus that facilitate food preparation. I will characterize the installations according to their building category, and make comparisons between buildings of different categories.

(Work)shops (Work)shops are the only building category that contain units without physical evidence for cooking. The small size of these properties prohibits setting aside space for a separate kitchen; cooking was done in multi-purpose rooms. Even cooking vessels are absent in the smallest single-room shops.³⁷ Of the twenty-one workshops, only one stove and one hearth were probably used exclusively for food preparation (Figs. 5.26, 5.73).³⁸ More circumstantial evidence is present in seven other (work)shops. There are fixed hearths in two (work)shops, and they serve a small *officina lanificaria* and a blacksmith respectively; it is possible that those hearths doubled as places to cook the residents' food.³⁹ Evidence for cooking on site in five other (work)shops consists exclusively of portable equipment such as cooking stands, tripods and vessels. Two appear to have been in the business of making, repairing or selling metal wares.⁴⁰ Three (work)shops have fairly secure artifactual evidence for on-site food preparation: a terracotta fornello (brazier, cooking stand) in I.4.18, a bronze cauldron in I.4.19, and a collection of ceramic mixing bowls, amphorae, plates and other vessels in I.10.5-6. The remainder, twelve (work)shops, have no evidence for cooking or eating.⁴¹ In sum, nearly half of the (work)shops have the apparatus to prepare meals on a daily basis.⁴² If self-sufficiency in food preparation equals full-time residency in a building, then evidence for cooking may measure which shops were inhabited and which were occupied only during 'business hours'.⁴³ The latter would have been staffed by slaves or freedpersons who lived and ate in their master's house.

³⁷This is not to say that fixed cooking installations never appear in one-room shops. Outside the sample, (work)shop IX.1.27 has a small one-arched stove, with a niche shrine above, and a niche for a bed or couch in the space underneath the stairway to the loft above. This example is unique in the ten city blocks that I examined personally.

³⁸I.4.4 (ST), used perhaps to cook food for a lunch-counter at I.4.3, to which it was connected by a large window; I.7.4 (HE and a tripod).

³⁹The *officina lanificaria* (I.4.27); the blacksmithy (I.6.1).

⁴⁰I.6.3, I.6.10 (see Grafts 1988 for detailed lists of the evidence in I.6.3). It is unclear whether the wares found in these (work)shops (clustered in insula I.6 along the Via dell'Abbondanza) were used for cooking and eating on site, or if they were simply part of the (work)shops' inventories.

⁴¹Knowledge about cooking artifacts from seven (work)shops is lacking because these properties were excavated without care in recording and publication: I.4.8, I.4.10, I.4.20-21, I.4.7, I.4.23-24, I.7.15, I.7.17.

⁴²Of twenty-one (work)shops, nine (43%) have evidence for cooking. Removing the seven (work)shops for which no artifactual evidence has been published, the percentage rises to 64%.

⁴³Scholars of medieval and ancient societies have often linked the definition of a domestic group, or 'houseful' to its common use of cooking facilities. So Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 92: "...the symbol of its (the medieval houseful's) unity is the place of common food preparation, the *fuoco*, just as the lares above the hearth symbolize the unity of the Roman household."

(Work)shop-houses Almost all (work)shop-houses have fixed cooking installations.⁴⁴ Most (work)shop-houses also contain supplementary kitchen equipment (braziers, tripods, terracotta cooking stands, cauldrons, skillets and *casseruole*), storage vessels (amphorae and dolia) and serving and eating wares (bowls, plates and cups). Nearly all have a single well-defined cooking area that served the workers and residents of the building; (work)shop-houses are as well equipped as small houses.

Notable kitchens and cooking assemblages appear in five (work)shop-houses. I.6.7, a large fullonica installed in an existing atrium-peristyle house, has an extremely well-preserved kitchen (m) with metal grills, pots and pans found hanging *in situ* from the wall above the stove (Figs. 1.1, 5.56). Pots sat on their tripods over the stove-top, and storage and cooking wares were stacked near the foot of the stove. Moeller correctly asserts that the kitchen indicates a substantial part, if not all, of the staff living on the premises.⁴⁵ The kitchen was intended to cook large evening meals, not to warm up breakfasts or lunches. I.7.5 has a small stove shaded by a roof at the edge of its central court (c); this cooking area also contains a brazier, ceramic cooking vessels, and a mortar (Figs. 5.75-5.76). A cauldron and *casseruola* are stored in an adjacent room. The assemblage amply services the one dining room in this, the smallest (work)shop-house. I.7.18 has an architecturally-defined kitchen (e) with a large stove upon which two ceramic cooking stands and other vessels were found (Figs. 5.100-5.101).⁴⁶ The largest kitchen is I.8.10 (9), containing a large solid masonry stove, more than sufficient to serve the one small dining area (Fig. 5.119). Finally, the small stove in corridor (4) of I.9.9 was found with a quantity of bronze and ceramic pots, cups, plates and utensils (Fig. 5.145).

Commercial eating establishments The sample contains a single bakery (I.4.12-17) outfitted with a large oven, a small oven (for pastries?), mills for grinding, basins for washing the grain, and benches/counters for working the dough (Figs. 5.12, 5.39). Storage containers are sunk into the ground in one of the shops (at #17) that face the street, and the products of the bakery were probably sold from another (at #15-16). It is not certain whether the business baked only its own bread, or whether it also rented out time to bake dough prepared and brought in by individual households that lacked ovens at home.

Lunch counters, the smallest commercial eating establishments, show a fairly consistent pattern to their cooking arrangements. In six of the seven lunch counters, a single hearth of sub-

⁴⁴Only the stable I.8.12, a stable yard with a small suite of rooms on the second floor behind the yard, has no sure stove or hearth, but cookwares were found fallen from an upper floor. One (work)shop-house, I.6.8-9, has two stoves, because the (work)shop is a diner.

⁴⁵Moeller 1976, 43.

⁴⁶See also PPM I, 742-743, #23-24.

type (4) (i.e. horseshoe-shaped burners) is built into the end of the counter.⁴⁷ Most have evidence for cooking and serving wares either in the same space as the counter itself, or in an adjacent space.⁴⁸ These artifacts include a tripod (I.10.13), ceramic cooking pots, colanders, mixing bowls, plates, bowls, glass containers and cups, bronze cauldrons and skillets. Finally, each of the three lunch counters connected to certain houses (I.4.3, I.8.1, I.10.2) possess the lone fixed cooking installation in the house. Owners of houses with lunch counters apparently made the most of their ready-made hearths, evidence for symbiosis between domestic and business activity.

Diners have more variety than lunch counters in the kind, number and arrangement of their cooking installations.⁴⁹ Three diners have sub-type (4) hearths built into their serving counters.⁵⁰ Just as common is a low hearth of sub-type (1) that is located to one side of the counter or in a different room altogether.⁵¹ At least one diner, I.8.15-16, has two: a hearth at the front counter and a kitchen located in a back room between two dining areas.⁵² The proprietor apparently decided to build separate cooking facilities for customers off the street and for those dining within. Three diners are connected to houses; in one (I.8.8-9) there is absolutely no evidence for cooking elsewhere in the house; the other houses have some evidence for a secondary kitchen.⁵³ Houses with attached diners, like houses with lunch counters, retained some dependency on those cooking facilities to serve the rest of the house.

Houses with or without (work)shops

Casa piccola The smallest houses generally have only one cooking area.⁵⁴ Cooking installations are generally simple; in five of nine cases they are a solid masonry stove.⁵⁵ Cooking areas are correspondingly small, never exceeding 10 m² (mean 7.6 m²). There was not much

⁴⁷I.4.3 has a separate hearth of sub-type (1) (with a horseshoe-shaped burner at one end) located in the atrium of the connected house (Fig. 5.8). See above, pp. 78-79 for the hearth typology.

⁴⁸No artifacts have been published for I.4.27.

⁴⁹The counters also vary in size, shape and material, from the short straight counter of I.4.11 to the L-shaped wooden counter in I.6.8-9 to the large []-shaped counters of I.8.8, I.8.15-16 and I.9.4.

⁵⁰I.8.15-16, I.9.4, I.9.11.

⁵¹I.8.8, same room; I.4.11, I.7.13-14, different room. Similar is I.6.8-9, which has a stove of sub-type (3) located in the corner of the atrium immediately behind the front room and its counter.

⁵²Two other diners (I.7.13-14, I.9.11) may also have had secondary cooking areas, but the evidence is insecure; neither has been published, and the latter has not been completely excavated.

⁵³Identifications of second cooking areas in the other two houses are not completely secure; I.9.3-4 may have another cooking area in the back of the house in area (10), and I.6.8-9 has a stove of sub-type (3) in its garden.

⁵⁴One exception is I.9.8, in which part of a brazier was found in the atrium outside the kitchen, but it is not certain that the brazier was used, and not just stored, in the atrium.

⁵⁵Two others (I.4.1-3, I.10.2-3) have hearths used in attached lunch counters. The cooking installation in I.8.18 has disintegrated since its excavation, and I.7.2-3 had no cooking installations, simply a tripod and bronze cauldron together with ceramic and bronze jugs.

room for storage space -- cooking and serving wares are usually found outside of the kitchen proper. A terracotta bowl and cup sitting on the stove in I.10.18 (9) are the only finds known to be directly associated with a stove in the kitchen of a *casa piccola*.⁵⁶

Casa media These have a single fixed cooking area.⁵⁷ The kitchens are no larger on average (7.7 m²) than kitchens in *case piccole* (7.6 m²), even though the houses themselves are twice as large. Instead of physically expanding the size or number of kitchens, owners simply added portable cooking appliances to modulate the cooking capacity and to be able to move cooking where it was needed. Eight of eighteen houses have supplementary portable devices (braziers, tripods, water heaters and cooking supports) that expand the total number of possible cooking areas to three. Portable cooking devices can be divided into two groups -- those obviously stored away with other domestic artifacts in cupboards, chests or store-rooms,⁵⁸ and those used where they were found (usually in or near a node such as an atrium or garden).⁵⁹ Nearly all braziers, tripods and water heaters were placed either in close vicinity to a dining area, or in a nearby storage area whence they could easily be fetched. The *casa media* had increased flexibility and options in deciding where and how much to cook.

Medium-sized houses contain a wide variety of fixed cooking appliances, including stoves of sub-types (1), (2) and (3), and hearths of sub-types (1), (2) and (4). Solid and arched masonry stoves, being the largest and most common cooking installations, are found only in distinct, architecturally defined kitchens. Three of the four smallest *case medie* do not have kitchens, but allotted space for hearths or sub-type (3) stoves in an atrium (I.6.13-14) or in corridors (I.9.12, I.10.8).⁶⁰ *Case piccole* set aside space for separate kitchens, so the issue is not a lack of ground area. The answer lies in the proximity of cooking to dining. All three of these cooking areas are practically adjacent to the dining room, even within range of smell, which (see below) is relatively rare. Ease of serving dinner determines the placement of the cooking area.

Assemblages of cooking wares and cooking devices were closely associated with stoves in four examples.⁶¹ Those exemplary assemblages provide a sense of how a typical kitchen may have been outfitted. Found at each site was at least one auxiliary cooking device, i.e. a tripod, brazier or grill, over which other pots might be placed for cooking. Other pots included: bronze

⁵⁶From a photo in PPM II, 502, #4.

⁵⁷I.9.3-4 has one hearth fixed to its attached counter; another possible fixed cooking area is located in room (10), where some stub walls that could be stove supports are visible, but the room has not been completely excavated and the room cannot be securely identified as a kitchen.

⁵⁸Portable cooking devices stored away: I.6.15 (g), I.8.17+11 (19), I.9.5-7 (9), I.10.7 (3), in a chest.

⁵⁹Portable cooking devices perhaps in use where they were found: I.6.15 (l), I.9.1-2 (2), I.9.5-7 (2), I.9.13-14 (o), I.10.7 (10), I.10.10-11 (9).

⁶⁰One other possible cooking area (I.9.5-7 (16)) was located along a corridor.

⁶¹I.6.4 (n), I.7.7 (i), I.9.13-14 (b), I.10.7 (11).

skillets, cauldrons, jugs, terracotta jugs, mixing bowls, amphorae, cups, bowls, plates, and a possible *testum*, small ceramic and glass vessels for spices and herbs, and some organic remains of food and fuel. Most kitchens preserve few finds, the result of any of the following factors: a) the household packed up cooking and eating wares and escaped the eruption, b) cooking and serving wares were normally stored elsewhere in the house when not in use, c) the kitchen and house were not occupied at the time of the eruption, and d) the finds recovered from the kitchen were not recorded accurately or have not been published.

Casa grande The largest houses vary widely in their cooking and dining arrangements. On average, their kitchens are no larger (7.9 m²) than smaller houses. They do, however, have more potential cooking areas (2-6) because they have more portable cooking devices. Individual building history seems to be the primary factor in determining their array of cooking areas. As a result, there are no general trends in *case grandi*. Because of their size and status they have risen above generalities; I will approach each on a case by case basis.

I.4.5-6+25+28 inherited the individual kitchens (42, 64) originally belonging to each of its two large atrium-peristyle houses. The kitchens contained a fixed stove and hearth respectively. A brazier was found in court (21), but no finds are recorded from the kitchens (Fig. 5.10). I.7.10-12 was also the product of at least two (possibly three) separate houses; accordingly, there are stoves in three fixed cooking areas -- (7), (8) and (21). A brazier was also stored in room (18), next to the two most elaborate dining areas in the house. Cooking equipment was found on two stoves; the imprint of a vase and hand mill in (7), and a tripod, bronze amphora, *casseruola* and skillet in (8) (Fig. 5.21). The Casa del Menandro, I.10.4+14-17, has a single kitchen (52) with a large stove. The incorporation of a small atrium-house at #16-17 added a hearth in atrium (41), and an assortment of items including a tripod, cooking pots, casseruole, bowls, cups and jugs.⁶² A brazier was located in peristyle (c) (Fig. 5.162).⁶³ Large scale cooking in this house was handled only by kitchen (52). The other, smaller cooking areas probably served several functions: a) the needs of slaves, b) breakfasts and lunches, and c) keeping food warm at dinner. Finds from the cooking areas of neither I.6.2+16 nor I.7.1+20 have been published. The main kitchen in I.6.2 was originally located underground in [F] and served the large entertainment room there; it was later destroyed and the cryptoporticus filled after the A.D. 62 earthquake (Fig. 5.50). Thereafter a small stove was built for the new masonry dining couches in area (16) of the reduced house. The main kitchen (14) in I.7.1+20 was also connected to its cryptoporticus via a

⁶²The small house at #16-17 probably had its original kitchen in room (45).

⁶³Braziers were also stored in underground room [A] (with numerous tablewares, including the famous silver service) and room (37) (with a tripod and other cooking pots).

stairwell that ran beneath its large triple-arched stove. A brazier stored in room (15) added to the cooking capacity of the house (Fig. 5.19).

Light and ventilation

Provisions for light and ventilation in cooking areas were almost universally miserable; whether in the smallest (work)shop or the largest house, kitchens tended to be dark, and full of smoke and stench. The only exceptions were braziers, and stoves or hearths set in the corners of airy atria, courts, gardens, or peristyles. Cooking in open areas was common only in (work)shop-houses, where it was a practical measure, and where the reception of guests was not a priority. The lack of concern for kitchen environments was probably due to the fact that slaves worked there.⁶⁴ Occupants of (work)shops or (work)shop-houses probably prepared their own meals and so arranged their cooking areas to take maximum advantage of available light and air.

(Work)shops (Work)shops are too small to have an interior court or light well. As a result, only the wide entrance onto the street allowed light in and cooking smoke out. In the two (work)shops where there is a fixed hearth or stove, it is located not in the front room near the street, but in a separate space away from the front entrance (Figs. 5.8, 5.20).⁶⁵ Unless the roof above these two cooking areas was pierced with a skylight or chimney (and no such evidence is reported), the street would have been the only source for light and air. In some (work)shops, only cookwares and portable cooking devices were found; cooking could have been done in the front room next to the door, on the threshold, or even on the sidewalk outside the door.

(Work)shop-houses Half of the cooking installations in (work)shop-houses are located within an area open to the sky (i.e. atrium, garden or court).⁶⁶ In these cases, the cooking areas are lit and ventilated directly. Cooking is consequently visible to anyone in the building; no effort is made to conceal the process of cooking or the persons who cook. In the other (work)shop-houses, cooking areas are located in a space immediately adjacent to an open area, and lit and vented exclusively by the open area, or by windows onto the street.⁶⁷ Occupants of (work)shop-houses judiciously build their cooking areas proximate to an open area in order to exploit natural light and ventilation.

⁶⁴For the comments of the elite on their smoke-filled kitchens, see chapter two, pp. 74-77.

⁶⁵I.4.4 and I.7.4.

⁶⁶I.6.8-9 (stoves in atrium (c) and garden (i)), I.7.5 (stove under shed roof in court (c)), I.7.16 (stove/hearth in court (2)), I.8.13 (stove in court (1)), I.10.1 (stove under shed roof in court (5)).

⁶⁷The open area provides light and air in: I.6.7 (m), I.7.18 (e), I.9.9 (4). I.8.10 (9) has two large windows above the stove in this subterranean room; I.9.10 (2) has two small windows to the east of the kitchen area.

Commercial eating establishments The bulk of cooking installations for lunch counters are built into the front counters, near the wide door to the street.⁶⁸ The street entrance is likewise the aperture of choice in most diners. A few have secondary *foci* that are lit and vented by windows onto the street or by the atrium or garden in which they are located.⁶⁹ The paramount consideration is having the cooking at hand for customers. The odiferous fumes emanating from eating establishments may have been an asset, an effective marker of the location of the business and an advertisement of the food and drink for sale.

Houses with or without (work)shops

Casa piccola Cooking areas in small houses (excluding those with hearths that serve lunch counters at the front) are generally set in a back corner of the house. They are thus poorly lit and ventilated solely through the kitchen door to an adjacent court, corridor or atrium.⁷⁰ The kitchens were dark, hot and filled with fumes.

Casa media In houses without eating establishments, less than half the kitchens have some form of direct lighting and ventilation either via windows, or by being located within an open area.⁷¹ Nine kitchens are lit and vented via their doors onto a corridor, court, atrium or garden.⁷² Interestingly, nine cooking areas line the street, but only two have windows onto the street.⁷³ Only the presence of a latrine in the kitchen seems to require special ventilation. The two kitchens with windows onto the street both contain latrines within the kitchen, while six of the seven cooking areas that do not have windows, do not have latrines.⁷⁴ No pattern whatsoever emerges in the location of cooking areas; nearly equal numbers of kitchens appear at the front, middle and back areas of *case medie*.⁷⁵

⁶⁸The one exception is the hearth for I.4.3, located in the atrium of the house behind.

⁶⁹The possible kitchen I.7.13-14 (6) has windows in the N wall into the neighboring house (I.7.19 (i), also a likely cooking area); the two stoves in I.6.8-9 are located in the atrium and the garden.

⁷⁰The exception is I.7.2-3, which lacks a cooking area with fixed installations; court (g) provides ample light and air to the cooking devices within. Kitchen I.9.8 (7) is the only example located not towards the back, but is midway along the house; its door to a corridor that connects the atrium and a back court is the only source of light and air.

⁷¹Direct lighting and ventilation: I.6.13-14 (b), I.8. 4-6 (14), I.9.13-14 (b, o) (located within an open area); I.6.15, I.7.7 (windows onto the street); I.8.17+11 (windows onto an open area).

⁷²Indirect lighting and ventilation via kitchen doors: I.6.4 (n), I.6.11 (8), I.7.19 (l), I.9.1-2 (6), I.9.5-7 (9), I.9.12 (9), I.10.7 (11), I.10.8 (9), I.10.10-11 (16).

⁷³I.6.15 (i) and I.7.7 (i) have windows from the kitchen onto the street. I.6.11 (8), I.8.17+11 (21), I.9.1-2 (6), I.9.5-7 (16), I.9.13-14 (b), I.10.8 (9) and I.10.10-11 (16) are adjacent to a street but lack windows onto the street.

⁷⁴I.9.5-7 (16), a possible cooking area (no installations are preserved) is adjacent to a latrine in (15) next to the street; no direct ventilation is provided by the street, but rather doors at either end (one to a stable, the other to a colonnaded garden) offer the only light and air.

⁷⁵Four cooking areas are located at the front of the house (in the atrium or rooms closer to the street than the atrium): I.6.13-14 (b), I.6.15 (i), I.7.7 (i), I.9.13-14 (b). Five are placed towards the middle of the house (in the range of rooms in between the atrium and the back garden, court or peristyle): I.6.4 (n), I.6.11 (8), I.7.19

Casa grande Kitchens in large houses have poor lighting and ventilation, except for those located alongside a street, which tend to have windows.⁷⁶ Other fixed cooking areas in large houses are located in or off open areas, and thus were lit only indirectly via doorways.⁷⁷ The two largest and best equipped kitchens are, by all available evidence, the most poorly lit and ventilated.⁷⁸ They are located down long corridors, the only outlets for smoke and fumes. Placed at significant distances from open gardens, their seclusion from guests in reception areas was apparently more important than the provision of light and air for slave cooks. Small niches are set above the stoves of both kitchens; they contained lamps that provided auxiliary lighting.

Water and drainage

I will examine the provision of fresh water for the cooking and serving process, the ability to remove waste and waste water via drains and latrines, and the sharing of water resources with bath facilities in the building. These questions are concerned with fixed cooking areas; portable cooking devices were as easily brought to water as water brought to them. The ability to maintain an independent water supply depended exclusively upon whether an area open to the sky was maintained within the building to collect rainwater. Buildings large enough to afford open space ((work)shop-houses, diners and houses) could supply their own water. Larger houses had commensurably larger water collection capacity. Additional water could always be procured from the public fountains, which remained the only source for the (work)shops and lunch counters. Houses and (work)shop-houses usually paired kitchens and latrines. The two domestic activities creating the most and most dangerous refuse were effectively quarantined. The largest houses took water-use to another level, employing it in fountains and baths. Their kitchens were also provided with the most comprehensive system of drainage via sinks and latrines. Access to and exploitation of water resources was a clear and visible marker of wealth and power.

(Work)shops Individual water sources were not found in any of the (work)shops; water was carried in from one of the many public fountains placed across the city by the first century A.D. For buildings in this sample, public fountains were located at the northwest corner of *insula*

(1), I.9.1-2 (6), I.10.8 (9). Six rest in the back of the house (in the back open space or in a space off of it): I.8.4-6 (14), I.8.17+11 (21), I.9.5-7 (16), I.9.12 (9), I.10.7 (11), I.10.10-11 (16).

⁷⁶I.4.5+25 (64), I.7.10-12 (8, 21) have windows onto the street; the latter two kitchens also contain latrines. I.10.4 (52) once had a window onto the street that was later blocked up; the latrine is located in an adjacent area.

⁷⁷I.10.4 (41) is located within a small atrium which provides light and air; I.4.5+25 (42), I.6.2+16 (16), I.7.1 (14), I.7.10-12 (7) are lit and vented indirectly.

⁷⁸I.4.5+25 (42) and I.10.4 (52), the main kitchens in those houses. Also I.6.2+16 [F], before A.D. 62.

I.4, the southwest corner of *insula* IX.11 (across the Via dell'Abbondanza from the northeast corner of I.6), the northwest corner of *insula* I.9, the northwest corner of *insula* I.16 (diagonal to the southeast corner of I.9) and the northeast corner of *insula* I.10 (Fig. 2.2). No (work)shop was further than 140 meters from a public source of water. Drainage in most cases must have been achieved by simply tossing or channeling the waste into the street. Some of the larger (work)shops had special facilities for holding and draining water. Those that cleaned and processed textiles required water for their industrial processes; traces of fixed basins appear in I.4.7, I.4.26, and I.10.5-6. Two of the largest (work)shops have separate latrines (I.4.26, I.6.1). I.6.12 preserves a down-pipe that once drained a latrine or sink on the upper floor.

(Work)shop-houses All (work)shop-houses have their own cisterns or water basins (including *impluvia*).⁷⁹ These points of water collection are fed by runoff from the roofs around open areas, and are usually accessed by cistern heads capped by stone or terracotta puteals. Additional water was always available from public fountains; the fountain at the northeast corner of *insula* I.10 rests at the nexus of three (work)shop-houses.⁸⁰ Because the cooking areas in (work)shop-houses are so closely connected to open areas, a water source is always at hand.⁸¹ Efficient use of heating and water installations was paramount; formal reception in two buildings (I.8.13, I.7.5) would have been compromised by the latrines immediately inside the front door.

Latrines are present in nine of the eleven (work)shop-houses.⁸² In six, the latrine is immediately adjacent to the kitchen.⁸³ In the other three cases, a latrine is located across a node from the cooking area.⁸⁴ Latrines were the principal point of drainage; cooking areas were usually closer to latrines than they were to the street. Latrines have rarely been excavated, so it is difficult to know how many were simple cesspits and how many drained into the city sewer system. Three latrines are located adjacent to streets under which they probably drained; one has visible evidence for street drainage.⁸⁵

⁷⁹I.9.9 and I.9.10 share a cistern head that is placed on the property line between them, in a gap of the common wall; I.9.10 has an auxilliary water basin at the W edge of court (1).

⁸⁰I.7.16, I.7.18, I.10.1.

⁸¹Only the stove in kitchen I.9.10 (2) is out of sight from its water sources, one space removed.

⁸²No latrines can be found in I.8.12, a stable without a cooking area, and I.9.9, for which the street was probably used for drainage.

⁸³I.6.7 (kitchen (m) and latrine (l)); I.7.18 (kitchen (e), latrine (f)); I.8.10 (kitchen and latrine in (9)); I.8.13 (stove adjacent to latrine at the SW corner of court (1); I.9.10 (kitchen and latrine in (2); I.10.1 (kitchen and latrine off court (5)).

⁸⁴I.7.5 (stove on E side of court (c), latrine off NW corner of the court); I.7.16 (stove/hearth in NE corner, latrine in SW corner of court (2)); I.6.8-9 (stoves in (c, i), latrine off garden (i) in (e')).

⁸⁵The drain for the latrine in the NE corner of kitchen I.8.10 (9) clearly extends under the street to the E. Latrines in I.8.13 and I.9.10 also have street frontage.

Commercial eating establishments

Lunch counters Water supply depends heavily upon whether the lunch counter is attached to a larger house. Of the four independent establishments, none has its own source of water because each lacks an open area to catch and collect it. Each must have relied exclusively upon street fountains. Two independent lunch counters have latrines, however, perhaps for the convenience of the customers.⁸⁶ The three lunch counters attached to houses rely upon water from their atria and gardens. The street served for drainage.

Diners Those attached to houses rely almost exclusively upon their water and drainage utilities. A single diner (I.8.8) has its own latrine, in the NW corner of room (1) next to the hearth. Independent diners, which are larger and have their own open areas, generally have their own cisterns and latrines.⁸⁷ Latrines tend to be in a back corner of the building; neither water nor drainage is associated with the front serving counter or a dining area.

Houses with or without (work)shops

Casa piccola Cisterns underlie all small houses; water is retrieved via cistern heads located in or just off the atria or garden courts. To the extent that kitchens are usually located in small rooms close to these open areas, water is readily available for cooking. Not all small houses have latrines, but in most of those that do (six of nine), the latrine is located either in or next to the cooking area.⁸⁸ The latrines are probably cesspits, as drainage to the street is unlikely; they sit in small rooms, out of sight at the back of the house.

Casa media Cisterns heads are found in the atria and gardens of all houses of medium size.⁸⁹ The increased roof area allows the collection of extra water. The Casa di Cerere (I.9.13-14) contains a set of sculpture that once served as a fountain, perhaps in the atrium.⁹⁰ Kitchens

⁸⁶I.4.27 has a latrine in (a); I.7.8-9 probably has a latrine in (b), and at least has a downpipe in the NW corner of (a) from a latrine or drain on the upper floor.

⁸⁷I.4.11 is the only diner that does not have its own identifiable water source. Garden (d) contains a latrine in its SE corner, and would seem to be suitable for collecting water, but no cistern or cistern head has been identified. A public fountain was available just 25 meters to the north at the corner of the insula. I.8.15-16 does not have a latrine, but has a sink and drain next to the stove in (5).

⁸⁸An exception is I.10.2-3, where the cooking area is a hearth at the attached lunch counter (2), while the latrine is located at the back of the house in area (10) near the small garden court where the cistern head is located.

⁸⁹All houses with attached eating establishments possess cisterns, but none have securely identifiable latrines or accommodations for drainage. The exception may be room (12) in I.9.3-4, which has the appearance of a latrine (it remains partially unexcavated).

⁹⁰Four cupids riding marble dolphins, their mouths serving as water spouts, were found stored in dining-room/tablinum (j). It is not clear where or when this ensemble was in use (see De Vos 1976 and Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, 226-227, #188).

are always located near an open area with a cistern head; water for cooking is easily retrieved.⁹¹ Thirteen houses contain latrines; nine are located in or next to kitchens.⁹² Kitchen I.6.11 (8) has its own drain to channel waste water into the street.

Casa grande Large houses are the best watered. Not only do they have cistern heads installed in nearly every node and open area, but four of the five houses have a fountain in a garden or peristyle that exhibits the residents' ability to 'waste' water in luxurious display instead of employing it for merely practical uses.⁹³ Each house also had a bath; in four of the five baths, a cooking area was closely associated.⁹⁴ I.7.10-12 had additional water capacity; it contained a *castellum aquae* at the northwest corner of the garden that brought in water from the aqueduct. The kitchens in the largest houses are also the best equipped for waste water disposal. Sinks appear in one kitchen of each of the five large houses, always in the company of a latrine.⁹⁵ Convenient drainage for the largest kitchens was essential, considering that they were often located far away from open areas or the street.

Floor and wall decoration

Cooking areas display little, if any, wall and floor decoration. There are two reasons why. First, most kitchens never had any decoration; they preserve only a plain coat of plaster on their walls, sometimes with a red socle and/or vertical red stripes in the corners. The black and white diagonal stripes usually associated with service areas were not found in any buildings in this sample.⁹⁶ Second, because kitchens lack interesting decoration, they were left open to

⁹¹Garden (8) in I.9.12 has a stone gutter running below the eave of the potico roof for collecting rainwater, but the location of the corresponding cistern head is uncertain, lest it lie on the other side of kitchen (9), in court (6) of the diner I.9.11 (a latrine is also present in room (7) of that diner -- no latrine is present in the house proper). It is difficult to interpret the water and drainage arrangements of I.9.12 without knowing the relationship between the house and the diner, which are connected by two doorways. A single water source suggests that both properties were connected in their ownership or occupants.

⁹²I.9.12 and I.9.13-14 lack latrines. Houses that juxtapose their cooking areas and latrines include: I.6.4, I.6.11, I.6.15, I.7.7, I.8.4-6, I.8.17+11, I.9.1-2, I.9.5-7, I.10.11.

⁹³I.6.2+16 does not have a fountain. Fountains appear in I.4.5+25 (17), I.7.1 (9), I.7.10-12 (23) and I.10.4 (c).

⁹⁴In I.4.5+25, kitchen (42) was the point from which the bath suite (39-41) was heated, drained and maintained. Before the section of the cryptoporticus was filled in after damage from the A.D. 62 earthquake, area [F] doubled as a kitchen and the praefurnium for the bath suite [18-21] in I.6.2+16. Small one-room baths were located in d' (just below kitchen (14)) of I.7.1, and in room (5), heated from court (6) next to the kitchen/dining area (7) in I.7.10-12. Only in I.10.4 were the kitchen (52) and the bath suite (46-49) areas completely separate.

⁹⁵Sinks with latrines appear in I.4.5+25 (42), I.6.2 [F] (the pre-A.D. 62 kitchen), I.7.1 (14), I.7.10-12 (21) and I.10.4 (52). A latrine appears alone in I.7.10-12 (8).

⁹⁶Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 39 n.4 provides references for locations, including Torre Annunziata, court (32), where diagonal black and white striping can be found. To his list can be added the corridors of the floor above the Suburban Baths at the Porta Marina in Pompeii.

weathering after their excavation, leading to the disappearance of any painted plaster they once may have had.

There are certain exceptions to the lack of decoration in cooking areas. First, it appears in kitchens that were converted from use as another type of room, often a cubiculum. Pre-existing decoration is usually ignored; appliances, installations and new walls are cut into the pattern without regard for its integrity when the kitchen is installed.⁹⁷ The second exception is painted shrines that appear in the kitchen (see below for further consideration of the relationship between cooking, dining, and ritual).⁹⁸ A third exception is the presence of cooking installations or portable cooking devices in rooms or areas that enjoy a wider use, such as atria, peristyles and gardens. In these cases, cooking is done in the presence of adornment designed for the larger space, not designed to complement the cooking.⁹⁹ Finally, cooking facilities built into the counters of eating establishments exist in the context of the decoration of the room -- counters clad in painted stucco or marble revetment, wall paintings, and sometimes painted shrines.¹⁰⁰

Kitchens in the largest houses are no better decorated than kitchens in the smallest houses. Walls were coated with plain white plaster to preserve them and allow them to be cleaned. Floors were either of *cocciopesto* or beaten earth; both surfaces are ideal for enduring endless spills and messes. There was no sense in decorating a kitchen in fine fashion, only to have it sullied by black smoke, blood, food remains, and waste water.

Dining area amenities

Dining area types and evidence

This discussion concentrates on the dimensions and number of dining areas, as well as the various pieces of evidence that suggest dining was actually carried out in these locations (i.e. couch niches, floor or wall decoration that indicates the placement of couches, evidence of the couches themselves, or vessels and utensils for serving, eating and drinking).¹⁰¹

⁹⁷Examples include I.6.15 (i), where the third style decoration of a cubiculum survives, and I.9.1-2 (6), where the patterned *cocciopesto* floor and second style wall decoration of a previous cubiculum can still be seen.

⁹⁸Examples include: I.7.18 (e), I.8.18 (8), I.10.4 (52), I.10.7 (11), I.10.11 (16), I.10.18 (9).

⁹⁹Examples include: I.4.5+25 (21), I.7.2-3 (g), I.9.1-2 (2), I.9.13-14 (b, o), I.10.4 (c), I.10.11 (9).

¹⁰⁰Examples include: I.4.27 (a), I.6.5-6; I.7.8 (a); I.8.1-2 (12), I.8.8 (1), I.8.15 (1), I.9.11 (1), I.10.2-3 (2), I.10.13.

¹⁰¹Floor decoration may be mosaic or *opus sectile* emblemata around which couches could be placed, or the actual delineation of couch positions with tesserae. Bipartite wall decoration distinguishes a smaller serving area at the front of the room from a larger area for couches at the back of the room (see chapter two, pp. 106-107).

(Work)shops No securely identifiable formal dining areas were found in any (work)shops (their lighting and decoration will therefore not be discussed below).¹⁰² The existence of cooking installations in several (work)shops, however, confirms that eating must have taken place there (see above, p. 129). Fallen from the balcony of I.7.4 was a bronze oinochoe, and the carbonized remains of figs, dates and almonds were recovered from glass containers stored in the ground floor room, along with a ceramic cup and bowl. Other (work)shops also contained tableware of ceramic, glass and bronze that strongly imply eating on the premises, either on the ground floor or on an upper loft or balcony.¹⁰³ Unfortunately, the finds for many (work)shops have not been published. Despite the uneven nature of the evidence, I believe that occupants ate at home in the majority of (work)shops.

(Work)shop-houses Ten of eleven buildings contain at least one possible dining area; three of these have two dining areas (the second appearing on an upper floor).¹⁰⁴ Relatively few are securely identified.¹⁰⁵ Reception of guests for dinner does not seem to have been a primary concern of the residents; dining areas are neither particularly large or well-accommodated. One well-prepared dining area went out of use when the house was converted into a (work)shop-house.¹⁰⁶ Dining areas are generally small, averaging 16.8 m². The preferred type is the dining room, appearing seven times; there are two dining halls, three dinettes, and one outdoor dining area.

The degree to which a (work)shop-house has dining areas depends on what sort of business is carried out on site. For instance, the outdoor masonry dining couches in court (2) of I.7.16 for instance may have served as a corporate entertainment center for the artisans who painted signs and electoral notices on the walls of Pompeii, a *collegium scriptori murali*.¹⁰⁷ The two dining areas in I.6.8-9 ((d) on the ground floor and cenaculum {k} above it) may have served

¹⁰²Fiorelli (1873, 68) suggested that back room (b) in the fullonica I.4.7 was used for dining, but he cites no supporting evidence. Room (a) in the *officina lanificaria* I.4.26 also seems of suitable dimensions, but given the similar function of both buildings, both rooms were probably large work areas.

¹⁰³I.4.18, I.4.19, I.6.3, I.6.10, I.10.5-6; I.4.23-24 may have contained a cache of carbonized olives (the original excavation reference to this (work)shop is not precise).

¹⁰⁴Only I.8.12 (a stable) contains no room in which dining could conceivably have been done.

¹⁰⁵Three dining areas are securely identified, three have a probable identification, and seven have a possible identification. See chapter two, p. 115 for the degrees of confidence ('secure', 'probable' and 'possible') in identifying dining areas.

¹⁰⁶I.6.7 (h) contains two couch niches and bipartite wall decoration, but was converted into a storage and work area after A.D. 62, when a fullonica was installed on the premises.

¹⁰⁷Refer to the Gazetteer entry for the complete argument and evidence for a *collegium* at I.7.16.

as space for hire by customers of the eating establishment.¹⁰⁸ The other three most securely identified dining areas appear in buildings with a clear and significant residential component.¹⁰⁹

Commercial eating establishments Lunch-counters by definition do not have distinct dining areas where customers recline; they are not included in any of the following discussions. Of the diners, only I.8.15-16 has securely identified dining areas -- room (4) with a set of three masonry benches, and room (6) with a niche for a dining couch.¹¹⁰ Dining areas are quite small, 15.9 m² on average. Most are dining rooms; two are dining halls, two have dining benches, and none include masonry dining couches, which are often taken as the most obvious sign of a commercial eating establishment (see chapter one, pp. 35-37).¹¹¹ For the diners in this sample, wooden couches, tables and chairs were provided for customers instead of masonry couches.¹¹²

Houses with or without (work)shops

Casa piccola Nearly all small houses have a single dining area on the ground floor. Two dining areas are securely identified; four others are probably for dining, and five are possible.¹¹³ Most are dining rooms (five) or dinettes (four). On average, they are hardly larger (17.9 m²) than dining areas in (work)shop-houses, which is not surprising given the comparable overall size of the two building categories.

¹⁰⁸See the gazetteer entry on I.6.8-9 for a discussion of the use and life of the building. I.6.8-9, I.7.18, and I.10.1 each have a dining area on the ground floor, and one on an upper floor.

¹⁰⁹I.7.5 (b) has a couch niche; I.7.18 (c) has a floor emblema and remains of a couch, stool and serving wares; I.9.10 (11) no longer has any decoration.

¹¹⁰I.6.8-9, DH•(d) contained four bronze feet and 2 runners for a couch, I.7.13-14, DR•(4) a couch niche, but both rooms are in the traditionally-identified position for a tablinum, and I cannot be positive that the couches were used for dining. These rooms were likely multi-purpose spaces. I.8.8 (2) has an opus sectile emblema in its pavement. Diners I.4.11, I.9.4 and I.9.11 had possible dining areas -- room (3) in the latter contains benches, but until the room has been completely excavated, it is not possible to know whether the benches were for seating customers, or whether they were cooking surfaces.

¹¹¹It has been suggested that loggia (16) of the Casa del Criptoportico, I.6.2, was converted into a public dining establishment after A.D. 62., on the basis of a set of masonry dining couches, benches and a nearby stove. While a change in the character of that house cannot be denied, its transformation from a house to a house with a diner cannot, in the end, be proved. See the Gazetteer entry.

¹¹²Masonry couches appear in greater abundance in the eastern quarter of the city near the entertainment center of the amphitheater; greater urban space is devoted there to open gardens in which the masonry couches are found. Examples include: I.11.16, I.20.1, I.21.3, II.2.2, II.3.9, II.4, II.6.2, II.6.5, II.9.6 (See Jashemski 1979,

¹¹³I.8.18 (6) and I.9.8 (9) both have couch niches; the latter room also contained a table and serving vessels. I.4.9 (m) has an emblema, and pilasters painted on the walls divide the room into a service area at the front ('anticamera') and a dining area at the back ('sala'). I.7.2-3 (c) has an emblema in its pavement; I.4.1-3 (g) and I.8.14 (6) are also probable dining areas. I.4.22 (d, l), I.10.2-3 (6) and I.10.18 (3, 11) are possible dining areas.

Casa media Houses of medium size have one to three dining areas on the ground floor, nearly twice as many on average as small houses.¹¹⁴ They average 21.9 m² each, twenty-two percent larger on average than dining areas in smaller houses. There is thus a significant increase in both the size and number of dining spaces. More are securely identified; one-quarter contain couch niches or the remains of couches themselves.¹¹⁵ A minority are identified as only 'possible' dining areas, the opposite of the case in smaller building types. The larger the houses, the more confidence with which the functions of dining areas can be identified, because more and better information tends to be preserved (and published).¹¹⁶

The vast majority are dining rooms; only two houses of this size do not contain at least one.¹¹⁷ In two houses, the dining rooms are of remarkably similar dimensions, perhaps because one set of dining furniture was moved from room to room depending on the occasion.¹¹⁸ However, houses that contain more than one dining area tend to have more than one *type*, emphasizing variety.¹¹⁹ Three houses have a set of one dining room, one dinette and one dining hall: each could contain different numbers of guests, and are arranged to take advantage of varying conditions of light and exposure to the elements.¹²⁰ In sum, larger houses have: more options for choosing a dining environment, an increased capacity for guests, and increased specialization in the function of rooms such that dining areas become easier to identify by means of the physical evidence.

¹¹⁴I.6.13-14, I.8.1-3, I.9.3-4, I.9.12 and I.10.10-11 each have only one dining area on the ground floor. Six other houses have two dining areas, and seven houses have three dining areas.

¹¹⁵I.6.4 (c) contained ten couch feet; I.8.4-6 (3, 13) have couch niches; I.8.8-9 (10) has two couch niches and an emblema in the pavement, and garden (11) contains a set of masonry couches; I.8.17+11 (14) has a couch niche, I.9.13-14 (d) has a couch niche and bronze pieces of couches, room (j) has two couch niches and an emblema in the floor and room (m) contains a 'T + U' mosaic marking out the position of the couches as well as numerous serving vessels. I.10.7 (9) has a couch niche, remains of a couch and floor decoration that marks the position of a set of couches.

¹¹⁶For the *casa media* category, ten dining areas were securely identified, twenty-one had a 'probable' designation, and eight were considered 'possible' dining areas. From the probable category, I.6.4 (p) has bipartite wall and floor decoration marking service and eating areas; I.6.13-14 (4) has an emblema and possibly a couch niche; I.6.15 (d, e) each have a pavement emblema, as does I.7.7 (b); I.9.1-2 (8) has bipartite wall decoration that separates serving and eating areas with engaged plaster pilasters, as does I.9.5-7 (11) -- rooms (11, 13, 17) in that house each have an emblema. Pieces of couches and some serving wares were found in I.10.7 (8), and remains of a bower in garden (12) there strongly suggest the location of a set of wooden couches underneath.

¹¹⁷I.7.19 (dining hall (b) and dinette (e)) and I.10.10-11 (dining halls 9, 20) do not contain a dining room. Of the total dining areas for the *casa media* category, twenty-four are dining rooms, eight are dining halls, five are dinettes and two are outdoor dining areas.

¹¹⁸I.6.11 (11, 15) have identical widths (4.37 m.), and I.8.4-6 (3, 7) are very similar in size (4.94 x 3.89 m. and 4.94 x 3.81 m.).

¹¹⁹In five of fourteen houses with more than one dining area, only a single type (usually a dining room) is present.

¹²⁰I.6.4, I.9.1-2, I.9.5-7.

Casa grande These have more than twice as many dining areas on average as *case medie*, and more than five times as many as *case piccole*. The number ranges from two to eight (Table 3.4).¹²¹ Dining areas (mean 29.4 m²) are on average thirty-four percent larger than those in *case medie* and sixty-four percent larger than those in *case piccole*. The top tier of houses demonstrates a dramatic increase in the number and size of dining areas; some dining halls are even larger than an entire small house or (work)shop-house.¹²² Dining areas are better identified in large houses - ten are securely identified, twelve are 'probable', and only six are 'possible'.¹²³ Dining rooms are again the majority of dining area types (fourteen), but dining halls (eight) and outdoor dining areas (four) are other significant types; the dinette, smallest of the types, appears but once, as does the dining bench. Four of five houses contained an outdoor dining area.¹²⁴

Given the number of dining areas in large houses, it is reasonable to assume that they had specialized uses. They could hold gatherings from the small to the very large in a variety of settings. In grand houses where guests could enjoy differently sized and decorated dining areas, the slaves also had a place to eat. Three houses appear to have an area set aside for meals of the servile household staff.¹²⁵ In I.10.4, the small atrium house at entrances #16-17 and its dependent rooms have long been considered the 'procurator's' quarters, i.e. residential slave quarters (Figs. 5.162, 5.165). The atrium (41) contained a hearth, a bed or couch in one corner and a table and chests filled with cooking, serving and eating wares. Similarly, atrium (A') in I.7.10-12 at entrance #10 seems a self-contained unit separated from the rest of the house by its status. Off that atrium, room (7) has two couch niches and a masonry stove against one wall, a neat fit of cooking and dining in the same room (Figs. 5.84-5.86). Upstairs rooms around the same atrium

¹²¹This count for I.6.2, the Casa del Criptoportico, does not include underground room [22], which was abandoned after A.D. 62, when a combination set of masonry dining couches and dining benches (counted here as one dining area) was built. The Casa del Citarista (I.4.5+25) does not include court (21), in which five feet for (bed/couch) furniture was found.

¹²²Notable are dining-halls (or perhaps *basilicae*) I.4.5+25 (19) (75.5 m²), (35) (65.8 m²) and I.10.4 (18) (93.8 m²).

¹²³Secure identifications: I.6.2 (16), with masonry couches and benches; I.7.1 (9), an outdoor area with wooden couches, (16), with couch niches and an emblema in the pavement; I.7.10-12 (7, 10) with couch niches, (17) with niches, an emblema and remains of couches, and (23), outdoor masonry couches; I.10.4 (c), an outdoor wooden couch and (18), with couch remains, a table and serving vessels. Probable identification: I.4.5+25 (35) contained remains of (perhaps) dining couches; I.6.2 [22] had an emblema and bipartite floor decoration; I.7.1 (18) had an emblema and a mosaic band in the pavement limiting the placement of couches; I.7.10-12 (16) has an emblema and floor decoration marking couch positions; I.10.4 (11) has an emblema and serving vessels and room (12) contained a single cup.

¹²⁴Only I.4.5+25 does not have an outdoor dining area recorded, although outdoor dining could easily have been arranged in either of the large gardens (32) or (56).

¹²⁵See the Gazetteer entries for more detailed treatments of slave dining areas. Maiuri 1933 first identified atrium (41) in I.10.4 as the 'procurator's quarters'. Maiuri NSc 1927, 38 and Maiuri 1954b, 459-460 suggested that atrium (A') in I.7.10-12 was used by slaves or women.

were perhaps used by the staff during summer.¹²⁶ A possibly analogous situation exists in I.4.5+25: court (21) is surrounded by small living areas, and contains both a brazier and remains of a bed or couch (Fig. 5.10). The court, while directly connected to the stables of the house at entrance #28, contains some fine decoration, and was probably not for exclusive use of the household staff.

Clearly, larger buildings have more and larger dining areas than smaller buildings. However, dining does not take up proportionally more space. Table 3.4 demonstrates a remarkable consistency in the percentage of the number of rooms and ground area dedicated to dining areas. On average, 10% of spaces and ground area is reserved for dining, regardless of the size of the building (in buildings with a substantial residential component).¹²⁷

Building type	Average total # spaces	Average total ground area	Average total # dining areas	Average total area, dining areas	Average # of dining areas, as % of total	Avg. area of dining areas, as % of total
(Work)shop-house	10.9	196.6 m ²	1.1	17.7 m ²	10.1%	9.0%
<i>Casa piccola</i>	12.9	198.2 m ²	1.1	19.7 m ²	8.5%	9.9%
<i>Casa media</i>	20.0	426.8 m ²	2.1	45.6 m ²	10.5%	10.7%
<i>Casa grande</i>	48.8	1476.4 m ²	5.2	151.1 m ²	10.7%	10.2%

Table 3.4: Comparison of average total number and ground area of dining areas. Percentages (two columns at far right) remain constant across houses and (work)shop-houses of all sizes.

There is a small increase in the percentage of space allotted for dining in larger buildings, but it is outweighed by the overall consistency of the numbers. Why is there an apparent 'tithe' for dining space? Any answer must be unrelated to the socio-economic status of households. Perhaps it is a matter of time; perhaps there is some correspondence between the amount of space reserved for an activity and the amount of time spent daily doing that activity. Ten percent of the day is approximately two and one-half hours; this seems a reasonable average for time spent at dinner. It is not the time spent eating that is important, but rather the time spent socializing over a meal. Occupants of (work)shops, who had no separate dining space, may well have spent part of that

¹²⁶In an upstairs '*cenaculum*' off the W side of the atrium were found several skeletons, the remains of a bed/couch, and some serving and drinking apparatus. Upstairs apartments could catch cooling breezes that could not reach kitchen/dining room (7) on the ground floor.

¹²⁷(Work)shops and lunch counters, which have no dining areas, cannot be included in this exercise. Diners, whose relatively small size and commerce in serving food means that more space is dedicated for dining in those buildings than in any other building type, are also excluded. Dining areas on average take up 16.7% of the number of spaces and 12.0% of the ground area of diners. Dining areas on the upper floor and in underground spaces are also not included because the assessment is based on total ground area. Otherwise, all dining areas, whether 'secure', 'probable' or 'possible', were included in this summary.

time at a local lunch counter or diner. The data states that, on average, the architectural space and effort reserved for dinner was proportional to (ten percent of) the household's socio-economic status. I suggest that this percentage derived from a consistent portion of the day reserved for evening socialization that was independent of a household's socio-economic status.

Light, aspect and orientation

The placement and orientation of dining areas reveals how they were lit, and what kind of view was available to dinner guests within the room. Lighting depends upon the size and arrangement of doors and windows, proximity to an open area, and orientation (the compass direction to which the axis of the dining area faces). The lighting of a dining area changes according to the course of the sun during the day and according to season. How certain dining areas are designed to take advantage of predictable light and shadows, heat and coolness is based on the temporal environment of dining. Aspect is the presentation of a visual tableau to the persons reclining at table. The tableau, framed by windows or doors, can be composed of portico columns, garden vegetation, flowers, sculpture, or waterplay from fountains or basins. In sum, this section discusses the formation of an external environment for the dining area, and how that environment is presented to the guests inside.

(Work)shop-houses (Work)shop-houses have on average one dining area, and the dining area is always lit by a node (usually open to the air).¹²⁸ Dining areas preserved on upper floors have the best light, air, and view through large windows onto the street or an open area.¹²⁹ Some on the ground floor, probably doubling as *tablina*, have a direct view to the entrance.¹³⁰ Others look onto courts and gardens.¹³¹ In general, little effort is made to construct a meaningful vista for banqueters, no dining areas appear to have been used seasonally, and none are provided with views of arranged gardens, statuary, or waterplay.¹³²

Commercial eating establishments Dining areas in 'diners' are lit in one of two ways: from the street through a nearby entrance, or by adjacent courts or gardens.¹³³ In only two diners are dining areas oriented towards the front counter and the front door; most are set inwards, away from the street.¹³⁴ I.9.3-4 (7) is the only example to enjoy a prepared vista, via the

¹²⁸The masonry couches within court (2) of I.7.16 are completely open to the air.

¹²⁹I.6.8-9 {k}, I.7.18 {g}, I.10.1 {6}.

¹³⁰I.6.8-9 (d); I.7.5 (d), via a window; I.7.18 (c); I.10.3 (3).

¹³¹I.8.10 (3), I.9.10 (11).

¹³²I.6.7 (h), used for dining prior to the house's transformation into a fullonica after A.D. 62, once had a wide doorway framing a view onto a peristyle garden.

¹³³Lit by a street: I.8.8 (2), I.8.15-16 (4, 6), I.9.11 (3); lit by a court or garden: I.4.11 (c), I.6.8-9 (d, k), I.7.13-14 (4), I.9.3-4 (7).

¹³⁴I.8.8 (2) and I.6.8-9 (d) look directly towards the counter and the street.

door that connects to the attached house. For the most part, dining areas are adequately lit, but no efforts are made to provide the customers with an interesting external setting for their meal. Rather, the dining areas are simply a short retreat from the street, a step removed from the bustle of the thoroughfare.

Houses with or without (work)shops

Casa piccola Small houses generally have a single ground floor dining area (probably used year-round) set next to a node, allowing in light and air through narrow doors or windows.¹³⁵ An exception by merit of its seclusion is dining hall I.4.9 (m). This, the largest dining area in any small house, is the most poorly provided with natural light and air, because it was not an original part of the house, but was added in the first century A.D. Its only light source comes from the small court (n) at the back of the house, down a narrow corridor. A general lack of wide doorways in these dining areas suggests that sheltering the room from the weather outside was required by a need to use the dining area in all seasons.

Few dining areas had any kind of structured vista for the diners within to enjoy; some look back towards the entrance, others across the atrium, and others towards a back court or garden.¹³⁶ There is no waterplay in sight, no statuary and little greenery. Residents in these abodes seem to have had neither the means nor the motive for lavish architectural display at the dinner table.

Casa media While dining areas in smaller buildings often take air and light from adjacent nodes, they are not commonly oriented directly at those nodes. Maintaining a dining room with a relatively stable year round environment is crucial because there is only one dining area. In larger houses, a variety of dining areas allows individual rooms to be used for special purposes or during designated seasonal periods.

Dining areas fall into three groups. Those sheltered from the weather are always next to the atrium and almost always reached from a narrow doorway off the atrium; none face fully onto a node. These were probably used in winter.¹³⁷ Being sheltered from the outside, their orientation would seem of limited importance, yet five of seven face southward towards greater exposure to the sun. The second group (dining areas most open to the environment) invariably

¹³⁵A possible exception is the small paved area in court (l) of I.4.22, which Fiorelli thought was the location of a wooden outdoor dining couch used in summertime.

¹³⁶I.10.2-3 (6) is in the traditional position of the tablinum, and this room may have served as a reception area for both business and meals. I.4.22 (l) is also located in the traditional tablinum position, but since it is open to the sky, this area was likely not used as a tablinum.

¹³⁷I.9.13-14 (11) is reached by the corridor connecting the atrium and garden, and is not directly linked to the atrium. Other likely winter dining areas are: I.6.4 (c), I.6.15 (e), I.7.7 (b), I.8.4-6 (3), I.8.17+11 (14), I.9.13 (d). Only two of these (I.6.15 (e), I.9.5-7 (11)) have black-ground painted wall decoration that Vitruvius advises for winter dining areas (see chapter two, pp. 102-103).

face directly onto a garden or peristyle through a wide door, or are located within a garden. These were probably summer dining areas.¹³⁸ Seven of ten 'summer' dining areas have a northward orientation, away from the warmest path of the sun in summertime, as per Vitruvius' advice.¹³⁹ The third and largest group of dining areas falls somewhere in between, with a variety of orientations, windows and doors. Light and air for the great majority (seventeen of twenty-two) comes primarily from a node, and is supplemented by other sources (such as doors onto corridors or other rooms). Lighting, temperature and air can be regulated simply by opening and closing doors and shutters. This flexibility suggests use throughout the year. Most (eighteen of twenty-two) are oriented southwards, so solar radiation was available, were it desired; those oriented towards the north were automatically deprived of direct sunshine.

Most dining areas (except for 'winter' dining areas) have some sort of aspect onto an atrium or garden. These views allowed the guests to enjoy painted garden walls, plantings, and sometimes water fixtures or sculpture.¹⁴⁰ No pattern of favored views for particular couch positions within the dining room can be detected; these dining areas face fairly square onto gardens, and while each guest would have a slightly different view, no guest (e.g. a person in the *locus consularis*) consistently has the best view.¹⁴¹

Casa grande The construction history of gardens and peristyles largely determines the environment and view of dining areas in large houses. Three of these (4, 7, 10) around the two atria of I.7.10-12 are the remnants of dining areas that belonged to individual houses before they were combined. Dining areas I.6.2 (5) and I.4.5+25 (53) are the only others located off of atria. Dining areas are often placed around the atrium in smaller houses, but in the largest houses they are almost always focused on gardens and peristyles behind the atria. This is clear in I.4.5+25, I.7.1 and I.10.4, where seven, four and six dining areas respectively face fully onto large peristyle gardens.¹⁴² Important dining areas in the two other *case grandi* (I.6.2 (16), I.1.10-12 (17, 23)) also concentrate their aspect upon large gardens.¹⁴³

¹³⁸'Summer' dining areas: I.6.4 (p) (before the earthquake of A.D. 62, it looked out over the expansive garden to the S); I.6.15 (d); I.7.19 (e); I.8.4-6 (13); I.8.8-9 (11) (an outdoor dining area); I.8.17+11 (18); I.9.1-2 (14); I.9.5-7 (17); I.9.13 (j); I.10.7 (12) (an outdoor dining area).

¹³⁹Vitr. 6.4 (see above, chapter two, p. 104).

¹⁴⁰Four fountain sculptures were found in I.9.5-7 (j); sculpture in a garden shrine was visible to all dining areas in I.10.7.

¹⁴¹*contra* Bek 1983 (see above, chapter two, pp. 100-101).

¹⁴²Three dining areas (I.7.1 (9), I.7.10-12 (23), I.10.4 (c)) are outdoor dining areas located in the center of a garden.

¹⁴³I.6.2, when it was joined with I.6.4 and a very large house before A.D. 62, had two spectacular dining areas -- [22] in the cool underground near a bath suite and lit only by windows up to the garden, and I.6.4 (p), which faced fully south onto the garden from its elevated position, and towards the mountains in that direction.

Wide doorways framed a visual tableau onto the peristyles and brought in ample light and fresh air. The tableau was modulated by formally dynamic garden colonnades that showed different, disarticulated views through the columns to guests arranged around the table. No guest had the best view. Certain important dining areas had their threshold marked by columns or pilasters *in antis*, giving added depth to the tableau.¹⁴⁴ In front of some dining areas, colonnades were broken or given wider intercolumniation, providing an uninterrupted view of the garden.¹⁴⁵

Sculpture, fountains and basins were arranged as points of interest in some dining areas. There are two elaborate set-ups: the bronze statue group set around the edge of a fountain basin in front of I.4.5+25 (18), and the free-standing sculptures, aedicular fountain and water basin concentrated around I.7.10-12 (23) and visible from dining hall (17) in the same house (Figs. 5.10, 5.21).¹⁴⁶ Other dining areas have simpler views, of a fountain basin.¹⁴⁷ The 'natural' garden environment is tamed by its inclusion in the civilized construction of the house, and often complemented by decoration within the dining areas. All in all, an impressive view for guests at table is clearly of primary importance for owners of large houses.

Case grandi have some seasonal dining areas. They are identifiable by their location and type of doorway, not their orientation -- summer and winter dining areas do not correlate to northward and southward orientations, respectively. I.4.5+25 (53), I.6.2 (5) and I.7.10-12 (10), with narrow doorways off atria, are likely for use in winter, as these are the most sheltered from the weather; the latter even has black ground decoration to disguise the smoke from the braziers that heated the room.¹⁴⁸ I.7.1 (16) has a narrow doorway onto the peristyle corner, and seems the likely winter dining area in that house. I.4.5+25 (20) is preceded by a small vestibule that offered further protection from inclement weather. Most dining areas with wide doorways probably had folding doors or shutters (although the evidence has infrequently been noted). I.7.10-12 (17) and I.10.4 (18) were provided with wooden shutters or doors that could be opened to whatever degree was comfortable, making them available in all seasons. Owners of the largest houses worked to have numerous options available for their banquets. They took advantage of orientation and natural light and heat to position a variety of dining areas. By controlling exposure to the outside world they ensured that those areas could be used for most of the year.

¹⁴⁴I.4.5+25 (18) has two columns in antis; I.4.5+25 (35) has two pilasters in antis.

¹⁴⁵Widened intercolumniations are made in colonnades in front of dining areas I.4.5+25 (18, 57, 58), I.7.1 (11a), I.10.4 (18).

¹⁴⁶A bronze Apollo also sat at the southeast corner of peristyle (32) in I.4.5+25, directly in front of dining hall (35).

¹⁴⁷I.7.1 (9, 18), I.10.4 (c, 18)

¹⁴⁸For black-ground decoration in winter dining rooms, see chapter two, pp. 102-103.

Floor and wall decoration

The decoration of dining areas provided a stable backdrop for the mealtime experience. The interior environment of dining areas included plaster mouldings, the 'styles', colors, designs and motifs painted on the walls and ceilings, and the marble, *cocciopesto* and mosaic floors and thresholds. Detecting large-scale patterns to dining area decoration requires awareness of differential preservation, problems in dating and identifying styles, and the immense complexity of the evidence. Wallace-Hadrill has compared the decoration of buildings of all size.¹⁴⁹ He found that more expensive decoration, such as mosaics, *opus sectile* and large scale panel paintings (especially of mythological scenes) tend to appear only in the largest houses; smaller, simpler, less costly decoration is found in smaller (work)shops and houses.

This study corroborates his conclusions. The time and expense lavished on decorating dining areas increases drastically in *case medie* and *case grandi*. Intricate mosaic and marble floor patterns appear, and there are more varied and exotic pigments for painting. Large-scale painted scenes of mythical episodes evoked conversation amongst guests at table, displayed the host's wealth, and revealed his education and philosophy.¹⁵⁰ The decoration of dining areas in these houses was meant to engage and impress the guests, encouraging their participation in a dinner that was a focus of cultural discourse, social interaction, and sensual pleasure.

~~(Work)shop-houses~~ Decoration in the dining areas of (work)shop-houses is difficult to characterize. Good third and fourth style decoration appears in only four buildings.¹⁵¹ Little decoration is preserved in any other dining areas; in some, like I.7.16 (2), there may never have been any. In dining rooms with decoration, floors are always of *cocciopesto*, sometimes with inset white tesserae forming patterns, or with tesserae and pieces of marble randomly scattered throughout the floor. A single emblem of white tesserae and cut pieces of marble appears on the floor of I.7.18 {g}. Wall decoration includes no large-scale mythological scenes. Rather, there may be vignettes of cupids, dancing women or birds drawing tiny chariots, small landscape panels, still lifes or medallions of masks, fruit baskets, birds and serving vessels.¹⁵² Middle zones tend to have a red, black, or white ground, with the same colors plus yellow for details, socles and borders. The vignettes lie within architectural or simple line frames. The means to paint detailed, large-scale figural panels was perhaps not available to the residents of (work)shop-houses. As a result, the interiors of their dining areas seem simple and almost austere.

¹⁴⁹Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 143-174; Wallace-Hadrill 1991c.

¹⁵⁰See Clarke's (1991, 170-193) analysis of the fourth style decorative ensembles in I.10.4.

¹⁵¹Third style: I.7.5 (d), I.7.18 (c, g) and I.10.1 (3). I.6.7 (g) was redecorated in the fourth style.

¹⁵²I.6.7 (g): vignettes of cupids and dancing women, small landscape panels, still lifes, and plants in socle; I.7.5: still life of fruit basket; I.7.18 (c): vignettes of birds drawing chariots, collections of serving vessels; I.7.18 {g}: medallions of masks and birds; I.10.1 (3): small panel of a bird.

Commercial eating establishments Decoration of dining areas in diners is not often preserved; when it is, simple white or plain plaster is common on the walls, and floors rarely have special treatment. I.8.8 (2) is an exception, possessing simple red ground third style wall decoration, a plaster cornice and an central emblema of *opus sectile* inserted in the cocciopesto floor. Providing an elegantly elaborate setting for customers does not seem to have been a high priority for owners or operators of the commercial dining establishments in this sample, although eating places of higher caliber are known elsewhere in the city (Figs. 2.47-2.48).¹⁵³

Houses with or without (work)shops

Casa piccola Dining areas in small houses are comparable to those in (work)shop-houses. Pavements are of cocciopesto, sometimes with white inset tesserae for decoration. Tesserae form an intricate emblema in I.7.2-3 (c) and identify the position of the dining couches. In I.4.22 (m), an emblema of multi-colored *opus sectile* marks the focus of that room. No wholly mosaic floors were identified.

Wall painting is based on red or white ground, with black and yellow for socles and panels or bands. Painting is poorly preserved in general, making styles and patterns difficult to identify. Only three examples preserve any appreciable detail.¹⁵⁴ Painting is in the second to fourth style. As in (work)shop-houses, small details ornament the decorative panels, and no large scale figural paintings or mythological scenes are found.

Casa media These dining areas are decorated with noticeably more expensive materials and more detailed treatment. The evidence also tends to be better preserved. Pavements are largely cocciopesto (twenty-two of thirty-four visible floors), and most are decorated with white tesserae set in patterns (ten examples) or dense carpets of polychrome or white and black limestone chips (four examples). Selected dining areas, however, have more elaborate floors. There are five emblemata of *opus sectile*, and two of mosaic, and three complete mosaic floors.¹⁵⁵ No mosaic floors or mosaic emblemata are present in buildings of a smaller size. The material expense in acquiring colored marbles for *opus sectile* and the labor and time required for laying mosaics must have been significant factors in determining what households could afford them.

¹⁵³See Parslow 1989 and Jashemski 1979, 167-181. The Praedia di Julia Felix (II.2), for instance, has a highly decorated dining room for rent in (83) at entrance #2-3, as well as a diner at a separate entrance #7, decorated simply with red plaster.

¹⁵⁴Some candelabra decoration remains in I.4.9 (m); in I.8.18 (6), a central aedicula is flanked by wreath medallions below a frieze of imitation ashlar blocks that imitates the first style decoration of the opposite wall on the south side of the atrium. I.10.18 {11} has small detailed panels at the center of each large panel that comprises the middle zone; in the upper zone, oinochoes and tambourines are shown hanging by strings from just below the plaster cornice.

¹⁵⁵Opus sectile emblemata: I.6.15 (d, e), I.7.7 (b), I.9.1-2 (10), I.9.5-7 (13), ; mosaic emblemata: I.9.5-7 (11), I.9.13 (j); mosaic floors: I.6.4 (i, p), I.9.13 (j).

Black (usually in the socle), red (the middle zone) and white (the upper zone) remain the most popular colors in wall paintings, often with added yellow. Maroon, purple, green and blue also make appearances, in borders and decorative edging as well as in backgrounds for landscape and mythical panel paintings. The majority of paintings are of the third style (fifteen); seven fourth styles and two second styles also appear. Paintings are therefore relatively 'up-to-date', though not so much as in the large houses, wherein fourth style paintings dominate (see below). For motifs, there are numerous vignettes of cupids, winged or dancing women, small landscape or seascape panels, still lifes of food, birds, vessels and masks and medallions. What distinguishes the decoration of these dining areas from those in smaller buildings is the prevalence of large-scale panel painting, especially of mythological scenes (in eleven dining areas) that include characters such as Hercules, Icarus, Andromeda, Dionysos and maenads, Hermes, Paris, and Diana. A few other large scale paintings also appear, for instance large landscapes or the 'portrait' of a child.¹⁵⁶ Megalography appears in the two second style dining areas as well.¹⁵⁷

Casa grande The twenty-seven identifiable dining areas in large houses are very well preserved on the whole, and contain the highest quantity and quality of decoration of any building category. Floors are variously paved in *cocciopesto*, mosaic and marble.¹⁵⁸ Emblemata are constructed of *opus sectile* (three times), mosaic (three) and *opus vermiculatum* (two examples). Floors combine techniques: I.4.5+25 had black and white mosaic bordering a marble pavement, I.7.10-12 (16) a *cocciopesto* floor with inset tesserae around a mosaic emblema, and I.7.10-12 (17) a *cocciopesto* floor with *opus sectile* marking the spaces where couches did not rest, centered on an *opus vermiculatum* emblema. This latter emblema was found covered with a lead sheet for protection, attesting to the value of the pavement and the care that must have been taken of floors that were also works of art.

Large painted panels with mythological scenes (especially with maenads, Perseus, or Dionysos) dominate the decoration, appearing in ten dining areas. Vignettes, landscape panels, still lifes, medallions, bird and garden scenes are also very popular. Red, black, white and yellow are the colors of choice; green, blue and purple also appear in borders and the background of landscape panels. Dining room (11) in the Casa del Menandro is a rare example of a room painted almost entirely in green, a color normally confined to minor details. Perhaps only in a

¹⁵⁶Large landscape panel: I.7.19 (b); 'portrait' of the child named Successus: I.9.3-4 (5).

¹⁵⁷Second style dining areas: I.6.4 (p), which was primarily in use when its house was joined with I.6.2 (as a *casa grande*). The painting depicts heraldic elephants, a seated philosopher, and the muse Clio. The scenes in I.9.13-14 (d) are fragmentary and faded.

¹⁵⁸Plain *cocciopesto* (five examples), *cocciopesto* with inset white tesserae or limestone chips (six examples), black and white or polychrome mosaic (eleven examples) and even slate and mosaic (one example).

casa grande could one dining area be spared for such unconventional coloration.¹⁵⁹ Certain houses seem to have certain colors that appear prominently in nearly every dining area; I.4.5+25 uses yellow in the ground, socle, borders or panels, and white ground decoration is favored in I.7.10-12. Large houses have far more 'up-to-date' painting than other buildings. Fourth style, the most 'modern' of the Pompeian styles, appears in sixteen dining areas; three are of the third style, and two are in the second style.¹⁶⁰ Wealthier owners of larger houses were more likely to redecorate their homes to keep in tune with the fashion of the times, and could best afford to (quickly) redecorate their rooms after the earthquake of A.D. 62 (when many of the fourth style works were executed). Damaged decorations of an earlier style in dining areas of smaller houses are often found patched to ensure structural stability, but not wholly redecorated.¹⁶¹ Households without the means for restoring their decoration must simply have had to use rooms in damaged condition.

Storage

Evidence for storage of cooking, serving and eating equipment (as introduced in chapter one, pp. 14-16) relies either upon circumstantial evidence such as brackets for shelving cut in the walls of certain rooms, or direct evidence such as the traces of chests or cupboards and the artifacts associated with them. Unfortunately, the state of the evidence for finds is not consistent between buildings. Excavated assemblages depend on whether the building was actually occupied, to what extent the occupants were able to pack their belongings and escape during the A.D. 79 eruption, and how severely the building was robbed out after the eruption by household salvagers or looters. The quality of the modern excavations and the recording of artifacts in their contexts also varies widely. These were the difficulties faced by Allison and Berry in their recent and valuable efforts to reintegrate the architecture and artifacts of selected houses.¹⁶² A quantitative study cannot be made of the evidence from this study sample -- not even all of the study sample can be included. I can offer, however, a sense of how some households and businesses arranged the storage of their cooking, serving and eating wares.

A few trends will emerge. In smaller households, cooking and serving wares are found close to or in the cooking areas; there is little space to store them elsewhere. Greater storage capacity appears in larger households. Storage areas become more numerous and more spread out through the house (even as the rooms themselves are no larger). Goods in these rooms tend

¹⁵⁹See Ling 1991b, 207-209, 234 (#9) for a summary of pigments, their sources, prices and uses in wall painting.

¹⁶⁰Third style decoration: I.4.5+25 (19, 20); I.7.1 (16); second style decoration: I.6.2 [22] (not in use after A.D. 62); I.7.10-12 (10).

¹⁶¹Examples of dining areas in smaller houses that may have been used despite damaged or incomplete decoration: I.6.4 (c?, p), I.6.15 (d), I.9.5-7 (13, 17), I.9.13-14 (d), I.10.8 (2).

¹⁶²Allison 1992b, Berry 1993.

to be specialized according to function (amphorae, table services, toilet articles or agricultural tools) and according to who is using them (the free family, guests, or household staff). Cooking and serving wares are often kept stored in cabinets, cupboards or shelves near atria and gardens, whence they can easily be retrieved for use in the kitchen or the dining room. Few kitchens in larger houses have evidence for shelving or hooks within the kitchen. I suggest that wares and utensils were brought into the kitchen for that meal and returned after they had been cleaned. The few collections found *in situ* on stoves were the result of the surprise of the eruption. Some persons brought vessels to their stoves to prepare a meal during the course of the eruption, as if the fall of ash would cease and the day continue, and they died as a result of their delay.¹⁶³

(Work)shops The small size of these properties requires that every room, including the upper loft, includes some storage. Cooking, eating and storage were all proximate. In cases where the evidence is available, cooking and eating wares are stored in a cupboard or chest in one corner, in the space underneath the stairs to an upper loft, or in the upper loft itself.¹⁶⁴ Storage cupboards are also sometimes built into walls (Figs. 5.40-5.41, 5.78).

(Work)shop-houses Cooking implements were found stored most often in the immediate vicinity of the cooking area itself. In four such areas, wares and vessels were *in situ* on stove surfaces or next to stoves.¹⁶⁵ In two of the same (work)shop-houses, serving and eating vessels were found stored in baskets or chests in the dining area.¹⁶⁶ In these cases, items were stored primarily where they were used. Supplementary storage was provided by cupboards and chests that stood along the walls of the atrium or entry court (the primary node of the building).¹⁶⁷ In a few cases, separate small rooms were used for storage; these were usually located close to the cooking area.¹⁶⁸

Commercial eating establishments Jars sunk into the front counter provided ready storage of food and drink for sale. Small built shelves that step up from the counter against one wall are sometimes found; thereupon goods for sale were placed in view of the customers (Figs. 5.139, 5.148).¹⁶⁹ In independent lunch counters there is additional storage of cooking and serving

¹⁶³Skeletons, and kitchen wares *in situ* on stoves were found in I.6.7, I.7.7, I.7.10-12, and I.10.7.

¹⁶⁴I.6.10: wares are stored in a cupboard or cabinet in (n); I.4.20-21: two dolia sunk in the floor underneath the stairs; I.10.5-6: mixing bowls, plates and vases were stored in an arcuated niche underneath the stair to the upper floor apartment at #5; I.6.3: vessels found far above the floor in (a) likely fell from the floor of the loft above.

¹⁶⁵I.6.7 (m), I.7.5 (c), I.7.18 (e), I.9.9 (4).

¹⁶⁶I.7.5 (d), I.7.18 (c).

¹⁶⁷I.6.7, I.7.18, I.9.10, I.6.8-9.

¹⁶⁸I.7.5 (b), I.7.16 (8)

¹⁶⁹Shelves attached to the counters are found in I.8.8, I.9.4, I.9.11.

wares in the same front room as the serving counter or in a loft above the counter.¹⁷⁰ In lunch counters attached to a house, other rooms in that house were probably available for storage.¹⁷¹

Diners attached to houses do not seem to have operated independently from the houses, which supplied storage space and probably the staff to run the operation. In all diners, upper floors were commonly used for the storage of wine amphorae, perhaps after they had been emptied and were much lighter. Amphorae full of wine then would be stacked in corners on the ground floor, ready to be dispensed at the counter or in the dining areas.¹⁷² Lunch counters and diners were presumably open at most hours of the day for the convenience of passing customers, and it made sense for utensils and supplies to be at hand at all times.¹⁷³

Houses with or without (work)shops

Casa piccola Little good evidence of the distribution of finds has been published for most small houses. There is limited evidence for storage on shelves in kitchens, in the under-spaces of staircases near kitchens or dining areas, or in other ground floor or upper floor rooms.¹⁷⁴ Multiple storage locations appear in three houses. In the main court or atrium, remains of cabinets, cupboards or chests (hinges, locks, and fittings) are associated with cooking and serving

¹⁷⁰Cooking and serving wares were stored underneath the stairs to the upper loft in I.6.5-6, and within the single ground-floor room of I.10.13. A mortar, colander and other vessels were found fallen from the loft in I.7.8-9. In bedroom (2) behind the counter of I.7.13-14 there are impressions of three shelves built into a wall niche, but whether these shelves were for cooking items or for articles in the bedroom is unclear.

¹⁷¹In I.4.3, cooking and serving vessels were found fallen from shelves or a cupboard in another shop (attached to the same house) at I.4.1; a hand mill was found in space (7) behind the front room in I.10.2. Storage vessels were placed in the NE corner of I.8.1-3 underneath stairs to the upper floor, and were perhaps for supplementary storage; primary storage of bronze and glass cooking and serving wares was near the lunch counter in I.8.1 itself.

¹⁷²Numerous (once full) wine amphorae were found on the ground floor, probably in court (3) of I.7.13-14; empty amphorae were brought up to the second floor and stacked upside down. Wine amphorae were found stored on a balcony that extended over the street at the southwest corner of I.8.15-16. Court (5) in I.9.11 also contained a large number of wine amphorae and other large storage vessels; more amphorae in atrium (2) of the adjacent (and connected) house I.9.12 suggest that perhaps the house was also used for storage of goods dispensed in the diner. Wine amphorae were found throughout the diner at I.8.8: fallen from a balcony that hung over the street to the east, in the northeast corner of atrium(4), and against the columns and masonry dining couches of (11).

¹⁷³See Balsdon 1974, 152-154 for literary reports of business hours in cook-shops.

¹⁷⁴Small holes and slots that once held wooden support pegs or boards for shelving are visible above the stoves in I.4.22 (h) and I.10.18. A space under the stairs in I.4.1-3, accessible to dining room (g) served for storage, likewise an understair space in room (l) next to the entrance for dining room (m). In I.8.18, items may have been stored in the space underneath the masonry staircase in room (10), next to kitchen (8). In I.10.2-3, a hand mill and several amphorae were recovered from room (7) behind the attached lunch counter, and storage and serving vessels were found fallen from the upper floor.

wares.¹⁷⁵ Dining areas were also possible storage locations.¹⁷⁶ Several other spaces, including workrooms or bedrooms, contain some cooking, serving or storage vessels.¹⁷⁷ In small houses, the main node (a court or atrium), the cooking area and dining area are usually sufficiently close such that the retrieval of vessels and utensils for cooking is not difficult. The kitchen itself is an important place of storage in about one-third of the cases.

Casa media Most have multiple places for the storage of food and cooking and dining apparatus. Storage areas fall into three categories: the kitchen itself, the atrium, or a separate space. Evidence within the kitchen area usually consists of pots and pans and storage amphorae found *in situ* on or near the stove of six houses.¹⁷⁸ As these articles appear to have been in use or ready for use at the time of the eruption, it is not possible to be sure that they were regularly kept in the cooking area when it was not in operation. In all six, cabinets, chests or storerooms elsewhere also contained substantial collections of cooking and serving wares, and it seems likely that when not in use these items were not left in the kitchen, but removed for storage elsewhere.

In six houses, the remains of wooden cupboards, cabinets and chests are found associated with cooking and serving wares in the atrium.¹⁷⁹ In three other houses, vessels are found stacked in one corner of the atrium, sometimes underneath a stairway to the upper floor.¹⁸⁰ Two cupboards and a chest were set against the wall under a staircase in peristyle (9) of I.10.11. Other storerooms (closets with shelving, or bedrooms or sitting rooms stuffed with wares), are located off an atrium or back garden.¹⁸¹ From that position, storage, cooking, serving, eating and especially drinking vessels were easily accessible to kitchens and dining areas.

¹⁷⁵A cupboard at the south edge of atrium (d) in I.7.2-3 contained a ceramic vase with eggshells and glass bottles; a chest containing a fine silver serving set was found in the entranceway of I.8.14; it was likely carried from the atrium but then abandoned in flight; numerous bronze, ceramic and glass vessels were found amongst traces of wooden containers in court (2) of I.9.8.

¹⁷⁶A cupboard niche (perhaps for table wares) was cut in the east end of dining area I.7.2-3 (c) and several serving wares and drinking vessels were located in dining room I.9.8 (9).

¹⁷⁷In I.7.2-3, rooms (h) and (i) around the locus of cooking in court (g) and a balcony overhanging the court contained cookwares; the latter had a storage nook in the west wall. In I.8.14, numerous amphorae were found in the well decorated cubiculum (9), and room (12) had holes for shelving and was probably a permanent storeroom, close by kitchen (11). Amphorae and other vessels associated with food were found in rooms (3, 4, 5) of I.9.8.

¹⁷⁸I.6.4 (n), I.7.7 (i), I.9.13-14 (b), and I.10.7 (11) have substantial assemblages; I.6.15 (i) and I.10.10-11 (16) contained a hand mill and a few pots, respectively.

¹⁷⁹I.6.4, I.6.11, I.7.7, I.9.1-2, I.9.13-14, I.10.7.

¹⁸⁰I.8.1-3, where storage vessels lie under the stair in the northeast corner of the atrium; I.8.8-9, where amphorae occupy the northeast corner of the atrium; I.9.12, where amphorae are concentrated in the northwest corner. Lunch counters or diners are associated with all three of these houses -- their atria appear to have been used for the easily accessible and rapidly replaceable storage that a commercial eating establishment needed.

¹⁸¹I.6.15 (g) has shelving; I.7.7 has a closet off the NE corner of garden (m), plus other rooms (g, o, p) used for storage; Rooms I.8.4-6 (9-11) off the peristyle garden were used for storage; I.8.17+11 (19) has a nook where a water heater was stored; I.9.1-2 (15), underneath the kitchen, was probably used for storage; I.9.3-4 (3), I.9.5-7 (9), I.9.13-14 (h, l) and I.10.8 (8, 12) were ostensibly bedrooms converted to storerooms.

Casa grande Larger buildings contain more distinct and more specialized storage spaces. Small houses have one or two places for cooking and eating items, houses of medium size have two to four, and the largest houses, four to eight. Suites of underground rooms in the *case grandi* I.6.2, I.7.1 and I.10.4 appreciably increase their storage capacity. In the first two, separate entrances led directly from the street to the cryptoportici, allowing the house to be re-stocked without disturbing any household business at the main entrance -- this service would have been invisible to invited guests. Rooms underneath the bath suite in I.10.4 contained a plethora of storage chests which included a large silver table service. I.7.1 appropriates an entire street as its own private roofed alley that leads to its cryptoporticus. I.4.5 and I.10.4 also have secondary entrances to stable yards where materials can be off-loaded and distributed to appropriate parts of the house; remains of carts were found in both courts, and a pile of amphorae choked stable yard (34) in I.10.4.¹⁸² On the ground floors of smaller *case grandi*, storage is concentrated around atria and (peristyle) gardens.¹⁸³ On the ground floor of the largest houses, storage tends to be removed from the primary centers of circulation, and is concentrated instead around the service quarters that accompany the cooking areas of the house.¹⁸⁴

¹⁸²I.4.5 has a stable at entrance #28; I.10.4 has a stable at entrance #14.

¹⁸³I.7.1 has two large closets on the east side of the atrium with evidence for shelving, and a niche and storeroom (15) off the northeast corner of the peristyle. In I.7.10-12 atrium (A'), there is a storage nook underneath the stairs to the upper floor and a pile of items in the southwest corner. Three storerooms surround atrium (A''): Rooms (13, 14) both contain storage vessels and table services; they are stored in chests in (13) and shelving held the items in (14). Room (11) of the same house had speciality storage of toilet and weaving implements. The narrow storeroom (18) was practically empty at the time of the eruption, but numerous amphorae were still stacked in the northeast corner of garden (23).

¹⁸⁴In I.4.5, there is storage in rooms (22-24) and closet (31) around court (21), storage in (62, 63) near kitchen (64) (which itself has a series of notches for shelving on one wall), and storerooms (39, m) near the bath suite and kitchen (42). The valuables of this household may have been kept in two strongboxes that rested on a low platform in the west ala (51) of atrium (47).¹⁸⁴ In I.10.4, cooking and serving implements are stored in chests and loose around the walls of atrium (41), the residential center of the household slaves and freedpersons. Rooms (37, 45) nearby also served for storage. For the main kitchen (52), fuel seems to have been stored in room (54), where a large mass of organic material was found. Besides the already mentioned storage areas under the bath suite and around the stableyard (34), two other rooms (10, 14) contained collections of cooking and serving wares. These small rooms with narrow doorways were located off of the north and east sides of the peristyle garden, well-placed to serve all six dining areas in the vicinity.

The relationship of ritual to cooking and dining areas

A close connection between ritual practices that insure the continued well-being of the household and culinary practices that ensure its physical survival cannot be denied.¹⁸⁵ How was ritual physically linked to the activities of cooking and eating? The location, decoration and attributes of domestic shrines have been well-documented for most buildings by Boyce, Orr and Fröhlich.¹⁸⁶ It remains to assess the spatial (and potentially symbolic) relationships between these points of worship and the places where food was prepared and consumed.

(Work)shops There does not seem to be a close relationship between places of cult, and cooking or dining areas in (work)shops from this sample (there is a general lack of good evidence).¹⁸⁷ However, close physical relationships between ritual and food did exist in some (work)shops, as the following examples drawn from elsewhere at Pompeii demonstrate.

The (work)shop at IX.1.27 (Fig. 2.11) is the only known one-room (work)shop that contains its own built masonry stove. The stove, of a common arched type found everywhere at Pompeii, was a late addition during the property's last replastering. Above the stove is an arcuated niche which the excavation report suggests was for the *Lares*.¹⁸⁸ The same report describes the stove as an 'altar', but a close connection between sacrifice and cooking in such close quarters makes sense. The multi-purpose nature of this (work)shop is further revealed by the impression of a niche large enough for either a couch or bed in the north wall underneath the staircase to the loft. Such furniture could have held up to three diners, and also doubled as a bed, if the sleeping quarters were not located in the loft above. Gods, humans, cooking and eating: all those who 'lived' within the (work)shop are intimately intertwined.

In IX.1.4, there is one main room off the street, again with a stair to a loft, and in a small room behind it are a stove, a latrine, and slots in the wall that indicate the position of a table or counter (Figs. 2.12, 2.25).¹⁸⁹ In this (work)shop, the *lararium* has moved out of the kitchen space, and rests in the form of a painting of two serpents facing each other over an altar that was painted on the back wall of the main room. Below the painting, a tile to hold offerings or a lamp stuck out of the wall (only the slot for the tile fit remains today). It is not clear where the eating in this (work)shop was carried out. Here is a shrine which has been separated slightly from a defined kitchen, but watches still over its entrance.

¹⁸⁵For instance, Jashemski 1979, 192-193 discusses a tripod and cooking wares found beneath a small garden shrine in the (work)shop-house I.20.5.

¹⁸⁶Boyce 1937, Orr 1973, Fröhlich 1991.

¹⁸⁷The sole example is in I.6.1, where a painted niche shrine occupied the wall above an industrial hearth used by the shop blacksmith; the hearth may also have been used to cook food.

¹⁸⁸Kekulé, BdI 1867, 162; see also Boyce 1937, 80, #389.

¹⁸⁹Minervini, BAN 1853, 156-157 ("La bottega n. 74..."); see also Boyce 1937, 79, #380.

(Work)shop-houses The association of ritual with cooking and dining areas varies dramatically amongst (work)shop-houses. Some have no evidence for ritual whatsoever, or evidence that is completely disassociated from cooking or eating.¹⁹⁰ Others have shrines in common areas such as courts or gardens which were visible from or close to a cooking or dining area.¹⁹¹ In three (work)shop-houses (discussed below), ritual is closely linked with food.

In 1.8.10, a shrine watches over the entrance to a cooking area -- two *lararia* flank the kitchen (9), which occupied a basement space.¹⁹² The left *lararium* is for the most part destroyed, the right is well preserved with two painted *Lares* flanking a niche decorated with flowers, above serpents facing an altar. The two *lararia* flanking this kitchen door echo the *Lares* flanking the niched shrine and the serpents flanking the altar in the painting. The niche would presumably have held figurines or offerings, offerings that are 'forever being burnt' on the painted altar. The kitchen door is in effect another 'niche' (that can be physically passed through) into the kitchen with its stove/altar; the kitchen is thus under particular divine protection. The food cooked for human consumption on this stove, part of which may have been given to the gods, appears to the guests only as it passes the threshold from the kitchen to the portico that leads to dining-area (3).

In some (work)shop-houses, shrines appeared within the kitchen areas proper. In 1.7.18 there are two complementary *lararium* paintings on the north and west walls above the stove (Figs. 5.101-5.102). The north painting shows two *Lares* on either side of a togate and veiled *Genius* who is sacrificing at the altar, holding a cornucopia. Two serpents guard an altar on the west wall. Of the two possible dining-areas in the house, room (c) adjacent to kitchen on the ground floor (which probably doubled as a *tablinum*), and room {g} on an upper floor facing the street, neither has any view of the kitchen whatsoever. Only those who enter the kitchen or use the latrine in the kitchen are asked to recognize the *Lares*; their cult seems restricted to members of the household and sequestered from any guests, unless the guests needed to use the latrine.

In the small (work)shop-house I.10.1, there are more than one shrine. Just inside the doorway to this house, a fragmentary painted panel shows a *Genius* sacrificing, accompanied by a *Lar*, similar to the scene shown in the previous (work)shop-house. The shrine at the entrance

¹⁹⁰I.6.8-9 and I.7.5 have no evidence for ritual, and the stable I.8.12 has an arcuated niche in its north wall, perhaps a shrine, but no cooking or dining areas are known on that property. A niched shrine is reported on the east side of dining room (h) in I.6.7, but it is no longer extant, and the dining room lost its dining function after A.D. 62, when the house was converted into a fullery.

¹⁹¹Arcuated niches in the northwest corner of courts I.7.16 (2) and I.8.13 (1) were probably shrines; terracotta altars, lamps, plates and a head of a figurine were found within the latter niche, which was closed off by small hinged wooden doors. An altar and niche were located against the south wall of garden (7) of I.9.9, close to the small stove at the west end of corridor (4). A terracotta altar and 'votive cup' were found in the southeast corner of court I.9.10 (1), near the entrance to kitchen (1), and in view of dining room (11).

¹⁹²See PPM I, 828, #2-4 for photos of the shrine.

was perhaps for visitors to see; anyone going up to dining-room {6} on the upper-floor had to use the stairs that skirted this *lararium*. A total of four arcuated niches appear in the small court (5) that contains the cistern head, latrine and a stove. In one niche was found a terracotta bust of Kore (Figs. 5.158-5.159). The proliferation of shrines suggests a multitude of different deities, each honored in their own place -- from household gods to a goddess of Greek origin, all watching over the preparation or delivery of the meal.

Commercial eating establishments Shrines in eating establishments appear to concentrate their gaze upon the serving counter. The counter is the place where the food and drink are stored, prepared, served, and consumed. The few shrines in the lunch counters of this sample are not particularly elaborate, consisting of simple niches in the west walls of I.7.8-9 and I.8.1 (Fig. 5.108), across from and behind their respective counters.

Shrines are somewhat more common and interesting in the diners. The masonry altar below a painting of a *Genius* and *Lares* sacrificing at an altar in garden (d) of I.4.11 was visible to some of the customers who congregated in rooms (b) or (c), and would have been noticed by anyone entering the garden to use the latrine in the southeast corner (Fig. 5.11). Simple niches suffice in I.8.15-16; one is located in the wall behind the serving counter and visible to customers (Fig. 5.125), another is hidden above a water collection basin in court (7) at the back of the building. In I.7.13-14, a painting of Priapus on the front face of the serving counter advertises the establishment, while two rectangular niches in the west wall of court (3) look out over the small hearth in the southeast corner and the dining area (4) just off the northwest corner (Figs. 5.22, 5.92). Ritual sanction is extended over customers both on the street and reclining indoors.¹⁹³

The best preserved and most elaborate shrine from this sample is in I.8.8 (Figs. 1.20, 2.6, 5.115). There an aediculated frame of stucco in relief features a panel depicting the *Genius* sacrificing at a tripod altar, flanked by two *Lares*, and Mercury and Bacchus on either side; below are heraldic serpents before another altar. This finely decorated shrine faces onto the street from behind the front counter, and adjoins the entranceway to dining room (2), which was used by customers of the establishment. Its strategic location allows it to be seen easily from the street, and its quality was further appreciated by those patrons who decide to enter the dining room.

Houses with or without (work)shops

Casa piccola As with (work)shop-houses, there is no clear pattern to the distribution of cult areas in small houses. There is no evidence for ritual in three houses, and in three others,

¹⁹³Sets of a shrine on the street and a shrine inside the building appear elsewhere as well; in the diner VII.1.38-39, a niched shrine occupies the wall behind the serving counter, while two more niches are set into the wall above the stove in kitchen (d-e) (see Boyce 1937, 61, #242-243).

ritual evidence is either slim or not associated either with cooking or dining areas.¹⁹⁴ Three small houses preserve evidence for a close association between ritual and cooking or dining. In I.8.14, an aediculated niche-shrine is set up in the north wall of dining room (6), facing the part of the room where the dining couches would have lain. Another painted shrine (now faded away) once occupied the north side of court (7), near kitchen (11). In two houses, shrines are installed exclusively in the kitchen of the house. Kitchen (9) in I.10.18 preserves part of a large ritual painting in three zones: the *Genius* with a *Lar* and large rhyton to one side, above a large serpent, and a pig's head, ham and skewered eel in the lower zone, clearly connecting household ritual to the food prepared in the kitchen.¹⁹⁵

One of the more complete shrines from this sample is located in kitchen (8) of I.8.18. A niche shrine is located between two painted *Lares* above serpents and an altar (Figs. 5.133-5.134). The niche contains a miniature altar and two rough figures, which by analogy to those figures found in the shrine (25) of the Casa del Menandro (I.10.4) have been identified as the *imagines maiorum* of this household (see below, p. 164). Until now, this shrine has been published as resting in the southeast corner of the atrium of the neighboring house I.8.17+11 (Fig. 2.6).¹⁹⁶ In that erroneous context, this shrine served as evidence for a characterization of the residents as "a family of robust traditions".¹⁹⁷ The shrine was thought to be located in the atrium, next to the largest and best decorated reception room (9). It was considered to be associated with the *paterfamilias* of the family, and seemed to display the value of *Romanitas* to any guests who visited the house. The fine Corinthian columns of the canonical atrium and the high-quality wall-painting in I.8.17 further reinforced the idea of a prestigious domus. However, I have found the shrine to lie in the much smaller house (I.8.18), whose atrium has rooms on only one side, and lacks even a garden or peristyle in back. Furthermore, the *lararium* is not set up in the atrium for

¹⁹⁴I.4.1-3, I.4.22 and I.7.2-3 have no evidence for ritual activity. In I.4.9, an arcuated niche is set in the wall of the tiny court (n) between kitchen (o) and dining hall (m), and would have been encountered by any persons entering the kitchen. A painted niche occupies the entranceway of I.10.2-3. A 'votive cup' was found in dining room (9) of I.9.8, but that does not necessarily prove ritual activity therein.

¹⁹⁵A photo of the shrine appears in PPM II, 502, #4.

¹⁹⁶Fröhlich 1991, 254, n.11 discusses the documentation of this shrine, and concludes that it cannot lie in I.8.17. He is however unable to place it elsewhere, rejecting the caption of the photo in the Archive in Pompeii that places the shrine "nella casa dell'atrio dorico [i.e. I.8.18], particolare angolo SE". Fröhlich apparently thought the caption referred to the southeast corner of the atrium of that house, where indeed there is no shrine. But the caption in fact refers to the southeast corner of the house as a whole, where kitchen (8) is located. A comparison of a 1977 photo of that shrine in PPM I, 918, #7, which places it in kitchen (8) of I.8.18, and the original 1941 excavation photo, published in PPM I, 853, #13 as belonging in the southeast corner of the atrium in I.8.17, reveals that they are pictures of the very same shrine, which has undergone severe degradation in the years since its excavation (compare Figs. 5.133 and 5.134). I have personally inspected and confirmed the location of the shrine in I.8.18 (8).

¹⁹⁷Castiglione Morelli del Franco & Vitale 1989, 208: "una famiglia di robuste tradizioni".

all to see, but is located in the kitchen, invisible to guests but quite visible to slaves. Graffiti from the house name several slaves with Greek and Syrian names. It appears that in this case, Roman 'robust traditions' were kept alive in the kitchen, and perhaps even by slaves of non-Roman origin. Traditional assumptions about Roman ritual and its role in the family are challenged by this example. Does the new physical context of the figurines (i.e. in the dark kitchen of a small house) preclude their association with the robust Roman aristocratic traditions? Certainly not. It is the assumption that traditional Roman 'family values' were the exclusive domain of the wealthier members of society or the free members of the household that is wrong. Rustic figurines that imply traditional Roman ritual practices are found in the peristyle of a *casa grande* (I.10.4) and the service quarters of a *casa piccola* (I.8.18). Household ritual lies above the socio-economic fray; it is open to all persons that embrace it. The wide degree of ritual evidence (from none to elaborate shrines) demonstrates a wide variety of actual observance. I would argue that household ritual and cult were personal, and based on beliefs of the household members.

Casa media In houses of medium size, shrines or ritual objects appear most commonly in gardens; a few are also present in atria and kitchens or dining areas.¹⁹⁸ In gardens, shrines take the form of arcuated niches, rarely visible from a cooking or dining area.¹⁹⁹ Even the arcuated niche in the west wall of garden (8) of house I.9.12, although it is located directly across from dining room (11), is not visible because a pillar of the garden portico blocks the view.

In only one house is a possible garden shrine visible from a dining area -- I.10.7, where a marble statuette of Hercules rested on a shelf at the back of the garden, facing dining areas (8, 9, 12) (Fig. 2.8). In the same house, kitchen (11) and dining room (9) are both intimately associated with their own shrine. Next to the stove in the kitchen is an elaborate painted shrine. Large coiled serpents stretch towards a small marble slab fixed in the wall that was probably an offering shelf (Figs. 2.27, 5.167). At the other end of the portico, the primary indoor dining-room (9) of the house contains a small niche up in one wall that shows again two coiled serpents snaking up towards a painted altar (Fig. 5.169). The scene is essentially a smaller copy of the painting in the kitchen, and is a rare example of a shrine within the confines of a dining-room. The family who lived here pursued a careful and deliberate strategy of locating their shrines in

¹⁹⁸I.6.15, I.9.5-7 and I.9.13-14 have no identifiable ritual areas. I.8.1-3 and I.8.8-9 have shrines at the counters of their attached lunch counter and diner, respectively. Statuettes stored in cupboards in the atrium are the only ritual evidence in I.6.4 and I.6.11, and a small arcuated niche appears in the southeast corner of the atrium of I.8.17+11. An arcuated niche painted with serpents and an altar adorns the east wall of kitchen (16) in I.10.10-11 (Fig. 5.175), one of the few shrines directly associated with a cooking or dining area.

¹⁹⁹I.7.7, I.7.19, I.8.17+11, I.9.3-4, I.9.12, I.10.7 and I.10.8 have shrines in their gardens.

association with food, and as a result, household gods were able to watch over both ends of the meal: preparation and consumption.²⁰⁰

Casa grande Large houses continue to demonstrate a variety of number, kind and location of shrines, from the one painted niche in garden (12) of the Casa del Criptoportico (I.6.2) to the seven shrines reported from the Casa del Menandro (I.10.4). In most of these houses, loci of ritual seem to fall into categories corresponding to the free and servile members of the household. This dichotomy of ritual areas is explored in the examples below.

In the Casa del Citarista (I.4.5), ritual expression and practice are divided between simpler shrines in servants' areas, and more expensive ritual objects in the display areas of the atria and peristyles. Kitchen (42) had a simple niche above the stove (Fig. 5.28). Court (21) contained a brazier, two small bronze altars, and two bronze statuettes of Minerva; it seems to have been the headquarters of the household staff. Atrium (47) contained a more expensive ritual item: a silver statuette of a togate 'sacrificant'. Peristyle (32) was the locus of a marble altar, and two herms were associated with a bronze sculptural group in peristyle (17).

In the Casa del Efebo (I.7.10-12), a standard painted niche shrine was installed in atrium (A'), servants' quarters with a combination kitchen/dining room (7) nearby. The main garden had a pair of luxurious indoor (17) and outdoor (23) dining areas facing each other amongst shrines, paintings and statuary that evoked traditional Roman religion, Greek gods and goddesses, and sacred Egyptian landscapes (Fig. 5.21). In the Casa di Paquius Proculus I.7.1, a simple arcuated niche was cut into the southeast corner of kitchen (14) (Fig. 2.22), while a finely carved marble altar sat in room (17), easily accessible to dining areas (9, 16, 18).

Specialization of ritual areas is clearest in the Casa del Menandro, I.10.4. In his publication, Maiuri associated the various shrines with various household members according to their rank and status.²⁰¹ The most elaborate shrine is encountered immediately upon entering the house, an *aedicula* located prominently in one corner of the atrium, across from the *tablinum*, and presumably fit for ritual conducted by the patron himself (Fig. 1.22). In a small room immediately behind this *aedicula* is a masonry stair to the upper story and beneath the arches of that stair is an podium-like altar with a smaller altar below it next to an arcuated niche. Perhaps this undecorated, 'humble' arrangement was used by those who lived up those stairs. In the

²⁰⁰A parallel to I.10.7 outside the study sample can be found in I.13.2, which falls into the *casa media* category. There the kitchen has a large painted sacrifice scene that depicts the entire household as well as representations of food products, and an outdoor dining area with a niche behind the masonry couches, in which a bronze statuette of Athena was found in situ. In this house cooking and eating are completely integrated with ritual. See PPM II, 874-880, Fröhlich 1991, 261 #L29, and Orr 1973, 161-162 for documentation of these shrines.

²⁰¹Maiuri 1933, 33: "Questa nobile casa conteneva più larari e sacelli, così come si ha in altre nobili e grandiose dimore: larari di carattere signorile e larari di carattere rustico."

subsidiary atrium (41) assigned to the *procurator*, an arcuated niche sits in the wall above the low hearth (Fig. 2.13). There is also one *lararium* painting in room (42) off the atrium of the *procurator*, another in room (45) (once a kitchen) and another in kitchen (52) on the other side of the house. All of these were probably not used by the higher ranking members of the family. The spatial compartmentalization of this house would have made these shrines, closely associated with cooking areas, socially invisible.

Most intriguing of all is the famous set of wooden ritual figurines that occupied an arcuated niche above an altar in one of the splendid *exedrae* (room (25)) that define the south portico of peristyle (c) (Figs. 5.162, 5.164). Maiuri explained these figures as the *imagines maiorum*, the images of the family ancestors.²⁰² To Maiuri's mind, these rough and rustic figures proved the noble Roman character of the owner of the house, who preserved the *ius imaginum* even in the context of the rich but corrupting Hellenizing decoration of the house.²⁰³ The shrine's position off the peristyle, within view of some dining-areas and next to the entrance of the luxurious bath suite, was a way to advertise the piety of the owner to selected guests. The shrine was not directly visible from any dining rooms, but it could not be missed by guests enjoying the baths before the meal.

In their individual surveys of domestic shrines at Pompeii, Boyce and Orr documented the areas of the house where shrines appear most frequently.²⁰⁴ Their combined totals show that the garden or peristyle was the most common shrine location, appearing 126 times. Following was the kitchen, 94 times, and the atrium, 67 times. All other spaces in the house combined appear 20 times, including only three in a dining area. It should not be surprising that shrines appear so often in the circulation centers for the household and guests: the atrium, garden and peristyle. In those locations, shrines were visible and could be visited. They demonstrated the religious devotion of the family to outsiders while serving the personal needs of insiders.

Orr has stated: "...the domestic deities had a long history of intimacy with the hearth and the storerooms."²⁰⁵ The continuance of the household depended upon a reliable (and to many Pompeians a ritually protected) food supply. The link between domestic ritual and food ended at the kitchen door. Dining areas almost never include a shrine, and guests could not often have seen a ritual area from their place at table. The preparation of a meal required assistance from the

²⁰²Maiuri 1933, 98-106.

²⁰³Clarke 1991, 193 interprets both the shrine and the decoration of the house positively: "In addition to the new decorations that presented him [the patron] as a man of high culture, proud of his knowledge of Greek theater and Hellenistic caricature, he had an important ancestry."

²⁰⁴Orr 1973, 98-99 summarizes his and Boyce's (1937) counts.

²⁰⁵Orr 1973, 98.

gods, but once that meal was safely in the hands (and mouths) of the dinner party, the need for divine intervention had passed.

The dichotomy of ritual areas raises the question of whether the shrines in atria or peristyle/gardens were for the use of the free family, and the kitchen shrines for the household slaves.²⁰⁶ In some *case grandi*, where impressive aedicular shrines dominate atria, and kitchen walls are adorned with simple paintings or niches, a division of ritual areas according to social rank is an attractive hypothesis. Because it is impossible to observe who used the respective shrines and how they were used, however, it is impossible to confirm the hypothesis. Larger houses do tend to have more ritual areas, and seemingly more specialized ritual areas, than smaller houses. For almost every issue discussed in this chapter, larger houses reveal increased specialization and segmentation of function. Specialization seems to be related in part to the social stratification of the household -- slaves have their own space to eat, drink and sleep. It seems as well that at least in the *case grandi* slaves also had their own space for worship.

In sum, it is clear that the *Lares* were particularly keen on watching over the preparation of the food, and not as likely to be present in the space where the meal was consumed. It is also evident that variation in shrine placement outpaces conformity. Household religion was tied to an individual family's traditions and beliefs: while the symbols of those beliefs (the *Lares*, the serpents, altar and *Genius*) were universally recognized, the construction of a ritual topography in the context of the home was highly idiosyncratic. If we assign social values to the quality and location of these shrines and consequently to the various members of the household who used them, it suggests that free-slave relations were highly complex and variable from household to household, and the line between free and slave was most pronounced in the largest households.

* * * * *

The final two sections discuss the spatial interrelationship between cooking and dining areas. These measurements of physical and perceptual distance are relatively uncomplicated; it seems best to discuss them together, rather than to organize discussion according to building category, as has been the format throughout this chapter.

Proximity and accessibility of cooking and dining areas

The walking distance (proximity) between cooking and dining areas affects the ease and speed with which a meal can be served, and is a basic measure of the segregation of the two activities. The accessibility of cooking and dining areas from the main entrance to the building determines two things: the degree of penetration into the building necessary for guests to

²⁰⁶Fröhlich's 1991 study postulates that the style, technique and quality of painting in certain shrines shows a 'folk' tradition of painting that can be related to the servants of the household.

participate in a meal, and how easily cooking areas can be supplied with foodstuffs purchased in the city. Proximity (distance in meters) and accessibility (distance in terms of the number of distinct spaces passed through) are discussed together because they provide parallel results, being different measurements of the same phenomena. Only fixed cooking areas (i.e. kitchens and hearths) in (work)shop-houses, diners and houses are included in the discussion.²⁰⁷

There is an obvious and direct relationship between the size of a building and the distances from the kitchen and dining area to the front entrance (see Table 3.5 below).

Building type	Avg. distance, fixed cooking area to front door	Avg. # of spaces from fixed cooking area to front door	Avg. distance, dining area to front door	Avg. # of spaces from dining area to front door
Diner	7.6 m.	2.9	9.6 m.	3.6
(Work)shop-house	12.5 m.	3.9	11.0 m.	4.0
<i>Casa piccola</i>	14.6 m.	5.1	15.3 m.	5.0
<i>Casa media</i>	18.0 m.	4.9	20.7 m.	5.5
<i>Casa grande</i>	27.3 m.	6.2	32.8 m.	6.3

Table 3.5: Comparison of the average distance and average number of spaces to the front door of a building from fixed cooking areas and dining areas according to building category. Distance to the entrance increases as building size increases, and cooking areas are located slightly closer to the front door than are dining areas.

This suggests that large houses are essentially expanded or stretched-out versions of smaller houses, and the basic layout and relationships between cooking and dining areas remains stable even as the distances increase between them.

Kitchens are consistently located slightly closer to the front entrance (in distance and number of spaces) than dining areas (see Table 3.5 above). The difference is not large, and is probably due to the fact that (in houses) fixed cooking areas are rarely located at the very back of a building, but dining areas often are, as they face onto a back garden or peristyle, far from the front door.²⁰⁸ In diners, hearths are usually located at the front of the building, where they can serve customers on the street and in the dining area behind.

Guests who attended dinners at larger houses had to penetrate further inside in order to dine. In the *casa piccola*, there was a single dining area, near the atrium. In the *casa media*, there

²⁰⁷Portable braziers and cooking stands could be moved anywhere cooking was needed. (Work)shops and lunch counters do not contain both distinct kitchens or dining areas, and are not discussed. In (work)shops, the distance between cooking and dining areas was essentially negligible; customers of lunch counters are assumed to have eaten at the counter or on the street.

²⁰⁸(Work)shop-houses do not seem to conform to this trend, because kitchen (m) in the Fullonica di Stephanus I.6.7 is located in the back corner of the house, far from the dining area (g) off the atrium, and the high figure of its distance from the front entrance skews the average. If this (work)shop-house is removed from the data, the average distance from fixed cooking areas to the door drops to 9.8 m.; dining areas remain steady at 11.1 m. from the door, and the pattern holds.

was usually at least one dining area off the atrium and another off a back garden or peristyle. Hosts could choose where a meal was to be held, not just according to the season or the weather, but also according to the social stature of their guests. The host judged the degree of penetration into the house that the guests merited. Distinctions in rank and status could and had to be made. The owners of *case medie* lived on the bubble between the world of the esteemed and the world of the ordinary -- depending on their handling of important social dinner events, their fortunes might move in either direction. The 'action' was in those houses. In a *casa grande*, rarely was there a choice between dining close to or away from the entrance. All significant reception rooms in large houses were located around peristyles and large gardens; those fortunate enough to gain an invitation therein deserved no less than to dine in such surrounds. Owners of *case grandi* had already made it to the top stratum of city social life. Their dining areas were designed to impress their peers; there was no need to dine near the entrance, where clients gave their daily *salutatio*.

The average distance and number of spaces between fixed cooking and dining areas also vary according to the size of the building; in larger buildings, centers of cooking and eating are further apart.²⁰⁹ Behind these averages, however, lies substantial variation. In the large houses I.10.4 and I.7.10-12, small cooking areas in (41) and (7) respectively are located in the very same space as humble dining areas, probably used by the household slaves (see above, pp. 144-145). However, the main kitchen (52) in I.10.4 is located ca. 30-50 m. and 6-7 spaces away from the six dining areas concentrating on the central peristyle. Likewise, kitchen (21) in I.7.10-12 is located (less dramatically) 8-12 m. from the dining areas it serves. In *case grandi*, dining areas for guests are far removed from the large kitchens that serve them, just as free citizens are far removed in rank from slave cooks. Activities that involves persons of the same rank, such as slave cooking and dining, are done in the same space.

Perceptibility of cooking areas from dining areas (sight, sound and smell)

The spatial relationship between cooking and dining areas depends not only upon the physical distance between them, but also upon the perceptual distance between them. This is the extent to which cooking areas were noticeable to dining room guests through the senses of sight, sound and smell, based upon lines of sight and upon the distance involved. See chapter one, pp. 41-42 and chapter five, p. 182 for descriptions of how sight, sound and smell ranges were measured.

²⁰⁹Average distance between fixed cooking and dining areas: diner (5.8 m.), (work)shop-house (9.1 m.), casa piccola (11.3 m.), casa media (12.7 m.), casa grande (23.1 m.). Average number of spaces between fixed cooking and dining areas: diner (2.4), (work)shop-house (3.3), casa piccola (4.5), casa media (4.2), casa grande (4.9).

The type of building in which it is easiest to see, hear and smell food preparation from a fixed dining areas is (not surprisingly) the diner. Cooking and eating are necessarily in close quarters in eating establishments; customers could not enter the fixed dining area without passing by the front counter and noticing the cooking on its built-in hearth. Over half of the dining areas are within direct or indirect visual contact with the hearth or the entrance to the cooking area. All dining areas are within range of hearing food preparation, and 78% allow persons in the dining area to smell the preparation of food or drink.²¹⁰ In (work)shop-houses, cooking areas are not so noticeable -- only about one-third are visible to any degree, all are within range of sound, and just 46% can be smelled from the dining areas.²¹¹

In houses, cooking areas are even less noticeable. They are somewhat visible in *case piccole*, where almost half of the dining areas are able to see a cooking area, but only 27% of dining areas were within range of smell of the cooking (all are within range of sound).²¹² For *case medie*, less than one-fifth of dining areas were able to view the kitchen, and only 28% were within the smell zone; again, all were within range of sound.²¹³ Only about one-fifth of dining rooms in *case grandi* were able to see the cooking area, and a paltry 8% were within range of smell (those in range consisted of the two dining areas in the 'servant quarters' around atrium A' in I.7.10-12).²¹⁴ Most interestingly, these largest houses are the only ones in which not even the sounds of cooking could be heard in some dining areas -- 31% in all.

In larger buildings, a decrease in the perceptibility of the cooking process is owed directly to an increased distance between cooking and eating activities. Owners had more available space in larger houses, and had the option of separating cooking and eating to a greater degree. But owners did not have to push cooking and dining further apart. The consequences of this decision was to make serving the food more difficult and time-consuming. Owners of large houses deliberately segregated the two activities for social reasons: guests were not to witness any food preparation before the meal was carried in. Hosts carefully made dining areas among the best decorated rooms in the house, in order to impress guests. Hosts also carefully excluded the more mundane domestic services of the household staff from the sensory experience of the guests.²¹⁵

²¹⁰In diners, 22% of dining areas can see directly into a cooking area; for 33%, the entrance to the cooking area is visible from a dining area.

²¹¹23% of dining areas can see directly into a cooking area; for 15%, the entrance is visible.

²¹²18% of dining areas can see directly into a cooking area; for 27%, the entrance is visible.

²¹³8% of dining areas can see directly into a cooking area; for 10%, the entrance is visible.

²¹⁴8% of dining areas can see directly into a cooking area; for 15%, the entrance is visible.

²¹⁵This is not to say that guests in large houses never smelled or saw their food before they ate it. The large number of portable braziers, often found in the vicinity of a dining area, implies that food was at least kept warm, if not sometimes cooked, in full view of the guests, as Seneca states (see chapter two above, p. 73).

CHAPTER IV

THE SOCIO-CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT OF MEALS

"Hattie Carroll was a maid in the kitchen
 she was fifty-one years old and gave birth to ten children
 who carried the dishes and took out the garbage
 and never sat once at the head of the table
 and didn't even talk to the people at the table
 who just cleaned up all the food from the table..."
 -- Bob Dylan, *Lonesome Death of Hattie Carroll*

How did the activities of cooking and dining define the residential roles of household members? Kitchens and dining rooms functioned because of pots, pans, stoves, sinks, couches and tables, but they derived meaning from the personal relations amongst those who cooked, those who served, and those who ate. The spectrum of mealtime social interaction between free and slave ranged from near-integration (in the smallest homes) to segregation (in the largest homes). Rank and status were the most important determinants; the archaeological evidence does not distinguish according to either age or gender at dinner.¹ Social standing determined where one ate, from a place at table (Fig. 1.27) in a specific dining area, to a particular house (or cook-shop) in a given community. At the community level, the time, effort, space and expense spent on dinner were proportional to the socio-economic standing of the household.

In the first three chapters, I described the overlapping physical, temporal, ritual and social topographies of Roman meals across the socio-economic spectrum. I defined the terms of the debate, and documented the archaeological evidence from households in six contiguous *insulae* (Fig. 2.2). I constructed this archaeological foundation in the hope that both the methodology and the conclusions will help structure future studies in other parts of Pompeii, other Italian cities, and the Roman world in general. In this conclusion, I summarize the archaeological evidence for how those various mealtime environments articulated and reinforced the various social positions of the participants. The synthesis begins at the community level, with the question of eating outside the home, and concludes with a focus on how the social order was linked to the environments of cooking and eating within the home.

¹As the literary sources suggest; see chapter one, 45-47 (age) and 47-50 (gender).

Community organization

Food was everywhere in Pompeii. Almost every city block had at least one, and often more, commercial eating establishments, from bakeries to cook-shops such as lunch counters or sit-down diners. Fifteen such eating establishments in the six *insulae* studied here served locals and passersby (Fig. 2.2). People could walk in any direction to a conveniently located bar or grill.

Commercial eating establishments were, however, sources of food secondary to the food prepared independently in individual homes. Salza Prina Ricotti's calculations for the houses of Campania claimed that 40% of 'case povere', 66% of 'case agiate del medio ceto' and 93% of 'case ricche' contained a fixed cooking surface such as a stove or hearth.² Consideration of the artifacts increased the percentages in my Pompeian sample: 100% of the fifty-two houses and (work)shop-houses in this sample showed evidence for either a fixed cooking installation, or localized cookwares.³ These figures suggest that every Pompeian home larger than ca. 80 m² had its own cooking area. Only in the smallest buildings, the (work)shops, is there doubt -- 43% percent of these have some evidence for cooking and eating.⁴ Pompeians took the majority of their meals at their homes; even in the smallest (work)shop, a rough meal of porridge could easily enough have been prepared with a single pot.

The poorest Pompeians must have visited the cook-shops more regularly than their richer neighbors. It was not because the food was cheaper, but because social ties were generated there. Commercial eating establishments were centers of interaction, not primary sources of nutrition, and were visited before or after real meals at home. The warmed drinks and snacks served there were social lubricants, engaging all comers in a common activity that fostered interpersonal relations. Diners and lunch counters especially catered to persons hanging on the lower rungs of the social ladder, and were thus described by the elite authors of literary texts as undesirable places to be or be seen.⁵ Certainly none of the largest houses in my sample had directly attached commercial eating establishments, but a diner or lunch counter was always next door or around the corner.⁶ Owners of several small and medium size houses did not shy away

²Salza Prina Ricotti 1978/80, 239.

³All commercial eating establishments (lunch counters, diners and bakeries) had cooking apparatus. The most tenuous evidence for cooking and eating on the premises of a house or (work)shop-house is in the stable I.8.12 where bronze vessels were found fallen from an upper floor and wine amphorae were stacked in one corner.

⁴(Work)shops and their finds are poorly documented and published. About two-thirds of (work)shops (for which the finds have been published) contained evidence for cooking on the premises (see chapter three, p. 129).

⁵For literary views of commercial dining establishments, see chapter one, pp. 35-37, esp. n. 153.

⁶I.4.5+25 (Casa del Citarista) had lunch counters nearby at I.4.3 and I.4.27. Diners I.7.13-14 and I.8.15-16 lay just south of I.7.10-12 (Casa dell'Efebo). I.10.4 (Casa del Menandro) had adjacent lunch counters at I.10.2 and I.10.13. Laurence 1994, 78-87 sees a similar pattern throughout the city. Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 175-186 reveals close relationships between house owners and those who operated lunch counters and diners in Herculaneum.

from actually incorporating eating establishments in their own street frontage.⁷ Despite the literary protestations, the elite clearly lived with cook-shops practically in their own front yards.

Household organization

Pompeian residents could procure food from local shops, forum markets, the sea, or the surrounding countryside. While the food supply of households is a complex problem worth further study, I have concentrated throughout on what happens to the food once it enters the house. As the center of preparation and consumption, the layout of the home reveals how social roles of household members were defined by food. Every evening, dinner reckoned the social standing of all Pompeians in their (work)shops, diners, small houses and mansions across the city. Standing was measured by the company and the conditions in which an individual ate. The following sections summarize cooking and dining facilities, their link to the socio-economic status of households, and how they helped shape social relationships between the free and slave within.

Physical topography

The size of a house (and household) significantly determined its cooking and dining arrangements. The larger the house, the more options for food preparation were available.⁸ Braziers were used to heat food for minor meals such as breakfast or lunch, but the large stoves and hearths in the kitchens were not fired up until it was time to prepare dinner.⁹ Grand, elite houses were able to handle small or large dinners, meals according to season, or banquets in more than one dining area at the same time.¹⁰

The size and number of dining areas prove to be excellent indices of house size, and consequently, of the status of owner and household.¹¹ I have conclusively demonstrated that the larger the house, the larger, more numerous, and better decorated the dining areas. Owners of larger houses also had a wider array of choices (see Table 4.1 below). In (work)shops, options are

⁷I.4.1-3 (lunch counter at #3), I.8.1-3 (lunch counter at #1), I.8.8-9 (diner at #8), I.9.3-4 (diner at #4), I.10.2-3 (lunch counter at #2).

⁸As might be expected from the pre-eminence of the dinner in elite Roman literature. Cooking capacity was one measure of social standing; Plin. *Nat.* 18.7 sarcastically remarks that the kitchens of Nero might well cover two *iugera* of land (just over an acre). Mart. 11.32 in turn chastises the beggar Nestor, who lacks toga, hearth, bed, apartment or slaves, and yet looks to play a role as a citizen: "It is not poverty, Nestor, to have nothing at all"; *non est paupertas, Nestor, habere nihil* (Loeb text and translation). Nestor has no hearth, no home, and no social status.

⁹A pattern noted and discussed earlier, in chapter one, pp. 27-28.

¹⁰Cicero recalls a banquet for Julius Caesar in multiple dining rooms (Cic. *Att.* 13.52.1-2, confirmed in Suet. *Jul.* 48.1; see chapter two, pp. 98-99).

¹¹Chapter one, pp. 37-39 and chapter three, pp. 123-124 argue that larger houses belonged to wealthier and more socially privileged members of Roman society at Pompeii, though they may have been successful freedpersons as well as patricians.

limited: cooking and eating in the very same space, or cooking on the ground floor and dining above. In small houses and work(shop)-houses, there was rarely more than one place to cook or one place to eat, but these two activities were at least discreetly separated from each other. In larger houses, by comparison, there are rooms with different degrees of openness onto gardens, with different orientations and with lighting suitable for different seasons.¹² Several dining areas with various decorative styles and themes allowed the host to choose a particular setting for the season or occasion. For example, in the Casa del Citarista (I.4.5+25), diners might enjoy the sculptural display and fountain that face the broad summer dining room (18), or the large painted mythological scenes on the walls of the more sheltered and intimate dining room (37) (Fig. 5.10).

Larger houses also consistently display richer decoration in their dining areas. Owners lavishly decorated dining room interiors with mosaic and *opus sectile* on the floors, and commissioned large and high-quality paintings of mythological scenes on the walls. Large houses used water not only for practical purposes, but for reasons of display, in fountains and pools that were usually in direct sight of a dining area, sometimes in concert with sculptural displays.¹³ Smaller houses were limited to cocciopesto floors and small-scale painted subjects on the inside, and garden vegetation on the outside.

In all homes, cooking areas were ill-lit and hardly decorated, but were put usually in close proximity to water sources, drainage outlets (such as latrines), and baths (in larger houses). A reliable water supply was essential to cooking operations. Cisterns are present in all buildings but the (work)shops, which lacked internal courts with roofs for collecting water and consequently relied (at least in the imperial period) on the numerous public street fountains.

In (work)shops, a few rooms sufficed for mercantile activity, living (i.e. cooking, eating and sleeping) and storage. In most smaller buildings, formal business and domestic supplies were all channeled through a single door, and pots and pans are often found at the cooking site. In the largest houses, secondary entrances near kitchens or servants' quarters allowed large amounts of supplies to be moved in and waste material moved out, without disturbing the patron's business in the atrium. Foodstuffs and cooking utensils were not often stored in the kitchen proper, but kept in chests and cabinets along the walls of the atrium, in separate storerooms, or simply piled in various corners of the house.

No regular pattern emerges in the location of fixed cooking areas; they appear at the front, middle and back of houses of all sizes. This variety corresponds well with the cooking *in vestibulo*, *in atrio* and *in postico* reported in the literary sources.¹⁴ The location of braziers in atria

¹²For arrays of dining areas built for use in specific seasons, see chapter two, pp. 99-105.

¹³I.4.5+25, peristyle (17) and I.7.10-12, garden (23) have water and sculptural displays.

¹⁴See chapter two, pp. 69-74.

or peristyles near dining rooms also confirms ancient testimony about cooking or heating at the dining room.¹⁵ Kitchens were sited for practical reasons; Romans did not consider it essential for cooking to be performed in any particular part of the house. Such flexibility was not always the case -- site-specific rooms such as *tablina* were almost always located opposite the entrance across the atrium, in prime position to receive guests, conduct business, and preside over household affairs. Dining rooms were placed to take advantage of natural light, seasonal advantage, or a nice view for the guests. Almost all were located off an area open to the sky (an atrium, peristyle or garden). Proximity to an open area allowed the option of controlling the temperature, light and air (the internal dining environment) simply by closing or opening windows and doors.

Dinner guests became less able to perceive the cooking process as house size increased. In diners and lunch counters, cooking and dining were practically side by side. In small and medium size houses, kitchens were usually on the opposite side of an atrium or garden from the dining areas. In the two grandest houses (I.4.5+25, I.10.4) of my sample, kitchens lay sequestered down long corridors, far away from the social centers of the house (the atria and peristyles), and completely out of sensory range from the dining rooms. The distance between free guests and slave cooks was stressed in the heavily stratified larger houses, as Table 4.1 summarizes below.

average total area for dining (sq. m.):	none	17.7	19.7	45.6	151.1
est. household population:	1-4	3-8	4-10	5-15	15-45
building size (sq. m.):	9.6-69.7	85.4-356.9	88.3-274.9	259.1-614.0	709.3-2502.8
building category and socio-economic standing:	(work)shop low	(work)shop-house	casa piccola	casa media	casa grande high
segregation of cooking and dining:	integrated cooking, eating and living in the same few rooms	cooking and dining separate, but nearby, in vicinity of a court	kitchens in a dark corner; dining areas off atrium or garden	kitchens segregated, far from dining areas around peristyles	
mealtime socialization:	household meals; socialization on the street or in public eating establishments	household meals, occasionally to regularly with guests; additional socialization at public or private eating establishments		regular, elaborate dinners for guests; separate cooking and eating area for household staff	

Table 4.1: Diagram of trends in the physical and social topography of cooking and dining areas across the socio-economic spectrum

¹⁵e.g. Sen. Ep. 78.23; see chapter two, p. 73.

Social topography

Cicero characterized the difference between Greek and Roman practice in terms of their respective terminology for meals:

The word our ancestors invented for a meal where friends meet was *convivium*, a 'living together', and they were quite right, because of its essential quality of a social reunion. The Greek terms 'a drinking together' and 'feasting together' are less satisfactory since they emphasize what is the least significant aspect of such occasions.¹⁶

Cicero realized that social interaction was the 'essential quality' of dinner, not the dinner itself. This commensality, fostering interaction between people, their gods and their environment, was the central meaning of the evening meal. The repeated prefix *con-* stresses how dinner brought the entire household together at a regular time of the day to make, serve and eat the meal. The dining room was the stage where the diners interacted with at least part of the household staff that served them.

As we have seen in smaller homes, where cooking and dining areas were close together, there were few architecturally expressed barriers to free - slave interaction, though this does not mean, of course, that there were no social or moral boundaries between free and slave. In the larger homes, dining areas and kitchens were further apart; in the grandest houses, it is not clear that guests would have had any idea where the kitchen was, because they could not see, hear or smell whence the food came. The literary and archaeological evidence combine to show that as wealth, rank and status increased (measured roughly by house size and complexity), the stratification and specialization of the household increased, and consequently the social distance between the free family and dependent servants (see Table 4.1 above).

The contextual meaning of the meal therefore shifted from a family gathering in a small residence to a *familia* entertaining and impressing outside guests in a large house. Control over whom the household could invite to witness or participate in the meal increased with socio-economic status, and the guest list became more exclusive, even as the 'business' of the meal, its social function, had ever stronger 'public' ramifications.¹⁷ The social axes of differentiation laid out by Wallace-Hadrill come into clear focus at mealtime: smaller households participated in humble, public meals, while owners of larger homes put on grand, private meals.¹⁸ I will

¹⁶Cic. *Sen.* 45: *Bene enim maiores accubitionem epularem amicorum, quia vitae coniunctionem haberet, convivium nominaverunt melius quam Graeci, qui hoc idem tum computationem tum concenationem vocant, ut quod in eo genere minimum est, id maxime probare videantur* (OCT text, M. Grant translation). Cicero expresses the same opinion in *Fam.* 9.24.3 (see D'Arms 1984, 344), and is supported also by Plu. *Moralia* 69C.

¹⁷See chapter one, pp. 10, 22-24, 40-41, and 50-55 for the 'public' role of private meals.

¹⁸Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 11; see chapter one above, p. 45, n. 193 and pp. 50-56.

illustrate this phenomenon with a series of examples drawn from *insula* I.7 (See Figs. 2.5, 5.19-5.23 for maps, and Gazetteer entries for more detailed exposés of these examples).

I.7.4 is a large (work)shop with a hearth in the northwest corner of room (1), next to a stairway to the upper floor and balcony (Figs. 5.20, 5.73). A tripod was found on the hearth; cups, bowls, and jars of fruit and nuts were stored nearby. A bronze oinochoe had fallen from the balcony over the street, suggesting drinking (and dining) upstairs. None of the residents could have gone upstairs to dinner without passing the stove by the stairs. The wide front door must have been open to some degree to let in light, and let out cooking smoke. Cooking is shielded slightly from the street by room (2), offering a modicum of privacy. In smaller (work)shops, such as I.7.6, meals may have been cooked on the threshold. Anyone passing by would have been briefly in the presence of the meal. After the meal, residents could walk down the street to the lunch counter at I.7.8-9 (Fig. 5.83), or the diner at I.7.13-14 (Figs. 5.92-5.93) to share wine, snacks and conversation with friends.

(Work)shop-house I.7.5 was built on the same plan as its neighbor to the west, except it has a large reception room (d) at back that probably doubled as a *tablinum* and a dining room (Figs. 5.20, 5.75-5.77). Room (d) is well-decorated and set up for three dining couches; the family and guests who ate here could gaze through a wide window through court (c) to the street. A small stove was built at the east edge of the court, and cooking wares were stored in a near corner. Guests who came for a meal passed the latrine on their right, and the stove on their left when they reached the court. The owner used the court to ventilate both the kitchen and latrine. He did not attempt to hide those amenities, but instead constructed an elegant dining room that was lit by the same court. The cooking process was part of the dining experience.

In the *casa piccola* I.7.2-3, meals were more intimate; dinette (c) faced away from the street (Figs. 5.20, 5.71-5.72). The dining area was small and plain, but equipped with a cupboard (perhaps for serving wares), and a pavement marked out for couches. Cooking was done on a tripod and cooking vessels collected in court (g) at the back of the house. Architectural boundaries of rank and status were distinguished but not overemphasized. The lack of multiple cooking and dining areas suggests that the free family and any slave staff ate in close proximity, even if they might not have eaten at the same time. The 'status' of a dining area would have changed if the family and guests left, and the room was taken over by the staff.

The residential core of *casa media* I.7.7 was located down a long *fauces* that had two doors along its length (Fig. 5.20, 5.79-5.82). Kitchen (i) and dining room (b) were located on either side of the entranceway. Both were accessible from the atrium, even as they were invisible to each other. Guests in the well-decorated dining room could enjoy the large panels of Herakles myths painted on the walls as they waited for dinner to be brought in from the kitchen around the corner. There was a careful architectural separation of service and dining areas.

Cooking and dining were clearly segregated according to status in the *casa grande* I.7.10-12 (Figs. 5.21, 5.84-5.91). Entertainment for guests was centered around a pendant of dining areas (17, 23) that faced each other amidst an extravagant collection of columns, statuary, garden greenery, painted walls, fountains and aedicular shrines. The owner had numerous options when planning dinners. Large banquets could be held in (17) and (23) concurrently. A dining room could be chosen according to the occasion or season: (23) outdoors in summer, the sheltered dining room (10) in winter, the dinette (16) for small parties, or the dining hall (17), at any time. Dining hall (17) was equipped with shutters that controlled its interior environment. Guests in any of these well-decorated areas were served by either or both kitchens (8) and (21), out of sight from the banquet areas.

In I.7.10-12, a specific part of the property was set aside for the servants, creating a home within a home centered on its own 'private' atrium (A'), complete with a separate hearth, dining couches and a household shrine.¹⁹ The rooms were small and undecorated, but the staff had their own cooking and eating scheme within the system that they operated for the benefit of their masters. These servants' quarters are sequestered from the rest of the house by a single door, and are given a separate entrance onto the street. The staff may also have varied their meals according to season, dining upstairs in summer and downstairs next to the hearth in winter.

Slaves and servants, because they made the household operate, were everywhere in the house, but they did not do everything everywhere. They might serve food in one of the fine dining areas, but it is doubtful they were welcome to eat it there, which is why Trimalchio's invitation to his slaves to share the meal is humorously unlikely.²⁰ In the largest households, slaves were given their own place to dine and allowed their own company at table. They were left alone and left to serve themselves. Given the literary evidence for hierarchies of large household staffs, it seems inevitable that social jockeying for privilege was also played out in slave dining areas, with slave procurators presiding over meals, just as Columella prescribes for the bailiff of a country villa.²¹

Conclusion

The location of any given household along the Roman socio-economic spectrum was crucial in determining its cooking and dining arrangements. Dinners in smaller households tended to integrate more closely free and slave family members across lines of rank and status. Dinners in larger households more strongly emphasized lines of social standing. The elevated social status that came with wealth and the ownership of larger houses included a commensurate responsibility to fulfill social obligations by entertaining outside guests within the home.

¹⁹See also I.10.4, atrium (41) and I.4.5, court (21) for similar servants' quarters.

²⁰Petr. 70.

²¹Col. 11.1.19 (see chapter one, p. 30-31). For hierarchy within slave staffs, see chapter one, p. 54.

Owners of larger houses lavished far more attention on their dining areas than on their cooking areas. They displayed their wealth, taste and learning at the meal not only by associating the dinner with a beautifully prepared setting, but also by disassociating the dinner from most of the cooking process. Kitchens were marginalized, separated from the sensory perception of the guests so that they noticed only the finished product, suddenly appearing at table as if from nowhere. 'Nowhere' is actually an accurate description of the cooking areas. At the end of a long corridor or at the edge of the house, kitchens had no sense of place for the visitor who could not perceive them. Only the slave and servant 'nobodies' attached to the kitchen were in a position to appreciate the food preparation. A Plautine slave describes the kitchen as "a warm place, where there are usually plenty of all good things (to eat)!"²² Authors of elite station complain instead about the smoke, smells, and fire hazards of kitchens.²³ At least in the largest houses, the inherent social distinctions between the household staff, and the free family and their guests, are formalized in the architectural segregation of cooking from elite eating space. The link between social standing and meals is confirmed by the closer physical association between cooking and eating areas in the smallest (work)shops and houses, and by the intimate association of cooking and eating in the servants' quarters of the largest houses.

Formal banqueting with invited guests in elite houses was an extension of the same simple principle that applied to the lowest of (work)shops and cookshops: food should be shared in proper company. The more socially proximate a group of individuals were, the more likely were they to eat together. Slaves, poor freedpersons and poor citizens tended to cook and eat in their own company. Slaves then served dinner in the houses of the wealthy, who shared it with their peers in a grand setting. Preparation and consumption of meals in Pompeii and the Roman world in general was a proven social barometer. Everyone at every level of society could recognize the culinary clues to the current social order: what was being eaten, how it was cooked and eaten, when it was eaten, where it was cooked and eaten, and most importantly, who was cooking and with whom the meal was shared.

I have characterized cooking and dining facilities in a relatively ordinary Roman town, at the heart of the Empire, and have used that information to illuminate household social relations. A similar study of cooking and dining in provincial contexts would offer the opportunity to compare customs at the center with customs at the Imperial periphery. Did local culinary customs survive, or were they mixed with, or replaced by, Roman foods, cooking techniques, and dining practices? This may be an effective way to address the question of Romanization.

²²Pl. *Per.* 630-635 (see chapter two, p. 72).

²³See chapter two, pp. 74-77.

CHAPTER V

GAZETTEER

Fors sua cuique loco est
(Ov. *Fast.* 4.507)

Introduction: definitions and format

The Gazetteer presents a mass of detailed evidence for cooking and dining in individual households at Pompeii. Each building is unique in its cooking and dining areas. This collection of detailed case histories illuminates the variety and complexity of Pompeian cooking and dining practices. The gazetteer provides the body of data from which large-scale trends discussed in chapter three are drawn.

Ten *insulae* (I.4, 6-10; VII.1, 14; IX.1-2) and all buildings contained therein were sampled and personally visited at Pompeii; this sample formed the typology of cooking and dining areas presented in chapter two (Figs. 2.1-2.12). Of these ten, the six *insulae* with the best preserved and documented evidence (I.4, 6-10) were selected for individual treatment. Their presentation in the Gazetteer is divided into two parts (**microanalysis** and **macroanalysis**) based on the detail of their documentation. The format of the documentation is explained below.

The first part of the gazetteer is a **microanalysis** of three *insulae* (I.4, I.6-I.7). Each building is given an entry that consists of five sections: *Synopsis*, *References*, *Data*, *Synthesis*, and *Figures*. Not every building has information listed in each section -- the extent of coverage depends upon the individual entry's array of cooking and dining areas. For example, a building with no cooking or dining areas will contain only a synopsis of any evidence for cooking and dining, references and a short list of data.

The second part (**macroanalysis**) provides considerably less detail, but the summary information allows more buildings to be included, increasing the sample size for the large-scale analysis carried out in chapter three. The macroanalysis of *insulae* (I.7-10) includes an extremely brief *Synopsis*, *References*, *Data* (consisting only of dimensions and areas for the building, and its cooking and dining areas), and *Figures*. The sections for each entry in the Gazetteer follow the format and style defined below.

1. Street address, name of building, building category (Figs. 5.xx-5.xx)

All entries have a heading with the number of the entry, the building's address, and the most common name for the building, if one exists.¹ Following is the category of building (e.g. (work)shop, house) which identifies the general nature of each building (defined in chapter two, pp. 117-128; see Fig. 2.2). Placed in parentheses after the building category are the numbers of the *Figures* that are associated with this building, which can be found in volume two of the thesis.

S y n o p s i s

This section includes a brief description of the building and evidence for its suggested function (i.e. (work)shop, house, etc.). The *Baugeschichte* of each building is briefly considered, concentrating upon the form of the building between ca. A.D. 62-79. When modifications to a building are relevant to the interpretation of its cooking and dining areas, chronology becomes involved in the discussion.

R e f e r e n c e s

References are chosen for their general usefulness and relevance to cooking and dining areas; sources of particular importance (to which the author is most indebted) are underlined. In-text citations of authors and works refer directly to these selected references. The sources listed can be used to compile a complete bibliography for each property.²

D a t a

This section includes two different types of information. First are categories of numeric data that quantify the dimensions of the building and its cooking and dining areas. Second is a series of categories that describe and discuss the appearance of, and evidence for, the use of these cooking and dining areas. There are ten categories total, each defined below. If more than one cooking or dining area is present in a given building, each will be identified by their room numbers or letters, usually under separate sub-headings.

Abbreviations are used for the cooking and dining area types. Other codes and conventions are employed for amenities, points of special interest, degrees of confidence in their

¹Building names and addresses come from CTP II and/or Pompei - L'Informatica 1988. Names are given in the common Italian form except for proper (Latin) names. The numbering or lettering schemes for spaces within buildings follow the *insula* maps in PPP I-III and PPM I-II. Spaces not numbered or lettered in those two publications are assigned designations according to those that appear in their original published plans. In several instances I have assigned new numbers or letters to spaces completely lacking designations; these are clearly marked on the plans. Numbering schemes of certain buildings in PPP and PPM are inaccurate due to errors in their maps; in those cases, I have introduced new numbering schemes that are clearly marked on the plans.

²The brief descriptions of each building in *insulae* I.6-10 that appear in the appendix of Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 187-194 are not cited in these references.

identification and measurements or directions. All abbreviations, codes and conventions are summarized below (Fig. 5.1 repeats these codes for use in interpreting the building plans):³

Abbreviations for cooking areas:

KI = Kitchen **HE** = Hearth **ST** = Stove **LO** = Large oven **SO** = Small oven
BZ = Brazier **CS** = Cooking supports or cooking stand **WH** = Water heater

Abbreviations for dining areas:

DR = Dining room **DH** = Dining-hall **DI** = Dinette
DO = Dining area (Open-Air) **DB** = Dining benches

Codes for amenities and points of special interest:

WS = Water source **LT** = Latrine **SG** = Storage area
CL = Cult place, evidence of ritual **sc** = Location of sculpture or bases for sculpture

Degrees of confidence in identifying the above areas, amenities and points of interest:

<no code> = Secure identification • = Probable identification ◇ = Possible identification
e.g. KI = "Secure kitchen"; DR• = "Probable dining room"; DI◇ = "Possible dinette"

Conventions for identifying rooms and street entrances:

() = Parentheses surround the number or letter of a room on the ground floor.
[] = Square brackets surround the number or letter of a room below the ground floor.
{ } = Braces surround the number or letter of a room above the ground floor.
= Indicates the number of a street entrance that corresponds to the building's address.

Conventions for measurements and directions:⁴

l. = length w. = width h. = height d. = diameter
Compass directions (following Local N) are abbreviated to: N, S, E, W, NW, NE, SW, SE

³The abbreviations for fixed cooking installations follow the typology defined in chapter two, pp. 78-84. The abbreviations for portable cooking appliances such as braziers, cooking supports and cooking stands follow the discussion in chapter one, pp. 17-20. Abbreviations for dining areas and the degrees of confidence in their identification follow the typology defined in chapter two, pp. 105-115.

⁴All measurements in this thesis are given in meters, but many measurements for objects or locations of objects in the PAH were given in Neapolitan palms. I have converted these measurements to meters based on the equivalent of 1 Neapolitan palm = 0.26455 m. as listed in CTP V, 505.

The categories of numeric and descriptive data are presented in the following order, and according to the following definitions.

A. Building areas⁵

Total area The total ground area encompassed by the property lines of the building, not including upper-floor rooms or underground built spaces such as cryptoporticus.⁶

Nodes⁷ The total ground areas of nodes. Nodes are defined as centers of activity and circulation, including atria, peristyles, gardens and courts usually open to the sky and normally allowing access to at least three other spaces. A peristyle or garden node includes the central open space and any associated porticos. A node may also be the front or main room of a shop or shop-house complex (see Figs. 5.2-5.7 for plans showing nodes, connectors and static spaces).

Connectors The total ground area of entryways, corridors, and stairways (not including steps traversing a small change in the local topography).

Static spaces The total ground area of individual rooms that access no more than three other spaces, and usually include such closed spaces as *tablina*, dining rooms, bedrooms, living/sitting rooms, kitchens, latrines, baths and storerooms.

B. Building complexity

Total # spaces The total number of distinct spaces in the building on the ground floor. Each portico around a peristyle or gardens counts as an additional space in the total.⁸

Nodes The number of nodes on the ground floor of the building. A peristyle or garden node includes the central open space plus any associated porticos.

Connectors The number of connectors on the ground floor of the building.

Static spaces The number of static spaces on the ground floor of the building.

⁵The 1:1000 RICA maps of Pompeii in CTP III were scanned into a Macintosh® PowerBook 145™ with an Apple Scanner™, providing scaled plans of the sampled *insulae* and their buildings which were then adapted, labelled and coded in Canvas 3.5™. For points of detail, the plans for Regio I were checked against the 1:500 maps of CTP IIIA and plans in the published reports for each building; the plans for Regiones VII and IX were checked against Tascone's maps in Fiorelli 1873. The map of Eschebach 1970 was consulted rarely, due to its several errors. Consult CTP V for an history and assessment of mapmaking at Pompeii. In order to calculate ground areas of a building, the author traced a building's perimeter along the split thickness of its outer wall in Canvas 3.5 with the 'polygon tool'. That tool automatically calculated the enclosed area in square meters represented by the polygon. All measurements in this study are in meters.

⁶Because any space under a connector stairway is distinct from the stairway itself, but both occupy the same 'ground area', the total sum area of nodes, connectors and static spaces may slightly exceed the total ground area of the building.

⁷See chapter one pp. 38-39 for a discussion of nodes, connectors and static spaces, based on Watts 1987, 124-131.

⁸Because a garden or peristyle and its associated porticos counts as one node, the sum of nodes, connectors and static spaces may not equal the total number of distinct spaces.

C. Cooking and dining area dimensions⁹

Area, KI () The total ground area of a cooking area.

Area, DR () The total ground area of a dining area.

Length, DR () The average length of a dining area.

Width, DR () The average width of a dining area.

D. Proximity¹⁰

Entry prox., KI () The shortest distance in meters from the threshold of the main entrance to the threshold of a cooking area.

Entry prox., DR () The shortest distance in meters from the threshold of the main entrance to the threshold of a dining area.

Prox., KI ()-DR () The shortest distance in meters between the threshold of a cooking area and the threshold of a dining area.

E. Accessibility¹¹

Entry access., KI () The number of distinct spaces from a cooking area to the street at the main entrance. Any subsidiary entrances available to a cooking area are also mentioned here.

Entry access., DR () The number of distinct spaces from a dining area to the street at the main entrance.

Access., KI ()-DR () The number of distinct spaces from a cooking area to a dining area.

⁹The interior length, width, and areas of cooking and dining areas were also calculated by using the 'polygon tool' in Canvas 3.5. A default area of 1.5 m² is used for the cooking area of a portable cooking device such as a brazier, cooking stand, water heater or tripod. Fixed cooking installations such as hearths built into lunch counters or other small hearths in atria and gardens are provided a standard 2.5 m². Larger cooking areas and appliances show their actual size. Three measurements each (along the two ends and through the center of the room) were averaged to arrive at the length and width of a dining area.

¹⁰See chapter one, p. 39. The shortest distance is taken as much as possible along connectors and nodes through the house. For instance, if a corridor and a *tablinum* both seem to offer passage from an atrium to a peristyle, the shortest distance is measured through the corridor, because the *tablinum*, as a static space, may have been blocked off with doors or curtains. However, if the *tablinum* is the only passage between an atrium and back garden, it is considered to be a 'connector' first and foremost.

¹¹See chapter one, p. 39-41. Both the space at the starting point (the cooking or dining area) and the ending point (the street) are counted.

F. Perceptibility¹²

Sight perc., KI ()-DR () The degree to which a cooking area is visible from a dining area. N = the cooking area is not visible at all; E = the entry to the cooking area is visible; V = the interior of cooking area is visible.

Sound perc., KI ()-DR () Whether a dining area is within 30.2 m. of the cooking area, and it is theoretically possible to hear activity in the cooking area (True/False).

Smell perc., KI ()-DR () Whether a dining area is theoretically in range of the smell of cooking food, i.e. ca. 9.1 meters (True/False).

G. Environmental amenities, dining areas¹³

A detailed discussion of the environmental conditions present in the dining areas. Amenities include: 1) light, 2) air and breezes, 3) aspect (view out of the room to gardens, arranged sculptural display, or water-play), and 4) orientation (the compass direction of the primary axis from the couches towards the front of the room, for determining the seasonal use of the room).

H. Installation amenities¹⁴

Installation amenities, cooking areas A detailed description of the evidence for (and confidence in) identifying installations, equipment and utilities required for a working cooking area. Amenities include: 1) heat (cooking appliances), 2) light, 3) ventilation, 4) water-sources, 5) drainage, 6) storage of foodstuffs and cooking wares, 7) work areas, 8) latrines or baths.

Installation amenities, dining areas A detailed description of the evidence for (and confidence in identifying) the following installations and equipment related to dining: 1) couches or benches, 2) tables, 3) serving and table wares (whether stored or used in the dining area).

I. Decorative amenities¹⁵

Decorative amenities, cooking areas A description of any architectural elaboration or decoration of floors or walls in a cooking area.

Decorative amenities, dining areas A summary of architectural elaboration or decoration (including the style) of the entrance, floor, walls, and ceiling, and what such decoration may have contributed to the atmosphere and setting of a dining area.

¹²See chapter one, p. 41-42 for definitions of sight, sound, and smell zones.

¹³See chapter two, pp. 99-105. Statuary visible from dining areas are marked on detailed plans.

¹⁴Cooking area installations are discussed according to the amenities and archaeological typology in chapter two, pp. 78-84. Dining area installations are discussed according to the archaeological typology in chapter two, pp. 105-115.

¹⁵See chapter two, pp. 94-99, 106-108. The assignation of decorative styles comes from PPP I (p. VI, n. 6) and PPM I. Dating of styles follows Ling 1991: 1st style, ca. 3 c.-80 B.C.; early 2nd style, ca. 80-40 B.C.; late 2nd style, ca. 40-15 B.C.; early 3rd style, ca. 20 B.C.-A.D. 25; late 3rd style, ca. A.D. 25-45; early 4th style, ca. A.D. 45-62; late 4th style ca. A.D. 62-79.

J. Sanctity¹⁶

A description of any evidence for shrines, altars, cult places or ritual activity in the house, and a discussion of any particular relationship between cult areas and cooking or dining areas.

Synthesis

This section summarizes the nature of the cooking areas, their relationship to the dining areas, and the place of cooking and dining in the building as a whole. It attempts to explain the individual design for cooking and eating within each household.

Figures

Figures appear separately in Vol. II of the dissertation, and are listed in the heading of the gazetteer entry for each building. Two maps of Pompeii show the sample *insulae* and their building categories (Figs. 2.1-2.2). There are also three sets of large-scale plans. The first set (Figs. 2.3-2.12) shows: street names, street addresses, property lines and the numbering/lettering schemes for rooms in the sample of ten *insulae* (I.4, 6-10, VII.1, 14, IX.1-2) used to construct the cooking and dining area typology. The second set (Figs. 5.2-5.7) breaks down the six *insulae* of the Gazetteer (I.4, 6-10) into nodes, connectors, and static spaces. The third set (Figs. 5.8-5.23) consists of detailed individual plans for buildings in the microanalysis (I.4, 6-7). Cooking areas, dining areas, water sources, latrines, storage rooms, cooking equipment, locations of sculpture, and sacred areas are all indicated. Specially-indicated areas and amenities are coded according to the degree of evidence preserved for identifying their function (see above, p. 180, and Fig. 5.1).

All plans are based on the 1:1000 plan in CTP III, with modifications based on other maps (see above, n. 5), and measurements made personally at the site. Compass directions follow "Local N" as marked on the plans; north is always at the top. Figures may also include detailed scale plans, measured perspective drawings, and photos. All photos were taken by the author (unless otherwise noted); they show the buildings and their contents as they are preserved today. No cleaning was effected in any area.

¹⁶See chapter one, pp. 43-45.

Gazetteer, part I: microanalysis

1. I.4.1-3, Casa + Popina, *casa piccola* + lunch counter (Figs. 2.3, 5.2, 5.8, 5.24-5.25)

Synopsis

This small atrium house has an entrance vestibule at #2, a connected shop of uncertain purpose at #1, and a connected lunch counter at #3.¹⁷ The lunch counter has an L-shaped serving counter revetted in marble, and three ceramic urns inset in its top surface. There is a large window in its N wall that connects with the shop at (I.4.4), which the owner of this house may have bought after blocking it off from the Casa del Citarista (I.4.5+25). Atrium (b) has a stone-lined *impluvium* at its center next to a small HE (Fig. 5.24). Behind the atrium is *tablinum* (c), with wide entrances at front and back. *Cubiculum* (d) lies to the S. To the N of both rooms runs a narrow corridor (e) that connects the atrium to the back part of the house. At the end of this corridor and largely behind *tablinum* (c) is a small garden court (f) with engaged brick columns, four on both the W and E sides, and one on the S, adjacent to the entrance into the court (Fig. 5.25). A well-head lies inside against the center of the W wall, and a tall rectangular niche is set into the N wall. A window in the center of the E wall provides light for DR•(g) at the back of the house. The S portico of court (f) leads to a masonry stair to the second floor, under which there is a small space suitable for a pantry. Fiorelli reported that these stairs were used to reach the kitchen as well as other upper-floor rooms, but no evidence exists to confirm this hypothesis.¹⁸

References

Jashemski 1993, 29; PPP I, 8-9; CTP IIIA, 8-9; Gassner 1986, 127; Evans 1978, 176; Della Corte NSc 1912, 336; Fiorelli 1875, 60; Fiorelli 1873, 65; Dwyer 1982, 79; Niccolini II, "Descr. Gen.", 79; Minervini BAN (2), 65, 118; PAH II, 581-583, 586 (18 Ott. - 2 Nov., 2 Dic. 1853).

Data

A) Total area: 242.1	Nodes: 131.1	Connectors: 21.4	Static spaces: 92.5
B) Total # spaces: 14	# Nodes: 4	# Connectors: 4	# Static spaces: 4
C) Area, HE in (b): 2.5	Area, DR•(g): 25.8	Length, DR•(g): 6.48	Width, DR•(g): 3.98
D) Entry prox., HE in (b): 6.3	Entry prox., DR•(g): 27.0	Prox., HE in (b)-DR•(g): 19.2	
E) Entry access., HE in (b): 4	Entry access., DR•(g): 8	Access, HE in (b)-DR•(g): 5	

¹⁷This shop appears on plans preceding the first official mention of excavation in this area in October of 1853, including a map of excavations up to 1827 made by Zahn (I, tav. IA; see *Italianische Reise* 1989, 383, #166 for the map). See also CTP IIIA, 8.

¹⁸Fiorelli 1873, 65: "viridario (f), che rinchiuso da otto colonne, tiene in fondo un triclinio finestrato (g), cui sta accanto una scala per montare alla cucina, e forse pure ad altre stanze."

There is a subsidiary entrance to the HE in atrium (b) via the *popina* at #3.

F) Sight perc., HE in (b)-DR•(g): V, if both the front and back doorways of *tablinum* (d) are open.

Sound perc., HE in (b)-DR•(g): T

Smell perc., HE in (b)-DR•(g): F

G) Environmental amenities, DR•(g): A window midway along the W wall looks into the courtyard (f) and receives light and air directly therefrom. If both doorways of *tablinum* (c) are open, the view extends through the atrium to the front door.

H) Installation amenities, HE in (b): The HE (Fig. 5.24) of sub-type (1) is a low, masonry, tile-topped structure ca. 0.9 m. wide, 1.6 m. long, and 0.40 m. high. The cobbles and boulders mortared together as the body of the hearth have a rough-cut exterior face. Irregular fragments of tile, now largely gone, sit upon the top of the hearth to form the working surface. At the E end of the hearth sat a built-in burner, horseshoe-shaped and open toward the W.¹⁹ The burner no longer survives. Light and ventilation were provided by the *compluvium* of the atrium. The water source for the kitchen came from the cistern head on the W edge of court (f) (Fig. 5.14). The cistern was fed by a terracotta pipe built into the W end of the N wall that collected rainwater from the court roof. An alternate source of water was the *impluvium* itself. The street may have served for drainage. There was probably ample space for storage in the atrium. There was no evidence for a latrine. No finds were specifically reported as coming from the area of the HE, or even the house at #2 itself. However, in the shop at #1, four small cooking pots with handles, a bronze frying pan, several fragments of glass cups, and three wide-mouthed vases were found 1.06 m. above the pavement, perhaps from shelves, a cupboard, or a loft above. The lunch counter at #3 was accompanied by an iron knife with bone handle.²⁰

Installation amenities, DR•(g): There is no direct evidence for furniture or finds. A small pantry space remains under the stairs to the upper floor on the S end of the room, suitable for the storage of dinner wares.

I) Decorative amenities, DR•(g): Traces of painted stucco survive on the walls, with a white socle and a red-bordered middle zone, 4th style.

J) Sanctity: No ritual installations or finds are reported from this house.

S y n t h e s i s

The HE in (b) was likely used for cooking and heating food to be served in the lunch counter at #3, which was well-placed to serve visitors to the Temples of Zeus Meilichios and Isis and the theater-odeon complex.²¹ Members of the household (perhaps slaves) must have

¹⁹The burner appears in the city plans of Overbeck 1884 and Eschebach 1969.

²⁰PAH II, 582-583, 586; finds were made 4 palms above the pavement in shop #1.

²¹Fiorelli 1873, 65: "atrio (b), ove è un focolare che serviva al termopolio n. 3, unito alla stessa abitazione."

prepared the food and run the counter.²² In the latter life of the house, a window was opened between the lunch counter at #3 and (work)shop (I.4.4); a proper stove therein may have taken over the cooking for the lunch counter at that time.

The HE in (b) may also have been sufficient to serve the members of the household eating in DR•(g). Fiorelli's suggestion of a kitchen on the second floor is intriguing; the upper story would have covered the whole house E of the atrium except for court (f), whose columns were walled up in its last phase, perhaps in order to carry extra upper-floor space above the former porticos. There remains no physical evidence, however, for a kitchen on that level. An upper story kitchen would not have been any more convenient than the existing HE in atrium (b).

Both the hearth and the dining room take advantage of the light and air offered by their respective courts. However, the HE in (b) is centralized, and DR•(g) is marginalized (or at least given a more secluded location). Furthermore, the lunch counter at #3 has a forward and very public location. This arrangement indicates that a clear spatial distinction was made between the more public, economic function of selling food on the street, and the more private, social function of the evening dinner. The hearth was located in the space between, suitable for serving both.

2. I.4.4, Taberna, (work)shop (Figs. 2.3, 5.2, 5.8, 5.26)

Synopsis

Front shop (a) has a wide entrance onto the street, and is connected to a back room (b) by a doorway and window. A doorway and a window in the N wall of (a) originally connected with the *fauces* of the Casa del Citarista (I.4.5+25), but were later blocked up into niches.²³ It was perhaps at the same time that a window was opened in the S wall of (a) to communicate with the lunch counter at (I.4.3); perhaps the owner of (I.4.1-3) may have gained possession of this shop at that time. Two steps lead up to room (b), which has a ST set in a deep recess in its NW corner, heavily restored (Fig. 5.26). Little stucco remains upon the walls, and there is no stair to the upper floor. There is no information about the identity of the occupants, or what was made or sold here.

References

CTP IIIA, 8-9; PPP I, 9; Gassner 1986, 127; Overbeck 1884, 360; Fiorelli 1875, 61; Fiorelli 1873, 66; Breton 1869, 488; Minervini BAN (2), 118; PAH II, 586 (2 Dic., 1853).

²²Kleberg 1957, 80 notes: "Le rattachement effectué dans les divers cas entre le local servant à la consommation et l'atrium témoigne indiscutablement d'une relation existant entre le tenancier de l'établissement et la propriétaire de la maison. Il est vraisemblable que celui-ci a utilisé comme gérant un esclave, au moins dans les cas où le fourneau requis par les besoins de l'établissement se trouve placé dans l'atrium de la maison."

²³The window niche in this wall is lined with a layer of red plaster, pockmarked to receive a new coat; this shop may have been in renovation at the time of the eruption.

Data

A) Total area: 38.6 Nodes: 23.9 Connectors: 0 Static spaces: 14.7
 B) Total # spaces: 2 # Nodes: 1 # Connectors: 0 # Static spaces: 1
 C) Area, ST in (b): 2.5 D) Entry prox., ST in (b): 6.6 E) Entry access., HE in (b): 3
 H) Installation amenities, ST in (b): The ST, sub-type (2), is made of rubble and cement masonry, poured over a peaked tile form to form a single supporting arch (Fig. 5.26). The arch has an exterior facing of radially set tiles. The stove-top is tiled, built slightly higher at the back than the front, perhaps to facilitate cleaning. The doorway and window in the W wall of room (b) afford light via the street. A niche in the W wall 0.41 m. above the stove top may have held a lamp. Ventilation would have been difficult through the same door and window, as there is no evidence for a chimney above the stove in the recess. The (work)shop has no internal water source, but a street fountain was located nearby at the NW corner of the block. The street served for drainage; no latrine was available. The whole shop complex served for storage and workspace. Few finds recorded from the shop, and none were specifically attributed to the stove.
 J) Sanctity: No ritual areas or finds are reported from this shop.

Synthesis

There is no obvious dining area in the complex. If the proprietors lived here, they probably used the back room as a multi-purpose area, for cooking, eating, living, and sleeping. If the occupants were part of the household directed from (I.4.1-3), they may have just worked in this shop, and lived in the main house. In its early life, the shop was probably owned by the owner of the Casa del Citarista, to which it was connected. At a later date, those connections were closed, and a window opened up with the lunch counter at (I.4.3). If the owner of (I.4.1-3) purchased this shop, he may have installed the ST in (I.4.4) to help produce food and hot drinks to be passed through the window for sale behind the counter of the lunch counter.

3. I.4.5-6+25+28, Casa del Citarista, *casa grande* + (work)shop
 (Figs. 2.3, 5.2, 5.9-5.10, 5.27-5.33)

Synopsis

This is the largest building in the sample, taking up the greater part of *insula* (I.4). It is the result of the fusion of two neighboring atrium-peristyle houses with entrances at #5 and #25. Once separated along the line marked by the stairs leading down from peristyle (56) to peristyle (17), these two houses were joined in the early first century B.C.²⁴ Late in the same century, a small atrium house at #28 was added and converted into a service entrance and stable; the entry

²⁴Italienische Reise, 119; PPM I, 117 dates the joining of the two houses to after the founding of the Roman colony in 80 B.C., although Dwyer 1982, 84 prefers a very late date of after A.D. 62.

was given a ramped threshold for admitting wheeled traffic. At the same time, the part E of the central peristyle (19-23+30) was renovated, and the bath/kitchen suite (40-43) was built.²⁵

A small two-room shop of uncertain function takes up entrance #6. Fiorelli (1873) reports that the front room (1) once had a small stair up to an upper loft, and the back room (2), perhaps a storage area, connected to atrium (6) via a doorway. No features survive in the shop today.

The entrance to the S half of the house is at #5, and leads through a long *fauces* (3) to atrium (6) and its surrounding rooms, including *tablinum* (14) at the back. From this atrium, a narrow corridor (38) runs past the bath suite (39-41) to the kitchen (42) and a small service court at (43); these service areas were also accessible from the NW corner of peristyle (17). The largest and best-decorated rooms in the house are all in fact placed at the narrow ends of the three parallel garden peristyles that occupy the center of the property. The N wall of the S peristyle (32) sets it off from the rest of the house; it is punctuated by a series of six windows. At either end of the windowed wall lie the two doorways from the main part of the house to the peristyle; access to this part of the house is therefore somewhat restricted. Maiuri (1954b) unconvincingly theorized that the southern section of this house around peristyle (32) was a *gynaeconitis*, or women's quarters. DR•(37) and DH•(35) lie off the NW and SE corners of that peristyle.

The central peristyle (17) once contained a rectangular pool that was later filled in except for a semi-circular basin at the W end (Fig. 5.31). The DH•(18) at the W end of the peristyle is complemented by DH•(19) and DR•(20) on the E end (Fig. 5.24). Through an arched entrance from the peristyle, a large covered court (21) provides access to a suite of rooms (22-24, 30'-30"), to upstairs rooms via a wooden stair in corridor (25), to stables (27), and to service entrance #28.

From peristyle (17), a flight of stairs traverses the two meter rise in local topography to the N part of the house, which has a street entrance at #25. Garden peristyle (56) has DH•(57) on its W end. A triad of rooms face the E end: DR•(58), flanked by *cubicula* (59-60) to either side. Off the NE corner of the peristyle, passage (61) provides access to two possible storage areas (62-63) and kitchen (64), set in the irregular space behind rooms (58-60). The N portico of peristyle (56) gives way immediately to atrium (47) and a complement of rooms, including a large storeroom (55) with a cistern-head in its SE corner. On the E side of the atrium lies DH◊(53), which may also have functioned as a *tablinum*. A short *fauces* leads into the atrium from the street, passing by a stairway on the E which accesses the upper floor rooms around the atrium.

The holders and occupants of this grand estate seem to have been the *gens Popidia*, an eminent local (i.e. pre-Roman) aristocratic family some members of which apparently had ties to

²⁵PPM I, 117 dates the renovation to the early Augustan era; Dwyer prefers a date in the 50's A.D., following Elia 1937.

the imperial court.²⁶ *Suggella*, bread stamps, of L. Rapinasius Optatus from *ala* (51) and Q. Octavius Romulus from rooms (22-24) may reveal the names of other occupants of the house or of upper-floor rooms; names of slaves such as Paris and Ikarus are also known. The house was subject to tunneling and disturbance by survivors or scavengers after the eruption, especially in the area of atrium (6) and the bath complex (40-41).

References

Jashemski 1993, 29-32; PPM I, 117-177; PPP I, 9-14; Richardson 1991, *Italianische Reise* 1989, 119-123; CTP IIIA, 8-9; Gassner 1986, 128 (shop at #6); Laidlaw 1985, 58-59; Guide Laterza 1982, 86-88; Dwyer 1982, 79-108, 151-162; Dwyer 1979, Bastet & De Vos 1979, 25-27, 90; Fabbriotti 1976, 74-76; Schefold 1957, 14-17; Maiuri 1954b, 457-459; Della Corte 1954, 208-209, 213, 222; Maiuri 1942a, 145; Pernice 1938, 68-69; Elia 1937; Maiuri, NSc 1931, 575-576; Mygind 1924, 5-12; Overbeck 1884, 359-366; Mau 1882, 64, 251-252, 411-413; Fiorelli 1875, 61-68; Fiorelli 1873, 65-67; Breton 1869, 480-481, 488-493, Brunn Bdl 1863, 101-102; Lugebil Bdl 1861, 239-240; Minervini BAN 1853 (2), 65-72, 117-118, 1859 (7), 129-132; PAH II, 581 (18 Ott., 1853), 583, 586-587, 659, 662-663, 666-667, 670-673, 684-688.

Data

A) Total area: ²⁷ 2502.8	Nodes: 1245.2	Connectors: 145.2	Static spaces: 1116.8
B) Total # spaces: 88	# Nodes: 8	# Connectors: 16	# Static spaces: 53
C) Area, KI (42): 17.0	Area, KI (64): 10.9		
Area, DH•(18): 28.6	Length, DH•(18): 4.84	Width, DH•(18): 5.90	
Area, DH•(19): 75.5	Length, DH•(19): 11.6	Width, DH•(19): 6.59	
Area, DR•(20): 26.5	Length, DR•(20): 6.19	Width, DR•(20): 4.28	
Area, DH•(35): 65.8	Length, DH•(35): 9.0	Width, DH•(35): 7.31	
Area, DR•(37): 21.2	Length, DR•(37): 5.69	Width, DR•(37): 3.73	
Area, DH◊(53): 19.4	Length, DH◊(53): 3.79	Width, DH◊(53): 5.13	
Area, DH•(57): 32.4	Length, DH•(57): 6.60	Width, DH•(57): 5.19	
Area, DR•(58): 19.7	Length, DR•(58): 5.17	Width, DR•(58): 3.80	
D) Entry prox., KI (42) to #5: 38.6	Entry prox., KI (64) to #25: 33.0		
Entry prox., DH•(18) to #5: 37.6Prox, KI (42)-DH•(18): 12.8			

²⁶L. Popidius Secundus Augustianus seems to have been a member of the Augustiani, a group of young nobles organized by Nero in A.D. 59. It also has been argued that Augustianus and perhaps the other residents were freedmen or members of a servile branch of an old family that was revived under Augustus (for the arguments, see Dwyer 1982, 85-86; *Italianische Reise*, 120; PPM I, 117-118; Castrén 1975, 207-209; Mouritsen 1988, 22, 146-147; Della Corte 1954, 208-213).

²⁷Fiorelli 1873, 65 provides a figure of 2471.52 m², a more accurate number than the commonly cited figure of 2700 m² (Guida Laterza 1982, 86).

Entry prox., DH•(19) to #5: 59.0	Prox., KI (42)-DH•(19): 31.1	
Entry prox., DR•(20) to #5: 56.1	Prox., KI (42)-DR•(20): 37.8	
Entry prox., DH•(35) to #5: 58.0	Prox., KI (42)-DH•(35): 48.8	
Entry prox., DR•(37) to #5: 32.2	Prox., KI (42)-DR•(37): 26.5	
Entry prox., DH◊(53) to #25: 9.7	Prox., KI (64)-DH◊(53): 26.2	
Entry prox., DH•(57) to #25: 54.6	Prox., KI (64)-DH•(57): 38.5	
Entry prox., DR•(58) to #25: 30.5	Prox., KI (64)-DR•(58): 13.5	
E) Entry access., KI (42) to #5: 7	Entry access., KI (64) to #25: 7	
Entry access., DH•(18) to #5: 6	Access., KI (42)-DH•(18): 5	
Entry access., DH•(19) to #5: 7	Access., KI (42)-DH•(19): 5	
Entry access., DR•(20) to #5: 8	Access., KI (42)-DR•(20): 7	
Entry access., DH•(35) to #5: 8	Access., KI (42)-DH•(35): 7	
Entry access., DR•(37) to #5: 6	Access., KI (42)-DR•(37): 7	
Entry access., DH◊(53) to #25: 4	Access., KI (64)-DH◊(53): 6	
Entry access., DH•(57) to #25: 8	Access., KI (64)-DH•(57): 7	
Entry access., DR•(58) to #25: 6	Access., KI (64)-DR•(58): 5	
F) Sight perc., KI (42)-DH•(18): N	Sound perc., KI (42)-DH•(18): T	Smell perc., KI (42)-DH•(18): F
Sight perc., KI (42)-DH•(19): N	Sound perc., KI (42)-DH•(19): F	Smell perc., KI (42)-DH•(19): F
Sight perc., KI (42)-DR•(20): N	Sound perc., KI (42)-DR•(20): F	Smell perc., KI (42)-DR•(20): F
Sight perc., KI (42)-DH•(35): N	Sound perc., KI (42)-DH•(35): F	Smell perc., KI (42)-DH•(35): F
Sight perc., KI (42)-DR•(37): N	Sound perc., KI (42)-DR•(37): T	Smell perc., KI (42)-DR•(37): F
Sight perc., KI (64)-DH◊(53): N	Sound perc., KI (64)-DH◊(53): T	Smell perc., KI (64)-DH◊(53): F
Sight perc., KI (64)-DH•(57): N	Sound perc., KI (42)-DH•(57): T	Smell perc., KI (64)-DH•(57): F
Sight perc., KI (64)-DR•(58): N	Sound perc., KI (64)-DR•(58): T	Smell perc., KI (64)-DR•(58): F

G) Environmental amenities, dining areas: All dining areas were well-lit by the open areas onto which they faced; the dining areas off peristyles (17, 32, 56) would especially have been afforded air, with the possible exception of DR•(20), which had an antechamber separating it from the E portico of (17). The aspects of all dining areas off the peristyles were carefully constructed; all possessed oblique views at the colonnades and the gardens within (Figs. 5.32). DH•(18) and DH•(35) also had two columns *in antis* framing their wide doorways. Dwyer (1982, 88-96) has restored the life-size bronze Apollo Citarista (a copy of a fifth c. B.C. original) to the SE corner of (32), in plain view of DH•(35). Elsewhere in the same peristyle (exact location unknown), was a large marble altar with relief decoration on all sides. Most of the sculptural decoration from the house was found in peristyle (17). A bronze sculptural group stood on the W edge of the semi-circular fountain basin, and consisted of (left to right): leaping stag, leaping lion, boar attacked by two dogs, and a serpent. The whole ensemble was flanked by two marble double-herms. The

group was arranged especially for viewing through the wide colonnaded entranceway of DH•(18) (a room usually termed an 'exedra', Fig. 5.31). In addition, marble oscilla carved with reliefs of Pan and fauns hung from the architrave, between the columns. Mythological creatures of nature, and wild beasts in action against the backdrop of a fountain created an active natural landscape contained by the forest of the peristyle columns. The architecture and sculpture were complemented in DH•(18) by a frieze of three 'villa and landscape' scenes painted on the walls. The scene would have been appropriate for any sort of gathering, including dinner; occupants of DH•(18) could have imagined themselves dining outside when they were actually inside. The NE aspect of the hall would have been coolly appropriate to summer dining, with the statuary catching the facing rays of the evening sun and reflecting them back into DH•(18). It is tempting to associate dining areas that face NE (18, 37, 57) with summer dining, and dining areas that face SW (19, 20, 35, 58) with winter dining. However, a variety of architectural forms (both wide and narrow doorways, both small and large rooms) are found in both sets of dining areas; there does not seem to be a simple correlation between the shape of a dining area and its supposed seasonal orientation. Perhaps an array of different architectural settings for dining were available for each season; individual rooms within the array could have been chosen according to the occasion.

H) Installation amenities, cooking areas: KI (42) has a broad masonry ST of sub-type (1) along the N wall (l. 2.62; w. 1.04; h. 0.68) (Figs. 5.9-5.27-5.28). Parts of the tiled surface and the back curb of upright tiles against the kitchen wall survive at the E end of the stove. Opposite the stove on the S side is a SO built into the wall shared with the bath complex (40-41) (Fig. 5.29). Above this oven is a flattened area of polygonal shape with a cut channel leading to the SW towards the apsed niche in the *caldarium* (41) of the baths. This channel presumably held a lead pipe that brought water heated in a metal tank down to fill the tub in the apse. A segment of lead pipe rests today in front of the stove, but it is not clear that it is *in situ*. No pieces of the tank survive; the bath complex was scavenged after the eruption, and such a large amount of metal must have been worth the effort of removing. The oven, while heating water for the baths, also would have been suitable for cooking food and perhaps even baking small amounts of bread. The hypocaust system of the baths was not heated by the oven, but by a stokehole, the W wall of which survives; the E wall has been restored on the detailed plan (Fig. 5.9). The placement of this stokehole served to heat a rectangular tub that took up the entire N wall of *caldarium* (41).

Accommodations for light and ventilation were minimal; the small open court (43) to the SE may have been the only source for both. Excavation was never carried out to clear the various 'basins' and 'wells' in this area, so it is difficult to precisely ascertain their functions. However, it is clear that water sources were ample. Water was collected from the small court (43), and from a plastered quarter-circle shaped basin (straight sides 0.94 x 0.84) in the NE corner of corridor (38b) that presumably drew from an underground cistern. Water was also collected from the peristyles

and atria elsewhere in the house. Immediately behind (E) of the masonry staircase in (38b) is a circular construction (d. 0.65) which was probably a pit for waste; traces of a narrow channel cut in the floor leading to this construction are still visible on its NW edge. A small plastered sink was also fit in a corner just S of the E end of the ST (Fig. 5.28). In the NW corner of the kitchen, a latrine adjacent to the W end of the stove was closed off from the rest of the room by partition walls; it was entered via a doorway on its S side (Figs. 5.9, 5.27). The arrangement of upper floor rooms gained by the staircase in (38b) is unclear; perhaps they were living quarters for the servants or storage space. The small room (m) (which may have once served as a cistern) at the E end of corridor (38b), was lit only by a small oculus in its vaulted ceiling; the walls and floor are well-plastered. It was probably used for cool storage.

KI (64) contains a low HE of sub-type (1) in the SW corner (l. 1.90; w. 0.96; h. 0.37); traces of the tiled surface survive (Fig. 5.30). Water must have come from the cistern-heads in peristyle (56) and the large storage or work room (55), paved in *opus signinum*. No accommodations for drainage are visible today in KI (64); perhaps a drain ran out to the street under the E wall. A window in the E wall admits light and provides some ventilation; two other windows were installed in the same wall along the connected corridor and storage area to the S. The E wall of (64), part of the corridor running to the S, has a series of seven square holes set at irregular intervals at 1.50 m. above the floor. These holes presumably held small wooden beams or brackets for shelving along the wall. Rooms (62, 63) may also have served for storage.

The find of a BZ in court (21), taken as an indication of cult activity (see below), may also be evidence for small scale cooking in an open area adjacent to the light, air and water of peristyles (17, 32) and the storage and work areas around court (26) (Fig. 5.22). Many household objects such as furniture feet (for couches?), a candelabrum, glassware, and a jewelry collection were found in rooms (22-24), suggesting to Dwyer (1982, 101-103) that the main living quarters of the house were located there. This area was located adjacent to the stables, and may have become the quarters of the household staff in the last period of the house's use.

Installation amenities, dining areas: In DH•(35) were found bone inlays, a pommel and pieces of bronze, all of which Minervini (1853, 117) believed belonged to a piece of furniture, probably a couch appropriate for dining. No direct evidence for furniture or finds associated with dining are reported from any other dining areas.

I) Decorative amenities, cooking areas: KI (42) has a floor of *opus signinum* and patches of faded plaster on the wall, especially in the area of latrine. The latrine also has a worn stone threshold and a tiled floor that slopes down towards the cesspit on the N. Rudimentary rough white plaster also survives in patches on the walls of KI (64).

Decorative amenities, dining areas: Much of the pictorial decoration from this house was removed to the Naples Museum after its excavation. The floor of DH•(18) had a B&W mosaic

border for a central carpet of marble slabs. A medallion of a bearded man and a frieze of three villa and landscape scenes of the 4th style were painted on the walls. The room also had a stuccoed ceiling vault. DH•(19) had a very fine B&W mosaic pavement, and painting of the early 3rd style, depicting Maenads on a large panel on the S wall; the panel stood above friezes of still lifes, marine scenes and gardens (Fig. 5.32). DR•(20) possessed a white pavement with scattered inserted marble chips (2-1 c. B.C.). On the walls, three large panels (of the early 3rd style) presented Croesus and Atys?, two lovers (Mars & Venus, Dido & Aeneas?), and Leda or Nemesis with the swan. The N wall in court (21) had a large painted scene of the Judgment of Paris in early 3rd style. This area may have originally been a dining hall similar to DH•(19); later, its E and S walls were broken up by doorways to surrounding rooms. The floor of DH•(35) had a 2nd style B&W mosaic meander border; two 4th style large panels of the wall decoration survived, showing Orestes & Pylades at Tauris, and Bacchus and Ariadne. DR•(37) had a white mosaic floor with a B&W border, and 4th style panels of Io, Argus & Mercury, Adonis & Venus, and Endymion. The 4th style walls of DH•(53) were painted with a violet ground edged in yellow, with still lifes centered in the central panels. The painting in DH•(57) has virtually faded away; traces of red ground panels survive. A threshold of marble slabs marks DR•(58), plants decorated the socle, with 4th style panels above, one of which apparently once showed Adonis with Cupids (Fig. 5.33).

J) Sanctity: Portrait busts of family ancestors and a bronze altar were recovered from atrium (6), and a silver statuette of a togate 'sacrificant' was found in atrium (47). A marble altar with fine reliefs was found in peristyle (32), and two herms were associated with the sculptural group that faced DR•(18). In (21), ritual objects (two bronze altars and two bronze statuettes of Minerva) were found with a brazier, which Dwyer (1982, 100-101) interprets as "important evidence of the domestic cult." A small arcuated niche above the sink in KI (42) suitable for a lamp or a shrine is the only other possible piece evidence for ritual associated with cooking (Fig. 5.28). No built shrines or '*lararium*' paintings existed in the house.

S y n t h e s i s

This house has arranged its formal reception and dining areas at the ends of its three large peristyles in order to supply visitors to those rooms with carefully constructed views to the central gardens and the columns that frame the tableaux. The dining areas comprise a spectrum of sizes and shapes, from the smaller basic dining rooms (20, 37, 58) to the broad rooms (18, 53), smaller dining-hall (57), and the extremely large halls (19, 35). Each of these rooms has a different view, aspect, and decoration, allowing a specific occasion to be fit to a specific setting.

Two kitchens were available, one for each of the two originally separate houses at #5 and #25. Both kitchens were set up down narrow corridors that kept them out of sight. KI (42) was

by far the most elaborate, constructed efficiently next to the baths with all amenities for heat, water and drainage provided. KI (64), containing only a simple hearth, might seem to have been put out of use after the two houses were joined, but the position of the HE against two piers of *opus listatum* (a construction style usually taken to postdate A.D. 62)²⁸ shows that the HE was installed after the two houses were connected.

The owners made clear distinctions between the cooking and dining areas. For dining, they emphasized a topography of architectural and artistic display designed to intrigue and impress, through a variety of oblique views to the peristyle gardens. As members of an established local nobility, the *Popidiae* must have had frequent occasion to entertain, and they built for themselves numerous settings in which to do so. The cooking areas, especially (42), were constructed to be beyond the ken of guests to the house, invisible and largely imperceivable by hearing or smell. The location of the cooking and dining areas for what must have been a sizable household staff remains unclear. Perhaps the once regal court (21), with its brazier, remains of furniture, and room (30') (with simple red-socle decoration and of suitable size for dining), was transformed late in the house's life to serve as servants' quarters. The complex and hierarchical layout of the house, centered on peristyle (17), implies a highly hierarchical household structure in which display for dining is the focus, and the *foci* themselves are marginalized.

4. I.4.7, Fullonica di Passaratus e Maenianus, (work)shop (Figs. 2.3, 5.2, 5.10, 5.27, 5.34)

Synopsis

This small establishment consists of a front room (c) with three plastered and paved 'basins' formed by three short low walls extending S from the N wall, added to the W wall of room (a) (Fig. 5. 34). The basins were found fitted with a lead pipe (*fistula*) and are interpreted as treading stalls for a *fullonica*. The identification is assisted by an electoral recommendation made by a fuller near the door of (I.4.5). Behind the front room is a small room (a), and an elongated room (b), once connected by doorways (later blocked up) to (I.4.5). A row of beam holes over room (a) implies an upper floor, but there is no evidence for an interior staircase. Fiorelli suggested that (b) "è forse un triclinio", but provided no supporting evidence, and the identification remains speculative. Two individuals, Passaratus and Maenianus, are mentioned in a dipinto at the entrance to this property.

References

CTP IIIA, 8-9; Moeller 1976, 41, #25; Della Corte 1954, 220, #520-521; Mau 1882, 413; Fiorelli 1875, 66; Fiorelli 1873, 68, BdI 1858, 144.

²⁸See Ling 1983, 38.

Data

A) Total area:	65.2	Nodes:	24.7	Connectors:	0	Static spaces:	40.5
B) Total # spaces:	3	# Nodes:	1	# Connectors:	0	# Static spaces:	2
C) Area, DR(b):	21.9	Length, DR(b):	6.93			Width, DR(b):	3.16
D) Entry prox., DR(b):	9.0	E) Entry access, DR(b):	4				
I) Decorative amenities, DR(b): Portions of white plaster remain on the N and E walls; Mau reports 3rd style decoration on a black ground.							

Synthesis

If dining ever took place in back room (b) of this workshop-house, no evidence remains, nor any evidence for cooking. It is perhaps best to characterize back rooms (a, b) simply as multipurpose living, work and storage areas.

5. I.4.8, 10, Tabernae, (work)shops (Figs. 2.3, 5.2, 5.11)
--

Synopsis

These two shops flanking the entrance to (I.4.9) were already described as "ruined" by Fiorelli. I.4.8 has two masonry podia just inside the shop on either side of the door, and a staircase in back to a loft. I.4.10 once connected to (I.4.9) but later blocked off, has no internal features. No evidence for cooking or eating can be assigned to either shop, as the record of finds in the PAH is mixed with the excavation of other buildings.

References

CTP IIIA, 8-9; Gassner 1986, 128; Dwyer, PG 1980 (5), 5; Fiorelli 1875, 66; Fiorelli 1873, 68; Niccolini II, "Descr. Gen.", 79, PAH II, 617-620 (27 Set. - 3 Ott. 1855).

Data (I.4.8)

A) Total area:	19.0	Nodes:	16.9	Connectors:	2.1	Static spaces:	0.0
B) Total # spaces:	2	# Nodes:	1	# Connectors:	1	# Static spaces:	0

Data (I.4.10)

A) Total area:	23.1	Nodes:	23.1	Connectors:	0.0	Static spaces:	0.0
B) Total # spaces:	1	# Nodes:	1	# Connectors:	0	# Static spaces:	0

6. I.4.9, Casa, <i>casa piccola</i> (Figs. 1.21, 2.3, 5.2, 5.11, 5.35-36)

Synopsis

This is a small house with side rooms only on the N of atrium (b). A large *tablinum* (h) rests in back with wide doorways onto both the atrium and a narrow open court (n). A passageway (i) leads past the *tablinum* and provides access to a stairway to upper floor rooms on

the N and to the court (n) at the back of the house. The court contains a cistern-head, and an arcuated, plastered niche rests in the back wall. The court accesses a KI with a latrine in (o) on the S, and reaches DH•(m) via a short corridor to the N (Fig. 5.35). DH•(m) was obtained from house (I.4.22), likely prior to its 3rd style redecoration towards the mid first century A.D.

References

Jashemski 1993, 32; PPM I, 178-180; PPP I, 14; CTP IIIA, 8-9; Dwyer, PG 1980 (5), 5-6; Boyce 1937, 24, #30; Bastet & De Vos 1979, 114, 139; Mau 1882, 413; Fiorelli 1875, 66; Fiorelli 1873, 68; Niccolini II, "Descr. Gen.", 79.

Data

A) Total area:	247.1	Nodes:	77.8	Connectors:	35.4	Static spaces:	135.3
B) Total # spaces:	16	# Nodes:	2	# Connectors:	5	# Static spaces:	9
C) Area, KI (o):	6.9	Area, DH•(m):	32.5	Length, DH•(m):	6.68	Width, DH•(m):	5.01
D) Entry prox., KI (o):	22.5	Entry prox., DH•(m):	24.4	Prox, KI (o)-DH•(m):	9.0		
E) Entry access., KI (o):	7	Entry access., DH•(m):	8	Access, KI (o)-DH•(m):	4		
F) Sight perc., KI (o)-DH•(m):	V	Sound perc., KI (o)-DH•(m):	T	Smell perc., KI (o)-DH•(m):	F		

G) Environmental amenities, DH•(m): Light and air were admitted to this hall from court (n) to the S. The only line of sight was also via this court directly to kitchen (o), although the kitchen may not have been visible if doors were interposed. The high vaulted roof of the hall would have remedied somewhat the extremely enclosed nature of the space.

H) Installation amenities, KI (o): Tucked into the SE corner of the kitchen is an L-shaped ST, sub-type (1), of masonry with a tiled top. It measures from w. 0.32 and h. 0.44 at the NE end to w. 0.73, h. 0.73 on the SW end (Fig. 35). Light, ventilation and water was provided by the court (n) and its cistern to the N. Drainage was likely provided by the latrine in the W half of the kitchen, on the other side of a short partition wall. Fiorelli reports that the seat of the latrine was supported by two column drums; one stuccoed and fluted colonnette remains *in situ*. The latrine was also associated in some way with a small alcove (w. 0.60, l. 0.60) in the SW corner of the room, used either as part of the latrine construction or for storage. Most storage must have been elsewhere in the house, perhaps in the storage nook under the stairs to the upper floor, or in the narrow room (d) off the atrium.

Installation amenities, DH•(m): Storage for table wares was perhaps in the cupboard-like space underneath the stairs to the upper floor, just S of the dining-hall.

I) Decorative amenities, DH•(m): An *opus sectile* emblema marks the center of the pavement (Fig. 36). The walls with red ground panels are of the 3rd style; painted pilasters divide the hall into a back part for dining, and a front service area (PPM I, 179, #1a-b).

J) Sanctity: An arcuated niche-shrine with a small shelf and a plain plastered interior occupies the back wall of court (n), directly between the cooking and dining areas (Figs. 1.21, 5.35). The shrine is on a direct axis through the *tablinum* (h) to the front door at (a). As the focus of a 'deep view' from the entrance, the niche is a point of reference for drawing the visitor into and through the house, eventually towards DR•(m).²⁹

Synthesis

Both KI (o) and DH•(m) are reached via corridors and the narrow court (n), the nexus at the back of the house. The cooking and dining areas, sequestered from the atrium, are barely inter-visible. There is little concern for occluding service areas or impressing potential guests with the situation of the dining area. DH•(m) is spacious and well-decorated, but surprisingly so to the person passing its threshold. Perhaps the lack of other rooms suitably sized for dining and the opportunity to purchase DH•(m) from (I.4.22) explain its position. The internalized nature of the hall must have contributed a secluded air to any dining occasion.

7. I.4.11, Caupona di Copiosus, diner (Figs. 2.3, 5.2, 5.11, 5.37-38)

Synopsis

This property has a counter and a large urn at the entrance of the front room (a). A narrow room to the NE contains a HE, and an entrance on the SE leads to room (b). Behind this room is the narrow (porch?) DI◊(c) that looks onto garden (d). The garden had a latrine in the SE corner, separated by a small partition wall, and a shrine painting and altar against the N wall. The name Copiosus was painted at the right of the entrance, and Della Corte suggests that he was the owner of this *caupona*, although the inscription does not say so. Fiorelli suggested that either or both (b) and DI◊(c) could have been used by customers of the tavern, i.e. they were places to eat. Of the two, DI◊(c) with its aspect onto the garden seems the more likely choice, as (b) must have been used largely as a corridor between the front and back parts of the house. However, Fiorelli's lack of supporting evidence makes the identification hypothetical.

References

Jashemski 1993, 32; CTP IIIA, 8-9; Dwyer, PG 1980 (5), 5; Della Corte 1954, 220, #519; Boyce 1937, 25, #31; Fiorelli 1875, 66; Fiorelli 1873, 68, 110 #53; PAH II, 627 (21 Dic. 1855).

Data

A) Total area:	83.2	Nodes:	25.7	Connectors:	13.3	Static spaces:	44.2
B) Total # spaces:	6	# Nodes:	1	# Connectors:	1	# Static spaces:	4
C) Area, HE in (a):	4.5	Area, DI◊(c):	10.0	Length, DI◊(c):	4.35	Width, DI◊(c):	2.29

²⁹See Watts 1987, 142-145 for a definition and discussion of the 'deep view'.

- D) Entry prox., HE in (a): 5.5 Entry prox., DI(c): 10.1 Prox., HE in (a)-DI(c): 6.8
 E) Entry access., HE in (a): 3 Entry access., DI(c): 4 Access., HE in (a)-DI(c): 4
 F) Sight perc., HE in (a)-DI(c): N Sound perc., HE in (a)-DI(c): T Smell perc., HE in (a)-DI(c): T
 G) Environmental Amenities, DI(c): This possible dining area was offered light, air and greenery via a wide doorway onto the garden court (d), where an altar and a painting marked a sacred spot against the N wall.
 H) Installation Amenities, HE in (a): Against the S wall of the narrow room NE of (a) is a HE (l. 1.70, w. 0.55, h. 0.43 m.) of combined sub-types (1, 2), consisting of two rubble supports with a tile top. Between the supports is a gap of 0.33 m., spanned by a tile that rests on the edges of both platforms. The open space perhaps forms a kind of 'burner'. All light and ventilation must have been provided by the street through the front door. Water may have been collected from court (d), but no cisterns seem to have been built to contain it. Water was probably drawn from a public fountain 25 meters away at the NW corner of *insula* I.4. The latrine in the SE corner of (d) provided drainage, but the street itself was nearer to the HE. Some storage space may have been available in the back of the room with the HE.
 J) Sanctity: Fiorelli described a *lararium* painting on the N wall of (d) that depicted a *Genius* flanked by *Lares*, pouring libations at an altar that itself was flanked by two serpents. A masonry altar stood below the painted shrine. Nothing survives today.

S y n t h e s i s

The cooking area off of (a) was obvious to anyone on the street, but was concealed from all other parts of the property. A glimpse of what was cooking could have enticed customers into the establishment, perhaps to dine in one of the rooms behind. In addition, the counter at the front of (a) could have sold food or drink to passersby. But because the nature of what was sold at the front counter is not definitively known, and because neither (b) nor (c) have any secure evidence for being identified as dining areas, Fiorelli and Della Corte's suggestion that this building was a *caupona* must remain hypothetical.

8. I.4.12-14+17, Bakery; I.4.15-16, Taberna di D. Iunius Proculus, (work)shop
 (Figs. 2.3, 5.2, 5.12, 5.39)

S y n o p s i s

This complex of shops and baking facilities takes advantage of the major crossroads of the Via Stabiana and the Via dell'Abbondanza, on the corner opposite of the Terme Stabiane. Entrance #12 leads to a large work area (b) with mills, benches, and the LO (c). More work and storage space is found in (d, f), (e) is a small stable, and a staircase at (g) accesses an upper floor. Indirectly connected is #13-13A, which has a SO at the back and storage space in (b). Thence a

door reaches #17, complete with two *dolia* sunk in the ground, which also is connected to the main bakery at #12. Dipinti at #17 advertise the complex: *pistor* for the main bakery centered on the LO, and *pistor dulciarius* for the rooms associated with the SO. The front rooms at #12, 13-13A, #17 were probably retail space for the sale of the baked goods. Entrance #14 simply accesses a stairway to upper-story rooms.

The corner shop #15-16 is connected on the E to the baking complex via #17. Here in December of 1853 was found a bronze lamp with a plaque hanging underneath that announced the name of the shopkeeper: D·Ivni Proqvli. It is not clear what was made or sold in this shop, or how close the relationship was with the bakery complex behind. On the S wall of the shop are two niches, both were once painted and may have been shrines. At the street corner is a street fountain and a *castellum aquae* of the aqueduct system.

References

[Bakery I.4.12-14+17]: CTP IIIA, 8-9; Dwyer, PG 1980 (5), 4-5; Mayeske 1979, 46; Mayeske 1972, 84-86; Della Corte 1954, 213, #500; Fiorelli 1875, 66-67; Fiorelli 1873, 68-69; PAH (2), 576-577 (24 Ago - 12 Set. 1853), 589-592 (16-30 Mar. 1854).

[Taberna I.4.15-16]: Eschebach 1982, 23-24; Larsen 1982; Della Corte 1954, 213, #499; Boyce 1937, 25, #32; Fiorelli 1875, 67; Fiorelli 1873, 68-69; Minervini BAN (2), 118; PAH II, 587-588 (9-17 Dic. 1853).

Data

A) Total area: 383.7	Nodes: 211.2	Connectors: 56.1	Static spaces: 116.4
B) Total # spaces: 14	# Nodes: 4	# Connectors: 4	# Static spaces: 6

9. I.4.18, I.4.19, I.4.20-21, Tabernae, (work)shops (Figs. 2.3, 5.2, 5.13, 5.40-5.42)

Synopsis

Shop #18 has a large front room (a) and a smaller back room (b), which Fiorelli calls a *cubiculum*. A stair on the E (no longer extant) led to upper-floor rooms, the doorway for one of which still survives, and a storage niche is cut into the back wall (Fig. 5.40). Della Corte identifies this shop with the *dissignator* Sabinus, who recommends the election of M. Epidius Sabinus in a lengthy notice near the entrance to this shop. Michaelis mentions the finds from this shop, which include a bronze vase, small terracotta and glass vessels, and "un piccolo [terracotta] fornello in mezzo della stanza". No fornello can be seen in the shop today; it was probably a portable cooking device of some kind (akin to those pictured in Figs. 1.10-1.11). The find does attest to the use of compact, portable cooking appliances in the limited space of a small (work)shop.

The shop at #19 has front and back rooms (a, b) of comparable size and shape; Fiorelli again identifies (b) as a *cubiculum*. A stair in the front room leads to the upper floor, over a

storage niche in the E wall (Fig. 5.41). Finds reported in the PAH include a broken bronze cauldron (h. 0.22 m.), a bronze pastry-mould, a small bronze vase with lid, an iron knife blade and a scraper, a glass cup, two carafes and bottle, three ceramic cups, three small terracotta vases and two lids, several lamps, an amphora and two large ceramic "dripping pans" (*scolatoi di acqua*), the intact one (l. 1.19, w. 0.79 m.) patched with lead. The list of finds contains clear evidence for cooking and eating activity and suggests as well some kind of industrial production in the "dripping pans", probably the terracotta moulds whose later misplacement in the neighboring Casa del Pressorio Terracotta (I.4.22) gave their name to that house.

Shop #20 consists of one room, connected with a staircase with its own entrance off the street at #21 to upper floor rooms. Fiorelli reports that two urns were sunk into the ground underneath the stairs (Fig. 5.42).³⁰

References

Gassner 1986, 128; CTP II, 227, n. 1; CTP IIIA, 8-9; Della Corte 1954, 203 (#489b), 213 (#501) [I.4.18]; Fiorelli 1875, 67; Fiorelli 1873, 69; Michaelis, BdI 1858, 133-134 [I.4.18]; PAH II, 662-663 (18 Mag - 12 Giu. 1858) [I.4.19].

Data (I.4.18)

A) Total area:	41.2	Nodes:	31.6	Connectors:	2.7	Static spaces:	10.3
B) Total # spaces:	3	# Nodes:	1	# Connectors:	1	# Static spaces:	1

Data (I.4.19)

A) Total area:	39.2	Nodes:	19.3	Connectors:	4.1	Static spaces:	19.5
B) Total # spaces:	3	# Nodes:	1	# Connectors:	1	# Static spaces:	1

Data (I.4.20-21)

A) Total area:	18.7	Nodes:	18.0	Connectors:	5.0	Static spaces:	0.0
B) Total # spaces:	2	# Nodes:	1	# Connectors:	1	# Static spaces:	0

10. I.4.22, Casa del pressorio di terracotta, *casa piccola*
(Figs. 2.3, 5.2, 5.13, 5.43-5.44)

Synopsis

A long *fauces* (a) leads from the street to atrium (b), where a table (*cartibulum*) and a puteal rest behind the *impluvium*. On the E, Fiorelli identified (f) as a *cella penaria*. Breton reported a tub fitted with a furnace in *ala* (g), a work area that also contained a stair to the upper floor next to KI (h). On the S side of the atrium, in the traditional position of the *tablinum*, is

³⁰Fiorelli 1875, 67 corrects Fiorelli 1873, 69, which reports three urns under the stair.

H) Installation amenities, KI (h): A masonry ST of sub-type (1), l. 2.26, w. 0.54-0.69, h. 0.82 takes up most of the S wall towards the SE corner of the room (Fig. 5.43). It has a tiled surface, and has been heavily restored. Light and air are admitted via the door to the atrium, and by a slit window high up in the N wall onto the stairwell in (g). The water source was the cistern in the atrium which probably contained water drawn from the garden (k, l) as well as the atrium itself. There are no obvious accommodations for drainage. However, in the NE corner of the kitchen is a short wall (l. 0.75, w. 0.29, h. 0.08) that runs S from that corner along the E wall. Associated with this wall and W of it is a plastered area preserved for 0.75 x 0.70 m. This feature might be the remnant of either a basin, sink, or perhaps a latrine, all implying drainage. Another wall of comparable dimensions skirts the W wall of the KI in the SW corner. Both features are fragmentary; their functions are ultimately uncertain. In lieu of proper drains inside the house, the street was close enough for dumping waste water. Two holes, d. 0.10 m., are punched one above the other in the S wall above the counter; these would have supported shelving. Other storage may have been in room (f), as Fiorelli suggests, or perhaps the two small cells (m, n).

Installation amenities, dining areas: For DO◊(l), Soprano suggests that a rectangular area of 1.70 x 2.50 m. in the SE corner of the garden (l), paved in *cocciopesto*, was appropriate for locating a wooden dining-couch that has not survived.

I) Decorative amenities, dining areas: Both possible dining areas are devoid of decoration.

J) Sanctity: No ritual material is reported from this house.

S y n t h e s i s

The identification of dining in both DI◊(d) and DO◊(l) is tenuous; because of the ongoing renovation in the house at the time of the eruption, any decoration that might help identify the function or the visual impact of these rooms is absent. Based on the available evidence, however, it appears that cooking and dining were very much centered around the atrium, the only large space and the clear center of this small house. The kitchen and both dining areas were all moreover visible to visitors emerging from the narrow entrance corridor. Finally, there may have been some effort to create seasonal dining spaces, with DI◊(d) off the atrium for use in winter, and DO◊(l) for summer. Practicality and convenience appear to be the rationale behind the spatial patterning of cooking and eating. However, framing the *impluvium* for the view from DO◊(l) does reveal some desire to construct the best vista for dining that the house could offer.

11. I.4.23-24, Tabernae, (work)shop (Figs. 2.3, 5.2, 5.13)

S y n o p s i s

This complex once consisted of two shops, each with a back room. The front rooms of both shops were joined in their last phase of use. The shop at #23 has a doorway that connects to

fauces (a) of (I.4.22), and a window in its back room (b) that connects with the atrium (b) of the same house, so it is possible that the owner of (I.4.22) also had an interest in these two shops. No cooking or dining evidence is reported, but some carbonized olives that may have been discovered here (PAH II, 664).

References

CTP IIIA, 8-9; Gassner 1986, 128; Fiorelli 1875, 68; Fiorelli 1873, 69; PAH II, 661 (19-23 Apr.), 663-664 (16 Giu. - 6 Ago.?).

Data

A) Total area: 69.7	Nodes: 36.9	Connectors: 0.0	Static spaces: 32.8
B) Total # spaces: 3	# Nodes: 1	# Connectors: 0	# Static spaces: 2

12. I.4.26, Fullonica di Dionysios, (work)shop (Figs. 2.3, 5.2, 5.14, 5.45)

Synopsis

In the SW corner of the main room of this workshop are the remains of a small basin with *opus signinum* lining; just to the E along the S wall is a fragmentary wall of a hearth or furnace (Fig. 5.39). Mau noted fragmentary decoration of the 1st and 2nd style near the same corner of the room. To the W is a small room (b) with a latrine under the stairs to the upper floor from #25; to the E is a large room (a) with a window onto the street. The installations in the main room led Moeller to identify the property as an *officina lanifricaria*. Electoral recommendations to the E of the entrance by a freedman Dionysios (who identifies himself as a fuller) for his patron L. Popidius Secundus (occupant of I.4.5+25) indicate a dependent relationship of this small establishment upon the Casa del Citarista. Hypothetically, the hearth / furnace could have been used for cooking as well as working, and the large room (a) might have provided eating-space as well as storage, work, and living space. However, if the proprietor was a freedman of the Casa del Citarista, he and his staff may well have lived and eaten in the large house.

References

Moeller 1976, 31, #2; Dwyer, PG 1980 (5), 7; Della Corte 1954, 213-214, #503-504; Mau 1882, 64; Fiorelli 1875, 68; Fiorelli 1873, 69; PAH II, 665-667 (11 Ago., 25-27 Ago.?), 670 (29 Ott.).

Data

A) Total area: 52.3	Nodes: 23.6	Connectors: 0.0	Static spaces: 28.7
B) Total # spaces: 4	# Nodes: 1	# Connectors: 0	# Static spaces: 3
C) Area, HE: 2.5			

13. I.4.27, Popina, lunch-counter (Figs. 2.3, 2.18, 5.2, 5.14, 5.46)

Synopsis

This eating establishment exploits the street corner. A tile-topped L-shaped counter fronts the Via dell'Abbondanza; two jars are immured in the counter on the W side, in line with a burner for a HE of sub-type (4) built into the end of the counter (Figs. 2.18, 5.46). At the back of this main room is a staircase to an upper floor, under which is a latrine (a) (Fig. 2.18). A small room (b) lies to the S of the flight of stairs, with a window in the E wall onto the street. A pair of painted gladiators engaged in combat were reported from the building, perhaps located on the E wall behind the counter where traces of paint still remain.

References

CTP IIIA, 8-9; Schefold 1957, 17; Sogliano 1879, 218, #667; Fiorelli 1875, 68; Fiorelli 1873, 69.

Data

A) Total area: 45.7	Nodes: 29.4	Connectors: 5.4	Static spaces: 12.7
B) Total # spaces: 4	# Nodes: 1	# Connectors: 1	# Static spaces: 2
C) Area, HE: 2.5			

14. I.6.1, Officina, (work)shop (Figs. 2.4, 5.3, 5.15, 5.47)

Synopsis

This small workshop had a rectangular HE (no longer extant) consisting of a single π -shaped burner near the center of the front room (1). In the W wall of the same room, near the HE, was a rectangular niche with a stuccoed interior, painted with leaves and fruit; this was probably a shrine. In the SE corner of the same room, stairs led N along the wall, over the ruins of two basins; traces of a third basin were identified in the SW corner, all evidence for some former function of the building. Two back rooms open off (1) (Fig. 5.47). To the W, room (2) has a furniture niche in the S end of the W wall, of a size suitable for a bed. Room (3) has a long masonry bench along its E wall, topped with tile. At the S end of the bench, a chimney built of stacked amphora necks relieved the room of fumes created by the fires started on the counter. A latrine occupied the small space to the S under the stairway to the upper floor of the adjacent house (I.6.2). Numerous iron and bronze implements and tools were found, especially in room (3), including an iron anvil and hammer. This evidence led to its identification as a blacksmithy. The presence of a likely bedroom in (2) and more upper floor space indicates furthermore that the proprietors lived in the same space. The residents may have cooked either at the hearth in room (1) under the gaze of household gods in the niche, or upon the bench used for working metal in room (3). There is no evidence for where they may have eaten.

References

Gralfs 1988, 79-82; CTP IIIA, 10-11; Boyce 1937, 25, #35; Beccarini 1922, 12; Della Corte, NSc 1913, 450-451, 476-477.

Data

A) Total area: 57.3	Nodes: 23.2	Connectors: 5.5	Static spaces: 31.6
B) Total # spaces: 5	# Nodes: 1	# Connectors: 1	# Static spaces: 3

15. I.6.2+16 Casa del Criptoportico, *casa grande* (Figs. 2.4, 2.46, 5.3, 5.15, 5.48-5.50)

Synopsis

Houses I.6.2 and I.6.4 are often discussed together because they were joined for much of their period of habitation. The cooking and dining arrangements present when the properties were joined is considered below in the synopsis for the Casa del Sacello Iliaco (I.6.4). In the last phase of their occupation, the houses were separated as part of the renovations undertaken at each property. Each house will therefore be considered separately.

The Casa del Criptoportico was entered by a long and narrow entrance (1) that led into the tetrastyle atrium (2), with a *tablinum* (6) at back, and various smaller cells (3, 4, 7) on the sides. DR◇(5) occupied most of the E side of the atrium, near the passage back to the small peristyle garden. Only plain plaster decoration remains in the atrium. Four small rooms (8-11) looked out upon the peristyle garden (12) to the W. In the N portico of (12) at the W end was the only decoration preserved in this part of the house, a ritual/garden scene focused on a niched shrine. Flights of steps led up to a loggia, DO/DB (16), which looked over a sunken garden at the center of a cryptoporticus, and accessed several rooms (13-15) to the E (Fig. 5.49). The house was not originally connected directly to the cryptoporticus itself. The stairways from (12) down to the galleries, and up to the loggia (16) were late installations, added after the owners of (I.6.2) gained sole custody of the cryptoporticus and access from (I.6.4) was cut off. This major transformation postdates the earthquake of A.D. 62, when the underground galleries were damaged, their W and E wings were filled up with debris, and the level of the garden (30) was raised. Only the N gallery of the cryptoporticus [17] was kept in use as a storage area. At the same time, the original N portico of the garden was walled off into a loggia or *solarium* (16). Masonry dining-couches and benches were installed at the W end, a small stove to serve the dining area was built at the NE corner, and the loggia was made accessible to the garden (30) via a short flight of steps (Figs. 5.15, 5.48-5.49). Eleven victims of the eruption were discovered in the garden.

A dipinto outside the entrance consists of the name Carus; attempts by Spinazzola and Della Corte to connect this name with the poet T. Lucretius Carus have not been widely accepted.

Scholars generally agree however, that an elite family owned both (I.6.2) and (I.6.4) before circumstances dictated the break-up and sale of the property to owners of lesser means. The Casa del Criptoportico in its last phase has been interpreted, on the basis of the masonry dining area in (16), as a locale for public dining and entertainment.

References

Jashemski 1993, 34-35; PPM I, 193-277; Fröhlich 1991, 251, #L4; De Albentis 1990, 196-198; Richardson 1988a, 167-169; PPP I, 15-26; CTP IIIA, 10-11; Guida Laterza 1982, 106-108; Salza Prina Ricotti 1978/80, 268-271; Fabbriotti 1976, 89-92; Guida 1976, 199-204; Beyen 1960, 82-119; Schefold 1957, 17-22; Della Corte 1954, 240-243, #583-584; Spinazzola I, 121-122, 435-593, II, 905-970; Soprano 1950, 294-295, #4; Maiuri 1942a, 150, 182, 204-205; Pernice 1938, 51-52, 61-62; Boyce 1937, 25, #36; Maiuri NSc 1933, 252-276; Della Corte 1927, 19-20; Beccarini 1922, 10-15; Spinazzola NSc 1914, 256-263, 364-368; Della Corte NSc 1914, 74-75, 399-402.

Data (not including 23 underground spaces of the cryptoporticus that take up 567.8 m²)

A) Total Area:	1308.2	Nodes:	853.2	Connectors:	57.4	Static spaces:	400.4
B) Total # spaces:	26	# Nodes:	3	# Connectors:	6	# Static spaces:	15
C) Area, ST in (16):	2.5	Area, DR(5):	22.9	Length, DR(5):	5.56	Width, DR(5):	4.11
		Area, DO (16):	22.3	Length, DO (16):	5.02	Width, DO (16):	4.58
		Area, DB (16):	5.1	Length, DB (16):	7.23	Width, DB (16):	0.40
D) Entry prox., ST in (16):	42.5	Entry prox., DR(5):	20.2	Prox, ST in (16)-DR(5):	23.6		
		Entry prox., DO/DB (16):	51.1	Prox, ST in (16)-DO/DB (16):	8.7		
E) Entry access., ST in (16):	9	Entry access., DR(5):	5	Access, ST in (16)-DR(5):	7		
		Entry access., DO/DB (16):	9	Access, ST in (16)-DO/DB (16):	3		
F) Sight perc., ST in (16)-DR(5):	N						
	Sound perc., ST in (16)-DR(5):	T		Smell perc., ST in (16)-DR(5):	F		
	Sight Perc., ST in (16)-DO/DB (16):	E					
	Sound Perc., ST in (16)-DO/DB (16):	T		Smell Perc., ST in (16)-DO/DB (16):	T		

G) Environmental amenities, dining areas: The preparations for light made in DR(5) include a window W onto atrium (2), a door to the corridor, and two windows in the E wall onto the street. These small apertures do not offer large quantities of light, air, or any sort of view. Its closed form and lack of decoration suggest a winter dining area used when the more open DO/DB (16) was unseasonable.

DO/DB (16) on the other hand was granted ample light and air from garden (30). Five wide windows topped the S wall of the loggia, creating a parapet that was too high (ca. 1.8 m.) to see over (Figs. 2.46, 5.49). The dining-couches and benches faced NE, and the high windows and overhanging shed roof or bower would have kept the dining area in perpetual shade, away from

the hot summer sun and potential rain. The elevated position of the loggia over garden (30) (which slopes away to the S with the topography), would have beckoned evening breezes sweeping up towards Vesuvius.

H) Installation amenities, ST in (16): An alcove in the NE corner of (16) contains a single-arched ST (l. 1.35, w. 0.91, h. 0.87 m.) of sub-type (2), built of brick and masonry with a plastered face (Fig. 5.48). The arch of the ST is repeated in the vaulted ceiling of the alcove 1.9 m. above the tiled stove-top. Light and ventilation were afforded by the wide windows on the S side of the loggia, although some smoke would seem to have collected near the vaulted ceiling above the ST. Water was available from peristyle (12) to the N or garden (30) to the S; no drainage facilities are evident. The remaining (N) wing of the cryptoporticus, [17], seems to have been used for storage in this period; ca. seventy amphorae were recovered there -- the area has been identified as a *cella vinaria*. Both the latrine and the baths [18-21] off the E wing of the cryptoporticus were filled with debris and no longer in use in the last period of the house (Fig. 5.50).

Installation amenities, dining areas: No installations or evidence for dining equipment come from DR◊(5), but (Spinazzola I, 438) and (Beccarini 1922, 10) identify it as a 'triclinium' on their plans, perhaps because of its suitable proportions. The room perhaps no longer in use during the last period of the house.

Three masonry couches of the DO occupy the W end of loggia (16), with their open end towards the E (Figs. 2.46, 5.49). They measure ca. 4.4-4.7 m. long and ca. 1.6-2.0 wide, according to Soprano. Their top surfaces slope slightly towards their outside edges, and around the inside edge of the couches is a small sunken ledge for drinks to be set. The couches focus on a round masonry table 0.55 m. in diameter. The E edges of the *lectus summus* and the *lectus imus* are defined by raised borders, and beyond the borders to the E, dining benches are arranged. Both sets of benches are L-shaped, and repeat the form of the larger couches; they measure ca. 0.4 m. high and 0.4 m. wide, and provide a total seating length of 7.23 m. Against the E end of the N set of benches is a rectangular podium, 1.2 m. long, 0.7 m. wide, and 0.5 m. high. Spinazzola and subsequent scholars have suggested that the benches were used by children or persons of lower status; the podium is interpreted as a table for setting food, drink, and table services.

I) Decorative amenities, dining areas: No decoration is recorded or extant in DR◊(5). The floor of DO/DB (16) was paved with *opus signinum* that covered the original white mosaic pavement of the portico. The walls of (16) were plastered and painted in the 4th style with a red socle that was carried over to coat the dining couches, benches, and table; the faces of the furniture were then further elaborated with plants, birds and vases.

J) Sanctity: A shrine is present in at the W end of the N portico of peristyle (12), unassociated with any cooking or dining areas. A bust of Mercury is painted within a small arcuated niche with a projecting shelf. An altar with entwined snake is painted under the niche, and a large

snake rises towards the niche on the N, all in the context of a painted garden that pretends to continue the real garden in (12).

S y n t h e s i s

The stove in loggia (16) was conveniently installed to serve the dining couches and benches there. No effort was made to disguise the preparation or serving of the food, the sight and smell and noise of which were clearly discernible at the couches. The loggia was situated to take advantage of natural light and air, while being protected from severe sun, wind, or rain. While most comfortable in seasonable months, it could conceivably have been used the year round. This entertainment and reception suite is located at the back of the house in its last phase, reached only after a long series of corridors, courts, and a final narrow staircase. Oddly, the surprise of a wide vista over the large garden (30) in back is suppressed by the height of the parapet that defines the S edge of loggia (16). No attempt was made to impress banqueters on the couches with fine decoration or an impressive natural view. Attention is focused on the loggia itself; Spinazzola (I, 122) proposed that the space in front of the couches might have been used for entertainment, such as dancing.

Spinazzola (I, 445) originally interpreted the filling of most of the cryptoporticus, the use of [17] as storage for large amounts of wine and the installation of the masonry dining couches in (16) as evidence that the property had been sold to a person of lower standing and converted into a "pubblico ritrovo" (public dining establishment). Maiuri (NSc 1933, 253) put it slightly differently: "Nè v'ha forse in tutta la città dissepolta esempio di più brutale e violenta trasformazione di una casa patrizia in casa plebea." The Casa di Octavius Quartio (II.2.2) and the Praedia di Julia Felix (II.4) are analogies; both have masonry dining couches and aspects onto large gardens. The evidence for a profound change in the layout and use of the property is overwhelming indeed. The hypothesis that the property was converted into a commercial dining establishment is attractive, but rests upon the circumstantial evidence of masonry couches (which are often but not always associated with commercial dining, see I.7.10-12), and the large store of wine amphorae in the cryptoporticus. No inscriptional evidence confirms a public dining function for the property. The dining would have been located far from the street, through two narrow corridors; most dining establishments have dining areas near a (wide) entrance onto the street. If the house was rented out for banquets, only the back loggia and a slave staff were used, as there are no suitable facilities elsewhere in the house. The use of DI(5) is problematic; its apparent lack of decoration and furnishings suggest that it was not in use at the time of the eruption. Without further evidence, the question must remain open.

16. I.6.3, Officina e taberna di Verus, (work)shop (Figs. 2.4, 5.3, 5.15)

Synopsis

In the SW corner of the front room (a) of this shop is the base for stairs to an upper loft. The front room is simply decorated; the floor is *cocciopesto* with polychrome marble inserts. Turned up the base of the walls as a socle, the flooring joins the black and red line decoration on a white ground that covers the walls, dating to the first century A.D. The back room (b) has a window high up in its S wall onto the atrium of (I.6.2), reached by two doors from room (a).

Within the property, nearly 360 finds were recovered, including at least 150 metal objects, the great majority being bronze. Among the finds were a *groma* for land surveying, other technical instruments and 33 bronze vases that included candelabrae and twelve oinochoe. Notices to the W of the entrance name a Verus, who identifies himself as a *faber (aerarius)*. The manufacture, repair and sale of metal goods seem to have taken place at this establishment.

Most of the evidence for cooking or dining on the premises comes from (probably) an upper floor deposit. Found in the ash between the floor of (a) and ca. 0.5 m. above it were the remains of twenty coarseware terracotta vases, including plates, pots, jugs and bowls, and another twenty smashed glass bottles, plates, cups and jars.³¹ The terracotta set may have been used for cooking and serving; vessels could have been heated above rough cooking supports of the associated amphora fragments (single necks, or three toes can serve as supports; see I.7.18 and I.9.13-14, Fig. 5.153). The glass wares must have been for eating and drinking. Apparently stored in one of the several cabinets identified in room (a) were a glass ladle, four bowls and a small pot of terracotta, and a silver spoon. Work, business, and storage were carried out on the ground floor; there is evidence for cooking and eating (and storage) both upstairs and downstairs.

References

PPM I, 278-279; PPP I, 26; CTP IIIA, 10-11; Gralfs 1988, 64-68; Gassner 1986, 129; Guida Laterza 1982, 106; Della Corte 1954, 242-243, #585; Della Corte 1927, 18-19; Beccarini 1922, 12; Della Corte NSc 1912, 141, 143, 252-256, 181-182, 251-256.

Data

A) Total area: 50.4	Nodes: 29.4	Connectors: 6.8	Static spaces: 19.9
B) Total # spaces: 3	# Nodes: 1	# Connectors: 1	# Static spaces: 1

³¹Della Corte NSc 1912, 252-256: "...fra il pavimento e i 50 cm. di altezza, una ventina di vasi rustici di terracotta di ogni forma: p iatti, pignatte, boccali, urcei, ecc.; e di vetro, sempre in frammenti impossibili a ricomporsi, altri venti vasi circa fra bottiglie, piatti, tazze e barattoli."

17. I.6.4 Casa del Sacello Iliaco, <i>casa media</i> (Figs. 2.4, 5.3, 5.15-5.16, 5.50-5.54)

Synopsis

Long before the A.D. 62 earthquake, this house was connected directly to the garden and cryptoporticus that were afterwards ceded to (I.6.2). Room (3) of (I.6.2) to the E of the atrium was probably also part of the atrium complex of I.6.4. Rooms (p, q, s) had wide doorways opening S onto portico (16), which then extended around three sides of the garden (30) (Fig. 5.15). Space to the W of (s) was later given over to work-basins of the *fullonica* (I.6.7) next door, whose odor may have contributed to a general decline in property values and provided reason for the large house complex (I.6.2-4) to be broken up and sold separately. Both (p, s) were large halls whose functions likely included dining; they enjoyed a spacious view through the portico over the sunken garden towards the rugged Sorrentine coast in the distance. Both halls were served by KI (n), whose cooking facilities seem to have been installed before the reorganization of the house.³²

Additional reception and entertainment rooms were located underground, off the E wing of the cryptoporticus. Prior to its restructuring, the cryptoporticus was reached from (I.6.2-4) by a narrow staircase between [21] and [22] in the E portico, and via the postern door at #16. From the latter entrance, a visitor was introduced to vestibule (29). Thence the singular hot bath [28] was accessible; a series of storage and work areas [23-27] lay further to the E. To the N, a few steps led down from (29) past a small room (usually identified as a porter's lodge) and into the gallery proper, where a large-scale continuous 2nd style frieze of the Trojan cycle began on the left (W) and continued around all six walls of the W, N and E galleries, ending opposite the starting panel. High slotted windows provided light to the galleries from the central garden. A bath suite [18-21] located off the E wing included a *vestibulum* [21], *apodyterium/frigidarium* [20], *tepidarium* [19] and *caldarium* [18] in succession (Fig. 5.50). Maiuri (NSc 1933) has described the service area [F] for the bath suite that included a latrine E of [21] and a *praeefurnium* for the *caldarium* of the bath.

DR•[22] lay at the end of the corridor, a large and extremely well-decorated room used probably for both reception and dining. This room, of elongated dimensions (l. 3.67, w. 10.72 m.), was elaborately decorated with late 2nd style painting and a stuccoed barrel vault. The mosaic and marble pavement is divided into a small fore-part separated from the main part of the room by a mosaic band of geometric emblema. The painting echoes the epic cycle shown on the walls

³²The walls of KI (n) are of mixed chunks of dark tufa and yellow Sarno stone bound by mortar, the same construction as the stove, with squared blocks marking the S jamb of the door; these techniques may date anywhere within the Republican period. *Opus mixtum listatum* was used to repair part of the N jamb of the door; this technique is usually (but not exclusively, see Ling 1991a, 254) dated after A.D. 62 (see Berry 1993, 10; Ling 1983, 38). The lack of floor or wall decoration makes it difficult to date the installation of the stove and the latrine, but there is no reason to believe that the room was ever used for anything but a kitchen

of the cryptoporticus galleries, and includes several still life panels depicting fish, a rooster and fruit, and a banquet of satyrs. The kitchen that served this dining room seems to have been located in the bath service area [F]. Maiuri (NSc 1933, 269) reported (refer to Fig. 5.50): ...lungo la parete occidentale, tre piedretti e l'accenno a volticine fanno supporre l'estistenza di un basso focolare (f¹): inoltre nell'angolo nord-ovest si osserva un rozzo podio costruito (f²).³³ Maiuri argued that DR•[22] was not used for dining in part because "non abbiamo in tutto il pianterreno alcuna traccia dell'apprestamento di una cucina in servizio del triclinio, all'infuori delle incerte vestigia di un focolare che si notano nel *praefurnium* F, il quale non ebbe mai alcuna comunicazione diretta con questa sala."³³ From DR•[22], service area [F] was reached through vestibule [21], which had a doorway into the latrine; thence, a narrow corridor continued N along the E side of the building into [F]. Connections between the stove and the dining area were surely difficult, which is perhaps why the door to the latrine from vestibule [21] was closed off at some point, and the W wall of service area [F] was opened up. It is unclear whether this modification of [F] led to the demolition of the stove; perhaps at the same time, the S entrance of DR•[22] to room [23] was blocked off by a low masonry podium that could have served for cooking, further defining the pre-existing bipartition of the pavement.³⁴ Maiuri's objections to cooking and eating in the cryptoporticus are not well founded, but the fragmentary nature of the evidence leaves the question open.

Earthquake damage, demolition, and the filling up of most of the E wing of the cryptoporticus followed. The restructuring of the eastern half of this *insula* reduced and closed off (I.6.4) to the rooms around courts (b, m). That post-earthquake state will be analyzed in depth below (Fig. 5.16). A short *fauces* (a) leads to atrium (b), with rooms only on the E side. DR (c) occupies the NE corner of the house, next to stairs to upper floor rooms (Figs. 5.53). Bedrooms (d, l) both contained preserved remnants of their beds against their back walls; in the storage space under the stairs accessible in (l) were found two amphorae, one filled with carbonized hazelnuts.³⁵ DI◊(i) is centered on the E side of the atrium, and *tablinum* (f) is centered on the S, next to a small storage room (e) whose vault is painted and stuccoed with scenes from the Iliad. A narrow corridor (g) reaches the back court (m) of the house, in which piles of gypsum for making plaster to re-stucco the walls are still visible along the E wall and in the NW corner. KI (n) lies to the E (Fig. 5.51). DH•(p) occupies the SE corner of the house, providing access to *cubicula* (r, q) (Figs. 5.54). Directly S of the court is room (s), where a mortar was fixed in the pavement in the NE corner, in the company of large quantities of gypsum and a mallet. A lime

³³Maiuri NSc 1933, 265.

³⁴Maiuri NSc 1933, 263 n. 2 argues expressly against this podium serving as a hearth, apparently for no other reason than that he does not wish to see dining in DR•[22].

³⁵The bed in (d) measured: l. 2.35, w. 1.24 m.; in (l): l. 2.31, w. 1.32 m. (Spinazzola I, 447). For the hazelnuts, see Della Corte NSc 1913, 83.

kiln was built half into the ground in the SE corner, and a small storage alcove on the SW contained charcoal/carbonized wood, possibly fuel for the kiln (Fig. 5.52).³⁶

Strocka has shown that fine 4th style redecoration in much of the N part of the house was interrupted by the A.D. 62 earthquake, and that only coarse plastering was thereafter carried out, and was still in progress in A.D. 79. Allison argues further that all re-plastering of the house had essentially been abandoned some time before the eruption, and that the house was in a state of reduced habitation. However: the unfinished nature of the walls in many rooms of the house, the presence of raw gypsum stored in piles, its association with working tools in (s), the kiln, and remains of ready fuel all support the standard opinion that the house was still in the process of renovation in A.D. 79. As Strocka has pointed out, the fact that the renovation was not uniformly carried out is irrelevant. The disruption of renovations did not mean, furthermore, that the house was 'downgraded' or less habitable. Inconvenience is a natural companion to remodeling a home. One would expect to see evidence for renovating a room side by side with evidence for its continued use, albeit in altered capacity. Change, not stasis, is the normal state of affairs in domestic life.³⁷

References

Jashemski 1993, 35; Allison 1992b, 318-331; PPM I, 193-195, 280-329; Clarke 1991, 58-59; De Albentis 1990, 196-198; Gury 1986; Laidlaw 1985, 59-60; Strocka 1984; PPP I, 26-32; CTP IIIA, 10-11; Guida Laterza 1982, 104-106; Guida 1976, 197-199; Schefold 1957, 17-24; Della Corte 1954, 240-242, #583-584; Spinazzola I, 435-593, II, 865-901; Maiuri 1942a, 147-150, 182; Boyce 1937, 25, #37; Maiuri NSc 1933, 252-276; Beccarini 1922, 16-18; Della Corte NSc 1913, 28-34, 83, 356-360; Della Corte NSc 1912, 182, 354, 401-406, 445-449.

Data

A) Total area:	432.4	Nodes:	141.4	Connectors:	27.4	Static spaces:	267.5
B) Total # spaces:	21	# Nodes:	2	# Connectors:	4	# Static spaces:	15
C) Area, KI (n):	11.7	Area, DR (c):	28.3	Length, DR (c):	7.08	Width, DR (c):	4.00
		Area, DI(i):	14.6	Length, DI(i):	3.64	Width, DI(i):	4.02
		Area, DH•(p):	39.9	Length, DH•(p):	8.49	Width, DH•(p):	4.70
D) Entry prox., KI (n):	1.8	Entry prox., DR (c):	7.2	Prox, KI (n)-DR (c):	16.9		
		Entry prox., DI(i):	12.2	Prox, KI (n)-DI(i):	10.4		
		Entry prox., DH•(p):	29.4	Prox, KI (n)-DH•(p):	8.7		

³⁶Carbonized remains in the storage alcove SW of (s): Della Corte NSc 1913, 357.

³⁷Berry 1993, 73: "There is no doubt that this [A.D. 62] earthquake accelerated change within the town, but *change* in this instance should not be seen as something abnormal or as a sign of social decline: instead it is something healthy which is warding off economic and social stagnation."

E) Entry access., KI (n): 5	Entry access., DR (c): 4	Access, KI (n)-DR (c): 4
	Entry access., DI◊(i): 4	Access, KI (n)-DI◊(i): 4
	Entry access., DH•(p): 7	Access, KI (n)-DH•(p): 4
F) Sight perc., KI (n)-DR (c): N	Sound perc., KI (n)-DR (c): T	Smell perc., KI (n)-DR (c): F
Sight perc., KI (n)-DI◊(i): N	Sound perc., KI (n)-DI◊(i): T	Smell perc., KI (n)-DI◊(i): F
Sight perc., KI (n)-DH•(p): N	Sound perc., KI (n)-DH•(p): T	Smell perc., KI (n)-DH•(p): F

G) Environmental amenities, dining areas: Light and air enter DR (c) primarily from its door on the SW corner onto the atrium (Fig. 5.53). A window up in the N wall towards the W end that would have opened onto the street was closed up with rubble prior to the last redecoration of the room. The SW orientation of this room and its closed form off the atrium suggests that it was used in winter. DI◊(i), with its wide entrance directly onto the *impluvium* of the atrium, is amply supplied with light and air. DH•(p) was originally designed for a commanding view over the cryptoporticus garden to the S via a doorway the width of the room, which would have provided ample light and breezes. The closure of the S wall severely limited light and air in this room to the two small doorways via (r) to court (m) (Fig. 5.16). This alteration must have either reversed the orientation of dining-couches from S to N, or limited the function of this room for proper reception and dining.

H) Installation amenities, KI (n): A masonry ST of sub-type (1) rests against the E wall (l. 1.67, w. 0.83, h. 0.80 m.) (Fig. 5.51). The ST has a tiled surface and a curb constructed of *imbrices* on its S edge; another arm of *imbrices* parallel to the curb extended from the E wall 0.5 m. to the N. The two curbs together formed a 'burner' across which spits, grates, or large pots and pans could have been placed. Found *in situ* on the hearth were a smoke-blackened bronze vessel upon an iron tripod, a blackened shallow bowl, or patera of terracotta, and a pot-bellied bronze vase.³⁸ A small bronze cauldron lay at the base of the N wall, accompanied by a ceramic cooking pot and a one-handled bowl; a flat mixing bowl sat in the SW corner, and two truncated amphorae in the NW corner were identified as having adapted as makeshift ovens.³⁹

Light and ventilation seems to have been provided by court (m). Water was available from the cistern head in atrium (b) and from court (m). The latrine in the SE corner, separated from the

³⁸Allison 1992b, 326, Della Corte NSc 1913, 358: "Sopra il podio di cucina...e sopra il corrispondente treppiede di ferro, per nulla spostato, si è rinvenuto un vaso conico di bronzo, alto m. 0.19, dall'orlo allargato e rialzato, esternamente tutto ricoperto di nero-fumo. Alla estremità meridionale del posio stesso, e sopra l'apposito fornello in muratura, due basi rettangolari di bardiglio, ivi utilizzate per sostenere altro vasellame: fra queste e la pentola sul treppiede, già descritta, un vaso panciuto di bronzo, alto m. 0.17, a stretto collo e orlo allungato in versatoio, con ansa desinente in giù in fogliolina."

³⁹Della Corte NSc 1913, 359: "Continuandosi a liberare la cucina, vi si sono rinvenuti questi altri oggetti sul pavimento di semplice terreno battuto: sotto la parete nord, una caldaia di bronzo col fondo a colotta e il corpo a tronco di cono, alta m. 0.16; e, di terracotta, una pignatta ovoidale e un urceo panciuto, monoansato; nell'angolo sud-ovest, due anfore tronche adoperate come fornelli."

rest of the kitchen by an E-W partition wall, provided drainage. Many cooking wares were obviously stored in the kitchen itself, but a blackened cooking-bowl and some foodstuffs were also found amongst the remnants of a cupboard in the SW corner of atrium (b).

Installation amenities, dining areas: The publication of the finds and their contexts from this house by Allison shed much light particularly on the storage of dining utensils, which are considered here after all the dining areas have been treated. DR (c) contained an assortment of finds; a statuette, lamp, bottle, and amphora at the E end suggest mixed storage. Pestles and raw plastering material at the W suggest some renovation work. Finally, ten bronze feet found along the S wall were probably supports for dining couches; it is unclear whether they were part of whole couches or if these were merely spare couch parts.⁴⁰ Allison concludes that the room was being used as a storeroom at the time of the eruption. Even if DR (c) was not used for dining at that moment, it was clearly intended as a dining room, judging by its size, shape, the couch fittings and painted scenes of food on the walls; the temporary storage of a few small items and some material for patching plaster does not refute that attribution. Moreover, if the room was meant to be used during the winter season, miscellaneous storage here at the time of the August eruption would not be surprising.

DI◊(i) did not have any recorded finds; the room has only its wide door, fine decoration and axial orientation onto the atrium to argue for its use as a dining area. DH•(p) likewise had no recorded finds; its original bipartite decoration however (see below) suggests that it was suited to hold dinners as well as other sorts of receptions.

Fittings for three cupboards, arranged in the NW and SW corners and in the center of the W wall of atrium (b) were found during excavation. The NW cupboard contained a ceramic cup, bowl and jug, three figurines (nude male with sword, Bacchant, and a small herm) and miscellaneous metal fragments; the central cabinet included an Arretine bowl and several bone items. In the SW cupboard were a quantity of glass cups, bowls and bottles which Allison reports were for eating and drinking. Amongst them was a blackened cooking bowl, an amphora, and a pot containing fish bones. A few bronze and glass vessels, and more fish bones were associated with a cabinet in the SW corner of *tablinum* (f). Finally, glass vessels for storage and table use were recovered from two chests in the alcove (e). As Allison has noted, these finds suggest the careful organization of domestic equipment according to material and function. Vessels for storing, serving and consuming, as well as a few pieces connected to food preparation, are stored *in atrio*. Their location makes them conveniently accessible from DR (c), DI◊(i), and KI (n).

⁴⁰See Della Corte NSc 1912, 406, Figs. 7-8. Allison 1992b, 320 notes that ten legs do not make up a suitable number for reconstructing a set of couches at a standard six legs to a couch, and argues that the legs were being stored here.

I) Decorative amenities, KI (n): Patches of white plaster remain upon the walls; the floor was of beaten earth. There is no suggestion that the room was ever decorated (see above, n. 39).

Decorative amenities, dining areas: DR (c) contained 4th style decoration long considered (because of its unfinished socle) to date to A.D. 79, but recently redated by Strocka to before A.D. 62, and interrupted by the earthquake. Of particular interest are three still life panels spread out across the N wall, consisting of a central panel with figs flanked by two panels showing table settings of silver (see Spinazzola for photographs). In the center of the E wall is a still life of birds, and the central panel of the W wall shows a large bunch of asparagus next to three baskets of ricotta, one of them spilled onto a large plate below (Fig. 5.53). Depictions of 'sacred' rural landscapes add to the decoration; the floor is paved with cocciopesto.

DI(i) has a pavement of polychrome mosaic with concentric black and white borders in the 2nd style. The walls are finely painted in the 4th style with some 3rd style motifs. DH•(p) was originally decorated with splendid late 2nd style wall and floor decoration. The N section of the floor (l. 4.36 m.) was paved with mosaic in the pattern of nine squares with geometric decoration, separated from the plain white mosaic of the S floor section (l. 3.30 m.) by a band with floral decoration (w. 0.83 m.) (Fig. 5.54). The bipartition of the floor is continued by a series of vertical stripes on the walls that correspond to the floral mosaic band and separate the megalographia of the N section of the room from the more plain decoration of the S. The N wall depicts a philosopher seated before a globe; the E wall preserves two heraldic elephants guided by cupids, opposite the muse Clio on the W wall. The S. wall of this room, added after the secession of the cryptoporticus to (I.6.2), was only coarsely plastered. This indicates either that the room eventually would have been redecorated if the eruption had not occurred (Maiuri 1942a), or that the room had completely lost its formal function (Allison).

J) Sanctity: The painted and stuccoed ceiling and upper frieze of room (e) has led some scholars (e.g. Schefold, Guida Laterza 1982) to interpret it as a shrine, but Allison's documentation of storage in this area confirms Boyce's strong doubts about a ritual function here. The three figurines found in the remains of a cupboard in the NW corner of atrium (b) (Della Corte NSc 1913, 33-34) better represent the ritual paraphernalia belonging to this household.

S y n t h e s i s

The disassociation of this house from I.6.2 and its cryptoporticus, and the renovations carried out in the house before and after the A.D. 62 earthquake make it difficult to determine clearly the pattern of cooking and dining. While DR (c) was unquestionably intended for dining, its condition at the time of the eruption suggests a temporary suspension of use. DR•(p) was originally designed as the premier reception room of the house, but after the blocking off of its S

wall from the cryptoporticus, its function became uncertain. There is no secure evidence that DI◊(i) was used for dining.

Table wares were neatly stored in cupboards in the atrium, and the position of cooking pots *in situ* on the stove clearly show that food was being prepared in an organized manner for an active household. The location of the kitchen, largely invisible to the senses of the diners and noticeable only upon passage through the transitional corridor (g), was convenient to serve any of the supposed dining areas.

Where did the members of the household eat? Perhaps our expectation of domestic conditions is too 'clean'; we expect to see fine and finished decoration accompanied by furniture fittings that can be reconstructed into a standard number of couches. The lack of any recorded finds (tainted by the lack of original recording) related to our understanding of dining accoutrements muddle the interpretation. The state of renovation in this particular house adds further difficulty. It is unclear where dining took place in Casa I.6.4 on the eve of the eruption. However, the three areas discussed above are the best candidates for where the inhabitants intended to dine. They reveal the owner's intention to have a variety of possible dining contexts: DR (c) near the entrance, protected by its position and layout from the elements, with scenes of food and summery landscapes that were no doubt inviting on a cold winter evening; the small, accessible and elegant DI◊(i), with completed wall decoration and a pleasant view of the atrium, an all-purpose space suitable for small formal gatherings or family meals; or the spacious DH•(p), reached only upon passage through the entire house, but offering the surprise of impressive megalography and an intricate mosaic pavement, though marred by the rough plaster of its S wall. At least one of these spaces must have been used regardless of condition; Pompeians in the years A. D. 62-79 had to become accustomed to living in a state of repair.

18. I.6.5-6, Popina, lunch counter (Figs. 2.4, 5.3, 5.16, 5.55)

S y n o p s i s

This complex consists of a large forward shop (1) with a marble-clad sales counter (now largely ruined). A small room (2), perhaps a *cubiculum*, sat in back, and a separate stairway from the street at #6 reached the upstairs quarters (Fig. 5.55). The walls are partially clad in *cocciopesto*, except for white plaster in the NW corner. Room (c) of the neighboring *fullonica* (I.6.7) once belonged to this shop; the doorway was blocked up and the room was given over probably after A. D. 62. The S and E walls of room (2) show double-walling and repair in brick and irregular lava courses, presumably to counter late earthquake damage. Della Corte identified the resident of the upper-floor apartment as a certain Ingenuus on the basis of three *dipinti* flanking the stairway at #6.

A cache of cooking and serving vessels was found in the space beneath the stairs; they included one squat bronze vessel, nine pots of various shapes, two jugs, two plates, two shallow bowls and one large flat mixing bowl, several with signs of burning on their surfaces.⁴¹ Della Corte (NSc 1912, 251) interprets these vessels as belonging to the operation of a lunch counter (he uses the term 'termopolio'). He reports that large terracotta jars were immured in the street-front section of the counter that had collapsed, that a stepped shelf was present on the E where samples of food and drink could be displayed, and that a glass jug shown a quarter full of red wine was painted on the exterior face of the counter. The end of the counter was widened and not topped with marble revetment, leaving space for a smoke-blackened HE of sub-type (4), for which only the foundations survive (Fig. 5.55). Those living above the ground-floor lunch counter probably used the built-in stove and vessels to serve themselves as well as their customers.

References

PPM I, 330-331, Sutherland 1990, 88-112; Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, 205-207, #123; Gassner 1986, 129; PPP I, 32; CTP IIIA, 10-11; Della Corte 1954, 239, #582; Della Corte 1927, 17-18; Della Corte NSc 1912, 182, 248, 250-251, 257.

Data

A) Total area: 33.0	Nodes: 22.6	Connectors: 4.9	Static spaces: 8.3
B) Total # spaces: 3	# Nodes: 1	# Connectors: 1	# Static spaces: 1
C) Area, HE in (1): 2.5			

19. I.6.7, Fullonica di Stephanus, (work)shop-house
(Figs. 1.1, 2.4, 2.20, 5.16, 5.56-5.57)

Synopsis

A *fullonica* was carefully installed here within a pre-existing atrium house after A.D. 62. The implantation of a fullery on the premises changed the plan in several ways. Peristyle garden (p) of that original house once took up its entire width, before ceding a strip on its W edge to Casa (I.6.8-9). Node (b) was enlarged from an entranceway at the expense of room (a), and room (c) was bought from the shop (I.6.5-6). The *impluvium* in atrium (e) was converted into a work-basin for washing clothes, another door from the atrium was opened directly onto corridor (i),

⁴¹Della Corte NSc 1912, 250-251: "...adibito a deposito di stoviglie. Vi si sono rinvenuti molti vasi di terracotta, alcuni dei quali dal fondo annerito pel contatto col fuoco: pignatte circolari senza anse, a fondo bombato, quattro; sferoidali biansate, due; piatti rustici, due; piccole scodelle aretine, due; una pelvi larga m. 0.36, col bollo due volte impresso sull'orlo, C.I.L. X, 8048: *M. Ma(rius) Primi(genius)*; una grossa lucerna monolychne di m. 0.11 di diametro, dal disco adorno di una corona di foglie impresse; e con le descritte terrecotte, un vaso di bronzo panciuto ad orlo tondo, alto m. 0.11, al quale fu adattata per ansa la parte inferiore di un'ansa di altro vaso più grande, desinente in giù in foglia di vite".

DR (h) lost its former function as a dining room, and numerous work basins were added to the SE corner of peristyle (p). Because the W. wall of garden (p) was moved to its present line after A.D. 62, and because pillars holding up the second floor terrace in that area are constructed of *opus listatum mixtum*, KI (m) and latrine (l) were installed in the last phase of the building's life. KI thus (m) postdates the use of DR (h) as a dining room; it is not possible to ascertain the dining room's relationship to whatever cooking area served it. DR (h) was never repaired after the earthquake; Sampaolo (PPM I, 333) presumes that it was "utilizzato per lavori collaterali all'attività dell'officina."

At least two rooms were built over the spaces to the N and S of the atrium; Sutherland reconstructs three more on the E side of the atrium. Above rooms (j, k) was constructed *cenaculum* {r} with a double colonnade. *Cenaculum* {r}, with open aspects above the house towards both the N and S, might have been suitable for dining in seasonable weather when the building was a house. It, like DR (h), probably lost any formal function when the *fullonica* was created, due to the unpleasantness of the process (i.e. the use of urine) in garden (p) below.

After the earthquake, wide entrance (b) allowed the easy flow of people and goods between the house and the street, watched over from the small cell (a). Atrium (e), with a stair to the upper floor to the side of the *impluvium*-turned-basin, was dominated by DR◇(g) on the E, interpreted variously as a reception room, *tablinum* and dining area (Fig. 5.57). Two smaller rooms (j, k) occupied the back of the atrium, beside corridor (i) that led past the former DR (h) to the peristyle garden (p) with its work-basins in the SE corner and service area of kitchen (m) and latrine (l) in the SW (Figs. 1.1, 2.20, 5.56). More stairs led from garden (p) to the second floor, most of which had been converted into a broad flat terrace used for drying clothes.

Numerous electoral recommendations flanking the entrance refer to *fullones*. Among them are two by a certain Stephanus, to whom the fullery is attributed, despite another recommendation by a woman named Spec(u)la (whom Della Corte describes as one of the workers -- on the basis of her gender). Spinazzola describes her rather as the director of the establishment, based on the higher and more prominent position of her name on the wall; Stephanus' dipinti appear nearer the socle. Behind the partially-opened door of the building was found the skeleton of an individual with a hoard of gold, silver and bronze coins worth 1,089.5 sesterces; three more individuals were recovered from the small room (a).

References

Jashemski 1993, 35; PPM I, 332-351; Sutherland 1990, 88-112; PPP I, 32-35; CTP IIIA, 10-11; Guida Laterza 1982, 102-104; Guida 1976, 194-197; Moeller 1976, 41-43; Schefold 1957, 24-25; Della Corte 1954, 238-239, #579-581; Spinazzola II, 765-785; Maiuri 1942, 173; Boyce 1937, 110, #2; Della Corte

1927, 15-17; Beccarini 1922, 18-19; Della Corte NSc 1913, 83-84, 141-143; NSc 1912, 246-250, 283-289, 331-333, 353-354.

Data

A) Total area:	356.9	Nodes:	175.6	Connectors:	16.2	Static spaces:	167.5
B) Total # spaces:	18	# Nodes:	3	# Connectors:	3	# Static spaces:	9
C) Area, KI (m):	5.7	Area, DR◊(g):	21.4	Length, DR◊(g):	5.17	Width, DR◊(g):	4.13
		Area, DR (h):	23.6	Length, DR (h):	6.27	Width, DR (h):	3.77
D) Entry prox., KI (m):	34.0	Entry prox., DR◊(g):	9.8	Prox, KI (m)-DR◊(g):	21.4		
E) Entry access., KI (m):	7	Entry access., DR◊(g):	4	Access, KI (m)-DR◊(g):	5		
F) Sight perc., KI (m)-DR◊(g):	N	Sound perc., KI (m)-DR◊(g):	T	Smell perc., KI (m)-DR◊(g):	F		

G) Environmental amenities, dining areas: DR◊(g), with its wide door onto atrium (e), was amply supplied with light and air (Fig. 5.57). In addition, a large window looked through the S wall via the former DR (h) to garden peristyle (p) (also visible via corridor (i) at the SW corner). The main view was of the work basin in the center of the atrium, formerly the *impluvium*. A large window in its N wall of DR (h) connected to DR◊(g) and provided some light from atrium (e). The primary aspect of the room was however via the broad entranceway to the S that offered a clear view of the peristyle garden (p), then free of washing basins. The SE aspect of the room would have made the room usable almost any season of the year (away from the summer afternoon sun but receiving some winter sun).

H) Installation amenities, KI (m): Against the W wall in the SW corner of the building was a single arched masonry ST (l. 1.63; w. 0.92; h. 0.73 m.) (Fig. 2.20). *Imbrices* defined a curb on the front edge, while the raised edges of tegulae formed a smaller curb at the back edge of the tiled stove-top. The numerous vessels found *in situ* on the stove, floor, and walls of this kitchen testify to its active state of use as reported by Della Corte.⁴² Suspended on the S wall, E of the stove-top

⁴²Della Corte NSc 1913, 142-143: "Si è oggi esplorata la parte bassa della cucina della *fullonica*, raccogliendovi i seguenti oggetti: Sospesi all parete sud, in alto: una padella di bronzo di m. 0.28 di diametro a lungo manico ed orlo rostrato; un treppiedi di ferro e una graticola (questi due ultimi rimangono tuttora aderenti al muro); sospesi alle parte ovest, una caldaia di bronzo a cono tronco alta m. 0.17, con accanto un raffio ansato di ferro a sette uncini, usato forse per attizzare il fuoco; sopra il podio, tuttora sul treppiede di ferro, un'altra caldaia di bronzo circolare, lenticolare, larga m. 0.32, munita di coperchio mobile e di maniglia a ponte fissata sull'orlo; ed accanto ad essa, un urceo di bronzo monoansato a pancia rigonfia, stretto collo ed orlo rostrato (vaso di olia?) alto m. 0.15. Continuatosi lo scavo di cucina, altra suppellettile ne è venuta fuori...sulla parete ovest, immendiamente appresso al podio, due altre caldaie di bronzo di forma conica alte m. 0.14 e m. 0.23, e molte stoviglie di terracotta per la più parte in frammenti: fra queste si sono recuperati interi quattro piatti rustici concavi, forati nel mezzo, un'anforetta a piede piano, ed un urceo e poi molti ossicini di ovini, qualcheduno di pollo e un osso di seppia. Questa parte della cucina termina in un gruppo di quattro anfore tronche, una delle quali contiene cenere: presso queste anfore, ancora due urcei, una oenochoe, due pignatte rustiche e una pelvi senza marche sull'orlo. Un più numeroso gruppo di anfore tronche era lungo la parete est, cioè nel *subscalare*, ivi allineato in due file".

were an iron cooking grill and tripod, and a bronze skillet. Further to the W along the same wall a bronze cauldron and a seven-toothed, handled 'hook' were reported.⁴³ On the stove-top itself were a covered cauldron and a bronze bowl, both on iron tripods. Next to the stove against the W wall were two more bronze cauldrons, and numerous terracotta vessels, including four coarse plates, a small amphora, and a bowl containing some sheep, chicken and cuttlefish bones. Still against the W wall were four truncated amphorae, two bowls, two coarseware pots, an oinochoe, and a flat mixing bowl. To the E, under the stairs to a terrace, were two more rows of truncated amphorae. The two photos (Figs. 1.1, 5.56) that claim to show the kitchen exactly as it was found actually show different assemblages, including more jugs and pans hung on the S wall, and more vessels on the stove proper. Even if the described inventory is complete, the precise disposition of those vessels cannot be reconstructed. This collection is most important for the range of cooking devices and vessels that speak for the boiling, stewing, grilling and frying of food. Light and ventilation for KI (m) came from the peristyle garden (p) to the N, which also was designed to collect a large quantity of water off of the terrace roofs (needed for industrial purposes), which was channeled to a cistern whose head was located in the SW corner, near the kitchen. A pipe immured in the S wall of the kitchen was part of the system that moved the water from the terrace to the cistern. Latrine (l) probably provided simple drainage for the kitchen; the various work-basins in the SE of the house do not have their own drainage outlets. Latrine (l) itself was a small self-contained alcove just N of KI (m) with its own shed roof.

Installation amenities, dining areas: No evidence for dining couches was found in DR◊(g); a bronze oinochoe from the NE corner and a wooden and bronze chest near the entrance containing a large pot amongst several tools are scant evidence for dining.⁴⁴ However, in the remains of a large cupboard in the NE corner of atrium (e) were stored several relevant items: one bronze pan; four glass bottles, a cup, glass and funnel; one terracotta pitcher, three shallow bowls, three deeper bowls, a cup, jug and a pot. The storage of these items in the corner of the atrium next to DR◊(g) would have been convenient, but their presence cannot confirm a dining function for the room.⁴⁵

Proof that DR (h) was a dining room before the house was converted into a fullery consists first of two couch-niches. The niche for the width of the *lectus medius* (1.38 m.) is still preserved; the E niche was later blocked up. Secondly, the wall decoration had bipartition by stucco 'pilasters' in

⁴³For an example of this type of 'hook', the various interpretations associated with it, and recent bibliography, see Alimentazione 1987, 157, #57. The device is usually called a *harpago*, or meat hook, but Della Corte (see above) thought it was for stirring up coals.

⁴⁴Della Corte NSc 1912, 333.

⁴⁵Della Corte NSc 1912, 286.

low relief (w. 0.4 m.) on the E and W walls, separating the dining-chamber to the N (l. 4.42 m.) from the entry and service area to the S (l. 1.90 m.). The ratio, of dining: service area = 2:1, is common for 2nd style dining rooms.⁴⁶ Traces of the 2nd style decoration still remain on the E wall of the room. No finds are reported from this room, save a painted semicircular niche with stucco figures in relief behind a frieze (no longer extant), the location of which Della Corte gives simply as "Ad oriente dell'ambiente h".⁴⁷ He says furthermore that the ash deposits in the S area of the house generally were mixed, and concludes that the area was disturbed in antiquity.

I) Decorative amenities, KI (m): Simple plaster covers the walls: a high red socle with white plaster above. At the base of the walls there is short (h. 0.24 m.) ledge, a sort of plastered washboard that would have helped to protect the base of the wall from water, mess and abuse.

Decorative amenities, DR◊(g): The pavement of the room contained pieces of polychrome marble set in the *cocciopesto*. The walls of the room were decorated in the 4th style; small personifications of the seasons of summer and autumn form vignettes in the centers of the E and N walls, respectively.

J) Sanctity: A scene of Bacchus as a child driving a chariot filled with vessels is painted on the right pilaster upon entering the building (see Boyce). Other than the possible niche in DR (h) (see above), there is no other evidence for ritual activity on this property.

S y n t h e s i s

The original house had DR (h) carefully designed to hold three couches and to have a view out onto the garden. The installation of the work-basins in the garden would have prohibited by their sight and smell any further comfortable dining there; consequently, it lost its dining function. DR◊(g) is the only other space in the house large enough, well-decorated enough and sufficiently removed from the work basins in (p) to serve as an area for formal reception and dining; it probably served multiple functions. Its position perpendicular to the axis of the entrance to the garden gives it some relief from being involved directly in the traffic along that axis, but still allows the room to dominate the atrium via its broad doorway. DR◊(g) could have been well served by KI (m), located only one corridor and two porticos away. The well-preserved kitchen demonstrates the array of equipment needed to serve the needs of a household that has a single formal dining area.

To what level of formality were dinners held, in a place where industry and living were so closely juxtaposed? What was the status of invited guests, if guests were ever invited? Were any efforts made to disguise the work areas during a banquet? Were there two household staffs,

⁴⁶Barbet 1985, 66-70, 130-135; see Dunbabin 1991, 123, n. 17.

⁴⁷Della Corte NSc 1912, 353. The description seems to be of a niched shrine, but Boyce makes no such mention in his volume.

one to run the fullery and one to look after domestic matters? These questions are valid for any house that also contained an industry. The *negotium* of this household was quite different from the *negotium* of an elite household; what impact various forms of work had upon the respective flows of domestic life warrants further investigation.

20. I.6.8-9, Casa + Caupona, (work)shop-house / diner
(Figs. 2.4, 5.3, 5.17, 5.58-5.60)

Synopsis

Both I.6.8-9 and I.6.11, because they were joined during the last years of the city, may have been owned by a single interest, but their respective domestic arrangements are sufficiently separate to merit individual entries. The original independent atrium house was altered significantly after the A.D. 62 earthquake. Its *fauces* and two flanking rooms at the front of the house were converted into one large node/shop (b) with an L-shaped wooden sales counter on the E side. Off the end of the counter were immured two *dolia*, adjacent to ST (c') (Fig. 5.58). The stove was built into the NE corner of atrium (c), underneath a flight of stairs to upper floor rooms along the street (Fig. 5.59). Opposite the stove in the NW corner of the atrium was a small room (a) constructed of *opus craticum* (light, timber framed masonry construction). At the back of the atrium was a general purpose reception DH•(d), that once served double roles of *tablinum* and dining area. A corridor led past this room to the peristyle garden (i) at the back of the property. The suite of rooms on the E side of the peristyle (e-h) were purchased from the neighboring property (I.6.7) after A.D. 62 and before it was converted into a *fullonica*. This suite was found more or less in a state of ruin during excavation; Maiuri's comments only on a *puteus* (cistern-head cover) in room (e') that functioned as a latrine.

Above DH•(d) and probably reached by a stair in the adjoining corridor was a *cenaculum* DH◊{k} with a single colonnade facing onto the atrium to the N (Fig. 5.58). *Cenaculum* DH◊{k} and DH•(d) below were both probably used for dining and reception when the property was a house. It is not clear whether *cenaculum* DH◊{k} continued in use as a dining area in the last phase of the property. How these multi-purpose areas were served by cooking facilities in the early days of the house is unclear; the date when the ST• was built against the parapet in the SE corner of garden (i) is not known (Fig. 5.60). ST (c') postdates the earthquake and no other cooking facilities can be identified.

At the SW corner of garden (i), a doorway was opened to the garden of the house (I.6.11) after the earthquake; Maiuri hypothesized that the owner of the latter, larger house purchased Casa I.6.8-9 and converted the front part into retail space and the back into storage for renovation material from (I.6.11). As Allison notes, the general lack of finds from I.6.8-9 and its ruined architectural state may indicate the subsequent failure of the business venture and the

abandonment of the property for practical use. The person of one Calavia Optata has been associated with this building on the basis of amphora dipinti found within the house, but no satisfactory argument can be made for the identity of the owner(s).

References

Jashemski 1993, 35; Allison 1992b, 246-252; Sutherland 1990, 113-133; PPM I, 352-353; Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, 211, #134; PPP I, 35; CTP IIIA, 10-11; Guida Laterza 1982, 102; Della Corte 1954, 238, #577a-578; Maiuri 1942a, 173; Maiuri NSc 1929, 391-401; Della Corte NSc 1912, 141-143, 183, 217-218.

Data

A) Total area: 268.0 Nodes: 166.9 Connectors: 30.3 Static spaces: 72.9

B) Total # spaces: 16 # Nodes: 3 # Connectors: 4 # Static spaces: 7

C) Area, ST (c'): 2.5 Area, ST• in (i): 2.5

Area, DH•(d): 22.6 Length, DH•(d): 4.87 Width, DH•(d): 4.63 (same for DH◇{k})

D) Entry prox., ST (c'): 5.7 Entry prox., DH•(d): 13.6

Entry prox., ST• in (i): 28.9 Entry prox., DH◇{k}: 22.4

Prox., ST (c')-DH•(d): 8.5 Prox., ST (c')-DH◇{k}: 17.9

Prox., ST• in (i)-DH•(d): 11.1 Prox., ST• in (i)-DH◇{k}: 24.6

E) Entry access., ST (c'): 3 Entry access., DH•(d): 4

Entry access., ST• in (i): 7 Entry access., DH◇{k}: 6

Access, ST (c')-DH•(d): 2 Access, ST (c')-DH◇{k}: 4

Access, ST• in (i)-DH•(d): 5 Access, ST• in (i)-DH◇{k}: 6

Subsidiary entrance: the ST• in (i) is located near to the back door to the connected house (I.6.11), convenient for serving either DR•(11) or DR•(15) of that house.

F) Sight perc., ST (c')-DH•(d)/DH◇{k}: E

Sound perc., ST (c')-DH•(d)/DH◇{k}: T Smell perc., ST (c')-DH•(d)/DH◇{k}: F

Sight perc., ST• in (i)-DH•(d)/DH◇{k}: V

Sound perc., ST• in (i)-DH•(d)/DH◇{k}: T Smell perc., ST• in (i)-DH•(d)/DH◇{k}: F

G) Environmental Amenities, Dining areas: DH•(d) has a wide doorway N to atrium (c) and a broad window S onto the peristyle garden (i), allowing in ample light and air from both sources and framed views likewise. Parts of two marble statue supports were found here, perhaps for sculpture once displayed in the garden. The *cenaculum* DH◇{k} has a row of three columns that frames its N facade; the westernmost column is attached on the interior to the remains of a partition wall that divided the room proper from the stairway that accessed it. Sutherland reconstructs a window in the S wall; light, air and a garden view were salient features of this second story room. The more closed DH•(d) would have been practical during inclement

weather by closing off the window with shutters; the open *cenaculum* DH◊{k} was probably used in summer, when, because of its SE orientation, it would have kept cool in the afternoon.

H) Installation amenities, cooking areas: The ST (c') is of sub-type three, a tile-topped masonry surface resting on wooden beams laid across two supports (l. 1.38, w. 0.97, h. 0.86 m.); the wooden beams have been replaced by modern iron bars (Fig. 5.59). The W support is constructed of bricks, the E of masonry. On the W edge of the stove-top is a rounded masonry curb; two short brick and masonry walls once extended W from the wall on the E edge of the ST, forming a 'burner' across which spits, grills and pots might have been placed; only the S half of the 'burner' survives today. Plenty of light and ventilation were available in the atrium, although the flight of stairs to the second floor above the ST must have caught some of the cooking smoke. Water could be retrieved from the cistern heads in the atrium or garden peristyle (i). Drainage is problematic; the street was probably more convenient than the possible latrine in (e'). Ample storage was afforded by the two *dolia* built into the pavement just to the W (Fig. 5.58), and by the five whole and two fragmentary amphorae found near the stove, which were the only finds published from this cooking area because they carried inscriptions (Maiuri NSc 1929, 398). Allison notes that most of the finds reported from the atrium were pieces of *dolia* and amphorae; the atrium had considerable storage capacity.

The structure at the SE corner of garden (i), which I identify as a ST•, is built over a portion of the rain gutter that collects water off the peristyle roof (Fig. 5.60). A tile-topped masonry surface is supported on two sides (once with wood or large tiles, but today with iron bars) over the parapet wall that joins the columns of the peristyle on the E, and over a brick and masonry support on the W (l. 1.60, w. 1.22, h. 0.85 m.). Maiuri (NSc 1929) and subsequent commentators have identified this structure as a 'dog-house'. Maiuri imagined that a dog guarded this unoccupied property for the owner in (I.6.11), from burglary via the ruined house (I.6.13) to the S. Allison first challenged this hypothesis, suggesting that the form of this feature was similar to hearths in the gardens of other houses in Pompeii. In fact, both construction and dimensions are notably similar to ST (c') in the atrium. No remains of a dog were found in either this house or (I.6.11). If the structure was a dog-house, the poor animal's home would have been subject to flooding from the water channel that ran through it. All indications suggest therefore that this construction was an outdoor ST, amply ventilated and lit, and conveniently watered and drained by garden (i). Six *dolia* found at the W end of the N portico of the garden peristyle may have served in part for kitchen storage, and a possible latrine was nearby in (e'). No finds were specifically reported from the vicinity of the ST• in (i).

Installation amenities, dining areas: Within DH•(d) were found four bronze feet and a runner for a bed/couch with reconstructed measurements of l. 2.20, w. 1.25, h. 0.55 m. The physical evidence for dining at the time of the eruption is suggestive. No finds are reported from the

cenaculum DH◊{k}. One bronze finial for a bed / couch in the form of a mule's head was found at the level of the second floor room over the front shop (b).

I) Decorative amenities, dining areas: Decoration from DH•(d) has largely disappeared; Sutherland (118, n.15) describes faded traces of 3rd-4th style painting in the NE corner of the room. No decoration survives from *cenaculum* DH◊{k} save its columns and mouldings (Sutherland provisionally dates the former to after A.D. 62). The engaged columns are of tufa with block capitals and Attic bases, with some finishing stucco work; the colonnade rests over a cornice block finished with Ionicizing stucco mouldings.

J) Sanctity: No ritual finds or installations are reported from this property.

S y n t h e s i s

It is difficult to assess the nature of the cooking and dining arrangements at this property at the time of the eruption, primarily because the state of occupation or use of the building is not certain. The front of the house had clearly been opened up for commercial use after A.D. 62. The concentration of ST (c') and storage vessels in the vicinity of the sales counter (b) to the N suggests that this ST was constructed to serve the needs of customers from the street. Food or heated wine prepared on ST (c') could have been sold and/or consumed at the counter. The fine settings of DH•(d) or *cenaculum* DH◊{k} may have been available for rented dining space, supported by either ST (c') or the ST• in (i). Both cooking areas were plainly visible from both dining areas; such an open display of cooking is unusual in houses, but common in (work)shops, lunch counters and diners.

I propose that turning this house into a diner was the intent of the new owner when he added this property to (I.6.11). The venture seems to have failed. The entire *insula* I.6 witnesses significant changes after A.D. 62; the large property I.6.2/4 is split, and the former part was possibly turned into a commercial eating establishment. Changes were not due solely to the earthquake. The implantation of a large-scale fullery at (I.6.7) with its work-basins at the very center of the *insula* must have altered the living environment of the surrounding houses significantly. The stench of processing and cleaning clothing was considerable, and the back garden portions of the houses (I.6.4, I.6.8-9) closest to these facilities are accordingly in a notable state of disrepair, as if they could no longer be used in their customary manners. The presence of the fullery may eventually have caused the eating establishment at I.6.8-9 to fail. Allison postulates that I.6.8-9 was closed and the property used for storage sometime before the eruption, on the basis of a general lack of retail wares in area (a, b) and little habitation evidence at ST (c') or in DH•(d). It seems fairly certain that the cooking and dining areas of this property were not in working order in A.D. 79.

21. I.6.10, Taberna, (work)shop (Figs. 2.4, 5.3, 5.17, 5.61)

Synopsis

This shop consists of two rooms on the ground floor and at least two more on the floor above. Front room (m) has a base for a stair in the SW corner; back room (n) once belonged to Casa (I.6.11) when it may have served as a small dining area (l. 4.99, w. 2.48 m.). Room (n) contains late 3rd style wall decoration identical to that in the atrium of (I.6.11); after the A.D. 62 earthquake, its door S onto room (1) of (I.6.11) was blocked up and the room was transferred from the house to the shop. Subsequently its painting was pock-marked to provide a rough surface for a new layer of *cocciopesto* to be applied. Its pavement of *cocciopesto* with inset rows of black and white *tesserae* belongs to the 2nd style, contemporary with a fragment of 2nd style painting that survives underneath the 3rd style plaster on the S. wall. Breaches in the walls of (n) indicate that ancient tunneling was undertaken to retrieve objects from the shop.

Circa 110 objects were recovered from the shop, many from the remains of a wooden cabinet or chest just inside the door to room (n) (Maiuri NSc 1929). Amongst those objects (many agricultural tools) were a bronze pail, pan, bowl, pitcher, tray, jug, *oinochoe*, pastry mould and two small amphorae as well as an Arretine plate and cup, all objects for food preparation or consumption. Furthermore, two iron tripods appear in an assemblage of iron objects found against the S wall of (n) and once displayed in the same room (see PPM I, 360, #11). De Vos (PPM I) proposes that the shop was operated by a slave or freedperson from the household of (I.6.11), because the two properties were once connected. If true, the cooking and eating wares from this shop may indicate that the operators of the shop, whatever their relationship to the big house, took their meals separately, either at the threshold of the shop or in one of its rooms. If household dependents, even those who operated a subsidiary shop, were expected to dine at their master's home, then de Vos is incorrect and the shop must have been operated by persons outside of (I.6.11). A final possibility is that these wares were part of the stock for sale in this shop; metal workshops and shops are numerous in this *insula*, appearing at (I.6.1, I.6.3, I.6.12). This last option assumes that the operators of the shop lived and ate elsewhere, i.e. in (I.6.11).

References

PPM I, 354-360; CTP IIIA, 10-11; PPP I, 35-36; Gassner 1986, 129; Schefold 1957, 25; Maiuri 1942a, 146; Maiuri NSc 1929, 400-404; Maiuri NSc 1927, 15; Della Corte NSc 1912, 216-217, 336.

Data

A) Total area: 42.0	Nodes: 26.8	Connectors: 5.5	Static spaces: 16.2
B) Total # spaces: 3	# Nodes: 1	# Connectors: 1	# Static spaces: 1

22. I.6.11, Casa dei Quadretti Teatrali, *casa media* (Figs. 2.4, 2.19, 5.17)

Synopsis

In the post-A.D. 62 earthquake phase of this house, it was connected to the property (I.6.8-9) via a doorway connecting the gardens of the two buildings. This house also was originally connected to the two shops at #10 (m, n) and #12 (m', n'); the latter shop was closed off from the house before the earthquake, but the former shop became completely independent only after A.D. 62. Most paintings in the house (especially the atrium) date to the late 3rd style; damage from the A.D. 62 earthquake was patched, not replaced, with 4th style decoration. Despite these various changes to its property lines, the house with entrance at #11 will be given an entry separate from the shops at #10, 12 and the property at #8-9.

The presence of numerous tunnels and disturbed stratigraphy in the house proves that the house was subject to salvage or robbing operations in antiquity. Maiuri (NSc 1929), on the basis of some undecorated rooms and building material found in room (14), believed that the house (particularly the S half) was undergoing restoration, and the recently purchased property (I.6.8-9) was used for storing material temporarily removed from this house.

Small rooms (*cubicula, cellae*) (1-5) flank atrium (b), which had at least four wooden cabinets filled with domestic items placed against its walls (Fig. 5.17). *Tablinum* (6) had wide doorways onto both the atrium and the ambulatory (12) of garden (16) (PPM I, 381, #34). It was flanked on the W by corridor (7) which also accessed a series of 'service rooms' on that side of the house (8-10). KI (8) (Fig. 2.19) apparently had a staircase in wood (Maiuri NSc 1929, 424) at the W end of its S wall, that continued S over room (9) to a second floor above rooms (6-7, 9-12). Maiuri locates a latrine in (9), probably underneath those stairs, and identifies (10) as a storeroom by virtue of a cabinet found filled with material against the S wall. Room (9) has been converted into a modern shower for the custodians of the site, and room (10) has become a modern bathroom; it is no longer possible to identify any features in those two rooms. DR◊(11) is today a storeroom for the custodians. It overlooks garden (16) through ambulatory (12) and portico (13), at the E end of which is room (14), which contained amphorae and building material. Off the SE corner of the garden is DR•(15); its N side has been walled off in modern times, presumably to protect its paintings (PPM I, 395-396, #64-66). Garden (16) itself is largely ruined due to the general collapse of its floor into an underlying cistern and cryptoporticus, which remain unexcavated today; access to these underground areas was gained (probably via a wooden staircase) in the S branch of room (h) in Casa (I.6.8-9) (CTP IIIA, 10).

References

Jashemski 1993, 36; Allison 1992b, 234-245; PPM I, 361-398; CTP IIIA, 10-11; PPP I, 36-39; Guida Laterza 1982, 101-102; Bastet & De Vos 1979, 86-87, 51; De Vos 1977, 41-42; Guida 1976, 193-196;

Schefold 1957, 25-26; Della Corte 1954, 237-238; #577-578; Maiuri 1942a, 146-147; Pernice 1938, 106; Maiuri NSc 1929, 396, 404-427; Della Corte NSc 1912, 217, 220, 222, 246.

Data

A) Total area:	534.8	Nodes:	350.8	Connectors:	24.1	Static spaces:	160.8
B) Total # spaces:	20	# Nodes:	2	# Connectors:	3	# Static spaces:	12
C) Area, KI (8):	6.0	Area, DR◊(11):	26.1	Length, DR◊(11):	5.98	Width, DR◊(11):	4.37
		Area, DR•(15):	23.1	Length, DR•(15):	5.29	Width, DR•(15):	4.37
D) Entry prox., KI (8):	21.1	Entry prox., DR(11):	25.3	Prox, KI (8)-DR(11):	8.5		
		Entry prox., DR•(15):	44.0	Prox, KI (8)-DR•(15):	23.8		
E) Entry access., KI (8):	5	Entry access., DR◊(11):	5	Access, KI (8)-DR◊(11):	4		
		Entry access., DR•(15):	8	Access, KI (8)-DR•(15):	6		
F) Sight perc., KI (8)-DR◊(11):	N	Sound perc., KI (8)-DR◊(11):	T	Smell perc., KI (8)-DR◊(11):	F		
Sight perc., KI (8)-DR•(15):	N	Sound perc., KI (8)-DR•(15):	T	Smell perc., KI (8)-DR•(15):	F		
G) Environmental amenities, dining areas: DR◊(11) received ample light and air as well as a pleasant view through a wide window S onto garden (16), but was protected from extreme weather by ambulatory (12) and portico (13). With its SE orientation, the room would have been suitable for dining at any season. DR•(15) was once even more open to the garden; in the early first century A.D., its large window in the W wall (directly onto the garden) was blocked up and painted over in the 3rd style. The decoration consisted of small panels of miniature landscapes against a red ground over a black socle, which, as De Vos (PPM I, 395, #63) notes, substituted for the view once held onto the garden. The resulting open N end of the room could only indirectly receive light and air from the E portico of the garden. If a dinner more open to the elements was desired, dining couches could be moved to the N end of the E portico, where they might enjoy a direct view of the garden.							
H) Installation amenities, KI (8): Against the N wall of the kitchen is a solid masonry stove of sub-type (1) (Fig. 2.19). At the back of its tile-topped surface, large upright tiles are built up against the wall, forming a high curb that would protect the wall from heat and the splatter of cooking. To the left of the stove in the NW corner of the room is a small area filled with debris; Maiuri mentions a "acquario con tubo fittile di scarico in vicolo" (a sink with an outlet to the street) -- the drain is still visible, and the sink probably lies underneath the debris in the corner. ⁴⁸ The latrine in (10) could have provided additional drainage. Water was available from the cisterns under either the atrium or the peristyle. Closed off from any open courts by corridor (7), light and air were scarce; no windows were present in the W wall onto the street. This room had							

⁴⁸Maiuri NSc 1929, 414.

a shed roof; perhaps a flue or chimney in the roof provided ventilation, although no identifiable fragments of such a device were found.

Only one terracotta vase was recorded from the kitchen, but cooking wares were stored elsewhere in the house. Against the W wall of the *fauces* (a) (perhaps fallen from the floor above) was found a bronze cooking pot (*olla*). In the cupboard on the W side of the atrium, two bronze *casseroles* were stored. The chest in the NE corner of the atrium held two more *casseroles* and two colanders of bronze. The quantity of cooking vessels from the kitchen and the house is not large; vessels and utensils seem to have been stored in cupboards in the atrium.

Installation amenities, dining areas: No finds were recorded from either DR◊(11) or DR◊(15), but the remains of cupboards and chests throughout the house revealed a substantial selection of stored cooking and eating vessels (Maiuri NSc 1929, 419-423, Allison). In the cupboard at the center of the W wall of atrium (b) were found four elaborate silver cups with relief decoration, two plates and two cups of bronze, and eighteen other serving and drinking vessels of glass and terracotta. In the chest in the NE corner of the atrium were found two iron knives, and nine other vessels of bronze and terracotta. A chest against the E wall of the atrium contained six more bronze and terracotta vessels. Finally, three bronze jugs were found in a cupboard against the S wall of room (10). This array of serving and dining wares was separated and stored away in partial accordance to their function; the expensive silver vessels were all kept under the watch of the bronze statue of Apollo in the cabinet on the W side of the atrium. Table settings were brought out from their shelf space in the atrium only when dinner was ready, and then returned to their places after they had been washed.

I) Decorative amenities, KI (8): This room had a shed roof, sloping down W towards the street, as evidenced by five beam holes in the N wall. The floor is paved near the stove (itself faced with *opus signinum*) with tiles in a diagonal pattern. Patches of plain plaster adhere to the wall in the NE corner. At the N end of the W wall is a relieving arch in *opus mixtum listatum* (Fig. 2.19).

Decorative amenities, dining areas: DR◊(11) was found bereft of decoration; the room appears by its size and aspect to have been designed as a dining room, but its function had changed by the time of the eruption. At some point after the late 3rd style decoration had been applied to the atrium and its surrounding rooms, a door was opened in the NE corner of this room connecting to room (3); the position of this door would have interfered with any standard layout of dining-couches and perhaps altered the use of DR◊(11). At a still later time, the entrance to (3) was blocked up, but the room received no subsequent redecoration. DR•(15) received decoration of the 3rd style (described above under 'Environmental Amenities'), after its wide window onto garden (16) had been blocked.

J) Sanctity: At the top of a cupboard on the W side of atrium (b) was found an archaizing bronze statuette of Apollo Phileios holding a small stag and a laurel branch in each hand. Allison 1992,

237 suggests that the upper part of the cupboard may have been a makeshift shrine, but is uncomfortable with the juxtaposition of ritual and utilitarian material (pots, pans, and a hoe). Whether this statuette had any ritual significance for the residents of this house remains unclear.

S y n t h e s i s

The assemblages of artifacts in the cupboards and chests in the atrium attest to the occupancy of this house (while undergoing restoration) in A.D. 79. The lack of decoration and finds in DR◊(11) is puzzling; either the room was in the course of restoration, as Maiuri believed, or it had ceased being used for dining. DR•(15) and DR◊(11) are of identical width; any dining furniture that once occupied the latter would have fit perfectly in the former without modification. It is possible then that DR•(15) was meant to replace DR◊(11) as the primary dining area in the house during its last period of occupation. However, Maiuri (NSc 1929, 414) declared that the peristyle area was in a state of ruin and abandonment; whether this fact implies that DR•(15) was neither in use at the time of the eruption is unclear. The cooking and dining facilities in this house are simply and effectively designed. KI (8) is tucked away in a space central in the house, out of sensory range but convenient for serving meals either to rooms around the atrium (a possible early dining room (n)), or to the two dining areas off the garden. DR◊(11) has a prominent but protected southerly aspect onto the decorated garden, and is the largest room in the house. The finely decorated DR•(15) was oriented for cool summer dining. If the two dining areas were ever in synchronous operation, they would have formed an interesting pendant comprised of two comparably sized well-lit and airy dining spaces offering different settings. However, the state of the dining areas in A.D. 79 (i.e. undecorated or not fully furnished rooms) implies that dining took place in disrupted conditions.

23. I.6.12, Taberna del faber ferrarius Iunianus, (work)shop (Figs. 2.4, 5.3, 5.17)

S y n o p s i s

This two-room shop complex at the NW corner of the *insula* was originally part of the house I.6.11; traces of 1st style decoration on the facade and a blocked-up passage to *fauces* (a) of the house demonstrate the connection, which was severed at some point prior to the earthquake of A.D. 62. Against the exterior of the shop, just W of the entrance onto the Via del Abbondanza, is the podium of an *ara compitalis*, dedicated to the *Lares* who watch over the crossroads (Fig. 5.17). At the SW corner of room (m') is the base for a stair to an upper story or loft. Immured in the corner itself is a pipe for draining fluids from that upper floor, a "condotto di scarico dei servizi di cucina ed latrina" that drains into the street, although no evidence for a kitchen or

latrine on the second floor survives today.⁴⁹ Simple 4th style decoration, including a pedestaled figure rendered in a crude, folksy style on the S wall of (m') (PPM I, 398, #1), covers the walls.

Within the shop were found more than 220 bronze and iron items, including numerous agricultural implements, horse trappings, tools, keys, hinges, hooks, knives and even shackles. Only five vessels were among the finds, and they do not indicate that either cooking or eating was carried out on the premises. Because no hearths or forges for making or fixing the metal items were found, this shop appears to have been exclusively for retail. Della Corte ascribed the property to one Iunianus; Gralfs has recently suggested that the shop was a point of sale for the wares of one P. Pilonius Felix, whose manufacturing center was located elsewhere. This shop is presently used as a local office for site custodians.

R e f e r e n c e s

PPM I, 397-399; PPP I, 39; Gralfs 1988, 84-86; CTP IIIA, 10-11; Gassner 1986, 130; Guida Laterza 1982, 101; Guida 1976, 193; Schefold 1957, 26; Della Corte 1954, 236-237, #576; Maiuri NSc 1929, 427-430; Della Corte 1927, 15; Della Corte NSc 1912, 336, 354-356, 402.

D a t a

A) Total area: 56.1	Nodes: 38.8	Connectors: 6.6	Static spaces: 18.6
B) Total # spaces: 3	# Nodes: 1	# Connectors: 1	# Static spaces: 1

24. I.6.13-14, Casa di Stallius Eros, *casa media* (Figs. 2.4, 2.14, 5.3, 5.18, 5.62)

S y n o p s i s

This property suffered such damage before the eruption that it was found in a state of nearly complete ruin at the time of its excavation. The house also underwent several structural changes. The limestone ashlar facade of the original house (3-2 c. B.C.) matches the 1st style (*opus signinum* with inset tesserae) pavement of the atrium and surrounding rooms, especially DR•(4), *tablinum* (6), and room (7). Room (3) was originally a shop with an entrance to the street on the S, attached to the house by a door in the NW corner that connected to corridor (d). A door and a stairway at (g) once allowed direct access from the street to the house and second floor rooms above. At some point (probably during the early first century A.D.), shop (3) was blocked off from both street and house, becoming completely isolated for an unknown reason. Maiuri adds that after the earthquake of A.D. 62, the street entrance to (g) was closed off, and a new stair opened up on the S side at #14, leading from the street to rooms over (a, 1-2). That range of upper floor rooms included a balcony projecting over the street from above room (2), which in turn accessed a small space over the stair to the upper floor, which Maiuri calls "un casotto,

⁴⁹Maiuri NSc 1929, 428.

adoperato per cucina o per dispensa, accessibile solo dall'esterno del balcone".⁵⁰ He offers no evidence that the space was actually used for cooking.

The house appears to have been under restoration before it was covered with debris and rendered uninhabitable. Garden (13) was painted in the 4th style, a pile of sand was found in (5) and a pile of lime in (7), evidence of renovation material. De Vos (PPM I, PPP I) dates the garden painting to before A.D. 62, and a coin of Nero dating to A.D. 60 (or 65) was found amongst the restoration building material; these data suggest that ongoing work at the house was perhaps interrupted by the earthquake of A.D. 62, which caused this house to collapse upon itself, the rubble of its walls forming a deposit of ca. 1.5 m. thick in the atrium. The severity of the damage apparently ended the renovation and the occupation of the house.⁵¹ Limited habitation continued, if anywhere, in the upper floor rooms reached from #14, if Maiuri is correct in assuming the entrance was installed only after A.D. 62. Maiuri's evidence for this dating is based however on his expectation that residences were subdivided in the post-earthquake period, not on any direct physical evidence. The scattered finds (coins, weaving implements, lamps and small vessels) found mixed in the rubble collapse (and almost exclusively in rooms along the street) can either be interpreted as refuse discarded on the abandoned property by other Pompeians, or evidence for humble occupation between A.D. 62-79.⁵² The house lay essentially abandoned for seventeen years; hence, the analysis of the cooking and dining facilities here must consider the layout of the house prior to its renovation and subsequent collapse.

The basic layout of the house in the early first century A.D. begins at *fauces* (a), flanked by two small rooms on the S side of atrium (b). The atrium has a HE in its SW corner (Figs. 2.14, 5.62); on the W, corridor (d) accesses shop (3), followed by DR•(4) (Fig. 5.62). *Cubiculum* (5) and *tablinum* (6) comprise the range of rooms on the N, with corridor (e) leading to room (7) and garden (13), with a wooden stair to the upper floor on the W. Further W along corridor (f) are a cistern head that allows for water to be drawn directly from the upper floor, and three small rooms (8-10) around a stair at (g). Allison mentions a latrine in (10). A small room (11) has a small niched shrine in its W face, and (12) in the NW corner has a latrine in its SE corner and

⁵⁰Maiuri NSc 1929, 431: "A 'utility room', used for cooking or storage, accessible only from the outside via the balcony".

⁵¹Maiuri NSc 1929, 430 suggested that the house had been converted into a 'builder's yard' after the earthquake, storing raw materials for the renovation of neighboring houses. Allison corrects him, noting that the rubble collapse was not building material for re-use, but the material of the collapsed house that buried the actual piles of sand and lime.

⁵²Allison 1992b, 259 suggests that the scattered finds belonged to the occupation of the upper floor of the residence, and that they were caught in the collapse of the house at some point between A.D. 62-79. However, her argument that undocumented tremors during those years may have been the cause of an interim collapse is based on negative evidence.

another stairway to the N. The name of Stallius Eros, the person associated with this house, was engraved on a bronze seal found in garden (13).

References

Jashemski 1993, 36, 313-314; Allison 1992b, 253-260; PPM I, 400-406; Michel 1990, 65; PPP I, 39; CTP IIIA 10-11; Laidlaw 1985, 60; Evans 1978, 175-176; De Vos 1977, 39; Schefold 1957, 26; Della Corte 1954, 224-225, #537; Maiuri 1942a, 159-160; Pernice 1938, 42; Boyce 1937, 25, #38; Maiuri NSc 1929, 430-436.

Data

A) Total area:	303.7	Nodes:	95.0	Connectors:	34.0	Static spaces:	177.1
B) Total # spaces:	24	# Nodes:	2	# Connectors:	8	# Static spaces:	13
C) Area, HE in (b):	2.5	Area, DR•(4):	24.8	Length, DR•(4):	6.57	Width, DR•(4):	3.86
D) Entry prox., HE in (b):	7.2	Entry prox., DR•(4):	10.2	Prox, HE in (b)-DR•(4):	2.5		
E) Entry access., HE in (b):	3	Entry access., DR•(4):	4	Access, HE in (b)-DR•(4):	2		
F) Sight perc., HE in (b)-DR•(4):	N						

Sound perc., HE in (b)-DR•(4): T

Smell perc., HE in (b)-DR•(4): T

G) Environmental amenities, DR•(4): With no windows in the back wall onto the street, all light and air and the only view came E from the atrium, through a doorway neither high nor wide. The view is not centered on the *impluvium*; little effort in general seems to have been made to improve the architectural setting of this room.

H) Installation amenities, HE in (b): A semicircular (radius 0.70; h. 0.30 m.) tile-topped podium fit into the SW corner of the atrium describes a HE of sub-type (1) (Fig. 2.14). Its construction against the plaster decoration of the atrium indicates that it was a later installation, although it is not possible to ascertain exactly when the HE was installed. Light and ventilation were available via the *compluvium*; water was available from cistern heads in atrium (b), corridor (f), and garden (13), and either the street or latrines in (10, 12) were available for drainage. No finds are reported from the area of the hearth. Allison interprets the HE as a sign that the atrium had been 'downgraded' prior to the ruin of the building. However, there is no basis for assuming a cooking installation that takes advantage of the light, ventilation, water source and proximity to street drainage in an atrium consequently indicates the 'social' degradation of that space.

Installation amenities, DR•(4): The W end of the thin S wall of this room shows a recess 1.48 m. long on Maiuri's (NSc 1929) plan; however, the disintegration of the wall since its excavation precludes confirmation of the presence of any couch niche at this point. The possibility of a couch niche, combined with the presence of a central emblema in the pavement decoration makes the identification of this room for dining highly probable.

I) Decorative amenities, DR•(4): Evans hypothesizes, on the basis of the construction styles of the atrium, that this room was not originally part of the house. However, the chronological correlation between the 1st style *cocciopesto* pavement and the ashlar construction of the rooms around the atrium suggests that DR•(4) was originally designed as part of the house, and as a dining area. Its pavement decoration consists of a diamond pattern in white tesserae centered on a rectangular emblema (l. 1.50, w. 1.30 m.) at the W end of the room (Pernice, Taf. 11.5). The emblema consists of an asterisk of alternating black and white 'spokes' bordered with a pattern of ivy. The emblema leaves 1.28 m. of space to its N and S, indicating perhaps the width of the dining couches, which would fit comfortably within the 1.48 m. of the niche in the SW corner. No wall-painting is preserved from this room.

J) Sanctity: An elevated, arcuated niche faces out from the SE corner of the garden (13), the lower part of its interior painted in red; Maiuri describes the niche as a modest *lararium*.

S y n t h e s i s

The cooking and eating arrangements in this house are few and simple: one large dining room to the side of the atrium, with appropriate decoration, and a small hearth in the near corner of the atrium, out of sight of the diners, but well within aural and olfactory range. DR•(4) is an original part of the house, but the HE appears to have been added later, perhaps as a more permanent substitute for portable cooking devices such as braziers that were also likely used within the atrium. The back garden is apparently not exploited as a vista or background for dining; practical concerns seem to have outweighed aesthetic concerns. Around the middle of the first century A.D., the house was cleared of its furniture and objects in the process of its renovation (explaining the paucity of finds in the house), but the work was suddenly cut off by the A.D. 62 earthquake, and the property was allowed to deteriorate, except perhaps for some limited occupation of the second floor above the S range of rooms.

25. I.6.15, Casa dei Ceii, *casa media* (Figs. 2.4, 2.16, 5.3, 5.18, 5.63-5.66)

S y n o p s i s

This atrium house was essentially constructed in the latter half of the second century B.C. The *fauces* (a), flanked by two *cubicula* (c, i), led into the tetrastyle atrium (b) without side rooms. Behind the atrium, a corridor (k) ran between the *tablinum* (d) on the W and a dining room (e) on the E back to a porticoed garden (h, r) with a large service room (l, m, n) on the E side. Michel hypothesizes that (l, m) was the original kitchen of the house, with a latrine in the space later blocked off to become (n).

Nearly the whole house received redecoration and repaving in the late 3rd style, including DR•(e), atrium (b), and the *cubiculum* (i). The S wall of *tablinum* (d) was then almost

completely closed off, and the room was given a new pavement, but not any wall painting; Spinazzola postulated that the room was used for summer dining and was under renovation at the time of the eruption. After the A.D. 62 earthquake, the undecorated space (l, m, n) was subdivided and cooking was transferred to KI (i). At its excavation, area (l) contained a bronze circular brazier (d. 0.29, h. 0.29 m.) at its center, associated with furniture fittings for a storage cabinet. Even after the kitchen installations were removed from this space, it seems to have continued to serve some role in storing cooking appliances. KI (i) was provided with a HE at the E wall, a ST in the SE corner, a latrine in the SW corner below a stair to a newly constructed upper floor facing onto the street, and a grinding table in the center of the N wall (Figs. 5.18, 5.63-5.64). Another stair on the W wall of the atrium led to second floor rooms above the back of the house and around the garden; the under-stair, closed off with *opus craticum*, became a storage space. A chest in the NE corner and a cupboard in the SE corner provided additional storage in the atrium. The N wall of garden (h) received a megalographic Nilotic painting in the 4th style. The walls of room (g), also painted in the 4th style, were still later punctured with a series of holes for shelving. A silver and bronze water-heater (h. 0.24, d. 0.19 m.) was found just N of the entrance to this storeroom.

The heavy tunneling of salvage or scavenge operations after the eruption may account for the few finds that were found in the house, especially from the storage spaces in the atrium. Allison doubts that the house could so thoroughly have been cleaned out after the eruption. Disbelieving that the inhabitants of the house would have been able to take many possessions with them during the eruption, she postulates that the house had been 'reduced' prior to the eruption. The storage in (g) and KI (i) is taken as evidence of this 'reduction', but the conversion of decorated rooms into storage spaces does not necessarily imply downgraded conditions in the whole house, but merely an alteration in the use of certain rooms. Without storage, a household is unable to operate at all. The house was occupied until at least A.D. 69 on the basis of numismatic evidence, and perhaps until A.D. 78 (according to Franklin) on the basis of the owner's run for the office of *duumvir*. This evidence implies a socially engaged, not a 'reduced' household.⁵³ It is likely that prompt escape with household goods during the eruption, and the subsequent salvage of remaining items can account for the general lack of finds. The house is connected to the Sabellian *gens* of the Ceii on the basis of numerous electoral recommendations painted on the 1st style facade.

⁵³Allison 1992b, 316, attempts to nullify Franklin's argument by noting Mouritsen's general arguments against the exact dating of electoral campaigns (1988, 41). However, she ignores Mouritsen's specific assertion that the candidacy for *duumvir* of L. Ceius Secundus "must be placed in the second half of the 70's" (1988, 42).

References

Jashemski 1993, 36, 315; Allison 1992b, 309-317; PPM I, 407-482; Michel 1990; Sutherland 1990, 373-374; Collezione 1989, 182, #70-72; Mouritsen 1988, *passim*; Watts 1987, 36-37, 206-207; PPP I, 39-45; Laidlaw 1985, 61-64; CTP IIIA, 10-11; Guida Laterza 1982, 98-100; Franklin 1980, *passim*; Evans 1978, 175-181; Salza Prina Ricotti 1978/80, 244, 248; Bastet & De Vos 1979, 96-99, 127, 135; Jashemski 1979, 69-70; Guida 1976, 189-191; Castrèn 1975, 151-152; Schefold 1957, 26-28; Della Corte 1954, 225-227, #540-542; Spinazzola I, 257-281; Pernice 1938, 101-102; Della Corte 1927, 20-22; Beccarini 1922, 19-20; Della Corte NSc 1914, 256, 292-296, 401-402; 1913, 189-190, 221, 250-252, 254-256.

Data

A) Total area:	331.4	Nodes:	179.5	Connectors:	32.3	Static spaces:	127.7
B) Total # spaces:	17	# Nodes:	2	# Connectors:	4	# Static spaces:	10
C) Area, KI (i):	13.1	Area, DR•(d):	21.5	Length, DR•(d):	4.92	Width, DR•(d):	4.36
		Area, DR•(e):	17.1	Length, DR•(e):	5.09	Width, DR•(e):	3.36
D) Entry prox., KI (i):	7.3	Entry prox., DR(d):	16.8	Prox, KI (i)-DR(d):	11.7		
		Entry prox., DR•(e):	15.9	Prox, KI (i)-DR•(e):	12.9		
E) Entry access., KI (i):	4	Entry access., DR•(d):	4	Access, KI (i)-DR•(d):	3		
		Entry access., DR•(e):	4	Access, KI (i)-DR•(e):	3		
F) Sight perc., KI (i)-DR•(d):	N	Sound perc., KI (i)-DR•(d):	T	Smell perc., KI (i)-DR•(d):	F		
Sight perc., KI (i)-DR•(e):	N	Sound perc., KI (i)-DR•(e):	T	Smell perc., KI (i)-DR•(e):	F		

G) Environmental Amenities, dining areas: DR•(d) receives direct lighting from its broad doorway N onto garden (h); indirect lighting arrives via a door and window S onto atrium (b), and a window high up in the W wall above neighboring house (I.6.13) (Fig. 5.65). A cross-draft would have run between the garden and atrium, and the northern orientation of the room would have been appropriate for summer, as Spinazzola and Michel suggest. The S colonnade of garden (h) breaks on axis with the doorway of this dining room, allowing a framed view of part of the center of the megalographic painting on the N wall of the garden, a scene of wild animals hunting. This scene in the distance extended the vision of those in the room beyond the walls of the house into a fantastic foreign landscape.

DR•(e) received primary illumination from a wide window cut (after A.D. 62) high up in the E wall over the garden of the neighboring house (I.6.2). Indirect light entered via the narrow doors onto atrium (b) and corridor (k) (Fig. 5.66). Although generally a dark room, the black ground decoration of the lower half of the room would have been lightened somewhat by the white ground of the upper painted zone. Protected from the elements and provided with a limited view in a southerly orientation, this room has commonly been described as a winter dining room.

H) Installation amenities, KI (i): The E half of this room is taken up by the kitchen proper. The W half, underneath the stairs from atrium (b) to the upper floor, serves as a latrine with a seat against the W end of the S wall and a small area paved with tiles in front of the seat. Along the E half of the S wall (in the former position of the bed alcove when the room was a *cubiculum*), was a ST of sub-type (3) (l. 1.36, w. 0.85, h. 0.80 m.) (Fig. 5.63). Only the W wall of the ST (which also serves to demarcate the latrine from the kitchen) and a minute fragment of the SW corner of the surface survives. The E end of the stove surface was presumably built into and supported by the room wall, which was breached by ancient tunneling after the eruption, destroying the ST. When the room was turned into a kitchen, a large window was installed in the S wall directly above the ST, to assist in the ventilation of the room and to provide light to work by. Additional (though limited) light and ventilation was available via the door to atrium and the stairwell to the upper floor. At the foot of the center of the E wall project forth two parallel stub walls of plaster-faced tiles (l. 0.40, w. 0.20, h. 0.43-0.47, and 0.43 m. apart) (Fig. 2.16). These walls form a HE of sub-type (2); Michel suggests alternatively that they are supports for a bench.⁵⁴ In the wall above the HE are punched four small rectangular holes at regular intervals, which certainly once held supports for two shelves at least 1.15 m. long, one below the other. The evidence for shelving on the E wall of the room implies storage of kitchen utensils, implements, vessels and perhaps even food or spices. Storage space in the corners of atrium (b) might also have held kitchen supplies. Two additional portable cooking devices were found elsewhere in the house: a bronze BZ in room (l), and a silver and bronze WH in room (g). Both devices were presumably stored in their find-spots, convenient for preparing or keeping food or drink warm in or near DR•(d) and DR•(e). Just W of the door along the N wall, in the corner adjacent to the stairs, is a quarter-circular podium of masonry (d. 0.56 (N) - 0.77 (W), h. 0.55 m.) with a plastered surface that slopes slightly downward towards its center (Fig. 5.64). A podium of identical construction in the NE corner of KI (21) in the Casa dei Cinque Scheletri (VII.14.9) had the lower half of a small hand mill affixed to its top surface (Fig. 2.33). A hand-mill found intact in KI (i) (Fig. 2.16) must therefore have been used on the podium, the plastered concave surface of which would have been ideal for collecting flour ground from the mill. A shallow Arretine bowl, a bronze oinochoe and three amphorae were also recovered from the room. Finally, a *dolium* full of ash (in the company of numerous clumps of charcoal, remains of the wooden stair) was discovered against the W wall immediately underneath the stairs. Perhaps ash collected from stove was saved in the *dolium*, and then tossed down the latrine hole to control (as activated carbon) the smell and activity of

⁵⁴The usefulness of a bench at this location in the kitchen is not easily apparent, since anyone seated thereupon would have had to duck below the shelving raised above it on the same wall. Another HE of this type was found with a tripod *in situ* in (I.7.10-12 (8)); other comparanda are provided in the typology in chapter two, pp. 78-79.

insects, efficiently recycling the material. Alternatively, the jar could have held water for washing up after using the latrine. Water for the kitchen was available from either atrium (b) or the double cisterns underneath garden (h). The latrine or the street were each suitable for drainage.

Install. amenities, dining areas: Few finds were recovered from either dining room. DR•(d) contained one bronze patera, and a rectangle (l. 0.90, w. 0.42 m.) cut in the center of the W edge of the pavement may indicate the position of a small piece of furniture. No finds or evidence for installations were reported from DR•(e). Serving and table wares could presumably have been stored in any of the three easily accessible storage areas in the corners of atrium (b), or perhaps on the shelves of room (g), wherein a broken crystal chalice was found.

I) Decorative amenities, KI (i): This room was originally a *cubiculum* with an alcove for a bed at the E end of the S wall. In the general redecoration of the house in the 3rd style, this room was given white-ground decoration with small vignettes painted in a simple style, suggesting to De Vos (PPM I, 434) that the room was given to a high-ranking household slave. When the room was converted into a kitchen, the ST was installed in the former bed alcove, and the decoration of the room was damaged considerably by the other installations -- the HE, latrine, and stairs to the upper floor. The room lacks any pavement today, and its floor level lies two steps (0.40 m.) down from the level of the atrium. When the room was a *cubiculum*, the floor was level with the atrium; it was lowered to its present level presumably to facilitate the installation of the latrine.

Decorative amenities, dining areas: DR•(d) was devoid of wall decoration at the time of the eruption, and was perhaps under renovation. Its pavement however dates to the 3rd style renovation of the house, and is raised two steps above the level of the atrium (Fig. 5.65). A pattern of white tesserae inset around pieces of colored marble in *opus signinum* (l. 1.5, w. 1.3 m.) centers on a rectangular emblema of *opus sectile* bordered with a vine pattern in tesserae. The spaces left around the emblema suggest a width of ca. 1.25 m. per couch.

The pavement and walls of DR•(e) were both redecorated in the 3rd style. The pavement of black cocciopesto with inset white tesserae centered on a small square emblema of *opus sectile* (l., w. 0.70 m.) leaves a width of 1.30-1.50 m. around it for the placement of couches (Fig. 5.66). The lower part of the walls were black ground, matching the pavement, with an upper zone on white ground. Two surviving central panels on the E and W walls depict a Maenad and Dionysos, respectively. The decoration of the E wall was disrupted by its window; ancient tunnelers destroyed the central panel of the N wall.

J) Sanctity: No finds or installations of ritual significance are reported from this house. However, De Vos (PPM I, 408-409) suggests that room (g) (before it was provided with shelves) and garden (h) formed an 'Osireion'. She argues that the Egyptian motifs, surrounding water channel and the engaged pillars on the exterior NW and NE corners of (g) facilitated the re-enactment of the

sacred union of Isis and Osiris in the artificial Nilotic setting of the W wall of the garden. The depictions and motifs of Dionysos, Osiris and Itys on the walls of DR•(e) are taken as further evidence for a household concern with deities associated with an afterlife. She also considers the black atmosphere of DR•(e) to have been an appropriate setting for ritual banquets for initiates. These suggestions are intriguing, considering the house's position only two blocks due east of the Temple of Isis. However, the Egyptianizing motifs may be as easily explained in terms of the patron's artistic preferences, and the water channel in garden (h) was certainly used to direct water fallen from the roof to the two large cisterns underneath the garden.⁵⁵ Without more secure corroborating evidence, De Vos' suggestion must remain an interesting hypothesis.

S y n t h e s i s

If the original kitchen of the house was indeed located in room (l, m, n), it was a convenient location for serving either DR•(d) or DR•(e), while being provided with light, ventilation and water from garden (h). It is unclear why the kitchen was moved to room (i) after the earthquake. Perhaps the installation and subsequent fumes of the work-basins of the *fullonica* (I.6.7) immediately to the N made the space uncomfortable for food preparation. The *fullonica* did not, however, prevent the owner of this house from painting the walls of garden (h) with elaborate 4th style decoration.

It is more likely that this house did not contain a kitchen with fixed installations in its original phases -- portable appliances such as the BZ found in (l) were used instead. The installation of a ST, HE, and grinding podium in (i) may represent a considerable upgrade of the house's cooking facilities, combined with a new latrine. De Vos (PPM I, 408) interprets the grand painting in garden (h) to be part of the owner's plan to impress guests during his runs for offices in the 70's A.D. Given the important link in Roman society between entertaining and political and social fortunes, a better equipped kitchen may have been required to provide satisfactory meals. The new KI (i) was convenient for serving DR•(d) and DR•(e), and was well-supplied with light, ventilation, water and drainage. The BZ and WH stored in the back of the house would have been brought out when necessary to keep food and drink warm, and in the case of DR•(e), to help heat the room during the winter season. The new location of KI (i) was by no means more visible to guests in the dining rooms merely because of its position off the atrium; any view to the entrance of the kitchen from either dining room was almost completely blocked by the position of the columns in the center of the atrium. Guests would have had only fleeting glimpses of the servants moving through the atrium before they arrived at the threshold of the dining room bearing food.

⁵⁵Consult De Vos 1980 for a general treatise on Egyptianizing motifs and styles in early Imperial painted and mosaic decoration.

26. I.7.1+20, Casa di P. Paquius Proculus, *casa grande*
(Figs. 2.5, 2.22, 5.4, 5.19, 5.67-5.70)

S y n o p s i s

A thorough analysis of the building history of this house is due in Ehrhardt's forthcoming monograph; I will sketch out only the major phases. Construction of the house, with its 1st style facade and 1st style decor in the forward bedroom (4) and room (15), dates roughly to the second century B.C. The original form of the house probably included the house to the E at (I.7.2-3), which may have served as a kind of second atrium. 2nd style decoration in the cryptoporticus provides an approximate 1 c. B.C. date to the construction of those underground rooms, as well as the peristyle above. KI (14) includes the stairway down to the underground rooms and must be as early as the cryptoporticus. Extensive decorating in the 3rd style followed, with particular attention to mosaic pavements. After the earthquake of A.D. 62, various wall repairs and redecorations were carried out throughout the house, including entrance (1-2), atrium (3), *tablinum* (6), area (8), around peristyle (9) and DR•(18).

The entrance (1-2) to the house, guarded by a 'cave canem' mosaic, leads into the high Tuscan atrium (3) with no side rooms. The spectacular early 3rd style mosaic floor of the atrium is divided into square and rectangular panels, each with an animal (largely birds) depicted at the center. Particularly interesting are two panels facing each other from the E and W sides of the marble *impluvium*, containing a male and female silhouette respectively, perhaps the master and mistress of the house. Two bedrooms (4, 7) flank the entrance to the N; the latter had an auxiliary entrance onto the atrium via a narrow space on its SE side. Two alcoves on the E wall of the atrium, formed from blocked-up doorways to (I.7.2-3), served as built-in storage cabinets. At the SW corner of the atrium, corridor (5) led through to the peristyle and, by a stairway along its W wall, to upper floor rooms over (6, 8) and the NW corner of the peristyle. The southernmost of these upper floor rooms was a colonnaded *cenaculum* (subdivided into two rooms, each l. 4.0, w. 3.0 m.) that overlooked the peristyle. By virtue of its elevation and the topography sloping away to the S, the *cenaculum* must have had a clear view of the mountains in that direction. On the ground floor, *tablinum* had wide entrances onto both the atrium and area (8), and a large alcove was built into the E side of the room, perhaps for the placement of furniture. Area (8) served as a third node in the house, directing and concentrating traffic between the atrium and peristyle; it had two columns *in antis* on its S side looking onto the peristyle, and a large *opus sectile* emblema in the center of its pavement. A small storage nook was available in the NE corner. It is conceivable that a large dinner party could have been carried out in area (8), or smaller gatherings in the *cenaculum* above. However, given the traffic to which area (8) must have been subject and the small size of the two parts of the *cenaculum*, as well as the numerous other dining areas present in the house, area (8) or the *cenaculum* were probably not regular dining areas.

The majority of rooms in the house were arranged around three sides of peristyle (9), in the center of which was a fountain and a DO of wooden couches. Two dining areas, DR•(18) and DR (16) sandwiched a small room (17), which contained an altar and was perhaps a focus of domestic cult (Figs. 5.69-5.70). The skeletons of seven youths were found huddled in DR•(18). Service and storage (13, 14 15) rooms occupied the E side of the peristyle; a stairway wrapped around the walls of KI (14) and led to an extensive cryptoporticus underneath the peristyle (Fig. 5.67-5.68). Rooms on the S side of the peristyle were found in poor condition due to the collapse of the vaults below; another stairway in (12) led to the cryptoporticus, while two bedrooms or sitting rooms (10, 11b) flanked DR◊(11a) on the W. The cryptoporticus, supplied with a bath, was turned into a storage area after the damage of the earthquake. Amphorae for both wine and garum were found in great quantity here, analogous to the reuse of the cryptoporticus in (I.6.2). The underground rooms had a third point of access at #20, directly onto the covered Vicolo di Paquio Proculo that followed the topography sloping down from N to S. This alley, with arrangements for closure at either end, was a private passage used for the convenient movement of people and goods into the house by means of the cryptoporticus.

There are competing assignments of families to this house, both based on inscriptions found at the entrance of the house. Della Corte preferred P. Paquius Proculus, whose electoral recommendations are painted on the front of the house. Spinazzola argued for C. Cuspius Pansa, the subject of a laudatory distych in the entranceway. Neither is completely convincing.

R e f e r e n c e s

Ehrhardt forthcoming; Jashemski 1993, 37; PPM I, 483-552; Sutherland 1990, 134-148; Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, 178-179, #62-63; Strocka & Ehrhardt 1988; Strocka & Ehrhardt 1987; PPP I, 45-53; CTP IIIA, 12-13; Laidlaw 1985, 64-65; Guida Laterza 1982, 111-112; Bastet & De Vos 1979, 112-114; Evans 1978, 186; Guida 1976, 208-210; Schefold 1957, 28-29; Della Corte 1954, 257-260, #638-640; Spinazzola I, 297-314; Soprano 1950, 307, #30; Maiuri 1942a, 147; Maiuri NSc 1929, 386-391; Della Corte 1927, 26-30; Della Corte NSc 1911, 426-430.

D a t a (not including 12 underground spaces of the cryptoporticus that take up 232.7 m², or the covered Vicolo di Paquio Proculo to the W taking up 190.1 m²)

A) Total area:	880.8	Nodes:	580.5	Connectors:	31.4	Static spaces:	281.0
B) Total # spaces:	29	# Nodes:	3	# Connectors:	5	# Static spaces:	17
C) Area, KI (14):	13.8	Area, DO (9):	17.7	Length, DO (9):	4.29	Width, DO (9):	4.13
		Area, DR◊(11a):	19.9	Length, DR◊(11a):	4.71	Width, DR◊(11a):	4.22
		Area, DR (16):	33.4	Length, DR (16):	7.88	Width, DR (16):	4.22
		Area, DR•(18):	19.8	Length, DR•(18):	4.61	Width, DR•(18):	4.29

D) Entry prox., KI (14): 39.8	Entry prox., DO (9): 39.0	Prox, KI (14)-DO (9): 10.6
	Entry prox., DR◊(11a): 53.8	Prox, KI (14)-DR◊(11a): 25.8
	Entry prox., DR (16): 38.3	Prox, KI (14)-DR (16): 7.1
	Entry prox., DR•(18): 25.8	Prox, KI (14)-DR•(18): 10.5
E) Entry access., KI (14): 7	Entry access., DO (9): 8	Access, KI (14)-DO (9): 4
	Entry access., DR◊(11a): 9	Access, KI (14)-DR◊(11a): 4
	Entry access., DR (16): 7	Access, KI (14)-DR (16): 3
	Entry access., DR•(18): 7	Access, KI (14)-DR•(18): 3
F) Sight perc., KI (14)-DO (9): E	Sound perc., KI (14)-DO (9): T	Smell perc., KI (14)-DO (9): F
Sight perc., KI (14)-DR◊(11a): E	Sound perc., KI (14)-DR◊(11a): T	Smell perc., KI (14)-DR◊(11a): F
Sight perc., KI (14)-DR (16): N	Sound perc., KI (14)-DR (16): T	Smell perc., KI (14)-DR (16): F
Sight perc., KI (14)-DR•(18): N	Sound perc., KI (14)-DR•(18): T	Smell perc., KI (14)-DR•(18): F

G) Environmental amenities, dining areas: DO (9), set up in the center of peristyle (9), was protected from the sun by a bower stretched over the four columns that limit the dining-space (Fig. 5.67, 5.69). A large marble-faced basin and fountain just to the N was the centerpiece of the diners' summertime view, and complemented the smaller marble basin around which the couches were arranged. Both DR◊(11a) and DR•(18) have wide doorways onto the peristyle garden, though in opposite directions. The doors provide views, light and air, and the framed views remain unblocked by servants, who enter through the small side doors. As Sutherland has noticed, the peristyle column meant to stand in front of DR◊(11a) was moved eastward, in order to allow an unobstructed view of the garden. DR (16) has no windows and two small doors at its SW corner; the room is sheltered off the corner of the peristyle and was perhaps used in winter.

H) Installation amenities, KI (14): This room has two levels. A ramp and stair lead down from the entrance around the N, E and S walls to a LT in the center of the stairwell, and finally the cryptoporticus, where numerous amphorae and evidence for storage were found (Figs. 2.22, 5.68). Above on the main floor is the kitchen proper, the level of the (now missing) floor clearly visible by a ledge that supported the floor beams. The three-arched masonry ST with tiled top surface takes up most of the E wall, above the passage downward; it is held up precariously by a rusting iron beam (these conditions precluded precise measurements of the stove). A small niche for a lamp is cut in the N wall just off the end of the stove. At the S end of the E wall is a large arcuated niche, either a *lararium* or a small storage space. Two floor-level apsed niches at either end of the S wall each lead to terracotta pipes immured in the wall, serving as drains. Della Corte (1927, 27) reports that a "portable iron stove", likely a brazier, was found (probably in storage) in room (15) just N of KI (14).

Installation amenities, dining areas: DO (9) consisted of three wooden dining couches and fifty nails; the imprints of the couches were discovered *in situ*. The couches were made of four

long boards set side by side and bound with iron bands nailed into the surface (Fig. 5.67). Each couch measured ca. 1.00-1.15 m. wide and 2.90-2.95 m. long. DR◊(11a), largely ruined by the collapse of the cryptoporticus vault below, had no evidence for dining finds or installations. DR (16) has a couch niche at the E end of the N wall (w. 1.30 m.) and an extended indentation on the S side, formed by a bend in that wall (probably useful for placing couches as well). There are no dining finds or installations in DR•(18), but the skeletons of seven persons seeking protection from the eruption were huddled in this room along the W wall. Still-life panels showing food (fish, bread, a glass bowl of fruit) were painted on the E wall of the atrium. Storage space was available in a niche just E of the door to DR (16), and there were two, possibly three deep niched cupboards on the E side of the atrium.

I) Decorative amenities, KI (14): Only traces of white plastering remain on the walls.

Decorative amenities, dining areas: A trace of mosaic flooring was left in the NE corner of DR (11a), but the ruined state of the room caused by the collapse of the vaults below left no other discernible decoration. DR (16) was provided with a late 2nd style central mosaic emblema of *opus vermiculatum* depicting pygmies in a Nilotic setting, a focus for the dining couches. The walls, of red-ground 3rd style had an upper zone on white ground with a painted 'balcony' running around the bottom of this zone, recalling the upper-floor colonnaded *cenaculum* that lay above room (8) just to the W. DR•(18) had a central mosaic emblema showing four theatrical masks, fronted on the S by a band of ivy that probably marked the limit of the dining furniture. The walls were a 4th style renovation of existing 2nd style decoration.

J) Sanctity: The arcuated niche at the S end of the E wall of KI (14) may have served as a *lararium*. More secure evidence for cult comes from the room (17), connected directly to DR (16). Therein Spinazzola reported and illustrated a small marble altar elaborately sculpted with facing doves on one side, and flowers and acanthus on the opposite side. On the basis of the doves "in amore", Spinazzola connected the domestic ritual practiced at this altar with Venus.

S y n t h e s i s

All dining areas are located deep into the house around the peristyle. The DO in (9) rests under a bower in the center of the garden, the open DR◊(11a) is oriented to the N, the open DR•(18) towards the S and DR (16) is sheltered in the NE corner. The variety of forms and orientations in these dining areas speaks to the importance of exploiting the seasonal advantages of this peristyle. The interior dining areas are given fine wall and floor decoration. A fountain provides scenery for the DO in (9). The atmospheres of dining are combinations of natural and mad-made scenery. All dining areas are placed at the ends of the peristyle, offering a long vista through the garden. Despite the specialization of the dining areas, all have remarkably similar widths; perhaps the same set of dining-couches was moved from room to room as the occasion

required. While the dining areas were arranged to gaze at each other, the suite of service and storage areas on the E side of the peristyle faced across the garden at only portico with no associated rooms. KI (14) was strategically placed in all of its aspects. Practically, it was able to draw upon storage from the cryptoporticus below, transporting goods without disrupting the rest of the house, through the secondary entrance at #20 and the private covered street. Servants could gather water from two cistern heads off the E portico. The kitchen was equipped with two drainage channels and a latrine within its own walls. Its large stove could handle dinners in any of the dining areas (all nearby), but the kitchen was removed just enough from the dining areas so that its preparations could neither be seen nor smelled. The whole design is integrated efficiently; guests can move smoothly through the house via the N and W porticos to a given dining area, where the orientation and decoration is guaranteed to present a pleasant view. The servants, drawing supplies and using utilities via a secondary, hidden entrance, move primarily along the E portico, where they will not interfere with the tableau presented to the diners.

27. I.7.2-3, Casa di M. Fabius Amandus, *casa piccola* (Figs. 2.5, 5.4, 5.20, 5.71-5.72)

S y n o p s i s

This house was originally part of the neighboring house (I.7.1) to the W; its facade and the border of its *impluvium* belong to the second century B.C. It gained its independence probably during the first century B.C. when the peristyle was built in (I.7.1), judging from traces of 2nd style decoration in rooms (e, l). Most of the house preserves 4th style decoration.

The house has two entrances; room (b) at #2 is a narrow space usually interpreted as a porter's lodge, but containing numerous weaving tools. A stair to upper floor rooms and a balcony over the street led from the S end of room (b). The *fauces* (a) ran past DI•(c) into atrium (d) with no side rooms (Fig. 5.71). The bedroom (e) lay off the SE corner of the atrium, where the *tablinum* might have been expected. A narrow passage (e') led to the rooms at the back of the house, centered around a court (g) and the small associated garden (f). Stairs led over a latrine in (h) to reach upper floor rooms at the back, including a balcony over the S edge of (g) (Fig. 5.72). A storage area (i) lay off the SE corner, and a well-decorated bedroom or sitting room (l) had an axial view directly onto garden (f).

R e f e r e n c e s

Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 169-173; Jashemski 37, 316; PPM I, 553-575; PPP I, 53-57; Gassner 1986, 130; CTP IIIA, 12-13; Laidlaw 1985, 65-66; Guida Laterza 1982, 112-113; Guida 1976, 211; Schefold 1957, 29-30; Maiuri 1954a, 110-112; Della Corte 1954, 260-261; #642-643; Spinazzola II, 687-689; Maiuri 1938, 1-3; Maiuri NSc 1927, 4, 7-15; Della Corte 1927, 30; Della Corte NSc 1912, 31-32; 65-68; 1911, 417, 458.

Data

A) Total area:	144.1	Nodes:	79.6	Connectors:	12.9	Static spaces:	55.39
B) Total # spaces:	13	# Nodes:	2	# Connectors:	3	# Static spaces:	6
C) Area, CS in (g):	3.0	Area, DI•(c):	11.6	Length, DI•(c):	3.26	Width, DI•(c):	3.56
D) Entry prox., CS in (g):	16.4	Entry prox., DI•(c):	7.2	Prox. CS in (g)-DI•(c):	12.5		
E) Entry access., CS in (g):	5	Entry access., DI•(c):	4	Access. CS in (g)-DI•(c):	4		
F) Sight perc., CS in (g)-DI•(c):	E	Sound perc., CS in (g)-DI•(c):	T	Smell perc., CS in (g)-DI•(c):	F		

G) Environmental amenities, DI•(c): The room is lit by a small window high in the N wall onto the street, and by the small doorway onto atrium (d). The view out of the room was marked primarily by the two light sources from the *compluvium* and court/garden (f, g), and any of the fine 4th style wall paintings in the atrium that these illuminated.

H) Installation amenities, CS in (g): There was no KI with fixed installations in the house, but Della Corte and Maiuri (NSc) report cooking vessels from several places within the house. Fallen from a room with a balcony located over entrance (a) and DI•(c) were four terracotta cooking/storage pots (*ollae*). A large lead water-storage barrel with relief decoration of the signs of the zodiac sat in the atrium next to the marble table. Used for pouring water was a large (h. 0.68 m.) one-handled terracotta jug with relief decoration was found in court (g).⁵⁶ From a room off of court (g), probably (i), a bronze cauldron with a cover came. Maiuri describes room (i) as a *cella penaria*; but only a niche for storage in the W wall supports such an attribution. An oinochoe and jug were also found near the LT under the stairs in the NE corner of (h).

Maiuri (1954a, 112) reports that: "The kitchen was represented by a few utensils and an iron tripod in one corner of the courtyard". Cooking seems therefore to have centered on the open court (g), probably against the W wall under the balcony that overhung the S edge of the court, where a fire would not block any doorways or traffic (Fig. 5.72). Cooking in an open court had obvious natural advantages of light and ventilation; furthermore, there was a water source at a cistern head in (g), and drainage close by via the latrine in (h).

Installation Amenities, DI•(c): Maiuri (NSc 1927, 9) identifies the function of DI•(c) on the basis of the imprint (presumably in the volcanic fill) of a couch (l. 1.75, w. 0.97 m.) within. Three couches of such a small size could be fit in this room, but the evidence might as easily support the identification of a *cubiculum* here. Cut in the S end of the E wall is a large niche used as a cabinet or cupboard (w. 1.00, h. 0.76, depth 0.22 m.). A cupboard at the S edge of the atrium near the NE pilaster of garden (f) contained a terracotta vase full of eggshells and ten glass bottles. The find of a bronze amphoretta and patera near the cooking area in the back of the house around court (g) may indicate other tableware storage.

⁵⁶Maiuri NSc 1927, 12, Fig. 4; underneath its handle was an inscription: "P. Corneli Corinti servos fecit", referring perhaps to the putative potter next door at I.7.4.

I) Decorative Amenities, CS in (g): Three marble bases for statuettes were placed in the small walled garden (f) around a semi-circular basin. On the S wall of court (g), painting in the 4th style complemented the natural vegetation. The decoration showed, against a background of flowering bushes, a low wooden fence curving around a tall fountain in the center, on which several birds perched. More flowering bushes over a red socle decorated the E wall of attached corridor (e'), also in the 4th style. The household cooked in a garden made up of real and artificial plants, flowers, and water sources.

Decorative Amenities, DI•(c): The floor was constructed of *opus signinum* and decorated with inset white tesserae that formed a central floral-bordered emblema (PPM I, 557, #7). Space occupied by couches was left undecorated on three sides of the emblema; the remaining space in front was elaborated by a pattern of squares outlined with white tesserae. The walls were simply decorated with a red socle and a white ground upper zone. Schefold calls room (l) a 'triclinium', presumably on the basis of its central mosaic emblema and still lifes of birds and fruit on the walls, but the room is exceptionally small (7.4 m²) for dining.

J) Sanctity: There is no evidence for ritual finds or installations in the house.

S y n t h e s i s

Rooms are of small size and there are few fixed installations. The largest room DI•(c) and the small room (l) both have central emblema and direct views onto the two nodes of the house; (l) would have been immediately next to the cooking in court (g) and seems too small for dining. In cramped quarters, it was practical to cook where utilities of light, air, water and drainage were concentrated, and this activity was also largely hidden from any dining taking place in DI•(c). Other than this, there does not seem to be any strong division of function between the front and back of the house; both areas include storage, work and reception or relaxation areas as well as the environmental benefits conferred by a space open to the sky. Given the need to utilize all available space by constructing upper floor rooms above both the front and back parts of the house, one wonders whether dining was also carried out on an upper floor space with a balcony, either over the street or over garden/court (f, g).

28. I.7.4, Officina vasaria di Corinthus, (work)shop (Figs. 2.5, 5.4, 5.20, 5.73)

S y n o p s i s

This two-room shop had a staircase along the W wall to an upper floor with a balcony overlooking the street. In the NW corner of the main room (1), between the base for the stairs and a small room (2) to the N, was a HE of which only traces remain today (Fig. 5. 73). Maiuri described the masonry hearth upon which a tripod was found *in situ*. An Arretine cup, shallow bowl, the lid for a cauldron, and several glass bottles and vases containing the carbonized

remains of dried figs, almond shells, and dates were discovered. A bronze oinochoe was recovered from the balcony overlooking the street, suggesting that dining may have been carried out on the upper floor. The numerous terracotta vessels found gave rise to the supposition that a pottery workshop was located here.

References

Sutherland 1990, 159-161; Gassner 1986, 130; CTP IIIA, 12-13; Maiuri NSc 1927, 15-16; Della Corte NSc 1912, 31, 66-67.

Data

A) Total area:	54.6	Nodes:	44.1	Connectors:	4.2	Static spaces:	7.3
B) Total # spaces:	3	# Nodes:	1	# Connectors:	1	# Static spaces:	1
C) Area, HE in (1):	2.5						

29. I.7.5, Casa di Philippus, (work)shop-house (Figs. 2.5, 5.4, 5.20, 5.74-5.77)

Synopsis

This small shop-house was constructed on the same pattern as its neighbor to the W, (I.7.4), with a facade of limestone ashlar, matching the second century B.C. date of the earliest pavements in the house. A front room / vestibule (a) with a latrine in the SW corner allowed traffic in from the street to the central open court (c), and gave access to bedroom (b) to the E (Fig. 5.74). The court provided light, air and collected water; a ST sat against the E wall under a narrow shed roof, a stair in the SE corner led to the upper floor rooms, and the wide DR (d) (perhaps the *tablinum*), originally was open to the court along much of its N side. There was one room above DR (d); a balcony along the W wall of court (c) provided passage to rooms at the front of the habitation over (a, b), and to a balcony overhanging the street facade. A major program of 3rd style redecoration was enacted later in rooms (b) and DR (d); the entrance to the latter was largely closed off except for a wide window, and the room accrued a reception function, becoming a combination dining room / *tablinum* (Fig. 5.75). Minor repairs were effected after the earthquake that included redecorating part of room (b) in the 4th style.

References

Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 169-173; Sutherland 1990, 159-161; PPM I, 576-585; Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, 212-213, #140, 143; PPP I, 56-57; Laidlaw 1985, 66; Bastet & De Vos 1979, 139; Jashemski 1979, 264, Fig. 391; Schefold 1957, 30; Pernice 1938, 39; Maiuri NSc 1927, 16-18; Della Corte NSc 1912, 31, 65-67.

Data

- A) Total area: 85.4 Nodes: 34.7 Connectors: 17.2 Static spaces: 33.5
 B) Total # spaces: 6 # Nodes: 1 # Connectors: 2 # Static spaces: 3
 C) Area, ST in (c): 4.0 Area, DR (d): 19.7 Length, DR (d): 5.06 Width, DR (d): 3.90
 D) Entry prox., ST in (c): 6.9 Entry prox., DR (d): 8.6 Prox, ST in (c)-DR (d): 5.7
 E) Entry access., ST in (c): 4 Entry access., DR (d): 4 Access, ST in (c)-DR (d): 2
 F) Sight perc., ST in (c)-DR (d): N Sound perc., ST in (c)-DR (d): T Smell perc., ST in (c)-DR (d): T
 G) Environmental amenities, DR (d): The room is airy and well-lit due to a window up in the S wall onto the peristyle of the neighboring house (I.7.7), and a broad window N towards the street through the open court (c) (Figs. 5.75, 5.77).
 H) Installation amenities, ST in (c): A small one-arched masonry ST of sub-type (2) is built against the middle of the E wall of court (c) (l. 1.06, w. 0.61, h. 0.84 m.). Fragments of its top tiled surface remain; the supporting arch is uniquely formed by a section of a *dolium* and its rim (Figs. 5.75-5.76). A single ridge of plaster that once held an *imbrex* tile extends W from the E wall; it was probably complemented by one or two other such *imbrices* which together formed separate 'burners' on the stove surface. Water was retrieved from a cistern head at the NW corner of the court, and drainage was available in the LT along the W wall of entrance (a) (Fig. 5.74). Numerous cooking items were found around the ST, including a small iron BZ, a stone mortar, and many coarse ceramic cookwares.⁵⁷ Five small broken lamps were stored in the arched space underneath the ST, and a bronze *casseruola* and cauldron were found in the company of a marble mortar in room (b).
Installation amenities, DR (d): The identification of dining in this room is confirmed by a couch niche cut in the E end of the N wall (w. 1.26 m.). Serving and dining wares were stored in both a wicker hamper that lay against the E wall and a wooden chest in the NW corner of room (a); these wares included bronze vases, a patera, a mixing bowl, and terracotta bottles, glasses, a cup and bowl. The finest items for a meal were found in room (b): a bronze cup, parts of two crystal chalices, and a ladle (for distributing wine) finished in crystal.
 I) Decorative amenities, ST in (c): Faded wall plaster adorns the E wall of court (c) above the stove; the stove was protected from the weather by a shed roof marking off the E end of the court.
Decorative amenities, DR (d): The cocciopesto floor of the room has a regular pattern of single white inset tesserae in the 1st style. The walls are decorated in the 3rd style, black-based decoration accented by central red panels (Fig. 5.77).
 J) Sanctity: No ritual finds or installations have been reported from this (work)shop-house.

⁵⁷Maiuri NSc 1927, 17: "Alla parete est è appoggiato il podio della cucina con sottoposto fornello ed accanto ad essa si rinvennero molti vasi fittili grezzi, un mortaio in pietra ed un fornello portatile in ferro: nell'angolo NE del cortile erano appoggiate varie anfore sane ed in frammenti."

Synthesis

The arrangement of cooking and eating is adapted simply to the constraints of space on this property. The multipurpose court (c) includes cooking, where natural light and ventilation and water recovery are used to greatest advantage. The ST is placed at the angle to DR (d) where it would be least visible to guests during the meal, although its presence (and the location of the latrine) could not have been missed upon entering the house. The sounds and smells of the cooking were likewise plainly part of the ambiance of the meal. The finest decoration with adequate light (although a limited view) was bestowed upon DR (d). Guests could be entertained on the ground floor; visitors would not have to disturb the upper floor rooms in the house. Even in this small residence, there is a deliberate attempt to present the most favorable aspects of the home for the context of a meal.

30. I.7.6, Taberna di Primilla, (work)shop (Figs. 2.5, 5.4, 5.20, 5.78)

Synopsis

This one-room shop (24.6 m²) had a stair to an upper loft in the SE corner. A niche in the center of the S wall served as storage space, but of the finds recorded by Maiuri, none are relevant to cooking or eating (Fig. 5.78). No decoration is recorded.

References

Gassner 1986, 130; CTP IIIA, 12-13; Maiuri NSc 1927, 18; Della Corte 1927, 31.

Data

A) Total area: 24.6	Nodes: 22.5	Connectors: 3.9	Static spaces: 0.0
B) Total # spaces: 2	# Nodes: 1	# Connectors: 1	# Static spaces: 0

31. I.7.7, Casa del Sacerdos Amandus, *casa media* (Figs. 2.5, 5.4, 5.20, 5.79-5.82)

Synopsis

In the original state of this structure, rooms (o, p) were part of the shop at (I.7.4), while the businesses at (I.7.6) and (I.7.8-9) belonged to this house.⁵⁸ Early first century B.C. decoration survives on the W wall of the very long *fauces* (a, a'), divided into two spaces halfway along by the imprint of a door found *in situ*. Nine skeletons were found in (a, a'), evidence of a failed escape attempt. The rest of the house is decorated with 2nd and 3rd style pavements in *cocciopesto*, and a program of late 3rd style wall painting.

⁵⁸Sutherland suggests that (o, p) were the limits of the original property line of (I.7.4); V. Sampaolo in PPM I, 586 suggests alternatively that all of the rooms (m, n, o, p) belonged to the properties at (I.7.4) and (I.7.5), extending them in their original phase to a depth matching that of the house (I.7.2-3).

At the end of the entrance, atrium (l) leads onto several suites of rooms (Fig. 5.79). A short corridor at the NE corner leads past a cistern head to KI (i) and the latrine in (h) (Fig. 5.80). A possible storage room (g), bedroom (f), and the sitting room or 'exedra' (e) fill out the E side of the atrium. Off the NW corner is DR•(b), the best-decorated room in the house, adjacent to a stair to upper-floor rooms (Fig. 5.81). That stairway reaches a landing over bedroom (c) which leads to upper floor rooms around the atrium. Below, a passage (sometimes called the 'tablinum') (d) leads to the quarter of the peristyle (m) (Fig. 5.82). Off the NE corner of the peristyle is a small storage alcove with holes marking the position of shelves on the walls. The N portico leads to the large but plainly decorated DH◊(n), and two service/storage rooms (o, p), the former having its own staircase to rooms overlooking the peristyle garden.

References

Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 169-173; Jashemski 1993, 37-38; Allison 1992b, 261-269; Sutherland 1990, 159-161; PPM I, 586-618; CTP IIIA, 12-13; PPP I, 57-60; Guida Laterza 1982, 113; Bastet & De Vos 1979, 81-83; Schefold 1957, 30-31; Maiuri 1954a, 112; Della Corte 1954, 261-262; #645-646; Maiuri 1938, 3-13; Pernice 1938, 101; Boyce 1937, 25, #39; Maiuri NSc 1927, 18-32; Della Corte 1927, 31-32.

Data

A) Total area:	259.1	Nodes:	92.7	Connectors:	33.7	Static spaces:	135.0
B) Total # spaces:	20	# Nodes:	2	# Connectors:	5	# Static spaces:	11
C) Area, KI (i):	11.1	Area, DR•(b):	19.8	Length, DR•(b):	5.25	Width, DR•(b):	3.77
		Area, DH◊(n):	28.8	Length, DH◊(n):	6.12	Width, DH◊(n):	4.71
D) Entry prox., KI (i):	16.2	Entry prox., DR•(b):	13.9	Prox, KI (i)-DR•(b):	7.3		
		Entry prox., DH◊(n):	29.8	Prox, KI (i)-DH◊(n):	23.0		
E) Entry access., KI (i):	6	Entry access., DR•(b):	5	Access, KI (i)-DR•(b):	4		
		Entry access., DH◊(n):	8	Access, KI (i)-DH◊(n):	7		
F) Sight perc., KI (i)-DR•(b):	N	Sound perc., KI (i)-DR•(b):	T	Smell perc., KI (i)-DR•(b):	F		
	Sight Perc., KI (i)-DH◊(n):	N	Sound Perc., KI (i)-DH◊(n):	T	Smell Perc., KI (i)-DH◊(n):	F	

G) Environmental amenities, dining areas: A door and window high up in the S wall admitted light and air to DR•(b), but the view from this space was very limited. The wide window E onto the peristyle garden (m) offered light and air to DH◊(n); the room also had three entrances at its NE corner to the storerooms (o, p) and the N. portico. Through the large window, DH◊(n) had a pleasant view of a marble table and a statue (only the base remained) in the garden, shaded by a large tree against its S wall, the root cavity of which was preserved (Fig. 5.82).

H) Installation amenities, KI (i): Filling the short W wall of this room was a solid masonry ST of sub-type (1) (l. 1.23, w. 0.81, h. 0.70 m.), with an upright tiled lip running along the back (Fig. 5.80). Found *in situ* upon this ST were ash and remains of fuel, a tripod, eight terracotta cups and

bowls, two bronze vessels, including a *casseruola* and a cauldron, two bronze jugs, and a small glass vessel that held perhaps a spice or herb. Two other ceramic pouring vessels were also found in the room, and a possible *testum*, which Maiuri describes as: "un grande coperchio di forma ellittica (m. 0.39 x 0.27) con manico girevole al centro".⁵⁹ The room was lit and ventilated via the short corridor to the atrium, and a window in the E wall onto the street (Fig. 5.79). Water was accessible from a cistern head built into a small niche off the corridor just S of the ST, or from the cistern head in the garden. A tile-floored LT (raised above the level of the kitchen (0.46 m.) in the SE corner of the room adjacent to the street provided drainage. A small alcove just N of the LT (and raised above it another 0.20 m.) held three terracotta vessels and was probably used for storage. Furniture fittings from (g) suggest storage in that room also, although Maiuri's label of *cella penaria* cannot be confirmed. Other storage was located in a closet off the NE corner of the peristyle garden that has rows of cutting in its walls for shelves; coarseware and amphorae were found in (p), and Maiuri also describes (o) as a storage area, although no finds were reported there. That the kitchen was left with vessels intact on the stove is not surprising in light of the nine individuals found in entranceway (a, a') who failed to escape.

Installation amenities, dining areas: No finds indicating the presence of dining couches or dinner wares are reported from either DR•(b) or DH◊(n). The only serving vessels found were in the kitchen. Others may have been stored in cabinets and chests in atrium (l) -- Allison remarks that except for areas (a, a', KI (i)), the finds from the house were poorly recorded.

I) Decorative amenities, KI (i): Traces of plain white plaster still hang on the walls.

Decorative amenities, dining areas: DR•(b) had an *opus signinum* pavement with patterned inset white tesserae. Around the W, N and E sides of the central emblema (a circle filled with *opus sectile* framed by a square diamond-patterned border) there was no decoration, suggesting the space had once been overlain by a standard set of three dining couches. Three bands of different patterns running E-W filled out the decoration of the floor in front of the couches (Fig. 5.81). The walls were, like the pavement, of 3rd style. The decoration consisted of a black socle, yellow-ground upper zone, and central red zone with large panels depicting mythological scenes: the liberation of Andromeda (W), Hercules in the garden of the Hesperides (N), the flight of Icarus (E), and Polyphemus and Galatea (S). DH◊(n) had only rough plaster on the walls, but incised lines on its surface suggest that a redecoration of the room was planned. The space was originally open to the sky, but was covered when a second floor was added to the house.

J) Sanctity: An arcuated niche framed by stuccoed pilasters at the N end of the W wall of garden (m) was described as a *lararium* by Maiuri and Boyce (Fig. 5.82). A ledge projected from the base of the niche, for the placement of statuettes, offerings, etc.

⁵⁹Maiuri NSc 1927, 29: "A large cover of elliptical form with a handle turned at its center". See chapter one, pp. 19-20 for a discussion of baking covers such as the *testum*.

Synthesis

DR•(b), with its fine wall decoration and pavement, is the show-room of the house, concentrating the viewer's attention within the room by means of the large scale panel mythological paintings in the center of the walls. Seascape and landscape elements in the panels substituted for an actual view out of the room. This room was reached almost immediately upon entering the house; visitors did not have to penetrate into the back quarter of the house unless dinners were also held in DH◊(n). DH◊(n) had its own view of a natural landscape through the large window onto garden (m), shaded by a large tree, which may explain its lack of interior decoration. However, the room (originally open to the sky) had recently been covered over, and seems to have been awaiting redecoration. If DR•(b) and DH◊(n) were both intended for dining, they formed a tandem that offered dining with emphasis on either indoor or outdoor settings. KI (i), found well-equipped with cooking utensils, a ready water source and drainage, was convenient for serving DR•(b). However proximate to the dining room, KI (i) was still practically invisible and just out of smell range. Servants bringing food would have seemed to appear suddenly. The irregular shape and layout of this house determined to a degree that visitors would not be treated to any traditional positioning of the rooms. However, long axial views still occur, from the front door to the back of the atrium, and the atrium to DH◊(n). The fact that DR•(b) was removed from the primary sight-lines of the house contributed perhaps to the owner's concentration on its interior decoration.

32. I.7.8-9, Popina, lunch-counter (Figs. 2.5, 5.4, 5.20, 5.83)

Synopsis

This lunch-counter had an L-shaped counter marking the front and center of main room (a). The counter had a marble-top with two inset storage jars; the exterior face was painted red (Fig. 5.83). At the S end of the counter was a HE of sub-type (4) with a burner upon which jars of water could be heated for the cutting and mulling of wine, and over which food could be cooked. Maiuri suggests that room (A) was used by the customers of the establishment; this cannot be confirmed -- it is small and irregularly shaped. Fallen from the upper floor rooms (reached via a wooden stair at #9) were a basalt mortar, a colander, five amphorae, and two bowls inscribed with the names of three *garum* producers. Balconies on the upper floor connected all the way across the narrow street on the E to *insula* (I.8). A LT on the upper floor is shown by a drainage pipe immured in the NW corner of room (a); another LT may have been located on the ground floor in room (b), reached with difficulty under the stairs. At the N end of the W wall of room (a) is a small painted niche, perhaps of ritual significance. A large local shrine is just across the street from this lunch counter: two painted serpents face a built podium shrine on the W exterior wall of *insula* (I.8); the whole ensemble measures ca. 14 m. long.

References

CTP IIIA, 12-13; Orr 1973, 152, #1; Della Corte 1954, 262; Della Corte 1927, 32; Maiuri NSc 1927, 32; Della Corte NSc 1912, 184-185.

Data

A) Total area: 44.6	Nodes: 31.0	Connectors: 1.5	Static spaces: 12.9
B) Total # spaces: 4	# Nodes: 1	# Connectors: 1	# Static spaces: 2
C) Area, HE in (a): 2.5			

33. I.7.10-12, Casa dell'Efebo, *casa grande* (Figs. 1.12, 2.5, 2.23, 5.4, 5.21, 5.84-5.91)

Synopsis.

The properties at I.7.10-12 and I.7.19 were connected by a small staircase located at the S end of the garden (23) of the former house. It is possible that both were owned and operated by the same family or individual, but because the two units are architecturally distinct, they will be considered separately. The synthesis of I.7.19 will consider a potential relationship between the properties.

This house was the result of the coming together of two atrium houses and their dependent rooms, with entrances at #10, #11 and #12 (Fig. 5.21).⁶⁰ Each of the houses was equipped with its own complement of living, cooking, reception and dining rooms, which explains the duplication in room function that appears when the houses are joined together and redecorated in the 4th style. The conglomeration takes place apparently after the earthquake of A.D. 62, and perhaps at the instigation of the freedman P. Cornelius Tages, whose name appears painted on a storage jar, and whom Della Corte and Maiuri considered the owner. The attribution of the house is not based on strong evidence, but is driven by a desire to see a Trimalchio-like freedman transform a series of petty houses into a sprawling, pretentious urban estate. The integration of separate houses poses problems for interpreting which identifiable dining areas were designed solely for their original separate houses, and which came to be an active part of the newly joined house.

The entrance (1) at #10 was found locked, barred and braced with a heavy timber from the inside, perhaps to keep out others during the eruption. This *fauces* was flanked by two bedrooms (2, 3) as it led into atrium (A'). On the N side of the atrium, a stair led to second floor rooms above rooms at both the front and back of the atrium (Fig. 5.84). On the W side, the large DR(4) dominated the atrium. To its S was a narrow room (5) with a bath at its W end. A door at

⁶⁰Sutherland and Maiuri believed two houses were joined, one at #10, and another with two entrances at #11 and #12; A. De Vos (PPM I, 619) argues there were separate houses at #11 and #12, a more unlikely scenario, as there is no evidence for a nucleus of rooms that identifies #12 as a separate residence.

the SW corner of DR◊(4) led to a small open court (6) and the adjacent DR/ KI (7) (Figs. 5.85-5.86). This house nucleus was found shut off from atrium (A") by a door.

N of entrance #11 was KI (8), once open to the street as a stairwell to upper floor rooms. To the S was bedroom (9), the storage/work area (11) containing toilet and weaving items, and DR (10).

On the W of atrium (A") was another bedroom (12), *tablinum* (13), converted into a storage area, and another storage room (14). Room (15) was a transitional space to the portico and reception rooms off the large garden (23) to the S. Passage (15) led past and accessed two dining areas, DI•(16) and DH (17) and the portico/corridor (19) at #12 (Figs. 5.87-5.88). Stairs to upper floor rooms overlooking the garden were built along the E side of room (20), across from KI (21).

Finally, bedroom (22) backed onto garden (23), which had a masonry DO on the W, and plantings on the E (Fig. 5.89). A door and stairs at the S end of the garden led to the other house joined to this property at (I.7.19).

R e f e r e n c e s

Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 74; Jashemski 1993, 38-41, 316; Allison 1992b, 270-287; Dunbabin 1991, 124; Fröhlich 1991, 251-252; Sutherland 1990, 149-173; PPM I, 619-727; Richardson 1988b; Richardson 1988a, 328-329; Salza Prina Ricotti 1984, 169-172; CTP IIIA, 12-13; PPP I, 60-70; Guida Laterza 1982, 113-115; Jashemski 1979, 92-94; Zanker 1979, 500-502; Guida 1976, 212-215; Schefold 1957, 31-34; Maiuri 1954a, 105-106; Della Corte 1954, 262-265, #647-648; Maiuri 1954b, 459-460; Soprano 1950, 295-296; Maiuri 1942a, 182; Maiuri 1938, 13-27; Pernice 1938, 106; Boyce 1937, 26, #40-41; Maiuri NSc 1927, 32-83; Della Corte 1927, 32-36.

D a t a

A) Total area:	709.3	Nodes:	294.2	Connectors:	110.1	Static spaces:	305.0
B) Total # spaces:	30	# Nodes:	3	# Connectors:	7	# Static spaces:	20
C) Area, KI (7):	2.5	Area, DR (7):	11.8	Length, DR (7):	4.88	Width, DR (7):	3.13
Area, KI (8):	5.1	Area, DR◊(4):	23.7	Length, DR◊(4):	7.29	Width, DR◊(4):	3.25
Area, KI (21):	5.3	Area, DR (10):	28.7	Length, DR (10):	7.64	Width, DR (10):	3.76
		Area, DI•(16):	10.1	Length, DI•(16):	2.50	Width, DI•(16):	4.04
		Area, DH (17):	26.7	Length, DH (17):	5.51	Width, DH (17):	5.39
		Area, DO in (23):	27.4	Length, DO in (23):	4.98	Width, DO in (23):	5.51
D) Entry prox., KI (7):	16.1	Entry prox., DR (7):	15.2	Prox, KI (7)-DR (7):	0.0		
				Prox, KI (7)-DR(4):	2.4		
Entry prox., KI (8):	6.7	Entry prox., DR◊(4):	8.7	Prox, KI (8)-DR◊(4):	6.1		
		Entry prox., DR (10):	9.4	Prox, KI (8)-DR (10):	8.0		

Entry prox., KI (21): 2.7	Entry prox., DI•(16): 10.0	Prox, KI (21)-DI•(16): 8.6
	Entry prox., DH (17): 14.0	Prox, KI (21)-DH (17): 12.5
	Entry prox., DO in (23): 14.1	Prox, KI (21)-DO in (23): 12.4
E)Entry Access., KI (7): 6	Entry access., DR (7): 6	Access, KI (7)-DR (7): 1
		Access, KI (7)-DR◊(4): 3
Entry Access., KI (8): 4	Entry access., DR◊(4): 4	Access, KI (8)-DR◊(4): 4
	Entry access., DR (10): 4	Access, KI (8)-DR (10): 3
Entry Access., KI (21): 3	Entry access., DI•(16): 4	Access, KI (21)-DI•(16): 4
	Entry access., DH (17): 4	Access, KI (21)-DH (17): 4
	Entry access., DO in (23): 4	Access, KI (21)-DO in (23): 4
F)Sight perc., KI (7)-DR (7): V	Sound perc., KI (7)-DR (7): T	Smell perc., KI (7)-DR (7): T
Sight perc., KI (7)-DR◊(4): N	Sound perc., KI (7)-DR◊(4): T	Smell perc., KI (7)-DR◊(4): T
Sight perc., KI (8)-DR◊(4): E	Sound perc., KI (8)-DR◊(4): T	Smell perc., KI (8)-DR◊(4): T
Sight perc., KI (8)-DR (10): N	Sound perc., KI (8)-DR (10): T	Smell perc., KI (8)-DR (10): F
Sight perc., KI (21)-DI•(16): N	Sound perc., KI (21)-DI•(16): T	Smell perc., KI (21)-DI•(16): F
Sight perc., KI (21)-DH (17): N	Sound perc., KI (21)-DH (17): T	Smell perc., KI (21)-DH (17): F
Sight perc., KI (21)-DO in (23): N		
Sound perc., KI (21)-DO in (23): T	Smell perc., KI (21)-DO in (23): F	

G) Environmental amenities, dining areas: DR◊(4) had a wide view E onto the testudinate atrium (A'), and was lit indirectly via a skylight in the atrium roof, and via the doorway onto court (6) (Fig. 5.84). DR/KI (7) was lit only by its door S onto the same court, which must have served also for ventilation. The room above DR/KI (7) would have precluded any direct ventilation of the stove, and would have made the room rather smoky if cooking and eating were carried out simultaneously in that room. A window towards the N end of the E wall that connected with DR◊(4) must have caused the atmospheres of the two rooms to mingle if they were in contemporaneous usage.⁶¹ The lofty DR (10) was lit by several small sources: two doors at its NW corner, and two windows (equipped with shutters) high up in the E wall onto the street. This room is sheltered from any open spaces in the house, and its windows onto the street could be closed during difficult weather. Given these facts and the nearly solid black decoration of the walls, scholars have generally considered this to be a good example of a winter dining room. DI•(16) and DH (17), located off the double portico on the N side of garden (23), could have been used at any time of the year. Both received ample light and air from the garden, but arrangements for wooden shutters built between the columns and pillars along the N line of (19) prove that both rooms could have been protected from cold, rain or sun as needed. Indirect

⁶¹The large windows in the W wall of DR◊(4) are modern inventions, but one window is reconstructed near the N end of the W wall in the reconstruction of Maiuri 1954b, 460, Fig. 7.

lighting from atrium (A") via passage (15) was always present. DI(16) does have an awkward view, half of a corridor down to a shrine, and half of DH (17). DH (17) however was carefully oriented to take advantage of an elevated aspect over the garden and its statues, outdoor dining area, and aedicular fountain. Four broken marble statuettes were found in this room; Maiuri believed they were brought into the room during the eruption for protection, and that they adorned the space in front of the couches, either under the portico or in the garden. Allison argues that they were broken before they were placed in the room, and that this (combined with too few dining couches in the room, see below) indicates the room had lost its dining function prior to the eruption and was being used to store broken pieces of sculpture. A lead sheet placed for protection over the central emblema of the dining-hall does suggest that the room was not being used for dining at the very moment of the eruption. However, the simple removal of the lead sheet and the dressing of the couches with cushions and linens by slaves would have very quickly made this room into an operating dining-hall. The sculpture may well have been part of the decoration, extending a wild, Bacchic theme that appears in the themes of the wall-decoration of DH (17) into three dimensions. Its view, through folding doors and colonnades onto a 'natural landscape' is echoed closely by a description of Pliny's Laurentine villa.⁶²

The DO in (23) has a complementary view of the main living quarters of the house from its 'insular' location amongst the water, air, statues and vegetation of the outdoors. It maintained a moderate temperature, protected from the harshness of direct sunlight by a bower stretched over four columns that mark the corners of the couches. The DO in (23) is indubitably for summer dining. The owners of this house clearly tried to differentiate their dining areas according to a vulnerability to, or exploitation of, the meteorological conditions.

H) Installation amenities, cooking areas: A solid masonry ST of sub-type (1) was built against the S end of the E wall of /KI (7), in a space not occupied by the dining couches in the room (Fig. 5.85). The tile topped surface of the ST (l. 1.85, w. 0.77, h. 0.51) had a lip on the front edge formed by the edges of tegulae. At the time of excavation, the imprint of a vase was identified on the stove-top, and parts of hand-mills were also recovered. Few other cooking items were reported from the area; three bronze vessels were piled in the SW corner of atrium (A'), but they are not well-enough described to know whether they were used for cooking, eating, or storage. Water was available from the quarter-circle basin in the SW corner of court (6), which caught the rain from the roof of the N part of the house and fed it to a cistern underneath atrium (A'), whence it could be drawn from a hole in the NW corner. Drainage was more difficult; the only latrine in this N section of the house was just to the side of the colonnaded *cenaculum* upstairs above room (2), where a down-pipe is still built into the NE corner. Another latrine was located on the

⁶²Plin. *Ep.* 2.17.5; see above, chapter two, p. 99, n. 212.

ground floor in KI (8). The bronze basin of the bath in room (5) was fitted with both a water intake and a drain, but Maiuri does not reveal how the drain leads out of the house (see Sutherland, 151). That large bronze basin, set above a masonry podium at the W end of the narrow room, had its water heated by a small masonry furnace (l. 0.73, w. 0.63, internal circular d. = 0.40 m.) through the back wall in the SE corner of court (6) (PPM I, 637, #29-30, Fig. 5.21). The heat and water utilities are clustered in the NW part of the house.

KI (8) has clear evidence for being in use at the time of the eruption. Against the N wall of the narrow room was a HE of sub-type (2); only two narrow masonry supports (each ca. l. 0.35, w. 0.22, and separated by 0.75 m.) are depicted on Maiuri's plans, and these have since disintegrated. Maiuri (NSc 1927, 40) confirms that these supports once held some kind of (probably tile-topped) cooking surface: "Piccolo stanzione adibito ad uso di cucina come mostra l'alto e stretto podio in muratura con sovrapposto treppiede e la varia suppellettile in bronzo ed in terracotta che si rinvenne nel vano." The tripod found on top of the HE suggests it was in use. Other vessels found here included a large decorated bronze amphora (see Maiuri NSc 1929, 74, Fig. 41), three bronze *casseroles* and one skillet.⁶³ Because the *casseroles* in this kitchen are associated with a well-decorated amphora, Allison assumes they were not used for cooking, and that therefore KI (8) was not actually being used as a kitchen. Cooking and serving vessels were absolutely segregated, however; cooked food or warmed liquids required transfer to serving vessels in the kitchen. These vessels and the tripod *in situ* on the HE support the conclusion that KI (8) was in use. Numerous table and serving vessels were stored in Rooms (13-14), but no cooking implements were found there. Allison mentions only fragments of iron grills "of uncertain use" in (14); it is unclear if these grills were used for cooking or for barring windows. At the E end of KI (8) is a LT, offering convenient drainage. Water was available from cistern-heads in atria (A', A"). The room was lit and ventilated from either end -- the door to the atrium, and a window onto the street over the latrine, where an entrance to the house used to be, before the room was converted into a kitchen.

The third kitchen is located next to the entrance at #12. KI (21) has a well-preserved upright ST of sub-type (3) (l. 1.51, w. 0.88, h. 0.80 m.). The masonry body of the ST is held up by a large stone slab acting as a lintel over two large ashlar supports (h. 0.33 m.), leaving a small space for storing fuel beneath the stove (Figs. 2.23, 5.90). Its tile-topped surface is bordered on the S by an upward extension of the masonry body of the stove (w. 0.21, h. 0.23 m.). A lip formed of upright tiles seals the back edge of the stove against the wall, and a rounded lip of *imbrices* marks the front edge. No finds were recorded from this kitchen; unless it was cleaned out during the eruption,

⁶³Maiuri NSc 1927, 74: "Grande e belle anfore in bronzo a corpo ovoidale...n. 3 casseroles in br. di tipo ordinario, di egual forma, e due di esse di egual misura....padella emisferica, con manico robusto..."

the room seems not to have been in use on that day. A pile of amphorae was stored in the NE corner of garden (23), behind KI (21). The kitchen was lit and ventilated from the street and from the garden by two small windows. Water was available from the cistern head just across corridor (19) in area (20); a large platform provided space for placing vessels to be filled or stored (Fig. 5.91). Another low platform on the E side of (20), under a flight of stairs to the upper floor, was associated with a shallow rounded niche, of unknown purpose. There was a provision for drainage within KI (21) itself; in the SW corner of the room, two stub walls flank a wide rectangular pit and would have held the seat for at least a two-person latrine. In the SE corner, between the LT and the ST, there was a low plastered basin that served as a sink and drain; amphorae not found in the room are being stored there today (Fig. 5.90).

Installation amenities, dining areas: Remains of a wooden bed and its bedding were recovered near the N wall of DR◊(4). A chest lay near the door to court (6). These finds led Allison to identify the room as a bedroom, over her own concern about the shape and location of the room. Most scholars (see Sutherland, De Vos in PPM I) consider the room to have been a *tablinum* in its original phase, perhaps adding some function of reception such as dining over the years. The term 'exedra' is often used to describe some vague role of reception for the room. The dimensions and bipartite decoration of the room are consistent with a function of dining, but it cannot be confirmed whether or when dining ever took place here. The storage cupboard underneath the stairs to the upper floor at the NE corner of atrium (A') did contain the broken remains of many glass vessels and a complete terracotta cup; the cupboard was subject to post-eruption salvage or scavenging, so its assemblage is probably incomplete.

There was a distyle in *antis cenaculum* above rooms (1-3) over the E side of atrium (A'), and facing onto the street. An uncolonnaded *cenaculum* lay above DR◊(4) with a back room above DR/KI (7). From that latter *cenaculum* were found the remains of a bed and bedding, a large bronze krater, several domestic vessels and pieces of furniture, and the skeletons of three individuals. It is possible that either of these upper story rooms could have been used for dining, both in the original and final phases of the building.

DR/KI (7) has niches cut in the E wall (l. 2.22, depth 0.11 m., for the *lectus summus*) and W wall (l. 3.61, depth 0.12 m., for the *lectus medius* and *lectus imus*) that correspond to the position of dining couches (Fig. 5.86). The ST in this room is carefully placed on the E side of the room where the set of couches is shortest (the *lectus summus*), allowing the cooking and eating furniture to fit neatly together. Because of the low height of the niches (ca. 0.45 high), Allison (1992b, 82, 274) doubts that they could have been used for couches, and doubts that the room was used for dining. Pernice and Maiuri disagreed; Maiuri (NSc 1927, 38) considered the room to have been a 'stanza rustica' used for cooking and eating by the household staff. As such, elaborate dining couches would not be expected, but rather simple wooden couches, little more than pallets. The whole N part of the house, entered at

#10, could be closed off from the rest of the house by a door located at the threshold to atrium (A"). During the summertime, the servile staff may have eaten upstairs in one of the '*cenacula*', or downstairs in DR(4); remains of wooden beds/couches were found in each. DR/KI (7), with its built-in stove, would have been a warm place to eat during the winter months. The summer eruption may explain the absence of dining couches in this room. Perhaps the household staff as well as the free family heeded the seasons by eating in different parts of the house. The provision of a specific room for slave dining would be unique in this sample, but given the plethora of finely-decorated dining areas elsewhere in the house, it seems reasonable. The situation in fact recalls the communal dining of slaves under the eye of their bailiff described by Columella.⁶⁴

A couch niche (w. 1.45 m.) at the S end of the E wall of DR (10) is the best evidence for dining there. Maiuri thought the room, due to its elongated dimensions, was a *biclinium*, containing only two couches, but three couches (l. 2.31 m.) can be fit securely in the space. The lack of actual couch remains can again be explained (as with DI/KI (7) above) if this room was used only during the winter months, as its placement and decoration suggests.

No finds were recorded from DI•(16). DH (17) is absolutely secure in its identification as a dining area. Besides the mosaic decoration and niches in the W and N walls for very large couches, actual couch fittings were recovered from the niches. Along the W wall, a large niche (l. 4.36 m.) allowed the placement of the long side of the *lectus imus* and the short end of the *lectus medius*. The niche continued along the N wall, more than long enough for the *lectus medius* (l. 3.95 m.). After a break of 0.39 m., another niche (w. 1.05 m.) is cut for the short end of the *lectus summus* in the NE corner of the room (Fig. 5.88). The dimensions for the niches are the largest in the sample, and suggest either oversized couches, or ample space between individual couches, allowing for the passage of servants and food. The physical remains of the couches were substantial (Maiuri NSc 1927, 79-80) -- one mule-headed furniture appliqué, probably to fit the curved end of a couch, seven bronze couch feet, eight bronze couch legs with fragments of the wooden supports within. One iron furniture foot, three bronze corner plates and numerous small tabs and fittings may belong to these couches or other furniture within the room. Allison counts only the couch feet (and not the legs with attached feet -- see Maiuri NSc 1927, 80, Fig. 46), and pronounces that the seven feet cannot support the modern restoration of two couches requiring a total of twelve feet; she concludes that the room was not being used for dining at the time of the eruption. However, fifteen total feet were actually found in the room, enough for two and almost three couches. Maiuri is unequivocal about finding the couches *in situ*: "I letti tricliniari poggiavano su sostegni di bronzo leggermente infossati nel pavimento".⁶⁵

⁶⁴See chapter one, p. 30-31, n. 126.

⁶⁵Maiuri NSc 1927, 49.

The three masonry dining-couches of the DO in (23) make its identification simple (Fig. 5.89). the *lectus summus* and *imus* are both 4.40 m. long; the *lectus medius*, divided into two parts by the water channel serving the central fountain, has two sections each 2.30 m. in length. The four columns that support the bower above the couches are built into the corners of the couches. The storage of serving and eating wares for use at table in DR (10), DI•(16), DH (17) and the DO in (23) seems to have been concentrated on the W edge of atrium (A"), in rooms (13-14). Room (13), of a form and location that suggests it may once have been a *tablinum*, contained many items put away in chests. Among them were four gilded bronze statuettes carrying silver trays upon which pastries were assumed to have been placed (see Jashemski 1979, 94, Fig. 149), and numerous terracotta and glass lids, cups and plates. The walls of room (14) are lined with holes set at regular intervals, indicating the presence of shelving; fittings from cupboards and chests indicate additional storage. As (Allison, 279) notes, this room contained "a large quantity of pottery and glass vessels, including large and small storage vessels, eating and drinking vessels, and a decorated bronze krater or mixing bowl...". The location of both of these rooms was convenient to serve all of the dining areas in the S part of the house; the quality and value of the objects are moreover commensurate with the fine decoration of those dining areas. One other area in the house is described as a *cella penaria* by Maiuri. The narrow room (18) adjacent to DH (17) has a high shelf (h. 0.75 m.) along the W side of the wall; this feature and the narrow form of the room suggests storage, but only one amphora and one rectangular iron brazier (Fig. 1.12) were found actually found here. The room does have a tunnel-hole in its E wall, proving it was subject to salvage, but it is unclear whether the room was largely cleaned out prior to the eruption or whether it stood largely empty. Despite the room's convenient location, Allison's argument (*contra* Maiuri) that the room did not explicitly serve the storage needs of DH (17) is convincing, at least at the time of the eruption. Its original design, however, seems clearly predicated on its usefulness for handling events held in DH (17). Given the provision of three well-equipped kitchens that served the rooms around each of the three nodes of the house, the brazier should be interpreted as an accessory to the kitchens, as a device for keeping food warm near or inside the dining areas, and perhaps to provide additional heat for gatherings held in DR (10), DI•(16) or DH (17) during the winter months. In the summertime, the brazier might be expected to be stored away, as were the braziers in I.6.15 (I) and I.7.1 (15).

I) Decorative amenities, cooking areas: Patches of simple white coarse plaster bedeck the walls of DR/KI (7), KI (8) and KI (21). Pernice describes an *opus signinum* floor with scattered inset stones in DR/KI (7).

Decorative amenities, dining areas: As mentioned above, DR/KI (7) has rough white plaster on the walls and an *opus signinum* floor. The layout and pavement of this room appear by all the evidence to belong to the original second century phase, when the building at #10 was an

independent property. DR(4) has bipartite decoration resulting from its original division into two distinct spaces (PPM I, 632-635, #20-26). The N space is marked by plain flooring, and it extends as far as the S end of the E wall. The ceiling of the N space is also a good 0.80 m. lower than the space to the S. This structural and decorative division was probably sufficient to mark its limits. The pavement of the S space consists of a *cocciopesto* pavement with white tesserae inset in regular rows, dating to the second century B.C. In the final phase, the walls were completely repainted in white ground 4th style, but a different manner of the same style prevailed in the N part of the room, reinforcing the original bipartition of the space.

The long and narrow DR (10) had a *cocciopesto* pavement with random inset pieces of white limestone, belonging to the second century B.C. The wall decoration was of the 2nd style, of nearly solid black ground, broken up into simple panels by red and yellow borders. The bright decoration of DR (16) has survived well (Fig. 5.87). The *cocciopesto* pavement has black and white inset tesserae marked out regularly in cross patterns on the three sides of the room where the dining couches would have been located. A band with diamond decoration defines the threshold of the wide but shallow room, and the pavement centers on an emblema with the crossed motifs of thyrsi and lotus and papyrus flowers done in red, yellow, green and white tesserae. The walls are white ground in the 4th style, with architectural frames in red. Vignettes (particularly, a still life of a plate of fish on the E wall) mark the centers of each wall.

The floor of DH (17) is clearly marked out for the disposition of three dining couches (PPM I, 682-685, #110-113). Plain flooring occupies the horseshoe-shaped position of the couches, and corresponds to the position of the couch niches at the base of the walls. Separated from the plain flooring by a border of white marble, the T-shaped area in front of the couches was paved in *opus sectile* with a diamond and square pattern. The central emblema was a square (0.90 m. a side) consisting of an intricate and brilliant pattern of *opus sectile* and colored glass. The value of this emblema is made evident by a thick lead sheet found laid over the top to protect it from wear during periods when the room was not being used for banquets. The walls are decorated in an early 4th style on a white ground, likely predating the A.D. 62 earthquake, in concert with the decoration of the two *aediculae* at the W end of (19) and at the S end of the garden, and prior to the 4th style decoration in the N end of the house (Fig. 5.88). The ceiling of the room is also elaborated with a shallow vault in its center that held coffers featuring painted stucco in relief. Appropriate to the outdoor setting of the DO in (23) are the paintings of the S garden wall and the faces of the masonry dining couches themselves, done in the 4th style (PPM I, 714-727, #166-187, Maiuri 1938). The S garden wall provided a megalographic backdrop for the dining couches, featuring a deer, bird, a bear pursuing a bull, and a crouching feline. The masonry couches had standard stuccoed masonry surfaces that sloped outward from the center, and an inset ledge revetted in marble, for the placement of cups and other utensils. The faces of the couches

possessed intimate motifs in a Nilotic setting. People, animals (such as hippopotami and crocodiles) and rural shrines dot a verdant landscape along the banks of the Nile. Particularly interesting are two banquet scenes that face each other at the S end of the inside faces of the E and W couches. Both depict persons reclining around *stibadia* (semicircular sets of couches). On the E side, seven persons are set around a large table upon which cups sit; a servant arriving from the left carries in cups of wine. On the W side, five pygmies recline around a table set with a krater and ladle for mixing wine; the leader raises his cup for the company. The W banquet scene is sheltered by a bower, and both parties take place on the banks of the river, in the vicinity of a large crocodile. As painted pendants, these banquet scenes mimic the diners reclining on the E and W couches on either side of the central fountain, a tame substitute for the Nile. The paintings also repeat (on a perpendicular axis) the pendant of the two elaborate dining areas DH (17) and the DO in (23) that face each other across a landscape of water and statuary, one room indoors and the other outdoors. One might speculate that a particularly large dinner party might have been held in both dining areas simultaneously, two *triclinia* comprising a kind of *oecus Cyzicenus* with boundaries extended beyond the architectural space of one room. Alternatively, a group of guests who might have begun to eat in DH (17) while the sun was still hot could have adjourned to the DO in (23) for the post-prandial *commisatio*, the drinking party that is depicted on the sides of the masonry couches. Richardson has suggested (to Dunbabin's disagreement) that due to the spray of the water from the central fountain, eating would have been impractical on these couches, and that they were used principally, even solely, for drinking.

J). Sanctity: There are numerous and different ritual areas in this house. At the SE corner of atrium (A') is a arcuated niche, below which is a painting of *Lares* and other attendants flanking the *Genius* as he sacrifices at an altar. Below is a larger altar decked with fruit and flowers, faced on either side by two serpents. At the W end of the corridor passing in front of DH (17), at the S end of the pantry (18), is another arcuated niche with a tile shelf that projects slightly from the wall. Below the niche are painted two snakes flanking a festooned altar. A more elaborate *aedicula* lies just to the S at the W end of portico (19). This *aedicula* was built at a 45° angle, turned directly towards the garden; its small half-domed interior (decorated as a seashell) is supported by two elaborate pilasters that frame the niche and hold up a pediment. A square podium, the base for a statuette, sits at the back of the niche. When the *castellum aquae* was built immediately to the S, this *aedicula* was largely blocked off from view within the garden.

Its aedicular form was repeated in the construction of a new shrine at the S end of the garden (23), set behind the DO (Fig. 5.89). Two round colonettes support a pediment above the architrave, upon which a relief frieze in stucco depicts Diana between two deer. The half-domed niche (also decorated as a seashell) shelters a bronze statuette of the goddess Pomona, who carries a shell-shaped tray filled with fruit. The niche is also a water source that cascades down

five marble steps into a basin, whence a channel brings the water to a fountain on the top of a marble table in the center of the outdoor dining-couches. The faces of these couches are covered with sacro-idyllic paintings, depicting ca. twenty country shrines with statues and altars (and a variety of gods and goddesses, many Egyptian) in the setting of the Nile. Parts of four broken statuettes (two of Pan, a goat and deer, and a sleeping satyr) found in DH (17) as well as the life-size bronze lamp-bearing ephebe stored at the NW corner of (15) are postulated to have decorated the garden space between DH (17) and the DO. Five circular podia in the same area might have held some or all of this sculpture. This garden context, with its sculpture, running water and plantings, creates a new, composite, sacro-idyllic landscape, evoking gods of Egypt, Greek nature gods, and also the traditional Roman household deities. The whole ensemble is guarded on the E side by a fence running N-S that divides the garden in two, a fence topped by four Herms, busts of Zeus, Hera, an unidentified woman, and a Bacchic child. The fence acts as a *temenos* to separate the sacred area of the banquet from the utilitarian water basin and storage area in the NE corner of the garden. The E half of the garden had no ritual material except for a possible small terracotta altar, located in the vicinity of a marble table and semi-circular bench.

S y n t h e s i s

Allison (1992b, 287) has posited:

"the true owners of this house may well have departed from Pompeii long before the final eruption and left it in the hands of a skeleton staff, while repair was going on. This would help explain the lack of need for an entertainment area and account for the occupancy concentrated in the area around *atrium A*'."

She is correct in seeing the operative division in the house laying between atria (A') and (A''), and in hinting that the division was based on rank, not gender.⁶⁶ Three skeletons were found in the *cenaculum* above DR◊(4); it seems possible that they were left behind to keep watch over the property, either because the owner and family had previously fled, or because (as Allison believes) they had been absent from Pompeii for some time. Slave quarters are likely centered here; as Maiuri first suggested, DR/KI (7) seems a good candidate for a combination cooking and dining area for the household staff. Perhaps even DR◊(4), redecorated in the 4th style, acted as a reception room for the head of the staff, the *procurator*, as is hypothesized for the small house #17 in the Casa del Menandro (I.10.4).

⁶⁶Maiuri (1954b) mistakenly saw a division based on gender; he postulated that this atrium was the women's quarters, or *gynaeceum*, and argued that the door was closed at #10 in order to keep the women secluded from the outside world.

There are two other kitchens in the rest of the house. The smaller KI (8) probably served the secluded winter dining area DR (10), or was used for smaller, everyday dinners. The large stove in KI (21) is well-placed to serve the more open DI•(16), DH (17) and the DO in (23), spacious and well-decorated dining areas arranged to take conspicuous advantage of decoration in the garden. DR (10), DH (17) and the DO in (23) could all hold large dinner-parties, each at different seasons of the year; the S part of this property clearly was the reception and entertainment center of the house. DH (17) had the central emblema of its pavement covered with a protective sheet of lead; it was not being used at the moment of the eruption, and suggests that banquets were not being held at the house for seasonal or other reasons (such as the absence of the owner and most of the household). Except for the DO in (23), the owner did not construct new dining areas, but assigned specialized functions to the dining areas already existing in each of the houses that they joined together. The rank of the persons eating in a given area, the season, and the nature of the occasion were the salient factors determining who was eating where, on any given day. The segregation of activities based on rank seems particularly clear; kitchens KI (8) and KI (21) were completely invisible to all of the dining areas. The exception, DR/KI (7), proves the rule. Only where persons of lowest rank were involved, could all boundaries between cooking, serving and eating be removed .

34. I.7.13-14, Caupona di Masculus, diner (Figs. 2.5, 5.4, 5.22, 5.92-5.93)

S y n o p s i s

This property is the only one in the sample which the author was unable to enter and inspect personally; the custodians were unable to find a key to open the gates. Maiuri published decoration from the face of the sales counter and from the N wall of an upper floor room; besides his description and accompanying plan, almost no other information is available on this property. The descriptions and analysis here must therefore be considered provisory, until an official publication appears. I am reporting only what I was able to record by looking through the gates.

The property has two entrances; the main entrance is on the S at #14, where an L-shaped, marble-topped sales counter greets the customer of the establishment. Behind the counter on the W is a door to the small room (2), with a niche carrying space for three shelves in its N wall, and two niches at the S ends of its E and W walls, for the placement of a bed. The front shop (1) and entrance #13 both pass into a central covered court area (3), with a HE• in the SE corner, near the bottom of a staircase to the upper floor that hugs the S wall of the court. Underneath the stairs is a cistern-head. The stairs accessed rooms above (1, 2) in the front of the shop directly, and reached a *cenaculum* over (4, 5), likely by means of a wooden balcony attached to the W wall of court (3). Facing onto court (3) on the ground floor is the large DR•(4), a multi-purpose reception area, room (5), a work area of some kind, KI◊(6), and the narrow room (7) with a LT at the W end.

The building is described as a shop and a habitation by a Maiuri, and a possible *caupona* by Della Corte. On the basis of electoral inscriptions flanking the entrance of the shop and a large rough inscription on the sales counter, Della Corte ascribes the building to one Masculus, whose name also appears next door in I.7.16 (2), celebrating his winning 200 sesterces at a contest.

References

PPM I, 728-729; PPP I, 70, CTP IIIA, 12-13; Schefold 1957, 34; Della Corte 1954, 265-266, #649; Maiuri 1938, 1, 34-35.

Data

A) Total area:	110.4	Nodes:	51.0	Connectors:	4.8	Static spaces:	58.4
B) Total # spaces:	8	# Nodes:	2	# Connectors:	1	# Static spaces:	5
C) Area, HE• in (3):	2.5	Area, DR•(4):	16.5	Length, DR•(4):	4.42	Width, DR•(4):	3.74
	Area, KI◊(6):	5.0					
D) Entry prox., HE• in (3):	5.9	Entry prox., DR•(4):	10.3	Prox, HE• in (3)-DR•(4):	4.9		
	Entry prox., KI◊(6):	13.5		Prox, KI◊(6)-DR•(4):	5.3		

Note: for the purpose of these data, the door at #14 is considered the main entrance (i.e. for customers) and #13 the subsidiary or working entrance to the building.

E) Entry access., HE• in (3):	3	Entry access., KI◊(6):	5		
Entry access., DR•(4):	4	Access, HE• in (3)-DR•(4):	2	Access, KI◊(6)-DR•(4):	2
F) Sight perc., HE• in (3)-DR•(4):	N				
Sound perc., HE• in (3)-DR•(4):	T	Smell perc., HE• in (3)-DR•(4):	T		
Sight perc., KI◊(6)-DR•(4):	N	Sound perc., KI◊(6)-DR•(4):	T	Smell perc., KI◊(6)-DR•(4):	T

G) Environmental amenities, DR•(4): This room faces directly onto the covered court (3) (which was probably lit by a sky light). A window in the NE corner lets onto KI◊(6).

H) Installation amenities, cooking areas: In the SE corner of the covered court (3), next to entrance #13, is a semi-circular HE• of sub-type (1) (ca. d. 0.75-0.90, h. 0.30 m.). The HE• has a plastered surface, which is irregular but not unknown for a cooking appliance (Fig. 5.93). It is also possible that the installation is merely a bench or low shelf. Water was available from a cistern head underneath the stairs to the upper floor in (3); a latrine at the W end of room (7) provided drainage, although the street was probably more convenient for the disposal of waste water. Light and ventilation were available via the door at #13 and perhaps via a skylight in the roof of the covered court. A proper kitchen may have lain elsewhere in the house, but due to the debris still covering the floors of rooms (5-7), only Maiuri's plan can provide clues to the location and nature of other kitchen installations. It is unclear whether the N end of the sales counter in (1) contained a built-in HE, because that end is in complete ruin; one vessel and perhaps another container were immured in the top of the N end of the counter according to his plan (Figs. 5.92-

5.93). Elsewhere in the building, a low bench of irregular shape is built along the E wall of room (5). Another bench-like feature takes up the E end of the N wall of KI◊(6), opposite a complex feature in the SE corner that has the appearance of a small HE. Small windows in the walls of both (5, KI◊6) would have provided an outlet for smoke and a source of light if either of these rooms were used for cooking. Della Corte is the only source to mention finds, a great quantity of amphorae found *in situ* on the ground floor and many other wine amphorae on the upper floor, turned upside down after they had all been emptied.

Installation amenities, DR•(4): In Maiuri's plan, two niches for couch legs are shown at the N end of the W wall, in the position of the *lectus medius* (ca. w. 1.10 m., suggesting a couch length of 2.64 m.). The position and proportions of this room can fit the definition of either a *tablinum* or a dining room; with only one couch niche, it is not possible to decide. In such a small shop-house, the room was perhaps used as both. I suggest moreover that the room was used by customers, a dining room for rent. No finds have systematically been reported, so storage of cooking and eating vessels and utensils is difficult to locate. However, in the N wall of room (2), there is an alcove with impressions of the boards that made up its three shelves clearly preserved (Fig. 5.92). I) Decorative amenities, cooking areas: The HE• was installed after room (3) was decorated, as it obstructs part of the red socle of the plain white plaster decoration. At least plain plaster covered the walls of KI◊(6).

Decorative amenities, DR•(4): Plain white plaster is still visible in patches; Maiuri described fine 2nd style decoration featuring a panel of the Muse Calliope on the N wall of an upper floor room, perhaps the *cenaculum*, that likely overlay DR•(4).

J) Sanctity: Two rectangular niches are set into the N end of the W wall of the covered court (3); it is unclear whether they had a ritual function (Fig. 5.92). On the face of the sales counter at entrance #14 was painted (it is no longer extant) a scene of Priapus standing in front of an *aedicula*, flanked by vignettes of rampant, heraldic felines. Maiuri discusses the ritual power of Priapus as a protector of boundaries, of gardens and their produce. This appearance of Priapus in the context of a diner is not unique; Jashemski reports a drawing of Priapus near the door to the Caupona of Euxinus (I.11.10), and a statue of the same god in the Caupona dei Gladiatori (I.20.1).⁶⁷

S y n t h e s i s

If this building was a diner with attached living quarters for the proprietor and his *familia*, it may be explained as follows. The front room (1) with its sales counter advertised the establishment and offered food to be eaten in that front room, on the street or à la carte. Small amounts of food and drink were prepared and heated up at the HE• in (3) and at the counter

⁶⁷Jashemski 1979, 120-121, 175-178.

itself. For those interested in reclining at a meal, DR•(4), with its couch niche, was available for rent, and perhaps the finely decorated room above it on the second floor. Rooms (5, KI•6) were used for storage, and to cook and prepare food and drink for these larger gatherings; the latrine in (7) offered relief to satisfied customers. The large quantity of wine amphorae found both downstairs and (empty) upstairs testifies to the consumption of significant amounts of drink on the premises. Room (2) seems to have doubled as a bedroom and storage area. But given the ithyphallic Priapus on the sales counter and the suggestive description of *Masculus'* troupe of clients as "phalli" in one of the inscriptions outside the door, it is conceivable that room (2) was an in-house *cella meretricis*.⁶⁸ Probable cooking and eating areas are all within complete sensory range of each other; there is no attempt to divorce the processes of preparation and consumption. Moreover, there seem to be different levels of food serving available to the customer, from the cheaper and more public lunch at the counter to the furnished DR•(4) available for rent on the ground floor, and perhaps a more secluded and exclusive upper floor *cenaculum* for rent. This gradation in the settings for meals is a recognizable feature of diners. Starting up a diner at this street corner would have been a wise business move, as it is within thirty meters of five different *insulae*.

35. I.7.15-17, Officina degli scrittori murali, Tabernae,
(work)shop-house, (work)shops (Figs. 2.5, 5.4, 5.22, 5.94-5.98)

S y n o p s i s

The workshop-house at #16 and its dependent shops at #15, 17, like their neighbor to the E (I.7.13-14) are still unpublished, making the interpretation of the building difficult and the analysis here provisory. Furthermore, the area was heavily damaged by Allied bombing in 1943, which largely accounts for its precarious condition today.

The two shops that flank the entrance to #16 each have a few rooms centered on a room (1) that fronts the street and has another door onto the entryway (1) for #16. Only traces of plain plaster remain on the walls of these shops, but the presence of an upper story for each is clear in the holes for floor joists and windows and doors high up in the walls (Figs. 5.94-5.95). No cooking or eating evidence is known from either (work)shop. The upper floor rooms for both shops were reached at the head of the stairway leading up from entrance (1) of #16. That entranceway opens out into garden-court (2) with a DO and a HE on the E side, and surrounded on the W and N by a simple portico (Figs. 5.96-5.97). From the NW corner, a stairway reaches the upper floor over a suite of rooms on the N. All rooms in that suite (3-8) open onto the N portico

⁶⁸The inscription was to the E of the entrance: *Masculus cum codatis ubique (rogat)*; see Della Corte 1954, 266, #649b and CIL IV, 7240.

and garden; rooms (6, 7) have traces of red ground plaster on its walls; their function is unclear. Only a second floor room directly over (6) has a niche at the N end of its E wall, for a bed.

The property is described by Della Corte as a workshop for artisans who write notices, advertisements and electoral programmata upon the walls of Pompeii. The identification is based on two persons, Astylus and Papilio (known as *scriptores* from their work elsewhere) who put their names on the walls of garden court (2).

References

Jashemski 1993, 41; Mouritsen 1988, 31-32, n. 119-120; CTP IIIA, 12-13; Gassner 1986, 130; Franklin 1978; Della Corte 1954, 266, #650-654; Soprano 1950, 296, #6; Maiuri 1938, 1.

Data (Not including 3 rooms and 45.0 m² of I.7.15 and 4 rooms and 49.7 m² of I.7.17)

A) Total area: 185.8 Nodes: 79.1 Connectors: 17.3 Static spaces: 89.4

B) Total # spaces: 14 # Nodes: 1 # Connectors: 3 # Static spaces: 8

C) Area, HE in (2): 2.5 Area, DO in (2): 16.9 Length, DO in (2): 3.94 Width, DO in (2): 4.30

D) Entry prox., HE in (2): 17.9 Entry prox., DO in (2): 15.9 Prox, HE in (2)-DO in (2): 3.0

E) Entry access., HE in (2): 4 Entry access., DO in (2): 5 Access, HE in (2)-DO in (2): 2

F) Sight perc., HE in (2)-DO in (2): V

Sound perc., HE in (2)-DO in (2): T

Smell perc., HE in (2)-DO in (2): T

G) Environmental amenities, DO in (2): This dining area, placed within the SE corner of garden-court (2), appears to have been completely open to the sky (Figs. 5.96-5.97). The garden walls on the E and S are preserved at too low a height to reveal whether they helped to support a bower for shade over the couches. If there was a bower, it was made of wood, as there are no traces of a support at the NW corner of the couches. The presence of a portico with wooden supports can however be inferred on the W and N sides of the garden (see below), so a simple bower over the couches is not out of the question. With its orientation towards the NW, this dining area is suitable for summer use. There are no other covered rooms at this address which show any evidence of being used for dining, so it appears that formal dinners could have been held only here, and only on limited occasions (fair weather).

H) Installation amenities, HE in (2): Against the N end of the E wall of garden (2) are two parallel masonry stub walls, each (w. 0.21-0.26, l. 0.63, h. 0.55, and 0.60 m. apart). These form a HE of sub-type (2), missing its tile-topped surface (Figs. 5.97-5.98). Traces of plaster still hang on the bottom of the interior and exterior faces of the stub walls. Space for storage was probably available in the small closet (8) just to the N. Light and ventilation were plentiful. Water was retrieved from a well with a platform next to the stairs to the upper floor under the roof of the NW corner of the garden. Water was collected off the shed roofs of the rooms on the N side of the building by a channel running along the N side of the garden, and eventually piped

underground to feed the cistern underneath its head in the NW corner. The channel widened into a low basin at its E end, just N of the HE. Drainage was provided by a one-seat latrine with a tiled floor in space (9) at the SW corner of the garden. Beam-holes in the walls behind reveal that a rough shed-roofed portico sheltered the W and N sides of the garden (Fig. 5.96). Supports for this portico must have been wooden columns or simple poles with no bases, as no traces of them survive. Another water source had its access point under the stairs in entranceway (1), but this was probably of more use to the shops at #15 and #17, neither of which have any water or heating installations of their own.

Installation amenities, DO in (2): The top surfaces of the three masonry couches have the customary gentle slope towards their outside edges. In their center is the remains of a rectangular masonry table. Soprano noted no plastering either upon the couches or the table, consistent with the general lack of extant decoration in the garden.

J) Sanctity: There is no record of any ritual installations or finds from the property; a small rectangular niche in the wall above the cistern head off the NW corner of the garden appears to be the only candidate for a shrine.

S y n t h e s i s

The layout of the main building at #16 with its flanking dependent shops is not a traditional house or shop type. The building seems to have functioned also both residence and business; the presence of a bedroom on the upper floor suggests that persons lived here, and the DO and HE prove that meals were made here. Because the DO is open to the elements and appears to be the only dining area, it is tempting to suggest that the couches were used for special occasions, perhaps communal meals whose invitees were primarily *scriptores*. One or more *scriptores* and their households may have inhabited sections of the upper floors over the main building and the shops; the ground floor could have served for business and pleasure. There is no attempt to impress a guest with elaborate decoration in garden court (2), and the couches themselves are of low quality; the only decoration seems to have been the wall-scribbling of the *scriptores* themselves. The cooking area is within plain sight of the dining couches; as there is no guarantee that *scriptores* could afford slaves, the occupants may very well have had to cook their own meals. The DO appears to have served the professional community of *scriptores* -- perhaps their *sodalitium* or *collegium* was headquartered within the walls of this home/office.

36. I.7.18, Taberna di Niraemius, (work)shop-house (Figs. 2.5, 5.4, 5.23, 5.99-5.103)

S y n o p s i s

The N half of this shop-house was excavated and published by Maiuri, but information for the S half, like (I.7.13-14) and (I.7.15-17), remains unavailable. The building originally had a separate *fauces* on axis with the present doorway of (d). Sutherland suggests that the garden (h)

of a neighboring house to the E was originally connected to this house, but this seems unlikely; A. De Vos (PPM I, 750) believes that garden originally belonged to a separate, small house. There is controversy in determining when: the entrance was changed, the house was redecorated in the late 3rd style and the upper floor rooms was added over (a, d). A. De Vos dates the alteration of the entrance and the repainting to ca. A.D. 35-45, and several minor repairs to the post-earthquake period. Sutherland, however, noting the numerous repairs, dates the whole renovation after the earthquake and follows Schefold in describing the program of redecoration as 'imitation' 3rd style. Sutherland is supported by the fact that the S wall of the *cenaculum* {g}, constructed of *opus craticum*, is painted in that 3rd style. Such construction is unlikely to have survived the shock of the A.D. 62 earthquake, and so was probably constructed (and decorated) afterwards.⁶⁹

The building was ascribed to a certain Niraemius by Della Corte, who posted an electoral recommendation next to the entrance. Because of the late transformation of room (a) into a entrance with wide doorways, this room has been identified as a shop. Numerous finds were made in (a), especially bronze vessels, tools and glass bottles, and terracotta bowls. Maiuri does not report the elevation of any of these finds, and whether (in the case of the serving vessels) they were likely to have fallen from the *cenaculum* DR◊{g} above. In any case, it is not at all certain what was sold on the premises. Otherwise, the pattern of habitation is clear: front room (a) offering clear passage from the street to the ground and upper floor rooms, with an atrium (b) around which bedrooms (d, h, i?), service (KI e, f) and reception, DR•(c), were arranged.

R e f e r e n c e s

PPM I, 730-749; Fröhlich 1991, 252, #L7; Sutherland 1990, 158-159; Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, 172-173, #56; Gassner 1986, 131; CTP IIIA, 12-13; PPP I, 70-72; Bastet & De Vos 1979, 93-94, #60; Guida 1976, 186; Schefold 1957, 35; Della Corte 1954, 267, #655; Pernice 1938, 107; Maiuri NSc 1929, 379-386.

D a t a

A) Total area: 145.0	Nodes: 69.2	Connectors: 3.5	Static spaces: 75.5
B) Total # spaces: 8	# Nodes: 2	# Connectors: 1	# Static spaces: 5
C) Area, KI (e): 8.9	Area, DR•(c): 13.6	Length, DR•(c): 3.73	Width, DR•(c): 3.64
	Area, DR◊{g}: 17.1	Length, DR◊{g}: 4.79	Width, DR◊{g}: 3.56

⁶⁹However, I.10.18 {11}, also with *opus craticum* walls, has 3rd style decoration; unless it is in imitation, it is possible that such construction could have survived the earthquake. A. and M. De Vos (PPM I, 407-409, 750-751) argue that decoration in the neighboring houses I.6.15 and I.7.19 were done in 'imitation' 3rd style after the A.D. 62 earthquake.

D) Entry prox., KI (e): 12.4	Entry prox., DR•(c): 10.4	Prox, KI (e)-DR•(c): 4.6
	Entry prox., DR◊{g}: 13.1	Prox, KI (e)-DR◊{g}: 17.0
E) Entry access., KI (e): 4	Entry access., DR•(c): 4	Access, KI (e)-DR•(c): 3
	Entry access., DR◊{g}: 4	Access, KI (e)-DR◊{g}: 5
F) Sight perc., KI (e)-DR•(c): N	Sound perc., KI (e)-DR•(c): T	Smell perc., KI (e)-DR•(c): T
Sight perc., KI (e)-DR◊{g}: N	Sound perc., KI (e)-DR◊{g}: T	Smell perc., KI (e)-DR◊{g}: F

G) Environmental amenities, dining areas: A high window in the E wall of DR•(c) and the wide doorway W onto the atrium (b) are the sources of indirect light in this room (Fig. 5.103). The find of a bronze candelabrum in the room indicates the use of artificial illumination. The view is highly axial, and directly to the street via the node (a). The upper floor *cenaculum* DR◊{g}, however, was amply lit and provided a superb view for guests (Fig. 5.99) through a large window over the crossroads to the W.

H) Installation amenities, KI (e): Along the W end of the N wall of the kitchen is a large ST of stub-type (3) (l. 2.30, w. 0.70-1.11, h. 0.70-0.80 m.). The masonry ST is tile-topped and supported by three pillars, dividing the appliance into two halves (Figs. 5.100-5.101). The rectangular under-space on the W is open (the gap was bridged perhaps by wood, as it has been restored today), and would have been available for storage. The under-space on the E apparently could not be supported, and a large ashlar block was moved into the under-space to provide solid support for the stove-top. The different elevations of the stove-top, higher on the W than on the E, roughly corresponds to the division below. Along the front edge of the ST was a lip of *imbrices*, at least on the W half. The stove-top partitioning may be the result of a need to have more than one 'burner', or perhaps the division of the counter into a cooking area (W) and a working counter (E). The E part of the stove has its corners and inside edges mortared and plastered to a slope, presumably to facilitate easier cleaning of the stove. The E edge of the ST is delimited by a high partition wall that separated the ST from the latrine in the NE corner of the room. Water was available in the room itself, from a cistern-head near the SE corner of the room, attached to a low *opus signinum* covered counter (h. 0.40 m.) (Fig. 5.100). The cistern was fed by a terracotta pipe immured in the wall to the E that drew water gathered from the roof into a small basin lined with *opus signinum* just to the NE of the cistern-head. Water could then be allowed either into the cistern or through a small drain pipe on the N side of the cistern head, where it could spill out upon the floor of the kitchen and be drained away via the latrine to the NE. The cleaning of the kitchen floor could be so accomplished; such drainage is not uncommon in Pompeian kitchens.⁷⁰ The latrine had its seat set against the E end of the N wall, made comfortable by a shallow arcuated recess for the back. The subsidence of the floor into the latrine channel as it passed

⁷⁰see Salza Prina Ricotti 1978/80, 244-246 for examples of kitchen drainage systems.

under the SE corner of DR•(c) caused the floor of the dining room to collapse at that point. A public water source (important if private water sources were reduced or cut off due to drought) was also located just across the street from the entrance, at the NE corner of *insula* (I.10) (Fig. 5.99). The only light and ventilation for the kitchen was apparently through the doorway into atrium (b). The finds from the S half of this property (including the kitchen) were never published, so it is difficult to discern where the bulk of kitchen goods and equipment were stored. However, a photo taken at the time of excavation (PPM I, 743, #240) shows three terracotta weights, a cylindrical terracotta cooking stand closed at the top by a round ceramic disk, a coarse lid with a handle and two other open ceramic cooking vessels. From this evidence, it would appear that the kitchen was in use at the time of the eruption.

Installation amenities, dining areas: Maiuri reasoned that DR•(c) was used in part for reception because there was evidence for a couch against the E wall.⁷¹ Several other finds in bronze support the suggestion that dining was carried out here: a foot stool for the couch, two table amphorae, two serving trays with handles, two jugs and three pastry forms (Maiuri, 385, Fig. 17). A few amphorae were found in the *cenaculum* DR◇{g} at the time of excavation, but no secure evidence for dining vessels or furniture exists.⁷² Other storage of dining apparatus was available in a cabinet, the imprint of which was recognized against the W wall of atrium (b). Associated with this cabinet were a bronze serving tray, *casseruola* and a ladle.

I) Decorative amenities, KI (e): The only decoration in the kitchen is from the *lararium* painting above the ST, described below, under 'Sanctity'.

Decorative amenities, dining areas: The *cocciopesto* pavement of DR•(c) centered on a square emblema with an inscribed circle in which a dog, birds and fish were depicted. The emblema was bordered by a meander pattern in white tesserae. The walls are in the late 3rd style; a thin architectural scheme imposed on a white ground frames vignettes in the central panels, showing rams, goats and swans pulling chariots. The central vignettes are flanked by miniature still-lives of gilt vases. Sutherland argues that the decoration is in 'imitation' 3rd style and dates to after the A.D. 62 earthquake. The pavement from *cenaculum* DR◇{g} was able to be reconstructed; a central (1.0 m²) square emblema consisted of marble cut-outs linked by lines of tesserae. The walls were again of the late (or 'imitation') 3rd style; red-bordered panels contained medallions of animals over a red socle.

⁷¹Maiuri NSc 1929, 384: "lungo la parete est si osservano tracce di un divano".

⁷²Of note is room (d), which was enlarged by the space formerly occupied by the *fauces* after the entrance to the building was moved into (a). The decoration is patchy and practically illegible, and there is a niche for a couch or bed (ca. l. 2.00, w. 0.90 m.) at the S end of the W wall, below a window to the street. Although the room (l. 4.75, w. 4.38 m.) is even larger than DR•(c), the small size of the niche (and consequently the couch) suggests a bedroom here.

J). Sanctity: On the N and W walls above the ST in KI (e) is a stretch of preserved plaster with a shrine painting (Fig. 5.102). The painting on the N wall shows two *Lares* on either side of a togate, veiled *Genius* who sacrifices at an altar while holding a cornucopia. On the left of the scene hangs a large ham. Two serpents flank an altar on the W wall. Fröhlich dates the painting to the late 3rd style, in keeping with the decoration of the rest of the house. The analogy between the painted altar and the real stove is clear; cooking and sacrifice are both watched over by the spirit of the household, who is symbolized in the wall painting. The painted *Genius* is located on the 'outside' of the wall for DR•(c), a room probably used by the master as a *tablinum*, as well as a dining room. The painted *Genius* observing the kitchen is parallel to the real *Genius* (the master) presiding over the residence from DR•(c).

S y n t h e s i s

This small shop-house uses multi-functionality to great advantage in many of its rooms. Reception and probably dining are concentrated in the two well-decorated rooms DR•(c) and DR◊{g}, with broad, axial views W onto the Vicolo del Menandro. KI (e), well-placed to serve both dining areas, contained a dense package of cooking and working areas, water and waste disposal, as well as the ritual focus of the habitation. The proximity of KI (e) to DR•(c) means that the latter is easily within the range of smelling the cooking food and hearing the cooking progress, despite being invisible. The location of the latrine drain, passing under (and eventually collapsing) the SE corner of DR•(c) implies that in some smaller abodes, it was necessary and acceptable to juxtapose the elegant and the noisome.

37. I.7.19, Casa annessa alla Casa dell'Efebo, *casa media*
(Figs. 2.5, 5.4, 5.23, 5.104-5.107)

S y n o p s i s

Originally (in the second century B.C.) this house was two properties, divided approximately along the line of the E wall of DH•(b). The property on the E was entered via a doorway at the S end of the E wall of room (i), later blocked up. Bastet & De Vos (28-29) date the conjunction of these two properties to the Augustan period, based on the affinities in the early 3rd style and quality of decoration in bedrooms (d, f). Many other areas, including DH•(b) and DI•(e), then underwent redecoration in a later 3rd style, ca. A.D. 35-45. After extensive damage (attributed to the earthquake of A.D. 62), the house was ceded in its last, post-earthquake phase to the Casa dell'Efebo at #10-12. During that last period, the house was undergoing extensive repairs and renovations and was apparently in limited occupancy in A.D. 79.⁷³

⁷³A. De Vos' (PPM I, 750-751) summary of this house suggests an alternative chronology. He dates the decoration in areas (d, e, f, h) all to the early 3rd style, and claims that rooms (a, b, c) were then redecorated after the earthquake in imitation 3rd style. The difficulty of dating the phasing of this house is recognized

The extensive evidence for renovation going on in this house in its last period makes an interpretation of the use of its cooking and dining areas problematic. Neither of the two dining areas, DH•(b) nor DI•(e), were in use at the moment of the eruption. Because of the confusion in dating the phasing of this house (based almost entirely on ambiguous painting styles), it appears best here to summarize the layout of the house as it was designed and was in use prior to the earthquake. The entrance (u) was flanked by bedrooms (a, t) on either side; a staircase in the latter room led to upper floor rooms over the front of the house (that Maiuri believed were installed after the earthquake). The N side of atrium (p) was closed off by a bedroom (r) flanked by two small probable storage areas (s, q). A small door led to the large DH•(b) on the NE, next to the wide doorway of *tablinum* (c) which dominated the atrium (Fig. 5.106). Alongside another bedroom (d) ran corridor (o) to the E part of the house, passing by another stair to upper floor rooms in (m), next to KI (l) and the small open-air court (n) that collected water and provided light through a wide window onto the *cubiculum* (Fig. 5.104). Rooms on the E part of the house were all arranged around garden (h) with a portico (g) on its N and E sides. DI•(e) had a broad view onto this garden from the N. Bedroom (f), the large (function uncertain) room (k), and service room (i) lined the E portico, at either end of which were stairs to the house at #10-12 and to upper floor rooms overlooking garden (h), respectively.

References

Jashemski 1993, 41, 316; Allison 1992b, 288-298; PPM I, 750-789; Sutherland 1990, 157-158; Andersson 1990, 218-219; CTP IIIA, 12-13; PPP I, 73-77; Jashemski 1979, 57-58; Bastet & De Vos 1979, 28-29, 95-96; Guida 1976, 215; Schefold 1957, 35-36; Pernice 1938, 107; Maiuri 1938, 27-34; Boyce 1937, 26, #42-43; Maiuri NSc 1929, 354-379.

Data

A) Total area:	369.5	Nodes:	156.2	Connectors:	30.2	Static spaces:	188.4
B) Total # spaces:	26	# Nodes:	2	# Connectors:	6	# Static spaces:	16
C) Area, KI (l):	4.4	Area, DH•(b):	25.6	Length, DH•(b):	5.68	Width, DH•(b):	4.50
		Area, DI•(e):	12.4	Length, DI•(e):	3.35	Width, DI•(e):	3.70
D) Entry prox., KI (l):	18.8	Entry prox., DH•(b):	9.7	Prox, KI (l)-DH•(b):	21.2		
		Entry prox., DI•(e):	15.1	Prox, KI (l)-DI•(e):	8.3		
E) Entry access., KI (l):	6	Entry access., DH•(b):	4	Access, KI (l)-DH•(b):	5		
		Entry access., DI•(e):	6	Access, KI (l)-DI•(e):	5		
F) Sight perc., KI (l)-DH•(b):	N	Sound perc., KI (l)-DH•(b):	T	Smell perc., KI (l)-DH•(b):	F		

by Allison (1992b, 297): "Studies concerned with the decoration of this house do not seem to have been able to agree on third or fourth style classifications for them. Hence this house may serve to demonstrate that such divisions should be handled with extreme care".

Sight perc., KI (l)-DI•(e): N Sound perc., KI (l)-DI•(e): T Smell perc., KI (l)-DI•(e): T

G) Environmental amenities, dining areas: For both DH•(b) and DI•(e), the only source of light and air is via their doorways onto the open spaces of atrium (p) and the peristyle garden (h) respectively. DH•(b) has a view limited to the entrance (u) and the flight of stairs to the N; despite a lofty ceiling equal to that of the *tablinum* (c) to the S, the door is narrow and small (Fig. 5.106). The *tablinum* is clearly designed to command a wide view of the atrium, while DH•(b) can be closed off completely from the atrium by closing the door. The SW orientation of the room and its concentration its own interior space suggests that this room was used primarily in the winter. DI•(e) in contrast has its whole width open to the peristyle garden, and with its orientation to the SE, would have provided a cool environment for dinner on a summer afternoon. Its view to the garden could be partially obstructed except through the central intercolumniation; Maiuri suggested that mats or curtains were hung from wooden beams set between the side intercolumniations 1.70 m. above the ground. Such hangings would have offered additional protection from sun, rain, and/or cold. Garden (h) had plantings arranged in an E-W direction; the extension of the colonnade and the garden beyond the walls of the house was achieved by 3rd style garden paintings on the S and W walls. A lattice fence, colonettes, birds, basins, fountains and at least one herm of Dionysos marked out the plants, flowers and trees of the garden scene.

H) Installation amenities, KI (l): Along the N, E and W sides of this room is stretched a long masonry ST, with one arch on the N and S, and a former double arch on the E, its masonry support replaced at some point by a large *dolium* (Figs. 5.104-5.105). The three sections of this ST are subtly diverse in their dimensions: The N section (l. 1.30, w. 0.98, h. 0.85 m.), E section (l. 1.54, w. 0.41, h. 0.67 m.) and S section (l. 1.55, w. 0.53, h. 0.74 m.). Near the center of the N section is the remains of a masonry division of that section of the ST into two 'burners', a division indicated on Maiuri's original (NSc 1929) plans. There was no internal allowance for light and ventilation; the room received its light and air largely from the small open court/light-well (n) to the NW. Water was collected by means of the same court lined with *opus signinum*. In the NE corner of the adjacent room (m), a small basin (d. 0.44 m.) was immured in a high quarter-circle podium (l. 1.03, w. 0.45, h. 0.70 m.); this basin presumably acted as some kind of sink. A channel (0.27 m. deep) on the S side of the basin provided drainage directly onto the floor, but where that water consequently drained is not clear. The only latrine identified in the house is across the house under the stairs next to room (i). In the last period of the house, additional water was piped down from the house at #10-12; this running water may have aided the renovation of the house or simply supply everyday domestic needs. The only finds reported from KI (l) were four truncated amphorae stacked against the S wall, which Allison interprets as either scoops for lime (building material), which were found in number elsewhere in the house, or as rudimentary

ovens.⁷⁴ It is not certain whether the remains of a small mill of volcanic stone located in the kitchen today actually belong there. A storage alcove was located against the W wall of room (m) underneath the stairs; this alcove may have been designed for storing kitchen goods, but at the time of excavation, no finds were recovered there.

The only possible cooking wares were located in the small vaulted room (i). Allison reports five large terracotta vessels (four of open form) collected in the SE corner, which she interprets as suitable for washing, cooking or preparing food. Consequently, she wonders if this room "may have acted as a temporary kitchen during the renovations and possibly until the time of the eruption".⁷⁵ Given the lack of usable dining areas in the house, and the absence of kitchen wares elsewhere, it seems reasonable to posit that temporary, reduced cooking arrangements were in operation. However, it is difficult to understand why KI (l), with its convenient stoves and work areas, would not have been used for cooking, unless that room or rooms on the floor above were undergoing restoration that prevented cooking from being done.

Installation amenities, dining areas: There were no niches, finds or installations from either DH•(b) or DI•(e) that suggested that dining was going on in either room at the time of eruption. In fact, all evidence points to the conclusion that dining ceased in these two rooms after they were heavily damaged by the A.D. 62 earthquake, and the house was ceded to the owners of (I.7.10-12). At the time of excavation, DH•(b) was found stacked full of orderly rows of roof tiles, for use in covering the impluviate atrium. Because it is not known how long such a roof repair might take, it is not possible to know the duration of the period when DH•(b) was not being used. A repair lasting the seventeen years between the earthquake and eruption seems unlikely; if DH•(b) was primarily a winter dining room, it may have been used for temporary storage of material during a summer renovation project. DI•(e) contained piles of building material, several terracotta vessels, and tools. Only a decorated stone vessel from the same room seems inappropriate to the process of renovating the room. Even room (k) on the E side of the peristyle garden, large enough (l. 5.80 w. 4.25 m.) to contain dining and with traces of black ground decoration, contained piles of lime on the floor that indicate renovation in this quarter as well. Six skeletons found in *fauces* (u) and room (a), as well as remains of beds in bedrooms (a, r) suggest that persons were occupying and using parts of the house. If there was a close association between the household of (I.7.10-12) and the occupants of this house, perhaps these persons cooked and ate their meals in the larger house to the N, at least during the summer; by winter, DH•(b) may have come back into use. On the other hand, if the occupants of the two houses comprised two reasonably autonomous households, then where did the occupants of

⁷⁴Truncated amphorae were interpreted as rudimentary ovens in KI (n) of house (I.6.4).

⁷⁵Allison 1992b, 293.

(I.7.19) eat? The extent of serving and table wares found in the house consisted of a silver kantharos with relief decoration with a skeleton in *fauces* (u), and two silver *casseroles* and a plate with a skeleton in bedroom (t). As items of personal possession intended to be salvaged during the eruption, these items unfortunately do not illuminate the storage locations of table wares, or indicate where the residents took their meals.

I) Decorative amenities, KI (I): Stretches of coarse plain plaster adorn the walls.

Decorative amenities, dining areas: The floor of DH•(b) belongs to the second century B.C., an *opus signinum* pavement with white tesserae dispensed in regular, equidistant rows. The walls have a black socle with vegetal decoration; above, the red-ground main zone has sacro-idyllic landscapes in panels centered on each wall (Fig. 5.107). The decoration is either genuine late 3rd style, ca. A.D. 35-45 (Bastet & M. De Vos), or a post-earthquake redecoration of the room in the manner of the 3rd style (A. De Vos, PPM I, 750). The latter hypothesis seems untenable, as the N wall of the room was badly damaged by the earthquake, and the decoration of the room shows no sign of subsequent repair or replacement; if this room was used as a dining area, it was in the context of partial decoration.

The decoration of DI•(e) is likewise damaged; no traces remain on the N wall, which was damaged by the earthquake. The N wall was later rebuilt; against its N face in garden (23) of the recently connected Casa dell'Efebo (I.7.10-12) was built the aedicular fountain with its background wall-painting of animals in the countryside. Traces of its late 3rd style decoration survived on the W and E walls of DI•(e), though damaged by tunnelers. Much of the central panel on the E wall showing Herakles and Nessos survived. The floor was paved with *cocciopesto*, but was piled over with plaster against the W and N walls. Maiuri interpreted the building material in the room as evidence of its imminent redecoration; Allison suggests that the renovation had ceased prior to the eruption and the room was being used for simple storage.

J) Sanctity: Two arcuated niched shrines were placed in the NW and NE corners of the garden portico (g). Just E of the stairs connecting this house to the Casa dell'Efebo are two arched niches; the lower larger niche seems to have been a storage nook. The upper niche contained the remains of a wooden chest containing two figurines: a marble Venus and a terracotta woman reclining on a couch and holding a patera towards which a snake climbs. This seems a clear instance of the storage of ritual material. At the W end of portico (g) was another arcuated niche marked by a painted aedicular facade.

S y n t h e s i s

The design of the dining arrangements in this house seems predicated on seasonal considerations. The large DH•(b) was protected from the elements by a small entrance and was appropriate to non-summer dining. The high ceiling expanded its interior space, and views were extended beyond the walls through their 3rd style decoration, which featured sacro-idyllic landscapes in large panels. The summer dining area DI•(e) had primary aspect onto the actual landscape of garden (h), itself expanded by the garden paintings on its W and S walls. As Clarke notes: "the view *out* was of primary importance".⁷⁶ The position, form and decoration of both these rooms exemplify the "view *out*" in their own particular way, based on their adaptation to seasonal climatic conditions.

KI (l) was conveniently placed between dining areas to serve them both; the room was well-equipped with extensive heating, working and storage facilities, as well as an adequate water source. The kitchen was invisible to DH•(b) and DI•(e), but the smell of cooking food (and doubtless a considerable din) were discernible in the latter, placed adjacent to the kitchen. Serving a dinner party necessitated considerable traffic along corridor (o). This attractive and practical arrangement was interrupted by the earthquake, and at the time of the eruption, neither dining area was operational; both were filled with building material. The lack of repair to the damaged decoration of these dining rooms might argue for the abandonment of dining in these rooms or the postponement of their use until other parts of the house had been renovated. On the other hand, at least in DH•(b), the storage of building material in that winter dining area may have been temporary, until repairs to the roof of the atrium were complete, and cooler days appropriate to the use of the room had arrived once more. The attachment of this house in its last phase to the Casa dell'Efebo, with its own slate of fine dining areas, further complicates the problem. Without knowing the domestic structure of the occupants of this house and their relationship to the owners and household of the Casa dell'Efebo, it is not possible to securely interpret its functionality, except to say that it was limited during its renovation.

⁷⁶Clarke 1991, 16.

Gazetteer, part II: macroanalysis

38. I.8.1-3, Casa e popina di Stephanus, *casa media* + lunch counter (Figs. 2.6, 5.5, 5.108-5.109)

Synopsis

This complex had a lunch counter in (12) with an L-shaped counter on the street; a HE of sub-type (4) located at the end of that counter was found in a ruined state, next to some bronze and glass serving vessels (Fig. 5.108). A *lararium* niche was cut in the W wall behind the counter. The identification of this shop as the "Taberna del fruttivendolo Felix" is based solely on an electoral inscription flanking the entrance, and must be considered spurious, despite Jashemski's effort to find fruit there. In the main house, storage vessels were stacked under the stairs in the NE corner of atrium (2), which may have supplied the lunch counter. It is possible that the HE in the shop in (12) served the house as well, as seems to be the case in I.9.4-6. DR•(8) faced away from the business end of the house towards the large peristyle garden (10) (Fig. 5.109). There was once perhaps another reception room off the SE corner of the peristyle, but the entire area has collapsed into the subterranean rooms of the workshop at (I.8.19). Along the W (street) side of the insular wall, is a large *ara compitalis*.

References

Jashemski 1993, 42; PPM I, 790-796; Castiglione Morelli del Franco & Vitale 1989, 185-193; Gassner 1986, 131; PPP I, 77; CTP IIIA, 14-15; Jashemski 1979, 265; Schefold 1957, 37; Della Corte 1954, 269-270, #662-671; Spinazzola I, 250-251; Della Corte NSc 1946, 92-93; Boyce 1937, 26, #44; Maiuri NSc 1927, 6; Della Corte 1927, 38-40; Della Corte NSc 1912, 184, 216, 232, 403-404.

Data

A) Total area:	614.0	Nodes:	363.2	Connectors:	47.9	Static spaces:	208.6
B) Total # spaces:	21	# Nodes:	4	# Connectors:	4	# Static spaces:	9
C) Area, HE in (12):	2.5	Area, DR•(8):	23.1	Length, DR•(8):	5.28	Width, DR•(8):	4.37

39. I.8.4-6 Casa della Statuetta Indiana, *casa media* (Figs. 2.6, 5.5, 5.110-5.113)

Synopsis

A double-arched ST of sub-type (2) with traces of burning on its tiled surface rests along the corridor (14) which ends in a latrine (Fig 5.110). The ST exploits the light and ventilation of the peristyle, but is very visible to anyone crossing the peristyle, or dining in DR•(7) or DR (13). Couch niches securely identify the dining areas DR (3) (*lectus medius*, w. 1.11 m.) and DR (13) (*lectus summus*, l. 2.39 m.). The latter has 4th style decoration (Figs. 5.111-5.113). Numerous domestic vessels and utensils (including 39 glass vases and 21 bronze vessels) were recovered from a wooden cabinet that resided in one of the three service rooms (9-11) on the W side of the

peristyle garden (8), in the company of an ivory statuette of the Indian goddess Laksmi. Orr's placement of a masonry shrine along the E wall of garden (8) is erroneous; no such shrine exists.

References

Jashemski 1993, 42; PPM I, 797-801; Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, #38, 60-61; Castiglione Morelli del Franco & Vitale 1989, 193-195; Gassner 1986, 131; PPP I, 77-78; Laidlaw 1985, 67-68; CTP IIIA, 14-15; Orr 1973, 152; Schefold 1957, 37; Della Corte NSc 1946, 93-95; Della Corte NSc 1912, 251.

Data

A) Total area:	426.7	Nodes:	134.8	Connectors:	35.5	Static spaces:	256.4
B) Total # spaces:	22	# Nodes:	4	# Connectors:	3	# Static spaces:	13
C) Area, KI (14):	6.9	Area, DR (3):	19.2	Length, DR (3):	4.94	Width, DR (3):	3.89
		Area, DR•(7):	18.8	Length, DR•(7):	4.94	Width, DR•(7):	3.81
		Area, DR (13):	12.7	Length, DR (13):	3.79	Width, DR (13):	3.35

40. I.8.7, Taberna, (work)shop (Figs. 2.6, 5.5, 5.114)

Synopsis

This shop was nearly void of finds; several recommendations flanking the entrance to this shop gave Della Corte the impression that it was a *collegium* for bakers, led by one L. Vetutius Placidus, owner of the adjacent caupona (I.8.8-9). There is however no secure evidence for either the owner or the function of the shop. The base for a stair to an upper loft sits in the SW corner.

References

Castiglione Morelli del Franco & Vitale 1989, 195; Gassner 1986, 131; Della Corte 1954, 270-272, #672-674; Della Corte NSc 1946, 95; Della Corte 1927, 40-41; Della Corte NSc 1912, 330.

Data

A) Total area:	23.7	Nodes:	21.7	Connectors:	3.9	Static spaces:	0
B) Total # spaces:	2	# Nodes:	1	# Connectors:	1	# Static spaces:	0

41. I.8.8-9, Casa e caupona di L. Vetutius Placidus, *casa media*, diner (Figs. 1.20, 2.6, 5.5, 5.115-5.118)

Synopsis

The front room (1) of the diner had a serving counter with seven *dolia* inserted into its surface, and solid step shelving for displaying goods above the counter on the E side (Fig. 5.115). A total of 683 sesterces worth of coins were found in one of the *dolia*.⁷⁷ A HE of sub-type (1) sits

⁷⁷See Laurence 1994, 5-6 for a brief discussion of what this sum of money may represent, whether earnings from a day, week, month, or the entire capital of the establishment.

next to a latrine near the NW corner of the room (Fig. 5.116). There is a well-preserved painted *lararium* on the S wall depicting a *Genius*, two *Lares*, Mercury and Bacchus at sacrifice, over two snakes at an altar (Figs. 1.20, 5.115). Another small *lararium* niche was located in the W wall of *cubiculum* (6). DR•(2) behind the counter served as a handy dining area for customers; its pavement had a central emblema of *opus sectile* and 3rd style wall decoration. Room (3) may also have been used for reception; an *opus sectile* emblema survives at the center of its floor. Further to the S were two other securely identified dining areas. DR (10) has niches for the *lectus summus* and *lectus medius* (l. 2.29, w. 1.39 m.) and a central emblema of marble fragments in the *cocciopesto* pavement, as well as 3rd style wall painting (Fig. 5.117). Against the E wall of garden (11) lay a masonry DO underneath a bower (Fig. 5.118). These latter dining areas were for the use of the household, and perhaps for special rental to customers of the diner. A total of 21 wine amphorae were found in the NE corner of atrium (4), against the columns and masonry couches of garden (11), and fallen from the balcony over the street to the E. Spinazzola reconstructs an upper floor over this complex, but there remains no evidence for a stairway to that level.

References

Jashemski 1993, 42, 317; PPM I, 802-825; Fröhlich 1991, 252-253; Castiglione Morelli del Franco & Vitale 1989, 196-197; Tella 1989; PPP I, 78-80; CTP IIIA, 14-15; Guida Laterza 1982, 117; Bastet & De Vos 1979, 79-80; Guida 1976, 217, 220; Orr 1973, 152-153; Schefold 1957, 37; Della Corte 1954, 270-272, #672-674; Spinazzola III, Tav. LXXIII; Della Corte NSc 1946, 95-100; Maiuri 1942a, 162, 202; Della Corte 1927, 41; Della Corte NSc 1912, 287-289.

Data

A) Total area:	317.1	Nodes:	172.0	Connectors:	42.7	Static spaces:	102.4
B) Total # spaces:	12	# Nodes:	3	# Connectors:	3	# Static spaces:	5
C) Area, HE in (1):	2.5	Area, DR•(2):	24.1	Length, DR•(2):	5.64	Width, DR•(2):	4.27
		Area, DR (10):	20.8	Length, DR (10):	5.65	Width, DR (10):	3.68
		Area, DO in (11):	13.4	Len., DO in (11):	2.96	Width, DO in (11):	4.52

42. I.8.10, Casa di Pulcinella, (work)shop-house (Figs. 2.6, 5.5, 5.119-5.120)

Synopsis

A solid masonry tile-topped ST of sub-type (1), a well, and a latrine rest along the E side of KI [9], located in an underground space beneath the garden and DO (11) of the property (I.8.8-9) to the N (Fig. 5.119). The entrance to the kitchen was flanked by two painted *lararia* and an associated niche (PPM I, 828, #2-4; see also chapter three above, p. 159). DI◊(3) has few traces of plaster left on its walls (Fig. 5.120). There were rooms on an upper level around the garden (1), but how these rooms were accessed is unclear; there is no trace of a stairway at this address. A

painting of popular style near the entrance depicting potters (painted over in its last phase) suggests that the property was once an *officina vasaria*.

References

Jashemski 1993, 42-43; PPM I, 826-833; Fröhlich 1991, 253; Castiglione Morelli del Franco & Vitale 1989, 197-199; PPP I, 80-81; CTP IIIA, 14-15; Della Corte 1954, 272, #675; Maiuri 1953/54; Della Corte NSc 1946, 100-101.

Data

A) Total area: 240.5	Nodes: 150.2	Connectors: 0	Static spaces: 90.3
B) Total # spaces: 9	# Nodes: 2	# Connectors: 0	# Static spaces: 5
C) Area, KI [9]: 22.9	Area, DI(3): 15.1	Length, DI(3): 3.68	Width, DI(3): 4.09

43. I.8.12, Stabulum/Officina, (work)shop-house (Figs. 2.6, 5.5)

Synopsis

A dead horse was found next to a manger on the W of court (1) near piles of bedding and manure. Fifteen wine amphorae were recovered from the NE corner, and sixteen bronze vessels were found here, perhaps from the upper floor. Numerous agricultural tools were also discovered. The building was certainly a stable and probably also a workshop, perhaps belonging to the owners of the house at (I.8.17+11). An arcuated niche shrine occupied the N wall of court (1).

References

Castiglione Morelli del Franco & Vitale 1989, 199-200; CTP IIIA, 14-15; Maiuri 1953/54, 101ff; Della Corte NSc 1946, 101-102.

Data

A) Total area: 108.6	Nodes: 66.7	Connectors: 3.1	Static spaces: 38.8
B) Total # spaces: 6	# Nodes: 1	# Connectors: 1	# Static spaces: 4

44. I.8.13, Officina di A. Granius Romanus, (work)shop-house (Figs. 2.6, 5.5, 5.121-5.122)

Synopsis

Numerous inscriptions recording financial transactions scrawled on the walls and twelve wine amphorae against the S wall of court (1) led Della Corte to interpret this complex as a center for the production and sale of wine. However, due to piles of building material found near the amphorae, Castiglione Morelli del Franco & Vitale argue that the building was under renovation at the time of the eruption. A latrine is located immediately to the right of the entrance inside the

building. Behind it to the E is a separate drain to the street beneath the remnants of a large HE• of sub-type (2); only one support wall survives (Figs. 5.121-5.122). The only room seemingly appropriate for dining is DR◊(3) at the ruined SE corner, with a window on to court (1). Off the NW corner of the same court is an arcuated shrine with associated ritual material: four small terracotta altars, four plates, a small head of a figurine, three lamps and fittings for a door that locked up the shrine (Fig. 5.122).

References

Jashemski 1993, 43; Castiglione Morelli del Franco & Vitale 1989, 197-199; Laidlaw 1985, 68; CTP IIIA, 14-15; Della Corte 1954, 272-273, #676-679; Della Corte NSc 1946, 102-107.

Data

A) Total area: 259.4	Nodes: 138.0	Connectors: 0	Static spaces: 121.4
B) Total # spaces: 13	# Nodes: 2	# Connectors: 0	# Static spaces: 9
C) Area, ST in (1): 2.5	Area, DR◊(3): 17.4	Length, DR◊(3): 4.44	Width, DR◊(3): 3.91

45. I.8.14, Casa di M. Epidius Primus, *casa piccola* (Figs. 1.7, 2.6, 5.5, 5.123-5.124)

Synopsis

A solid masonry ST of sub-type (1) takes up the N end of KI (11); its tiled top is bordered by a front lip of *imbrices* (Fig. 5.123). A latrine is situated just to the E in room (10). The spacious DR•(6), with 2nd style decoration, is the likely choice for a dining area (Fig. 5.124). Castiglione Morelli del Franco & Vitale report an aedicular (nicked) *lararium* in the N wall of DR•(6) and a painted shrine in the NW corner of the garden court (7). A chest was found in entranceway (1), perhaps abandoned in flight, containing nine silver pieces of tableware, including four drinking cups, a ladle, two sauce or dipping pans, and two small jugs (Fig. 1.7). 32 coarseware vessels and 18 glass vessels probably supplied the kitchen and the table respectively, and a collection of wine amphorae were stacked in the NW corner of court (7). Amphorae were also stored in room (9), and bracket holes for shelving indicate storage in (12). Nearly a hundred bronze and iron tools suggests that the house was also used as a workshop, perhaps for leather working.

References

Jashemski 1993, 43; PPM I, 834-843; Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, #32, 100-104, 114; Castiglione Morelli del Franco & Vitale 1989, 201-205; PPP I, 81-82; CTP IIIA, 14-15; Della Corte 1954, 273-274, #680-682; Della Corte NSc 1946, 108-112.

Data

A) Total area: 211.4	Nodes: 78.8	Connectors: 21.0	Static spaces: 111.6
B) Total # spaces: 13	# Nodes: 2	# Connectors: 3	# Static spaces: 8
C) Area, KI (11): 4.0	Area, DR•(6): 22.3	Length, DR•(6): 6.35	Width, DR•(6): 3.51

46. I.8.15-16, Caupona di N. Fufidius Successus,
diner (Figs. 2.6, 2.49, 5.5, 5.125-5.127)

Synopsis

This complex combined the functions of serving food and manufacturing unknown products, either pigments (according to Della Corte) or foodstuffs (Castiglione Morelli del Franco & Vitale). Manufacture took place in room (2), where three hand-mills, nine mortars and pestles and a furnace were found. The serving counter for the diner in room (1) included six *dolia* and a small HE of sub-type (4) in its top surface, overlooked by a niched shrine in the E wall (Fig. 5.125). Behind and to the N, a π -shaped bench in DB (4) furnished seating for customers (Fig. 2.49). Further along was KI (5) with a solid masonry ST of sub-type (1) against the E wall (Fig. 5.126). DR (6) in the NW corner, perhaps for rent by customers, had a couch niche (*lectus medius*, w. 1.26 m.) (Fig. 5.127). In the small open court (7) used to catch water, a basin against the S wall sat below another niched shrine. Fourteen wine amphorae were found fallen from a balcony over the street at the SW corner of the diner.

References

PPM I, 844-846; Castiglione Morelli del Franco & Vitale 1989, 205-208; PPP I, 82; CTP IIIA, 14-15; Guida Laterza 1982, 115-116; Guida 1976, 70; Della Corte 1954, 274-276, #683-696; Della Corte NSc 1946, 113-117; Maiuri 1942a, 197.

Data

A) Total area: 190.9	Nodes: 51.4	Connectors: 6.1	Static spaces: 133.4
B) Total # spaces: 11	# Nodes: 2	# Connectors: 2	# Static spaces: 7
C) Area, HE in (1): 2.5	Area, DB (4): 3.1	Length, DB (4): 4.10	Width, DB (4): 0.60
Area, KI (5): 5.2	Area, DR (6): 19.0	Length, DR (6): 5.04	Width, DR (6): 3.76

47. I.8.17+11, Casa dei Quattro Stili, *casa media* (Figs. 2.6, 5.5, 5.128-5.132)

Synopsis

The KI (21) was located towards the postern entrance at #11; it included a large once-arched masonry ST of sub-type (2) with a tiled top and low curbs along its W and S edges (Fig. 5.128). Just to the S was a latrine in room (22). This kitchen seems to have replaced one originally located in (5-6), where the remains of a low masonry podium in the SW corner and some bracket

holes for shelving are still visible (Fig. 5.129). For additional heating, an elaborate bronze portable stove was stored underneath the stairs in room (20) (Rediscovering Pompeii 1990). Three spacious reception and dining rooms lay off the atrium and peristyle; DH•(9), with late 3rd style decoration, is sometimes considered to have been the *tablinum* as well (Fig. 5.130); its entrance was adjacent to a small arched shrine that has been confused with a shrine found in KI (8) of the neighboring house (I.8.18) (see below). DR (14) had a couch niche (*lectus summus*, 1. 2.52 m.), and 4th style painting (Fig. 5.131). DR•(18), with late 3rd style decoration, looked out towards another cult spot in the garden (17) (Fig. 5.132). There a tile inscribed with the word "FVLGVR" marked a pit filled with pieces of the house that had at some point been struck and damaged by lightning (Maiuri 1942b).

References

Jashemski 1993, 43; PPM I, 847-913; Fröhlich 1991, 254, #L10; Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, #42, 59; Castiglione Morelli del Franco & Vitale 1989, 208-210; Falanga 1989; PPP I, 82-88; CTP IIIA, 14-15; Laidlaw 1985, 68-74; Guida Laterza 1982, 116; Bastet & De Vos 1979, 83-84; Guida 1976, 215-217; Della Corte 1954, 276-277, #697-700; Della Corte NSc 1946, 117-123; Maiuri 1942b.

Data

A) Total area:	583.4	Nodes:	220.5	Connectors:	76.5	Static spaces:	287.6
B) Total # spaces:	24	# Nodes:	2	# Connectors:	4	# Static spaces:	17
C) Area, KI (21):	15.4	Area, DH•(9):	33.5	Length, DH•(9):	6.69	Width, DH•(9):	5.01
		Area, DR (14):	21.6	Length, DR (14):	6.12	Width, DR (14):	3.53
		Area, DR•(18):	19.3	Length, DR•(18):	5.95	Width, DR•(18):	3.25

48. I.8.18, Casa di Balbus, *casa piccola* (Figs. 2.6, 5.5, 5.133-5.134)

Synopsis

KI (8) no longer contains a cooking installation, but evidence for low walls in the SW and SE corners suggests that a small ST or HE stood in one of the corners. Four bronze cooking pots were found from somewhere in the house. A latrine occupied the space to the E in (9). In the center of the S wall was a shrine with painted serpents and *Lares* flanking an altar. From a niche were recovered (by pouring plaster into the cavities) three small, rustic busts perhaps representing the *imagines maiorum*. Scholars have consistently and erroneously placed this shrine in the SE corner of the atrium of (I.8.17+11), but personal inspection has confirmed that it belongs here.⁷⁸ The photo taken at the time of excavation (Fig. 5.133) shows the shrine in pristine

⁷⁸Fröhlich was able to see that the shrine, with rustic busts of deities, normally attributed to the SE corner of atrium (3) of the house (I.8.17+11), did not match the smaller niched shrine actually located there, but he was unable to place its true location. The error derived from the mistaken interpretation of the provenance

condition. A photo taken in recent times (Fig. 5.134) reveals the severe degradation of the same shrine. DR (6), painted in the 2nd style, takes the form of the one *ala* in the house, but a couch niche (*lectus medius*, w. 1.06 m.) confirms that dining took place here, facing the fine 1st style decoration of the S wall of the atrium.

R e f e r e n c e s

PPM I, 914-918; Fröhlich 1991, 254, #L10; Castiglione Morelli del Franco & Vitale 1989, 210-211; PPP I, 89; CTP IIIA, 14-15; Laidlaw 1985, 74-75; Della Corte 1954, 277-278, #701-703; Della Corte NSc 1946, 123-124.

D a t a

A) Total area: 242.1	Nodes: 82.1	Connectors: 16.4	Static spaces: 143.6
B) Total # spaces: 11	# Nodes: 1	# Connectors: 2	# Static spaces: 9
C) Area, KI (8): 9.9	Area, DR (6): 12.3	Length, DR (6): 3.62	Width, DR (6): 3.39

49. I.8.19 Officina tinctoria di Terentius (Fig. 2.6)

S y n o p s i s

A series of lead-lined tanks and storage jars line the main room and passages of this complex, located completely underneath the peristyle of (I.8.1-3), to which this workshop originally belonged. According to Moeller, the apparatus are used for the dyeing of cloth. There is no evidence for cooking or eating at this address.

R e f e r e n c e s

Castiglione Morelli del Franco & Vitale 1989, 211-212; CTP IIIA, 14-15; Guida Laterza 1982, 116; Moeller 1976, 35-36; Della Corte 1954, 278, #704-706; Maiuri 1954a, 75; Della Corte NSc 1946, 124-125.

D a t a

A) Total area: 273.7	Nodes: 49.3	Connectors: 0	Static spaces: 224.4
B) Total # spaces: 17	# Nodes: 1	# Connectors: 0	# Static spaces: 16

written on the back of the photo of the shrine: "Iarario sito nella casa dell'atrio dorico, particolare angolo SE". The house referred to is the Casa di Balbus (I.8.18), but scholars looked for the shrine in the SE corner of the atrium instead of the SE corner of the house, where it is located in the kitchen. Not finding the shrine in the atrium, they attributed the shrine to the more grandiose house (I.8.17).

50. I.9.1-2, Casa del Bell'Impluvio, *casa media* (Figs. 2.7, 5.6, 5.135-5.136)

Synopsis

KI (6) was converted from a *cubiculum*. A HE of sub-type (1) in the NW corner of the room served as a cooking surface (Fig. 5.135). A latrine was located to the N in room (5), and beneath both rooms was a cellar, accessed by a stair in the NW corner of the peristyle garden (13), used probably for storage and additional workspace; it has not been completely excavated (Fig. 5.135). DR•(8), just across the atrium/passageway (7), has bipartite, late 3rd style decoration marked by plaster pilasters that separate the dining area to the N from the serving space to the S (Fig. 5.136). The spacious DH◊(14), acquired from the property (I.9.15) in the early Empire, collapsed into that latter property, situated at a lower level. *Ala* (10), with a central square emblema of *opus sectile*, may have been suitable as supplementary space for dining. An iron tripod found in atrium (2) suggests additional cooking space there, and against the W wall of atrium (2) was a large cupboard filled with cooking, serving and eating vessels and utensils amongst other household goods. Paintings on the walls of the *fauces* have been interpreted as a shrine in the entranceway (PPM I, 922, #2-3).

References

Jashemski 1993, 44; Berry 1993, 12-14, 34; PPM I, 919-941; Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, #109, 120; Gassner 1986, 132; PPP I, 89-91; CTP IIIA, 16-17; Laidlaw 1985, 75; Guida Laterza 1982, 123; Bastet & De Vos 1979, 71-73; Guida 1976, 223-224; Schefold 1957, 38; Maiuri 1954a, 79-80; Della Corte 1954, 282-283, #723; Della Corte NSc 1913, 34-35; Maiuri 1942a, 202.

Data

A) Total area: 513.7	Nodes: 272.5	Connectors: 65.6	Static spaces: 177.5
B) Total # spaces: 24	# Nodes: 3	# Connectors: 5	# Static spaces: 13
C) Area, KI (6): 3.9	Area, DR•(8): 17.7	Length, DR•(8): 5.52	Width, DR•(8): 3.20
	Area, DI◊(10): 10.5	Length, DI◊(10): 3.00	Width, DI◊(10): 3.50
	Area, DH◊(14): 50.8	Length, DH◊(14): 7.62	Width, DH◊(14): 6.67

51. I.9.3-4, Casa e caupona di Successus, *casa media* + diner (Figs. 2.7, 5.6, 5.137-5.139)

Synopsis

The one identifiable HE, sub-type (4), from this complex is built into the S end of the counter of the diner (14) at #4. The counter has solid-step shelving above the counter on the W side for displaying goods (Fig. 5.139). An additional cooking area may have been located in room (10) past the garden to the S, where two low masonry supports 1.2 m. apart perhaps supported a cooking surface (Fig. 5.138). Room (10) was apparently once part of a bath complex; Berry (pers.

comm.) reports that the *praefurnium* is still visible. Room (12) probably housed a latrine. Neither area has been completely excavated. DR◊(7), attached to the diner, was probably a dining area for customers.⁷⁹ DR•(5), well-decorated in the 4th style, may also have served for dining (its sometime identification as a bedroom is insupportable). Area (9) at the SW corner of the garden may once have been a large hall, decorated in the 3rd style, but it was demolished by the earthquake in A.D. 62. Cooking, serving and eating utensils and vessels were stored largely within room (3).

R e f e r e n c e s

Jashemski 1993, 44; Berry 1993, 14-16, 34; PPM I, 942-966; Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, #109, 120; PPP I, 89-91; CTP IIIA, 16-17; Laidlaw 1985, 75; Guida Laterza 1982, 123; Guida 1976, 224; Schefold 1957, 38; Maiuri 1954a, 80; Della Corte 1954, 283, #723a.

D a t a

A) Total area:	536.0	Nodes:	383.2	Connectors:	39.8	Static spaces:	116.1
B) Total # spaces:	16	# Nodes:	3	# Connectors:	3	# Static spaces:	8
C) Area, HE in (14):	2.5	Area, DR•(5):	14.2	Length, DR•(5):	4.00	Width, DR•(5):	3.55
Area, KI◊(10):	20.7	Area, DR◊(7):	20.1	Length, DR◊(7):	5.64	Width, DR◊(7):	3.56

52. I.9.5-7, Casa dei Cubicoli Floreali, <i>casa media</i> (Figs. 1.17, 2.7, 5.6, 5.140-5.143)
--

S y n o p s i s

Although no fixed installations survive, a kitchen was perhaps located in area (16), next to a latrine in (16) (Fig. 5.140). A stable (18) was located at #7 to the S. Cooking apparatus were actually found in the N part of the house -- two bronze and iron braziers were found in the NW corner and along the E side of atrium (2), and an iron tripod, bronze water heater and several pots appeared in room (9) (Fig. 1.17). Berry sees evidence for wine-selling from the shop at #6. Other cooking, serving and eating vessels were found in a chest along the E side of the atrium. DR•(11) contains strong evidence for dining, perhaps during the winter months. Bipartite, 3rd style black ground decoration on the walls separates the dining area from the serving area with painted pilasters, and a mosaic central emblema marks the focal point for the arrangement of couches (Fig. 5.141). An *opus sectile* central emblema sits in the center of DI•(13) (Fig. 5.142), and DH•(17) is also marked by a large mosaic emblema around which couches (one possible bronze foot of which was found there) were arranged. The latter had rough walls, and was perhaps under restoration in A.D. 79 (Fig. 5.143).

⁷⁹PPP and PPM both erroneously describe the decoration of room (6) under the heading of room (7). Room (7) has no preserved wall decoration.

References

Jashemski 1993, 44, 317-322; Berry 1993, 16-17, 35; PPM II, 1-137; *Rediscovering Pompeii* 1990, #85, 120; Gassner 1986, 132; PPP I, 94-102; CTP IIIA, 16-17; Laidlaw 1985, 75-76; Guida Laterza 1982, 123-124; De Vos 1980, 15-21; Sichtermann 1980; Jashemski 1979, 74-79; Bastet & De Vos 1979, 74-76; Salza Prina Ricotti 1978/80, 240, Fig. 2; Guida 1976, 224-226; Maiuri NSc 1958, 101-104; Schefold 1957, 38; Maiuri 1954a, 80; Della Corte 1954, 283, #723b-726; Della Corte 1927, 48-49; Della Corte NSc 1913, 188-190; Maiuri 1942a, 202.

Data

A) Total area:	451.9	Nodes:	226.9	Connectors:	41.4	Static spaces:	185.1
B) Total # spaces:	23	# Nodes:	4	# Connectors:	6	# Static spaces:	10
C) Area, KI(15):	5.8	Area, DR•(11):	23.3	Length, DR•(11):	6.18	Width, DR•(11):	3.77
		Area, DI•(13):	10.2	Length, DI•(13):	2.89	Width, DI•(13):	3.53
		Area, DH•(17):	50.6	Length, DH•(17):	7.95	Width, DH•(17):	6.43

53. I.9.8, Casa, *casa piccola* (Figs. 2.7, 5.6, 5.144)

Synopsis

KI (7) was located off corridor (6) from court (2). Along the W. end of the S wall stands a solid masonry ST of sub-type (1), its tiled surface showing signs of burning (Fig. 5.144). KI (7) itself contained only a small terracotta vase and plate. The majority of cooking artifacts were stored (and perhaps also used) in court (2), including utensils, plates and bowls, and iron pieces of a BZ at the western edge. Iron feet for a couch/bed were found in the NE corner of the court, but it is not possible to know if dining was also carried out in the court. DR (9) is identified by a couch niche (*lectus medius*, w. 1.20 m.); its 2nd style decoration is based on a white ground. The room contained a marble table, and vessels for food preparation and consumption that supports a dining function. Due to the large number of other finds, Berry believes the room was also used for storage. A small 'votive cup' was also found here.

References

Jashemski 1993, 44; Berry 1993, 18-19, 35-36, 40-52, 67-68; PPM II, 138-141; PPP I, 102-103; CTP IIIA, 16-17; Della Corte 1954, 283-284, #726a-c.

Data

A) Total area:	188.8	Nodes:	69.0	Connectors:	24.5	Static spaces:	95.3
B) Total # spaces:	10	# Nodes:	2	# Connectors:	2	# Static spaces:	6
C) Area, KI (7):	9.6	Area, DR (9):	17.6	Length, DR (9):	5.07	Width, DR (9):	3.47

54. I.9.9, Casa, (work)shop-house (Figs. 2.7, 5.6, 5.145)

Synopsis

At the W end of corridor (4) are the remains for the supports for a ST of sub-type (3), next to a cistern head that is shared with house (I.9.10) (Fig. 5.145). Associated with the ST in the corridor were cooking pots, cups, plates, cooking utensils, knives and spoons. A dining area is not immediately apparent; room (5) is of the proper dimensions, but contained utensils and containers of raw materials for the manufacture and manipulation of pigments. Berry suggests DI(3) (no finds were reported there), though this room is quite small. In the absence of more secure data, it seems wise to leave the question open. A votive altar was found in a small *aedicula* in the S wall of garden (7).

References

Berry 1993, 19-20, 36; Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, #20-24; CTP IIIA, 16-17; De Vos 1976, Pl. 35; Della Corte 1954, 283-284, #726b.

Data

A) Total area:	135.9	Nodes:	69.2	Connectors:	20.1	Static spaces:	48.6
B) Total # spaces:	8	# Nodes:	2	# Connectors:	2	# Static spaces:	4
C) Area, KI (4):	2.5	Area, DI(3):	9.6	Length, DI(3):	3.50	Width, DI(3):	2.75

55. I.9.10, Casa, (work)shop-house (Figs. 2.7, 5.6, 5.146-5.147)

Synopsis

KI (2) to the S of court (1) has not been completely excavated, but against the W end of the S wall stands a solid masonry ST of sub-type (1) with a tiled top, a back curb of upright tiles and a front curb of *imbrices* (Fig. 5.146). Associated with the ST is a slot cut in the W wall that probably supported a small shelf or table. Separated from the ST by a partition wall is a latrine in the SE corner. A cauldron and terracotta cooking equipment were found in the SE corner of court (1), near a small terracotta altar and 'votive cup'. Across the court in the NE corner were located a large quantity of cooking, serving and table wares of bronze, glass and ceramic, apparently stored in a nook underneath the stairs to the upper floor. DR•(11) was added to the house from (I.9.12) after the A.D. 62 earthquake (Fig. 5.147).

References

Jashemski 1993, 44; Berry 1993, 20-21, 36-37; PPM II, 142-145; PPP I, 103CTP IIIA, 16-17; De Vos 1976, Pl. 35; Della Corte 1954, 283-284, #726c.

Data

A) Total area: 280.3	Nodes: 153.6	Connectors: 12.6	Static spaces: 116.1
B) Total # spaces: 14	# Nodes: 2	# Connectors: 3	# Static spaces: 8
C) Area, KI (2): 9.1	Area, DR•(11): 20.5	Length, DR•(11): 4.84	Width, DR•(11): 4.23

56. I.9.11, Caupona di Amarantus, diner (Figs. 2.7, 5.6, 5.148-5.149)

Synopsis

A HE of sub-type (4) was built into the N end of the serving counter in the front shop (1). Solid step-shelving for display was constructed above the counter on its E side (Fig. 5.148). In the adjacent room (4) to the W, an iron tripod was found in the SW corner. Room (3), located between the counter and a large area (5) where numerous amphorae were found, is difficult to interpret (Fig. 5.149). A narrow bench runs along the W side, and two small ashlar podia are set in the NE and SE corners. Berry calls this room a kitchen, and it is reasonable to imagine additional cooking space upon these benches and podia. However, these features recall the benches and bench supports for customers to sit and eat their meal found in room (4) of diner (I.8.15-16) and in diner (IX.2.25). A small latrine occupied room (7). The N half of this building was never completely cleared of volcanic fill; any interpretation must remain hypothetical. The diner was connected to the neighboring house (I.9.12) by means of doors through rooms (4, 6).

References

Jashemski 1993, 45; Berry 1993, 21-23, 37; PPM II, 146-149; PPP I, 103; CTP IIIA, 16-17; De Vos 1976, Pl. 35; Della Corte 1954, 284, #726d-e.

Data

A) Total area: 182.9	Nodes: 116.8	Connectors: 4.4	Static spaces: 61.7
B) Total # spaces: 8	# Nodes: 2	# Connectors: 1	# Static spaces: 5
C) Area, HE in (1): 2.5	Area, DB•(3): 4.9	Length, DB•(3): 3.86	Width, DB•(3): 0.55

57. I.9.12, Casa (Lupanare di Q. Mestrius Maximus), <i>casa media</i> (Figs. 2.7, 5.6, 5.150-5.151)
--

Synopsis

The small KI (9) is also a passageway from this house to the diner at (I.9.11) (Fig. 5.150). Tucked in the S half of the room is a low tile-topped masonry HE of sub-type (1) with a back curb of upright tiles. DR•(11) is adjacent to the N, its view to the colonnaded garden split by a column, its walls adorned with red-ground 4th style painting (Fig. 5.151). Two *situlae* (pails) and a few vases were found along the S ambulatory of the garden, and a bronze patera was taken from DR•(11); these comprise the limited artifactual evidence for cooking and dining. A small

niched shrine was set in the W wall of the garden, ostensibly in plain view of DR•(11), but actually blocked by a portico column. Judging by the piles of construction material found, this property seems to have been undergoing renovation at the time of the eruption. The house probably also had a commercial function; large numbers of amphorae were found stacked in neat rows along the W wall of atrium (2) (PPM II, 151 #1). This house probably supplied, managed, or owned the diner I.9.11 to which it is connected.

References

Jashemski 1993, 45; Berry 1993, 23-24, 37; PPM II, 150-171; PPP I, 103-105; CTP IIIA, 16-17; De Vos 1976, Pl. 35; Orr 1973, 153, #4; Della Corte NSc 1958, 77-184 (passim).

Data

A) Total area:	298.1	Nodes:	188.7	Connectors:	17.5	Static spaces:	91.9
B) Total # spaces:	14	# Nodes:	2	# Connectors:	2	# Static spaces:	8
C) Area, KI (9):	2.8	Area, DR•(11):	18.4	Length, DR•(11):	4.84	Width, DR•(11):	3.80

58. I.9.13-14, Casa di Cerere, <i>casa media</i> (Figs. 2.7, 5.6, 5.152-5.156)
--

Synopsis

The large number of furniture and finds recovered from this house aids in its reconstruction. Cooking was done in both of the nodes of this house, not in any particular room of the house with fixed installations. In atrium (b), a low masonry cooking platform was used as a ST of sub-type (1). A metal cooking grate, numerous cooking pots and pans, amphorae, storage vessels, serving bowls and plates were found along the W wall near the SW corner (Fig. 5.152). In the SW corner of court (o) was a metal BZ, upon which the toes of three amphorae were arranged so as to form a cooking support for a cooking vessel (Fig. 5.153). Vessels and utensils for serving and eating were stored largely on shelves and in cupboards in the small rooms (h) and (l). One dining area, DR (m), contained serving and dining wares. This same dining room had late 3rd style wall decoration, a T+U pavement pattern marking the placement of the couches, and three feet of one of the couches (Fig. 5.156). A masonry platform in the same space may have been used for heating or cooking.⁸⁰ DR (j), perhaps doubling as a *tablinum* and also with late 3rd style painting, was provided with couch niches (*lectus summus*, l. 2.68, *lectus medius* w. 1.29 m.) and an emblema in the pavement offset for accommodating the couches (Fig. 5.155). The room contained tools, four marble statues (cupids riding dolphins, for use as fountain spouts) and damaged decoration, suggesting that it was under renovation. DR (d) had a couch niche (*lectus medius*, w.

⁸⁰PPM II, 229, #86: "la base quadrata in muratura rivestita di cocciopesto...forse faceva da ripiano per il fornello."

1.08 m.), bronze pieces of the couches, and 2nd style decoration. It is now filled with modern construction material (Fig. 5.154). No shrine or latrine can be identified in the house.

References

Jashemski 1993, 45-46, 323; Berry 1993, 24-25, 37-38, 53-68; PPM II, 172-229; Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, #188; PPP I, 105-109; CTP IIIA, 16-17; Guida Laterza 1982, 120-123; Bastet & De Vos 1979, 30-31; Guida 1976, 222-223; De Vos 1976; Della Corte NSc 1958, 105-107; Della Corte 1954, 284, #726f-i.

Data

A) Total area:	565.2	Nodes:	364.7	Connectors:	42.1	Static spaces:	158.4
B) Total # spaces:	18	# Nodes:	3	# Connectors:	2	# Static spaces:	11
C) Area, ST in (b):	6.6	Area, DR (d):	16.6	Length, DR (d):	5.07	Width, DR (d):	3.28
		Area, DR (j):	19.5	Length, DR (j):	5.17	Width, DR (j):	3.78
		Area, DR (m):	16.0	Length, DR (m):	4.49	Width, DR (m):	3.56

59. I.9.15 Officina (Fig. 2.7)

Synopsis

This property, located completely underneath the rooms off the S end of garden (13) of house (I.9.1-2), has a terracotta lamp as the lone recorded find. A latrine is clearly identifiable in a small room at the SW corner of the building, but it cannot be determined whether this latrine was associated with a cooking area in an adjacent room, or where eating would have been carried out.

References

Berry 1993, 13; Gassner 1986, 132; CTP IIIA, 16-17.

Data

A) Total area:	86.8	Nodes:	25.3	Connectors:	0	Static spaces:	61.5
B) Total # spaces:	6	# Nodes:	1	# Connectors:	0	# Static spaces:	5

60. I.10.1, Casa, (work)shop-house (Figs. 2.8, 5.7, 5.157-5.159)

Synopsis

KI (5) was an open court containing a cistern head; off the NW corner was a single-arched ST of type (2) with a tiled surface, divided from a latrine to the S by a high masonry dividing wall (Figs. 5.158-5.159). An Arretine cup and six terracotta vases were recovered from KI (5). One arched niche in its N wall and three in the S wall suggest a concentration of cult activity here; a terracotta bust of Kore was found *in situ* in the easternmost niche on the S wall

(Fig. 5.159). The kitchen was added to this building from the neighboring property (I.10.2-3) already by the second to early first century B.C. A large upper floor room DR◊{6} at the NE corner of the building overhung the street corner and may have been a dining room. The stair leading to this room passed by a *lararium* painting on the N wall of entry (1). On the ground level, room (3), decorated in the 3rd style and usually referred to as the *tablinum*, may have also served for dining; a mixing bowl, amphora and a few other ceramic vessels were found there (Fig. 5.157). Bowls and cups were also found in rooms (2, 4).

References

Jashemski 1993, 47; PPM II, 230-237; Fröhlich 1991, 254-255; Ling 1987, 154-158; PPP I, 109-110; CTP IIIA, 18-19; Ling 1983; Bastet & De Vos 1979, 139; Schefold 1957, 38; Boyce 1937, 26-27, #45-46; Elia NSc 1934, 265-270; Della Corte NSc 1933, 277-278; Della Corte NSc 1929, 455-456.

Data

A) Total area:	97.3	Nodes:	25.5	Connectors:	3.5	Static spaces:	70.5
B) Total # spaces:	8	# Nodes:	1	# Connectors:	1	# Static spaces:	6
C) Area, KI (5):	10.2	Area, DI(3):	14.7	Length, DI◊(3):	3.20	Width, DI◊(3):	4.60
		Area, DR{6):	16.5	Length, DR◊{6):	4.41	Width, DR◊{6):	3.75

61. I.10.2-3, Casa e popina di Coponia, *casa piccola* + lunch counter
(Figs. 2.8, 5.7, 5.160-5.161)

Synopsis

The cooking area in this complex is a HE of sub-type (4) at the S end of the serving counter, next to two immured *dolia* in area (2) at #2, a lunch counter. DI◊(6), usually considered the *tablinum*, has a 1st style decorated floor and 4th style wall painting, and seems the only part of the house where formal meals could have been held (Figs. 5.160-5.161). Various domestic items, including a spoon and an amphora filled partway with organic material (Elia suspected bran) were found here. Food cooking and storage vessels (an *urceus*, *olla*, cup and wine amphora) were found fallen from the upper floor over rooms (2, 3). A hand-mill and amphora were located in room (7), behind the lunch counter. A painted niche shrine is inserted in the E wall of the S end of entranceway (3). Room (12) contains a latrine at the back of the house, off a small open court (11) that offers light and air to DI◊(6) (Fig. 5.161).

References

Jashemski 1993, 47; PPM II, 238-239; Fröhlich 1991, 255; Ling 1987, 154-158; PPP I, 110-111; Laidlaw 1985, 77; CTP IIIA, 18-19; Ling 1983; Guida Laterza 1982, 97; Guida 1976, 185-186;

Schefold 1957, 38; Della Corte 1954, 243-244, #586-591; Pernice 1938, 39; Boyce 1937, 27, #47; Elia NSc 1934, 271-275; Della Corte NSc 1933, 279-282; Della Corte NSc 1929, 456-460.

Data

A) Total area:	88.3	Nodes:	27.5	Connectors:	15.2	Static spaces:	47.5
B) Total # spaces:	11	# Nodes:	2	# Connectors:	3	# Static spaces:	6
C) Area, HE in (2):	2.5	Area, DI(6):	10.7	Length, DI(6):	3.30	Width, DI(6):	3.23

62. 1.10.4+14-17, Casa del Menandro, *casa grande*
(Figs. 1.3, 1.8, 1.13, 1.22, 2.8, 2.13, 2.17, 2.26, 5.7, 5.162-5.165)

Synopsis

An exceptional wealth of information for cooking and dining from this house has been documented by Allison. One large kitchen, KI (52), served the dining rooms around peristyle(c) via a twisting long and narrow corridor (51, 53) (Fig. 2.8). Against the N wall of the kitchen was a large combination ST comprised of a double-arched section of sub-type (2) on the W and a solid masonry counter on the E (Fig. 2.26). Both parts of the ST had tiled surfaces, a back curb of upright tiles against the walls, and traces of heavy burning on the tiled surface which Maiuri noticed at the time of excavation and which are still visible. A drain was built into the SW corner, near the latrine that occupied the W end of corridor (51). A *lararium* scene was painted on the W wall of the kitchen. Only fragments of pottery were found, due to the extensive post-eruption tunneling carried out here. Several other fixed and mobile cooking areas were scattered throughout the house. An ash-filled bronze and iron BZ was located in the N portico of peristyle garden (c), in the company of a bronze cooking pot (Fig. 1.13). This brazier was convenient for any of the dining areas around the peristyle. Near the NW corner of atrium (41) (in the section of the house assigned to the *procurator* and the slaves) was a low HE of sub-type (1), below an arcuated niche-shrine (Figs. 2.13, 5.165). An iron tripod and several cooking pots were found close by, in the doorway to court (44). In the SW corner of atrium (41) was located a bed/couch, and a marble table on which were placed two bronze jugs and a *casseruola* (Fig. 1.3). A nearby chest contained a cache of glass, bronze and ceramic storage wares, serving and drinking vessels, and utensils. More items associated with cooking and eating were found against the W wall and in the SE corner. A latrine occupied an alcove in room (45) perhaps used as a kitchen in an earlier phase. The household servants probably used the HE and vessels to prepare meals for themselves; they were given the space of this former independent atrium house at #17, that had been bought up by the owner of the Casa del Menandro. Four upright hearths of sub-type (3) were located in areas (3, 20, 54, 34) (Fig. 2.17). All of these hearths show signs of burning; a pile of organic material (carbonized fuel) was found near the HE in (54). Besides non-diagnostic

collections of amphorae in (20, 34), however, no cooking or eating wares or utensils are associated with these hearths. The evidence suggests these types of hearths were not used for cooking, but for various industrial purposes.

All dining and reception rooms were located around peristyle (c). Within the peristyle itself was found the remains of a single wooden dining couch (DO) facing the central fountain and pool (Fig. 5.162). DR•(11) has green-ground 4th style decoration and a delicate central emblema of *opus vermiculatum* in the pavement around which the couches may have been placed. Found inside was a storage chest containing domestic vessels. Another chest packed with pots sat off the NW corner of peristyle (c). A single cup was found in DR•(12), with its 4th style decoration. DR◊(15), also with 4th style painting and a slate and mosaic floor, contained evidence for a bed/couch, a chair, and a large cupboard. DH◊(19) (4th style painting) contained the skeletons of three individuals, a pick and a hoe, with which they probably tried to cut their unsuccessful escape. Both of these possible dining areas flanked the premier reception and dining room in the house, the massive DH (18) (Fig. 5.163). This room, painted in the 4th style and worthy of being called a *basilica*, was considerably disturbed after the eruption. Pieces of dining couches, a bronze and marble table and a bronze jug were found here. Numerous fittings for doors indicate that the room could be closed off from the peristyle.

Cooking, serving and table wares were found stored in the narrow room (10) and there were a number of amphorae containing wine or vinegar in room (14). There was further storage of cooking and eating apparatus in the service rooms underneath the bath suite (46-49). Underneath (49) in [A] was found an iron BZ, a bronze *casseruola*, and a bronze jug. A latrine occupied the NW corner of the space underneath (47), and Allison postulates that a semicircular masonry platform in the SW corner was a cooking hearth; this cannot be confirmed. The furnace for heating the baths lies underneath (48). Underneath (46) in [B] was a room that contained at least five storage chests. Amongst the contents was a large collection of cooking, serving and dining wares, including the famous 118-piece silver service (Fig. 1.8).

Two main shrines served the center of the house. In the NW corner of the atrium, a large *aedicula* greeted visitors to the house, near a smaller shrine underneath the stairs to the upper floor in room (2) (Fig. 1.22). In area (25) off the SW corner of peristyle (c), near the entrance to the bath suite, an arcuated niche above a tall podium preserved the cavities of five roughly carved wooden statuettes which Maiuri explained as the images of the ancestors, the *imagines maiorum*. This private family shrine was not directly visible from any of the reception rooms, and its contents were further concealed by wooden shutters (Fig. 5.164).

References

Jashemski 1993, 47-49, 323-324; Allison 1992b, 158-198; Fröhlich 1991, 255; PPM II, 240-397; Clarke 1991, *passim*; Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, #45, 54, 58, 93, 106-107; Ling 1987, 152-160; Gassner 1986, 132; PPP I, 111-133; Laidlaw 1985, 77-78; CTP IIIA, 18-19; Ling 1983; Guida Laterza 1982, 90-96; Ward-Perkins & Claridge 1976, 100-102; Fabbriotti 1976, 87-89; Guida 1976, 175-185; Orr 1973, 90; Beyen 1960, 120-198; Schefold 1957, 38-46; Della Corte 1954, 244-249, #592-595, 253, #620-622; Soprano 1950, 307, #31; Maiuri 1942, 150-152, 182-183; Pernice 1938, 59-60; Boyce 1937, 27-28, #48-53; Della Corte NSc 1933, 282-304; Maiuri 1933; Della Corte NSc 1929, 460-467.

Data (not including 5 spaces underneath the baths that take up 107.8 m²)

A) Total area:	1980.7	Nodes:	1025.1	Connectors:	163.6	Static spaces:	798.2
B) Total # spaces:	71	# Nodes:	8	# Connectors:	15	# Static spaces:	41
C) Area, HE in (41):	2.5	Area, DR(11):	16.3	Length, DR(11):	4.69	Width, DR(11):	3.47
Area, KI (52):	11.2	Area, DR(12):	34.4	Length, DR(12):	8.54	Width, DR(12):	4.03
		Area, DR(15):	20.0	Length, DR(15):	4.62	Width, DR(15):	4.33
		Area, DH(18):	93.8	Length, DH(18):	11.80	Width, DH(18):	7.95
		Area, DH(19):	27.8	Length, DH(19):	5.16	Width, DH(19):	5.19
		Area, DO(c):	4.70	Length, DO(c):	2.69	Width, DO(c):	1.74

63. I.10.5-6, Fullonica, (work)shop (Figs. 2.8, 5.7, 5.166)

Synopsis

A painted niched shrine marks the wall of the staircase to the upper floor at entrance #5. A latrine seems to have been located at the NE corner of the upper floor; the down-pipe is visible in ground floor room (b). Della Corte questionably identified the upper floor space as a brothel. On the ground floor, a group of ceramic food preparation and storage vessels was stored in the cupboards underneath the stairs in (b) -- three mixing bowls, two small amphorae, a plate and other vases (Fig. 5.166). Treading basins in the SW corner of space (a) identify the operation of a small fullery here, whose proprietors probably lived in the rooms above.

References

Ling 1987; CTP IIIA, 18-19; Ling 1983; Guida Laterza 1982, 89; Moeller 1976, 43, #27; Della Corte 1954, 249, #596-598; Boyce 1937, 29, #54-55; Elia NSc 1934, 276-277; Della Corte NSc 1933, 304-305; Della Corte NSc 1929, 467.

Data

A) Total area:	38.8	Nodes:	21.9	Connectors:	7.4	Static spaces:	14.6
B) Total # spaces:	3	# Nodes:	1	# Connectors:	1	# Static spaces:	1

64. I.10.7, Casa del Fabbro, <i>casa media</i> (Figs. 2.8, 2.27, 5.7, 5.167-5.170)
--

Synopsis

The finds and furniture from this house were numerous and well-recorded. Underneath the stairs at the back of the house is KI (11), closed off from portico (10) by a wall of *opus craticum*. Tucked into the arch that supports the staircase is a one-arched masonry ST of sub-type (2) (Figs. 2.27, 5.167). The ST has a plastered facade, a tiled top, and a curb of *imbrices* at the front edge. In the SW corner of the ST are two burners of brick built against a back curb of upright bricks. Found in the kitchen were several cooking vessels: two bronze cooking pots, a bronze jug, two ceramic jugs, a ceramic cooking pot and two ceramic bowls. Associated with a small plaster shelf S of the ST is a large scale *lararium* painting on the S wall. At the W end of portico (10), near KI (11), a large iron BZ was uncovered in the company of a hand mill. Atrium (3) was the center for storage of cooking, serving and eating apparatus; there were two cupboards each against the S and E walls, and one chest each along the E and N walls. In the chest near the NE corner was an iron brazier and tongs, and numerous glass vessels. A mortar and pestle, and a few other bronze and ceramic vessels belonged to the cupboards on the S wall. Two chests containing serving and storage wares, fallen from the room above (7), offered additional storage. The latrine in the house was located under the stairs to the upper floor in room (1).

DR•(8), painted in the late 3rd style, was apparently converted from a *cubiculum* to a dining room; remains of a couch/bed were found, as well as several pots, a ladle, and a chest of iron tools that indicate a storage function as well (Fig. 5.168). DR (9), also painted in the late 3rd style, has a pavement of white tesserae in *cocciopesto* that clearly mark out the position (for three, not two as Elia claims) dining couches around a central emblem. A niche for a couch (*lectus medius*, w. 1.24 m.) in the NW corner was actually found filled with a dining couch. At this couch were two skeletons with a hoard of coins and two bronze jugs; three other bronze vessels were found in the SW corner (Fig. 5.170). A *lararium* niche was cut into the E wall of the room (Fig. 5.169). Remains of a wooden bower were recovered from the center of garden (12), suggesting the location of a DO there, a counterpoint to the two dining areas DR•(8) and DR (9). Statuary decorated the garden, including a statuette of Hercules on the S wall that may have marked another cult place.

References

Jashemski 1993, 49; Allison 1992b, 199-211; Fröhlich 1991, 256; PPM II, 398-420; Rediscovering Pompeii 1990, #31, #44; Gralfs 1988, 50-56; Ling 1987, 154-158; PPP I, 133-137; CTP IIIA, 18-19; Ling 1983; Guida Laterza 1982, 88-89; Jashemski 1979, 122; Bastet & De Vos 1979, 87-88, 114; Guida 1976, 172-174; Schefold 1957, 46-47; Della Corte 1954, 249-250, #599-602; Soprano 1950, 307,

#32; Pernice 1938, 107-108, 135, 139; Boyce 1937, 29, #56-57; Elia NSc 1934, 278-308; Della Corte NSc 1933, 305-309; Della Corte NSc 1929, 467-468.

Data

A) Total area:	330.2	Nodes:	182.3	Connectors:	34.4	Static spaces:	117.3
B) Total # spaces:	16	# Nodes:	2	# Connectors:	4	# Static spaces:	9
C) Area, KI (11):	5.1	Area, DR(8):	16.0	Length, DR(8):	4.65	Width, DR(8):	3.44
		Area, DR(9):	17.6	Length, DR(9):	4.65	Width, DR(9):	3.79
		Area, DO• in(12):	26.0	Length, DO• in(12):	5.10	Width, DO• in(12):	5.10

65. I.10.8, Tessitoria di Minucius, *casa media* (Figs. 2.8, 5.7, 5.171-5.174)

Synopsis

An upright masonry and wood ST of sub-type (3) was built into the NW corner of corridor (9), which served as the kitchen (Figs. 5.172-5.173). The ST has disintegrated since excavation and only traces of the one supporting wall are still visible. Two ceramic jars, one containing "vegetal material" (Allison) were found here. Several cupboards and chests stood in atrium (1). Cooking vessels were hung on nails or placed on shelving in room (8): two grinding stones, seven terracotta vessels, a ceramic cooking pot, two small amphorae and a cup. Room (12) had additional storage of cooking and table wares on its shelves: one bronze cooking pot, shallow bowl and *casseruola*, thirteen ceramic vessels, and nine storage jars or jugs. A latrine was located at the S end of (14). Both possible dining areas were in poor condition at the time of the eruption. DI(2) had a fine central emblema in its pavement, but its 1st style walls had been plastered over with plain stucco (Fig. 5.171). DR(10), with a window onto garden (11), seems to have been under renovation, judging from the piles of building material found within; it retains traces of 3rd style decoration (Fig. 5.174). A niched shrine was built into the E wall of garden (11).

References

Jashemski 1993, 49; Allison 1992b, 212-222; PPM II, 421-432; Ling 1987, 154-158; PPP I, 137-138; CTP IIIA, 18-19; Ling 1983; Guida Laterza 1982, 88; Moeller 1976, 39 #19; Guida 1976, 172; Schefold 1957, 47; Della Corte 1954, 250-251, #603-616; Boyce 1937, 29, #58; Elia NSc 1934, 308-320; Della Corte NSc 1933, 309-312; Della Corte NSc 1929, 468.

Data

A) Total area:	295.0	Nodes:	140.2	Connectors:	14.5	Static spaces:	141.3
B) Total # spaces:	16	# Nodes:	3	# Connectors:	4	# Static spaces:	9
C) Area, KI (9):	2.9	Area, DI(2):	12.5	Length, DI(2):	3.30	Width, DI(2):	3.80
		Area, DR(10):	16.8	Length, DR(10):	5.10	Width, DR(10):	3.30

66. I.10.9, Taberna di P.C.F., (work)shop (Figs. 2.8, 5.7)

Synopsis

There was a complete lack of finds, furniture and installations from this (work)shop, and no evidence for cooking or eating.

References

Ling 1987, 154-158; Gassner 1986, 132; PPP I, 138; Ling 1983; Della Corte 1954, 251, #617; Elia NSc 1934, 320-321; Della Corte NSc 1933, 313; Della Corte NSc 1929, 468-469.

Data

A) Total area: 9.6	Nodes: 9.6	Connectors: 0	Static spaces: 0
B) Total # spaces: 1	# Nodes: 1	# Connectors: 0	# Static spaces: 0

67. I.10.10-11, Casa degli Amanti, *casa media* (Figs. 2.8, 5.7, 5.175-5.176)

Synopsis

Extensive tunneling disturbed much of the stratigraphy of this house. KI (16) contains a large solid masonry ST of sub-type (1) against the S wall (Fig. 5.175). The ST has a tiled surface and a back curb of upright tiles. Built into the W end is a cocciopesto-lined basin. A bronze jug was found on the stove-top; two amphorae and two ceramic jugs were stored in the NW corner of the room. A niched shrine above a *lararium* painting overlooked the ST on the E wall, next to the door to the latrine in room (15). Elia interpreted the entire S wing of the peristyle on both floors to be the servants working and residential quarters. Cooking and serving wares were stored off the peristyle (Fig. 5.176). Two cupboards sat below the wooden staircase to the upper floor in the N portico of peristyle (9); these contained ceramic jugs, pots, a bronze pastry mould, and plates of alabaster and glass. A BZ was found near the NW corner of the peristyle, next to another chest containing eight glass flasks. Off the same corner of the peristyle was DH•(8), a large hall with an elaborately painted vaulted ceiling and 4th style painted decoration. Two skeletons were found here. Any of the small rooms (10-12) on the E side of the peristyle conceivably could have held small gatherings; room (10), for instance, contained iron rods that may have supported couches or beds. Elia suggests that DH{20} on the upper floor was another major reception room, but no decoration survives.

References

Jashemski 1993, 50; Allison 1992b, 223-233; Fröhlich 1991, 256-257; PPM II, 433-499; Ling 1987, 154-158; Gassner 1986, 132; PPP I, 138-147; CTP IIIA, 18-19; Ling 1983; Guida Laterza 1982, 97-98; Guida 1976, 186-188; Schefold 1957, 47-48; Della Corte 1954, 251-252, #618; Maiuri 1942, 183; Pernice 1938, 108; Boyce 1937, 29, #59; Elia NSc 1934, 321-339; Della Corte NSc 1933, 313-317.

Data

A) Total area:	520.7	Nodes:	312.5	Connectors:	18.5	Static spaces:	191.3
B) Total # spaces:	26	# Nodes:	3	# Connectors:	3	# Static spaces:	16
C) Area, KI (16):	8.0	Area, DH(8):	29.0	Length, DH(8):	6.18	Width, DH(8):	4.69
		Area, DH(20):	33.7	Length, DH(20):	6.94	Width, DH(20):	4.86

68. I.10.12, Taberna, (work)shop (Figs. 2.8, 5.7, 5.162)
--

Synopsis

Eschebach erroneously suggested that this was a *latrina publica*., but this shop once did connect to the latrine in room (31) of the Casa del Menandro (I.10.4) (Fig. 5.162, marked '31b' on the plan). There was a stair to an upper loft, but no finds, and no evidence for cooking or eating.

References

Ling 1983; Eschebach 1970, 120; Elia NSc 1934, 339-340; Della Corte NSc 1933, 317.

Data

A) Total area:	30.1	Nodes:	28.1	Connectors:	4.0	Static spaces:	0
B) Total # spaces:	2	# Nodes:	1	# Connectors:	1	# Static spaces:	0

69. I.10.13, Popina dei Poppaei, lunch-counter (Figs. 2.8, 5.7, 5.162)
--

Synopsis

This shop was also once connected to the Casa del Menandro (I.10.4) via a door in the W wall (Fig. 5.162, marked '33b' on the plan). The front counter was clad in red-painted cocciopesto and contained two immured jars; at the W end was a built-in HE of stub-type (4). An iron tripod was found *in situ* against the S wall, carrying a terracotta pot. Bronze, ceramic, and glass cooking, serving and eating wares (a cauldron, two jugs, a plate, a shallow bowl, and four bottles) were also discovered here.

References

CTP IIIA, 18-19; Ling 1983; Packer 1978, 30-34; Elia NSc 1934, 340; Della Corte 1954, 252, #619; Della Corte NSc 1933, 317.

Data

A) Total area:	29.0	Nodes:	26.4	Connectors:	5.2	Static spaces:	0
B) Total # spaces:	2	# Nodes:	1	# Connectors:	1	# Static spaces:	0
C) Area, HE in (1):	2.5						

70. I.10.18, Casa degli Aufidii, <i>casa piccola</i> (Figs. 2.8, 5.7, 5.177-5.178)
--

Synopsis

The small KI (9) has a solid tile-topped masonry ST of sub-type (1) in the SE corner (Fig. 5.178). A masonry curb runs around the back of the ST to protect the walls; two low supports once extended N from the S curb to create two burners on the stove-top. In a photo taken during excavation, a ceramic bowl and cup are shown on top of the ST, but it is not clear if they were *in situ* (PPM II, 502, #4). A slot cut in the wall above the ST suggests shelving. On the same wall is a large *lararium* painting featuring a pig's head, a ham, and a skewered eel below a scene of sacrifice. A cutting 0.92 m. long and 0.38 m. above the floor at the W end of the S wall may indicate the position of a piece of furniture such as a low table, bench or crude couch. A latrine occupies the narrow space (10) behind. DI{3} just S of the entrance may have served for small gatherings at meals; the primary reception room was probably DR{11} on the upper floor (Fig. 5.177). This room covered the space over the entrance and room (2), and gained additional width by being cantilevered over the street to the E. It possessed fine 3rd style decoration and views over both the atrium and the street.

References

PPM II, 500-505; Fröhlich 1991, 257; Ling 1987, 154-158; PPP I, 147; CTP IIIA, 18-19; Ling 1983; Franklin 1978, 60-62; Schefold 1957, 49; Della Corte 1954, 253, #623-625; Boyce 1937, 29, #60; Elia NSc 1934, 341-344.

Data

A) Total area: 144.6	Nodes: 35.4	Connectors: 39.1	Static spaces: 74.0
B) Total # spaces: 14	# Nodes: 1	# Connectors: 4	# Static spaces: 9
C) Area, KI (9): 5.8	Area, DI{3}: 9.9	Length, DI{3}: 3.34	Width, DI{3}: 2.97
	Area, DR{11}: 19.9	Length, DR{11}: 4.73	Width, DR{11}: 4.20

REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS

Note: all ancient authors and collections of inscriptions are cited by their abbreviations in the Oxford Latin Dictionary or the Greek-English Lexicon of Liddell and Scott, 1968 editions.

Adam, J.-P. 1984: *La construction romaine. Matériaux et techniques*, Paris.

AdI: *Annali dell'Istituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica*, Roma, 1829-1885.

Alföldy, G. 1985: *The social history of Rome*, trans. D. Braund & F. Pollock, London.

Alimentazione 1987: Ministero per i Beni Culturali e Ambientali, *L'alimentazione nel mondo antico-i romani, età imperiale*, Roma.

Allison, P. 1992a: "The relationship between wall-decoration and room type in Pompeian houses: a case study of the Casa della Caccia Antica", *Journal of Roman Archaeology* (4), 235-249.

Allison, P. 1992b: *The distribution of Pompeian house contents and its significance*, vols. I-II, Ph.D. diss., University of Sydney (Australia), University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.

Andersson, E.B. 1990: "Fountains and the Roman dwelling", *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* (105), 207-236.

André, J. 1961: *L'alimentation et la cuisine a Rome*, Paris.

Annechino, M. 1977: "Suppellettile fittile da cucina di Pompei" in *L'instrumentum domesticum di Ercolano e Pompei nella prima età imperiale*, Roma, 105-114.

Ault, B. A. 1993: "Type-houses, house types and isonomia in classical Greece", paper at the 95th annual meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America, Dec. 29, Washington, D.C.

Balsdon, J. P. V. D. 1974: *Life and leisure in ancient Rome*, London.

BAN: *Bullettino Archeologico Napoletano*, Nuova Serie, Vols. 1-7, 1852-1859, Napoli.

Barbet, A. 1985: *La peinture murale romaine; les styles décoratifs pompéiens*, Paris.

Bastet, F. & De Vos, M. 1979: *Proposta per una classificazione del terzo stile pompeiano*, Archeologische Studiën van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome (IV).

BdI: *Bullettino dell'Istituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica*, Roma-Berlin, 1829-1885.

Beccarini, P. 1922: *Un decennio di nuovi scavi in Pompei*, Milano.

- Bek, L. 1983: "Questiones convivales. The idea of the triclinium and the staging of convivial ceremony from Rome to Byzantium", *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici* (12), 81-107.
- Bergmann, B. 1991: "Painted perspectives of a villa visit: landscape as status and metaphor" in E. Gazda, ed., *Roman art in the private sphere. New perspectives on the architecture and decor of the domus, villa, and insula*, Ann Arbor, 49-70.
- Berry, J. 1993: *Insula 9, Regio I: domestic behaviour in Pompeii and its significance*, M.A. thesis, University of Reading, unpublished.
- Berry, J. 1994: "Engendering the Roman house?", paper at *Domestic Space in the Ancient Mediterranean*, conference at the University of Reading, 26 March.
- Beyen, H. G. 1960: *Die pompejanische Wanddekoration von zweiten bis zum vierten Stil* (2.1), Den Haag.
- Blanck, H. 1980: "Essen und Trinken bei Griechen und Romern", *Antike Welt* (11.1), 17-24.
- Blong, R. J. 1984: *Volcanic hazards. A sourcebook on the effects of eruptions*, Sydney.
- Boëthius, A. 1934: "Remarks on the development of domestic architecture at Rome", *American Journal of Archaeology* (24), 158-170.
- Bonfante, L. 1986: "Daily life and afterlife" in L. Bonfante, ed., *Etruscan life and afterlife*, Detroit, 232-278.
- Boyce, G. K. 1937: "Corpus of the lararia of Pompeii", *Memoires of the American Academy in Rome* (14).
- Bradley, K. 1986: "Wet-nursing at Rome: a study in social relations" in B. Rawson, ed. *The family in ancient Rome*, Ithaca, 201-229.
- Bradley, K. 1991: *Discovering the Roman family*, Oxford.
- Braund, S. H. 1989: "City and country in Roman satire" in S. Braund, ed., *Satire and society in ancient Rome*, Exeter Studies in History no. 23, 23-47.
- Breton, E. 1869: *Pompeia décrite et dessinée*, Paris, 2nd rev. ed.
- Brockmeyer, N. 1975: "Die Villa rustica als Wirtschaftsform und die Ideologisierung der Landwirtschaft", *Ancient Society* (6), 213-228.
- Brothwell, D.R. 1988: "Foodstuffs, cooking and drugs" in M. Grant and R. Kitzinger, *Civilization of the ancient Mediterranean; Greece and Rome*, New York, 247-261.
- Carandini, A. 1977: "Alcune forme bronzee conservate a Pompei e nel Museo Nazionale di Napoli" in *L'instrumentum domesticum di Ercolano e Pompei nella prima età imperiale*, Roma, 163-168.
- Carandini, A. 1990: "Domus aristocratiche sopra le mura e il pomerio del Palatino" in M. Cristofani, ed., *La grande Roma dei Tarquini*, Roma, 97-99.
- Carcopino, J. 1960: *Daily life in ancient Rome*, New Haven.

- Carrington, R.C. 1933: "The ancient Italian town-house", *Antiquity* (6), 5-23.
- Castiglione Morelli del Franco, V. & Vitale, R. 1989: "L'insula 8 della Regio I: un campione d'indagine socio-economica", *Rivista di studi pompeiani* (3), 185-221.
- Castrén, P. 1975: "Ordo populusque Pompeianus. Polity and society in Roman Pompeii", *Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae* (8), Roma.
- Ciolek, T. M. 1980: "Spatial extent and structure of the field of co-presence: summary of findings", *Man-Environment Systems* (10.1), 57-62.
- Clarke, J. R. 1991: *The houses of Roman Italy, 100 B.C.-A.D. 250*, Berkeley.
- Clemente, G. 1981: "Le leggi sul lusso e la società romana tra III e II secolo A.C." in A. Giardina and A. Schiavone, eds., *Società romana e produzione schiavistica* (3), Bari, 1981, 1-14.
- Collezioni 1989: *Le collezioni del Museo Nazionale di Napoli. I mosaici, le pitture, gli oggetti di uso quotidiano, gli argenti, le terrecotte invetriate, i vetri, i cristalli, gli avori* (Vol. I), Roma.
- Conticello, B. 1987: *Pompeii. Archaeological Guide*, Istituto Geografico de Agostini, Novara.
- Crawford, M. 1978: *The Roman Republic*, Harvard.
- Crouch, D. P. 1993: *Water management in ancient Greek cities*, Oxford.
- CTP (II, III, IIIA, IV, V): *Corpus Topographicum Pompeianum*, H.B. Van der Poel, ed., Rome, 1977-1986.
- Cubberley, A. L., et al. 1988: Cubberley, A. L., Lloyd, J. A. & Roberts, P. C., "Testa and clibani: the baking covers of classical Italy", *Papers of the British School at Rome* (56), 98-119.
- Cubberley, A. L. forthcoming: "Clibanus and sub-testu in the Roman world: further thoughts", in *Food in the ancient world*, Exeter University.
- Curtis, R. I. 1979: "The garum shop of Pompeii", *Cronache Pompeiane* (V), 5-23.
- Daremberg, C & Saglio, E.: *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, C. Daremberg & E. Saglio, eds., Paris, 1877-1919.
- D'Arms, J. H. 1984: "Control, companionship, and clientela: some functions of the Roman communal meal", *Echos du Monde Classique/Classical Views* (28.3), 327-348.
- D'Arms, J. H. 1986: review of Salza Prina Ricotti 1983, *Gnomon* (58), 64-67.
- D'Arms, J. H. 1990: "The Roman *convivium* and the idea of equality" in O. Murray, ed., *Symptotica. A symposium on the symposium*, Oxford, 308-320.
- D'Arms, J. H. 1991: "Slaves at Roman *convivia*" in W. J. Slater, ed., *Dining in a classical context*, Ann Arbor, 171-183.
- De Albentiis, E. 1990: *La casa dei Romani*, Milano.

- De Vos, M. 1976: "Scavi nuovi sconosciuti (I 9,13): pitture e pavimenti della Casa di Cerere a Pompei", *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome*, nov. ser. 3 (38), 37-75.
- De Vos, M. 1977: "Primo stile figurato e maturo quarto stile negli scarichi provenienti dalle macerie del terremoto del 62 d.C. a Pompei", *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome*, nov. ser. 4 (39), 29-47.
- De Vos, M. 1980: *L'egittomania in pitture e mosaici romano-campani della prima età imperiale*, Études préliminaires aux religions orientales (84), Leiden.
- Della Corte, M. 1927: *Pompeii. The new excavations (houses and inhabitants)*, new ed., Valle di Pompei.
- Della Corte, M. 1954: *Case ed abitanti di Pompei*, 2nd ed., Napoli.
- Detienne, M. & Vernant, J.-P. 1989: *The cuisine of sacrifice among the Greeks*, Chicago.
- Dill, S. 1905: *Roman society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, London.
- Di Mino, M.R.: "Gli alimenti nelle <<nature morte>> romane" in Ministero per i Beni Culturali e Ambientali, *L'alimentazione nel mondo antico-i Romani, età imperiale*, Roma, 43-45.
- Dixon, S. 1992: *The Roman family*, Baltimore.
- Dosi, A. & Schnell, F. 1986a: *Le abitudini alimentari dei Romani* (Museo della Civiltà Romana, Vita e costumi dei Romani antichi 1), Roma.
- Dosi, A. & Schnell, F. 1986b: *Pasti e vasellame da tavola* (Museo della Civiltà Romana, Vita e costumi dei Romani antichi 2), Roma.
- Dosi, A. & Schnell, F. 1986c: *I Romani in cucina* (Museo della Civiltà Romana, Vita e costumi dei Romani antichi 3), Roma.
- Douglas, M. 1970: *Purity and danger*, Harmondsworth.
- DuBois, P., 1988: *Sowing the body: psychoanalysis and ancient representations of women*, Chicago.
- Ducrey, P. 1991: *Eretria. A guide to the House with the Mosaics*, Swiss School of Archaeology in Greece, Eretria.
- Dunbabin, K. M. D. 1991: "Triclinium and stibadium" in W. J. Slater, ed., *Dining in a classical context*, Ann Arbor, 121-148.
- Dunbabin, K. M. D. 1993: "Wine and water at the Roman convivium", *Journal of Roman Archaeology* (6), 116-141.
- Dupont, F. 1992: *Daily life in ancient Rome*, Cambridge.
- Dwyer, E. J. 1979: "Sculpture and its display in private houses of Pompeii", *Pompeii and the Vesuvian landscape*, Washington, 59-77.
- Dwyer, E. J. 1982: *Pompeian domestic sculpture*, Roma.

- Dwyer, E. J. 1991: "The Pompeian atrium house in theory and in practice" in E. Gazda, ed., *Roman art in the private sphere. New perspectives on the architecture and decor of the domus, villa, and insula*, Ann Arbor, 25-48.
- Ehrhardt, W. forthcoming: *Casa di Paquius Proculus (I 7,1)* (Häuser in Pompeji).
- Elia, O. 1932: "I cubiculi nelle case di Pompei", *Historia* (4.3), 394-421.
- Elia, O. 1937: "Le pitture della Casa del Citarista", *Monumenti della pittura antica scoperta in Italia* Sez. III.2 (Pompei), Fasc. I, Roma.
- Elia, O. 1961: "Il portico dei Triclini del Pagus Maritimus di Pompei", *Bollettino d'Arte*, 200-211.
- Ellis, S.P. 1988: "The end of the Roman house", *American Journal of Archaeology* (92.4), 565-576.
- Ellis, S. P. 1991: "Power, architecture, and decor: how the late Roman aristocrat appeared to his guests" in E. Gazda, ed., *Roman art in the private sphere. New perspectives on the architecture and decor of the domus, villa, and insula*, Ann Arbor, 117-134.
- Engelmann, R. 1904: *Pompeji*, Leipzig.
- Erdemgil, S., et al. n.d.: *The terrace houses in Ephesus*, Istanbul.
- Eschebach, H. 1970: *Die städtebauliche Entwicklung des antiken Pompeji*, (Mitteilungen des Deutsches Archaeologischen Instituts, Suppl. 17), Heidelberg.
- Eschebach, H. 1979a: "Zur Entwicklung des pompejanischen Hauses", in *Wohnungsbau im Altertum (Diskussionen zur archäologischen Bauforschung (3))*, Berlin, 152-161.
- Eschebach, H. 1979b: "Die Gebrauchswasserversorgung des antiken Pompeji", *Antike Welt* (10), 3-25.
- Eschebach, H. 1979c: "Probleme der Wasserversorgung Pompejis", *Cronache Pompeiane* (5), 24-60.
- Eschebach, H. 1982: "Katalog der pompejanischen Laufbrunnen und ihre Reliefs", *Antike Welt* (13.3), 21-26.
- Étienne, R. 1979: "L'eruzione del 79" in *Pompeii 79: Raccolta di studi per il decimonono centenario dell'eruzione vesuviana*, F. Zevi, ed., Naples, 289-292.
- Evans, E. 1978: "A group of atrium houses without side rooms in Pompeii" in H. McK. Blake, T. W. Potter & D. B. Whitehouse, eds., *Papers in Italian archaeology I: the Lancaster seminar*, BAR Supplementary Series 41(i), 175-195.
- Evans, E. 1990: "Dining with the ancients", *Archaeology* (43.6), 54-61.
- Fabbricotti, E. 1976: "I bagni nelle prime ville romane", *Cronache Pompeiane* (2), 29-111.
- Falanga, L. 1989: review of A. Gallo, *La Casa dei Quattro Stili*, tesi di laurea, Accademia di Archeologia, Lettere e BB.AA di Napoli, Napoli, *Rivista di studi pompeiani* (3), 306-307.

- Farb, P. & Armelagos, G. 1980: *Consuming passions: the anthropology of eating*, Boston.
- Finley, M. I. 1985: *The ancient economy*, 2nd. ed., Berkeley.
- Fiorelli, G. 1873: *Gli scavi di Pompei dal 1861 al 1872*, Napoli.
- Fiorelli, G. 1875: *Descrizione di Pompei*, Napoli.
- Fisher, N. R. E. 1988: "Roman associations, dinner parties, and clubs" in M. Grant and R. Kitzinger, *Civilization of the ancient Mediterranean; Greece and Rome*, New York, 1199-1225.
- Flower, B. & Rosenbaum, E. 1958: *The Roman cookery book*, London.
- Förtsch, R. 1993: *Archäologischer Kommentar zu den Villenbriefen des jüngeren Plinius*, Mainz am Rhein.
- Franchi dell'Orto, L. 1992: "Food and drink" in *Rediscovering Pompeii*, Roma, 187.
- Franklin, J.L. 1980: *Pompeii: the electoral programmata, campaigns and politics, A.D. 71-79*, Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome (28), Rome.
- Franklin, J.L. 1978: "Notes on Pompeian prosopography: programmatum scriptores", *Cronache Pompeiane* (4), 1978, 54-74.
- Frayn, J. M. 1978: "Home-baking in Roman Italy", *Antiquity* (52), 28-33.
- Friedländer (I-IV): *Roman life and manners under the early empire*, 4 vols, J.H. Freese & L.A. Magnus, transl., New York, 1908.
- Frier, B. 1991: "Pompeii's economy and society" (review of Jongman 1988), *Journal of Roman Archaeology* (4), 243-247.
- Frier, B. 1980: *Landlords and tenants in ancient Rome*. Princeton.
- Fröhlich, T. 1991: *Lararien und Fassadenbilder in den Vesuvustädten. Untersuchungen zur 'volkstümlichen' pompejanischen Malerei*, Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Roemische Abteilung: Ergänzungsheft (32), Mainz.
- Fuchs, J. 1977: *Horace's satires and epistles*, transl., New York.
- Fulvio, L. 1879: "Delle fornaci e dei forni pompeiani" in *Pompei e la regione sotterrata dal Vesuvio nell'anno LXXIX*, Napoli, 273-291.
- Gardner, J. F. & Wiedemann, T. 1991: *The Roman household, a sourcebook*, New York.
- Gardner, J. F. 1986: *Women in Roman law and society*, Bloomington.
- Garnsey, P. 1991a: "Child rearing in ancient Italy" in D.I. Kertzer & R.P. Saller, eds., *The family in Italy: from antiquity to the present*, New Haven, 48-65.
- Garnsey, P. 1991b: "Mass diet and nutrition in the city of Rome", in A. Giovanni, ed., *Nourrir la plebe. Actes du colloque tenu a Geneve les 28 et 29.IX.1989 en hommage a Denis Van Berchem*, F. Reinhardt, 67-95.

- Gassner, V. 1986: *Die Kaufläden in Pompeii*, Dissertationen der Universität Wien, 178, Wien.
- Gazda, E. (ed.) 1991: *Roman art in the private sphere. New perspectives on the architecture and decor of the domus, villa, and insula*, Ann Arbor.
- GdS: *Giornale degli Scavi di Pompei*, Nuova Serie, Vols. 1-4, 1868-1876, Napoli.
- Giannini, A. 1960: "La figura del cuoco nella commedia greca", *Acme* (13.2-3), 135-216.
- Goddard, J. 1994: "The tyrant at table" in J. Elsner & J. Masters, *Reflections of Nero: culture, history & representation*, London, 67-82.
- Gowers, E. 1993: *The loaded table. Representations of food in Roman literature*, Oxford.
- Gozzini Giacosa, I. 1992: *A taste of ancient Rome*, Chicago.
- Graham, J. W. 1966: "Origins and interrelation of the Greek house and the Roman house", *Phoenix* (20), 3-31.
- Grafbs, B. 1988: "Metallverarbeitende Produktionsstätten in Pompeji", *BAR International Series* (433).
- Greene, K. 1986: *The archaeology of the Roman economy*, Berkeley.
- Grmek, M.D. 1989: *Diseases in the ancient Greek world*, Baltimore.
- Guida 1976: *Guida archeologica di Pompei*, E. La Rocca, M. De Vos, A. De Vos, Verona.
- Guida Laterza 1982: *Pompei Ercolano Stabia*, Guide archeologiche Laterza (11), A. De Vos & M. De Vos, Roma.
- Gury, F. 1986: "La forge du destin. À propos d'une série de peintures pompéiennes du IV^e style", *Mélanges de L'École Française de Rome* (98.2), 427-489.
- Harris, M. 1985: *The sacred cow and the abominable pig: riddles of food and culture*, New York.
- Harsh, P. 1935: "The origins of the insula at Ostia", *Memoires of the American Academy at Rome* (12), 7-66.
- Hauthal, F. 1864: *Acronis et Porphyrius commentarii in Q. Horatium Flaccum*, F. Hauthal, ed., 2 vols., Berlin.
- Hayden, B. 1993: *Archaeology: the science of once and future things*, New York.
- Helbig, W. 1868: *Die Wandgemälde der vom Vesuv verschütteten Städte Campaniens*, Leipzig.
- Hilgers, W. 1969: *Lateinische Gefäßnamen. Bezeichnungen, Funktion und Form römischer Gefäße nach den antiken Schriftquellen*, Düsseldorf.
- Hoffman, A. 1979: "L'architettura", in *Pompeii 79: raccolta di studi per il decimonono centenario dell'eruzione vesuviana*, F. Zevi, ed., Naples, 97-118.

- Hudson, N.A. 1989: "Food in Roman satire" in S. Braund, ed., *Satire and society in ancient Rome*, Exeter Studies in History no. 23, 69-87.
- Italienische Reise 1989: *Italiensiche Reise: immagini pompeiane nelle raccolte archeologiche germaniche*, Soprintendenza Archeologica di Pompei, Napoli.
- Jansen, G. C. M. 1991: "Water systems and sanitation in the houses of Herculaneum", *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome* (50), 145-166.
- Jashemski, W. 1979: *The gardens of Pompeii, Herculaneum and the villas destroyed by Vesuvius*, New Rochelle.
- Jashemski, W. 1993a: *The gardens of Pompeii, Herculaneum and the villas destroyed by Vesuvius, Appendices*, New Rochelle.
- Jashemski, W. 1993b: "Excavations in the gardens in the House of Bacchus and Ariadne and in the East Temple at Thuburbo Majus", paper at the 95th Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America, Dec. 29, Washington, D.C.
- Johnson, R. W. & Threlfall, N.A. 1985: *Volcano town. The 1937-1943 Rabaul eruptions*, Bathurst (Australia).
- Johnston, H. W. 1932: *The private life of the Romans*, Chicago, rev. ed.
- Jones, C. P. 1991: "Dinner theater" in W. J. Slater, ed., *Dining in a classical context*, Ann Arbor, 185-198.
- Jongman, W. 1988: *The economy and society of Pompeii*, Amsterdam.
- Kent, S. (ed.) 1990: *Domestic architecture and the use of space*, Cambridge.
- Kleberg, T. 1957: *Hôtels, restaurants et cabarets dans l'antiquité romaine*, Almqvist & Wiksells, Uppsala.
- Künzl, E. 1979: "Le Argenterie" in *Pompeii 79: raccolta di studi per il decimonono centenario dell'eruzione vesuviana*, F. Zevi, ed., Naples, 211-228.
- Lafon, X. 1981: "A propos des <<villae>> republicaines", *L'art décoratif à Rome. À la fin de la république et au début du principat* (Collection de l'École Française de Rome) (55), 151-172.
- Laidlaw, A. 1985: *The first style in Pompeii: painting and architecture*, Roma.
- Larsen, J. D. 1982: "The watertowers in Pompeii", *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici* (11), 41-67.
- La Torre, G. F. 1988: "Gli impianti commerciali ed artigianali nel tessuto urbano di Pompei" in *Pompei. L'informatica al servizio di una città antica*, Roma, 75-102.
- Laurence, R. 1994: *Roman Pompeii: space and society*, Routledge.
- Laurentine 1982: *La laurentine et l'invention de la villa romaine*, Paris.
- Lauter, H. 1975: "Zur Siedlungsstruktur pompejis in samnitischer Zeit" in B. Andreae & H. Kyrieleis, eds., *Neue Forschungen in Pompeji*, Recklinghausen, 147-152.

- Lazzari, M. 1987: "De re coquinaria su alcuni trattatelli perduti" in Ministero per I Beni Culturali e Ambientali, *L'alimentazione nel mondo antico-i romani, età imperiale*, Roma, 69-70.
- Lepore, E. 1950: "Orientamente per la storia sociale di Pompei" in *Pompeiana. Raccolta di studi per il secondo centenario degli scavi di Pompei*, Napoli, 144-166.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1965: "Le triangle culinaire", *L'Arc* (26), 19-29.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1975: *The raw and the cooked: introduction to a science of mythology I*, London.
- Lewis, N. & Reinhold, M. 1966: *Roman civilization, sourcebooks I & II: the Republic and the Empire*, New York.
- Lindsay, W.M. 1964: *Nonii Marcelli. de compendiosa doctrina, libros XX*, W. M. Lindsay, ed., Hildesheim.
- Ling, R. 1978: "Pompeii and Herculaneum: recent research and future prospects" in H. McK. Blake, T. W. Potter & D. B. Whitehouse, eds., *Papers in Italian archaeology I: the Lancaster Seminar*, BAR Supplementary Series 41(i), 153-173.
- Ling, R. 1983: "The insula of the Menander at Pompeii: interim report", *Antiquities Journal* (63), 34-57.
- Ling, R. 1987: "A new look at Pompeii" in B. Cunliffe, ed., *Origins. The roots of European civilization*, BBC Books, London, 148-160.
- Ling, R. 1991a: "The architecture at Pompeii" (review of Richardson 1988), *Journal of Roman Archaeology* (4), 248-256.
- Ling, R. 1991b: *Roman painting*, Cambridge.
- Ling, R. 1993: "German approaches to Pompeii" (review of Zanker 1987 & Michel 1984), *Journal of Roman Archaeology* (6), 331-340.
- Maiuri, A. 1933: *La Casa del Menandro e il suo tesoro di argenteria*, Roma.
- Maiuri, A. 1938: "Le pitture delle Case di M. Fabius Amandio, del Sacerdos Amandus e di P. Corenelius Teges", *Monumenti della pittura antica scoperta in Italia* Sez. III.2 (Pompei), Fasc. II, Roma.
- Maiuri, A. 1942a: *L'ultima fase edilizia di Pompei*, Istituto di Studi Romani, Spoleto.
- Maiuri, A. 1942b: "Fulgur conditum", *Rendiconti dell'Accademia di Archeologia, Lettere e Belle Arti di Napoli*, 55-72.
- Maiuri, A. 1950: "Gli scavi di Pompei" in *Pompeiana. Raccolta di studi per il secondo centenario degli scavi di Pompei*, Napoli, 9-40.
- Maiuri, A. 1952: "Gli <<oeci>> vitruviani in palladio e nella casa pompeiana e ercolanese", *Palladio* (1-2), 1-8.
- Maiuri, A. 1953/54: "Due singolari dipinti Pompeiani", *Römische Mitteilungen* (60-61), 88-99.

- Maiuri, A. 1954a: *Pompeii*, Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, Roma.
- Maiuri, A. 1954b: "Gineceo e 'hospitium' nella casa pompeiana", *Memorie della Romana Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, ser. 8, (5), 451-461.
- Maiuri, A. 1958: *Ercolano: i nuovi scavi (1927-1958)*, Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, Roma.
- Maiuri, A. 1973: *Alla ricerca di Pompei preromana*, Napoli.
- Marquardt, J. (I-II): *La vie privée des Romains*, publ. A. Mau, trans. V. Henry, (Manuel des antiquités romaines 14-15), Paris, 1892-1893.
- Mau, A. 1882: *Geschichte der decorativen Wandmalerei in Pompeji*, Leipzig.
- Mau, A. 1908: *Pompeii: its life and art*, trans. F. Kelsey, Leipzig.
- Maurin, J. 1983: "Labor matronalis: aspects du travail féminin à Rome", in *La femme dans les sociétés antiques*, Strasbourg, 139-155.
- Mayeske, B.-J. B. 1972: *Bakeries, bakers, and bread at Pompeii: a study in social and economic history*, Ph.D. diss, University of Maryland, University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.
- Mayeske, B.-J. B. 1979: "Bakers, bakeshops, and bread: a social and economic study" in *Pompeii and the Vesuvian landscape*, Washington D. C., 39-57.
- McKay, A. G. 1975: *Houses, villas and palaces in the Roman world*, London.
- Michel, D. 1990: *Casa dei Cei (I 6,15) (Häuser in Pompeji 3)*, Hirmer, München.
- Mielsch, H. 1987: *Die römische Villa: Architektur und Lebensform*, München.
- Moeller, W. O. 1976: *The wool trade of ancient Pompeii*, Leiden.
- Morel, J.-P. 1979: "La ceramica e il vetro" in *Pompeii 79: raccolta di studi per il decimonono centenario dell'eruzione vesuviana*, F. Zevi, ed., Naples, 241-264.
- Mouritsen, H. 1988: "Elections, magistrates and municipal élite. Studies in Pompeian epigraphy", *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici - Supplementum* (15).
- Murray, O. (ed.) 1990: *Symptotica. A symposium on the symposion*, Oxford.
- Mygind, H. P. T. 1917: "Die Wasserversorgung pompejis", *Janus* (22), 294-351.
- Mygind, H. P. T. 1921: "Hygienische Verhältnisse im alten Pompeji", *Janus* (25), 251-281, 285-324, 353-383.
- Mygind, H. P. T. 1924: *Badene i de pompejanske Privathuse*, Studier fra Sprog-og Oldtidsforskning #132, København.
- Nappo, S. C. 1994: "Popular housing in Pompeii at the end of the third and the beginning of the second centuries B.C.", paper at *Domestic Space in the Ancient Mediterranean*, conference at the University of Reading, 26 March.
- Néraudau, J.-P. 1984: *Être enfant a Rome*, Les Belles Lettres, Paris.

- Nevett, L. 1993: "Separation or seclusion? Towards an archaeological approach to investigating women in the Greek household in the fifth to third centuries B.C.", in Pearson, M. P. & C. Richards, *Architecture and order: approaches to social space*, London, 98-112.
- Niccolini (I-IV): *Le case ed i monumenti di Pompei disegnati e descritti*, A. F. & F. Niccolini, Napoli 1854-1896.
- NSc: *Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità*, Roma.
- Orr, D. G. 1973: *Roman domestic religion: a study of the Roman household deities and their shrines at Pompeii and Herculaneum*, Ph.D. diss., University of Maryland, University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.
- Orr, D. G. 1978: "Roman domestic religion: the evidence of the household shrines" in W. Haase, *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (2.16.2), Berlin, 1557-1591.
- Overbeck, J. 1884: *Pompeji in seinen Gebäuden, Alterthümern und Kunstwerken dargestellt*, 4th ed., care of A. Mau, Leipzig.
- Packer, J. 1975: "Middle and lower class housing in Pompeii and Herculaneum", in B. Andreae & H. Kyrieleis, eds., *Neue Forschungen in Pompeji*, Recklinghausen, 133-142.
- Packer, J. 1978: "Inns at Pompeii: a short survey", *Cronache Pompeiane* (4), 5-53.
- PAH (I-III): *Pompeianarum Antiquitatum Historia*, G. Fiorelli, ed., Napoli, 1860-1864.
- Pandermalis, D. 1989: "Δίον", *Αρχαιολογία* (33), 6-53.
- Paoli, U. E. 1958: *Rome. Its people, life and customs*, New York.
- Parslow, C.C. 1989: *The Praedia Iulia Felicis in Pompeii*, Ph.D. diss., Duke University, University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.
- Parslow, C.C. 1990: Review of Zanker 1987, *American Journal of Archaeology* (94.3), 512-513.
- Pavolini, C. 1989: *Ostia*, Guide Archeologiche Laterza (8), 3rd ed., Roma.
- Peacock, D. P. S. 1989: "The mills of Pompeii", *Antiquity* (63, # 239), 205-214.
- Peck, H. T. 1923: *Harper's dictionary of classical literature and antiquities*, H. T. Peck, ed., American Book Company, New York.
- Pernice, E. 1925: "Gefässe und Geräte aus Bronze", *Die hellenistische Kunst in Pompeji* (IV), Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Pernice, E. 1932: "Hellenistische Tische, Zisternenmündungen, Beckenuntersätze, Altäre und Truhen", *Die hellenistische Kunst in Pompeji* (V), Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Pernice, E. 1938: "Pavimente und figürliche Mosaiken", *Die hellenistische Kunst in Pompeji* (VI), Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.
- PG: *Pompeian Gleanings* (newsletter distributed by E.G. Dwyer), Kenyon College, Ohio.

- Pirson, F. 1994: "Rented apartments in Pompeii", paper at *Domestic Space in the Ancient Mediterranean*, conference at the University of Reading, 26 March.
- Pirzio Biroli Stefanelli, L. 1990: *Il bronzo dei Romani: arredo e suppellettile*, <<L'Erma>> di Bretschneider, Roma.
- Pompei - L'Informatica 1988: *Pompei. L'informatica al servizio di una città antica*, Roma.
- Pool, D. 1993: *What Jane Austen ate and Charles Dickens knew. From fox hunting to whist - the facts of daily life in nineteenth-century England*, New York.
- PPM (I-III): *Pompei, pitture e mosaici*, G. P. Carratelli & I. Baldassarre, eds., Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, Roma, 1990-1993.
- PPP (I-III): *Pitture e pavimenti di Pompei*, I. Bragantini, M. de Vos & F. Parise Badoni, eds., Istituto Centrale per il Catalogo e la Documentazione, Roma, 1981-1986.
- Progetto Pompei 1988: *Progetto Pompei: un bilancio*. Ministero Beni Culturali Archeologia, Architettoni, e Ambienti di Pompei, Napoli.
- Purcell, N. 1994: "The city of Rome and the *plebs urbana* in the Late Republic", *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 2nd ed., Vol. IX, 644-688.
- Quentin, D.H. 1926: "Clibanus, pigella, panis artopticus", *Rendiconti. Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana Archeologia* (4), 81-89.
- Ragni, E. 1987: "L'agricoltura Romana nell'età imperiale" in Ministero per I Beni Culturali e Ambientali, *L'alimentazione nel mondo antico-i Romani, età imperiale*, Roma, 9-15.
- Ransom, C. L. 1905: *Couches and beds of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans*, Chicago.
- Raper, R. A. 1977: "The analysis of the urban structure of Pompeii: a sociological examination of land use (semi-micro)", in *Spatial archaeology*, D.L. Clarke, ed., 189-221.
- Raper, R. A. 1979: "Pompeii: planning and social implications" in B.C. Burnham & J. Kingsbury, eds., *Space, hierarchy and society: interdisciplinary studies in social area analysis*, British Archaeological Reports (59), 137-148.
- Rathje, W. & Murphy, C. 1992: *Rubbish! The archaeology of garbage*, New York.
- Rediscovering Pompeii 1990: Ministero per I Beni Culturali e Ambientali & Soprintendenza Archeologica di Pompei, *Rediscovering Pompeii*, Roma.
- Renfrew, J. 1988: "Food for athletes and gods: a classical diet" in W.J. Raschke, ed., *The archaeology of the Olympics*, Madison, 174-181.
- Richardson, L. 1955: "The Casa dei Dioscuri and its painters", *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* (23).
- Richardson Jr., L. 1983: "A contribution to the study of Pompeian dining-rooms", *Pompeii Herculaneum Stabiae* (1), 61-71.
- Richardson Jr., L. 1988a: *Pompeii: an architectural history*, Baltimore.

- Richardson Jr., L. 1988b: "Water triclinia and biclinia in Pompeii" in R. Curtius, ed., *Studia Pompeiana et classica in honor of Wilhelmina Jashemski*, vol. I, 305-312.
- Richardson Jr., L. 1991: "Innovations in domestic architecture at Pompeii, A.D. 62-79", *Archaeological News* (16), 21-35.
- Richter, G. M. A. 1966: *The furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans*, London.
- Robinson, D. & Graham, J. W. 1938: *Excavations at Olynthus, part VIII: the Hellenic house*, Baltimore.
- Rodger, A. 1972: *Owners and neighbors in Roman law*, Oxford.
- Rozin, E. 1992: *Ethnic cuisine*, New York.
- Saller, R. P. 1982: *Personal patronage under the early Empire*, Cambridge.
- Salza Prina Ricotti, E. 1978/80: "Cucine e quartieri servili in epoca romana", *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia* (51-52), 237-294.
- Salza Prina Ricotti, E. 1979: "Forme speciali di triclini", *Cronache Pompeiane* (V), 102-149.
- Salza Prina Ricotti, E. 1983: *L'arte del convito nella Roma antica*, *Studia Archaeologica* 35, Roma.
- Salza Prina Ricotti, E. 1984: "The importance of water in Roman garden triclinia", in *Ancient Roman villa gardens*, E. MacDougall, ed., 137-184.
- Salza Prina Ricotti, E. 1987: "Alimentazione, cibi, tavola e cucine nell'età imperiale" in Ministero per I Beni Culturali e Ambientali, *L'alimentazione nel mondo antico-i Romani, età imperiale*, Roma, 71-130.
- Sanders, D. 1990: "Behavioral conventions and archaeology: methods for the analysis of ancient architecture" in S. Kent, ed., *Domestic architecture and the use of space*, Cambridge.
- Scheffer, C. 1981: "Cooking and cooking stands in Italy, 1400-400 B.C.", *Aquarossa* II.1, (Acta Instituti Romani Regni Sueciae, ser. 4, XXXVIII:II,2), Stockholm.
- Schefold, K. 1957: *Die Wände pompejis. Topographisches Verzeichnis der Bildmotiv*, Berlin.
- Schmidt-Colinet, A. 1991: "Exedra duplex", *Hefte des archäologischen seminars des universität Bern* (14), 43-60.
- Schuring, J. M. 1988: *Experimental studies on Roman and Medieval ceramics; pottery from the San Sisto Vecchio in Rome*, Ph.D. diss., University of Leiden.
- Scobie, A. 1986: "Slums, sanitation, and mortality in the Roman world", *Klio* (68), 399-433.
- Sherwin-White, A. N. 1966: *The letters of Pliny; a historical and social commentary*, Oxford.
- Sichtermann, H. 1980: "Zu den Malerein des Tricliniums der Casa del Frutetto in Pompeji" in *Forschungen und Funde, Festschrift B. Neutsch*, Innsbruck, 457-461.

- Simoons, F.J. 1961: *Eat not this flesh: food avoidances in the old world*, Madison.
- Slater, W.J. (ed.) 1991: *Dining in a classical context*, Ann Arbor.
- Sogliano, A. 1879: "Le pitture murali campagne scoperte negli anni 1867-1879 descritte" in *Pompei e la regione sotterrata dal Vesuvio nell'anno LXXIX*, Pt. 2, Napoli, 79 ff.
- Sogliano, A. 1937: *Pompei nel suo sviluppo storico. Pompei preromana (dalle origini all'a 80 av.C.)*, Roma.
- Soprano, P. 1950: "I triclini all'aperto di Pompei" in *Pompeiana. Raccolta di studi per il secondo centenario degli scavi di Pompei*, Napoli, 288-310.
- Sparkes, B.A. 1962: "The Greek kitchen", *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (82), 121-137.
- Spinazzola (I-III): *Pompei alla luce degli scavi nuovi di Via dell'Abbondanza (anni 1910-1923)*, V. Spinazzola, Roma, 1953.
- Stambaugh, J. E. 1988: *The ancient Roman city*, Baltimore.
- Strocka, V. M. 1984: "Ein missverstandener Terminus des vierten Stils: die Casa del Sacello Iliaco in Pompeji (I 6,4), *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts, Roemische Abteilung* (91), 125-140.
- Strocka, V. M. & Ehrhardt, W. 1988: "Internationales Forschungsprojekt <<Häuser in Pompeji>>. Bericht über die Kampagne 1987", *Rivista di studi Pompeiani* (2), 246-247.
- Strocka, V. M. & Ehrhardt, W. 1987: "<<Case di Pompei>>: un progetto scientifico internazionale dell'Istituto Archeologico Germanico", U. Pappalardo, trans., *Rivista di studi Pompeiani* (1), 203-208.
- Sutherland, I.M. 1990: *Colonnaded cenacula in Pompeian domestic architecture*, Ph.D. diss., Duke University, University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.
- Tamm, B. 1963: *Auditorium and palatium, a study on assembly-rooms in Roman palaces during the 1st century B.C. and the 1st century A.D.*, Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm.
- Tassinari, S. 1993: *Il vasellame bronzeo di Pompei*, Soprintendenza archeologica di Pompei, 5, Roma.
- Tassinari, S. 1979: "Il vasellame di bronzo" in *Pompeii 79: raccolta di studi per il decimonono centenario dell'eruzione vesuviana*, F. Zevi, ed., Naples, 229-240.
- Tella, F. 1989: "Un quadro con Bellerofonte e Atena dalla Caupona I.8.8", *Rivista di studi Pompeiani* (3), 105-110.
- Thilo, G. & Hagen, H. 1961: *Servii Grammatici. Qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*, G. Thilo & H. Hagen, eds., Hildesheim.
- Tsakirgis, B. 1984: *The domestic architecture of Morgantina in the Hellenistic and Roman periods*, Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.
- Van Binnebeke, M.C. 1991: "Some remarks on the functions of houses and rooms in the *insula V* at Herculaneum", *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome* (50), 136-144.

- Vehling, J D. 1936: *Apicius. Cooking and dining in imperial Rome*, New York.
- Veyne, P. 1990: *Bread and circuses. Historical sociology and political pluralism*, London.
- Visser, M. 1991: *The rituals of dinner*, New York.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1988: "The social structure of the Roman house", *Papers of the British School at Rome* (LVI), 43-97.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1991a: "Elites and trade in the Roman town", in *City and country in the ancient world*, John Rich & Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, eds., London, 241-272.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1991b: "Houses and households: sampling Pompeii and Herculaneum" in B. Rawson, ed., *Marriage, divorce and children in ancient Rome*, Oxford.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1991c: "The social spread of Roman luxury: sampling Pompeii and Herculaneum", *Papers of the British School at Rome* (59), 145-192.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1994: *Houses and society in Pompeii and Herculaneum*, Princeton.
- Ward-Perkins, J. B. & Claridge, A. 1976: *Pompeii AD 79*, London.
- Ward-Perkins, J. B. 1979: "Note di topografia e urbanistica" in *Pompeii 79: raccolta di studi per il decimonono centenario dell'eruzione vesuviana*, F. Zevi, ed., Naples, 25-39.
- Watson, A. 1985: *Digesta. The digest of Justinian*, A. Watson trans., T. Mommsen & P. Krueger, eds., Philadelphia.
- Watts, C.M. 1987: *A pattern language for houses at Pompeii, Herculaneum, and Ostia*, Ph.D. diss., University of Texas at Austin, University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.
- White, K.D. 1970: *Roman farming*, Ithaca.
- Whitehouse, D.B. 1978: "Home baking in Roman Italy: a footnote", *Antiquity* (52), 146-147.
- Wiedemann, T. 1989: *Adults and children in the Roman empire*, London.
- Wiseman, T. P. 1987: "Conspicui postes tectaque digna deo: the public image of aristocratic and Imperial houses in the late Republic and early Empire" in *L'urbs. Espace urbain et histoire*, (Collection de l'école Française de Rome, 98), 393-413.
- Yardley, J. C. 1991: "The symposium in Roman elegy" in W. J. Slater, ed., *Dining in a classical context*, Ann Arbor, 149-155.
- Zahn (I-III): *Die schönsten Ornamente und merkwürdigsten Gemälde aus Pompeji, Herculaneum und Stabiae*, W. Zahn, Berlin 1828-1859.
- Zanker, P. 1979: "Die Villa als Vorbild des späten pompejanischen Wohngeschmacks", *Jahrbuch des deutschen archaologischen Instituts* (94), 460-523.
- Zanker, P. 1987: *Pompeji. Stadtbilder als Spiegel von Gesellschaft und Herrschaftsform*, Von Zabern, Mainz.