

Anna ANGUISOLO (Hg.), *Privata Luxuria. Towards an Archaeology of Intimacy: Pompeii and Beyond*. International Workshop Center for Advanced Studies, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München (24-25 March 2011). Münchener Studien zur Alten Welt 8. München: Herbert Utz Verlag 2013, 244 S.

This book is based on an International Workshop for young scholars held in Munich in 2011, the papers of which were published within a year and thus incredibly fast. The workshop served to create “a common ground and lively discussion platform to deal with the problem of ‘privacy’ in the domestic life of the Romans and to improve our understanding of it,” as is outlined by the editor Anna Anguissola in her brief preface (pp. 9-12, citation p. 12). While the preface includes a modern definition of privacy from the Oxford English Dictionary, it fails to address appropriately how exactly this key topic is defined and examined in this book with reference to the ancient evidence. Astonishingly, there is no engagement with previous research (vast indeed on this topic), and evocative key terms that appear in the title of the book are not defined at all: what precisely do the *privata luxuria* refer to? That privacy is equated with the intimacy mentioned in the subtitle of the book is stated without further explanation only much later, in the editor’s own paper (p. 46).¹ Only one author, Margherita Carucci (pp. 167-168), provides a more detailed discussion of “intimacy” and the Latin term *intimus*, but it is questionable whether all of the other authors would agree with this discussion, especially with the notion that “though the content of intimacy and its expression in specific forms of behavior are the outcome of continuous cultural negotiation, the broad idea of intimacy as a value is shared by all cultures and in any historical period” (p. 167).² Anguissola warns that “our notion of ‘privacy’ hardly applies to a system where social conditioning played such a pervasive role to the definition of domestic space” (p. 11), but this very modern notion of privacy nonetheless pervades the book, as a benchmark for either assessing the Roman concept of privacy/intimacy as similar to “ours” (the Romans were like us/like modern western cultures, e.g. chap. I.1, V.1) or for demonstrating its “shocking” difference (conditions “that we would nowadays find unacceptable,” e.g. chap. IV.2, p. 156). The reader can only assume that “us” and “ours” refers to the norms and values of the average middle/upper class male in European/US American societies, who can afford and enjoy the conditions implied to by this benchmark. As the main issue in the investigation of privacy in the domestic realm

¹ This is outlined in a single sentence, where public is equated with social, but all four terms are set within quotation marks.

² Laura Nissinen (pp. 15-29), for example, provides a cross-cultural comparison of sleep contexts, which in some non-Western cultures would not correspond with Carucci’s notion of intimacy.

Anguissola identifies the question of whether houses are “built for the inhabitants or rather to impress outsiders” (p. 11). But are these really oppositions? Could these purposes not easily and neatly be combined and indeed complement each other? Constructing this artificial contrast betrays again an essentially modern perspective, whose validity for ancient house owners remains to be demonstrated.

The book is subdivided into five thematically organized sections, each with two chapters. I. A Space of One’s Own; II. Work and Leisure under One Roof; III. Quantifying Privacy; IV. Organizing Privacy; and V. Privacy beyond Pompeii. Attached at the end of the book are five color plates; a general bibliography for all ten contributions (pp. 209-228); an index of sites and buildings (pp. 229-233); and English abstracts (pp. 235-239). There is no list of authors and no list with source credits of figures, which are also not consistently given in captions.³

While the book adopts an innovative approach, consciously moving away from the focus on the social (“public”) function of Roman houses that has dominated scholarship for decades it raises several problems and questions, which will be addressed here before individual papers are briefly discussed. As already outlined, the introduction is intellectually disappointing and strangely lacks theoretical or methodological discourses that one would have expected for such a presumably remarkable “turn” in research perspectives and from a discussion workshop of young scholars. To what extent intensive discussion really shaped and informed the papers is not clear because systematic cross-references are missing, although authors sometimes adopt different views: however, clearly stating dissent, evaluating different arguments, and contrasting interpretations often of the very same evidence would have significantly enriched the book and reflected current discourses and methodological problems.

The book reveals an increasingly popular practice in academia: that young scholars publish preliminary results of their ongoing doctoral research or key results of their recently completed PhD dissertations in a paper or often several papers before a comprehensive study (book) is published, if it ever appears at all. What can the book offer if the major results have all been presented beforehand, but a thoroughly “positivistic” discussion of the evidence, which, in turn, can never be duly treated in articles? What then, with view to the general inundation in academic publishing and increasing time constraints in academic careers, should and will scholars interested in the work of these young academics read?

³ Without citing all instances: no source credits of figures at all e.g. in chap. II.1 and IV.1; incomplete e.g. in chap. II.2 and III.2 (author and year, but no numbers of plates or figures; or only “author” without reference to originals and models); exemplary e.g. in chap. II.2 and IV.2.

A certain “justification” for publishing this book with its focus on dissertation research may have been that all papers are published in English, thus providing convenient insight into the research of nine scholars, who are not English native speakers and mostly have written their dissertations in another language. The increasingly popular trend towards Anglophone publishing entails costs, however, regarding, at the worst, comprehensibility, and, at the best, “just” the pleasure of reading well-written or even elegantly composed English. Here, the English also would have benefitted from much more rigorous copy-editing or even professional translation by native speakers in order to avoid the frequent awkward phrases and even mistakes. To cite just a few examples, sentences such as “[s]ections of the individual houses completely lacked an attempt to create a private sphere” (p. 201) are clumsy, but phrases such as “[i]t refers to the analysis of the spatial trends, evaluating the distribution of rooms from a multi-scale point of view with the aim of seeing through Pompeii’s urban outline” (p. 116) are simply unintelligible. “Research” is not used in the plural in English (cf. chap. III.2), in contrast to the German “Forschungen,” the Italian “indagini” / “ricerche,” or the French “recherches.” Pompeian houses were “remodeled” rather than “restored” (chap. IV.1), and “affordable,” strangely used throughout chap. III.2, should probably rather be “appropriate” or “convenient” (a mistranslation of the Italian word “conveniente”?). In contrast, some chapters such as chap. II.1, III.1, and IV.2 are very well written, and there are overall very few orthographical mistakes.

In contrast to the obvious attempt at making this book accessible to a larger audience, including probably undergraduate and graduate students,⁴ is the somewhat old-fashioned “bildungsbürgerliche” attitude of citing long Latin passages without translation in chap. I.1. While translations of Apuleius and Columella are relatively easily available, even online, this hardly holds true for the late antique *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*.⁵

By far the weakest point of the book, which seriously impedes comprehensibility and (aesthetic) pleasure for the reader, are the illustrations. Almost all of the plans are far too small and strangely blurred (worst on p. 34, fig. 1; and p. 189, fig. 1). Some plans lack essential features such as a measure and a north arrow (e.g. all throughout chap. II.1; p. 138, fig. 3). Few plans have appropriate legends (e.g. lacking in all plans of chap. II.1 that obviously use different gray shades to mark separate units; as well as in chap. III.2, figs. 2-3, which also use

⁴ The nature of the intended audience is never specified.

⁵ Cf. now E. Dickey, *The Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana. Volume 1: Colloquia Monacensia-Einsidlensia, Leidense-Stephani, and Stephani. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 49*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

different gray shades to mark different building types). Most plans are highly schematic, which is not only disappointing from an aesthetic point of view, but entails lack of crucial features for understanding the authors' arguments, such as the relationship of walls, thresholds, channels, wells, cisterns, pavements etc. In color plate 1, the diagrams of the legends use different colors than the corresponding plans. The print quality of the photos is mediocre to the point of illegibility (e.g. p. 180, figs. 6-7), and most of them could have been left out, particularly at the benefit of more and larger plans. Finally, in a book focused on spatial analysis of domestic space and written by a generation that grew up with computers and other digital media, one would have expected more awareness of and versatility in exploiting the power and possibilities of visualization. Instead, no plans show features such as view axes, view sheds, circulation patterns, boundaries, or construction phases. With the exception of two axonometric drawings and two sections, all taken from old publications (pp. 153-156, figs. 4, 5, 7; p. 182, fig. 9, wrongly labeled as plan), the vertical dimension is illustrated only in some photos. The two single GIS based illustrations are barely legible (p. 119, fig. 4: small, and without legend) and not easy to read (color pl. 2). In conclusion, one wonders whether the authors would not have been better served by publishing their contributions in another format, which would have allowed for significantly more and larger illustrations, using other media (e.g. 3D-models) and color to substantiate their arguments.

When briefly discussing individual papers, these general problems are not mentioned again, unless they are central to understanding a specific paper. Since the abstracts conveniently summarize the aim and arguments of papers, the focus here is on some comments.

Laura Nissinen (chap. I.1, pp. 15-29) provides an interesting cross-cultural comparison of contexts for sleep in order to assess "how privacy is perceived in the domestic sphere of ancient private dwellings and especially in sleeping areas" (p. 15).⁶ Based on an analysis of literary sources, she argues that the sleep pattern of the Roman elite (solitary or with carefully chosen bed-companions, in a secluded, quiet, undisturbed and permanent setting) is strikingly similar to that of the modern Western world. The only crucial difference would be accessibility to these ideal conditions, which in antiquity were most likely granted only to a privileged minority. How this result can be correlated with the archaeological evidence is not discussed in this paper, except for some general statements, which are hard to follow. One would have appreciated some examples in order to understand, which and how many rooms per

⁶ These are preliminary results from her dissertation project on sleeping areas and arrangements in Roman houses, which already yielded another paper published in 2009.

house would have qualified as secluded bedrooms, and what this may suggest about the size and composition of households – esp. if all members of elite families potentially slept alone. Also, it is unclear whether the author really considers the evidence from Herculaneum to be representative and what precisely it is representative of, especially in general statements such as: “Activities associated with the use of a bed [...] evidently took place on upper floors. The wooden beds which have been found in Herculaneum support the idea of fixed bedrooms, since they are all fairly large and were not very easy to be moved around the house” (p. 26).

Anna Anguissola (chap. I.2, pp. 31-47) provides a close reading of the circulation patterns, changing visibility, and manipulation of space “to create a polysemantic structure, where ‘public’ and ‘private’ (or in other terms, ‘social’ and ‘intimate’) intersected at several levels” (p. 46) in two lavish Pompeian houses, by focusing on their peristyle sections during their last stage of use.⁷ That visitors of the Casa del Labirinto (VI 11,8-10) would have experienced different views of the house when standing in the atrium as opposed to when slowly strolling through the garden-peristyle area is, on first sight, hardly groundbreaking. Anguissola’s intricate interpretation of subtle clues, however, cannot fully be appreciated: the tiny plan of the house (p. 34, fig. 1) does not show that the perspective from the atrium through the tablinum and peristyle “ended at a short wall hiding the west row of the columns” (p. 34) in the Corinthian *oecus*, and more appropriate visualization to demonstrate the visitor’s progression through the various spaces (e.g. a 3D model) is missing. The general interpretation – that the suite of reception rooms at the back of the peristyle is carefully designed, that its decoration is not gender-specific but rather mirrored the social status and prestige of the house owners, that visitors experience the spatial dimensions of these rooms only when entering and striding through them, etc. – is very convincing, but again not really innovative.⁸ Anguissola’s reconstruction of the traffic flow in the Casa degli Amorini Dorati (VI 16,7.38) depends upon an efficient closing and control of the north porticus of the peristyle section, but the crucial “traces of a fastener toward the east on the first column” (p. 43, n. 31) that may give evidence of a fence are not shown on the plan (p. 40, fig. 4) and are not visible on the photo p. 44, fig. 6; a corresponding cutting on the back wall of the east porticus (northern door

⁷ This research, as well as the idea for an entire workshop on privacy in Roman houses, emerged from the author’s dissertation, published in 2010: A. Anguissola, *Intimità a Pompei. Riservatezza, condivisione e prestigio negli ambienti ad alcova di Pompei. Image and context* 8. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010.

⁸ For similar previous approaches, cf. J.-A. Dickmann, *Domus frequentata. Anspruchsvolles Wohnen im pompejanischen Stadthaus. Studien zur antiken Stadt* 4. Munich: Verlag Axel Pfeil, 1999, esp. 161-170, 229-240.

post of room G) is strangely missing, challenging the reconstruction of a fence that would have been installed in the east porticus at the height of the north-east corner column. Instead, the opening and closing of doors that led from atrium B to the north porticus or to the large exedra G would have been instrumental in channeling traffic towards either the north or the east porticus. While Nissinen in her study emphasizes the importance of permanent settings and locations for sleeping, Anguissola assumes that bedrooms were changed relatively often in wealthy houses (p. 38, n. 19), referring to an earlier paper by Nissinen, but not to the one in this volume.

Complementing earlier papers on a related topic,⁹ Miko Flohr (chap. II.1, pp. 51-72) focuses on a quantitative assessment of spatial priorities in atrium houses that included or were connected with workshops. Focusing on workshop types, which are significantly frequent in the city (20 bakeries; 16 *lanifricaria*; 12 *fullonicae*; 5-6 dyeing workshops), he analyzes whether and how separation between working and domestic living space was systematically achieved. He argues that separation was desired not for social reasons, namely the potentially negative reputation or even stigma of the workshops, but for practical reasons: workshops whose operation entailed inconveniences from heat, smell and smoke, and also involved living or dead animals were generally kept at distance from living space. This tendency applies to bakeries, dyeing workshops, and *lanifricariae*, which are intriguingly interpreted as facilities for the processing of meat or bones, whereas *fullonicae* were fully integrated because their operation did not cause any sensory or sanitary hazards. Unfortunately, illustration is not at level with the overall convincing argumentation (see above) and does not show any details, including for example the decoration that, according to Flohr, would not always have suffered and haven been lacking in houses with workshops; instead, many house owners would have invested in an improvement of the decoration precisely at the moment when the workshop was installed.

Antonio Calabrò (chap. II.2, pp. 73-91) discusses a similar topic as Flohr, notably the relationship between *cauponae* (with counters) and surrounding buildings and between commercial and residential concerns.¹⁰ Calabrò's wording repeatedly suggests that commercial activity was an undue intrusion that seriously interfered with the intimacy of the inhabitants and had to be kept away from domestic space as much as possible. In contrast to Flohr, he does not

⁹ Since 2003, Flohr has published at least 13-14 papers on the topic of *fullones* and *fullonicae* and recently also a monograph (M. Flohr, *The World of the fullo. Work, Economy, and Society in Roman Italy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013) that is based on his dissertation completed in 2010. Here, he clearly states, for the benefit of the reader, how this paper differs from his previous two publications on a similar topic.

¹⁰ This contribution emerged from dissertation research devoted to Pompeian *cauponae*.

specify whether this distancing had practical reasons (e.g. noise, smoke, and smell) and/or socio-cultural reasons. The detailed analysis of numerous case-studies is not always easy to follow because the author does not provide plans for all of his examples and legibility of the nine printed plans is restricted for the above-mentioned reasons. Calabrò examines a broad variety of options, which clearly reveal certain patterns: whenever possible, particularly in larger houses, commercial and domestic activities were separated, in accessibility and spatial layout; in smaller houses, practical solutions were adopted for economic reasons, such as the use of the atrium for cooking food that was sold in a front room. The remarkable lack of *cauponae* in the largest houses, according to Calabrò, does not reflect some “form of economic morality,” which would have prevented the upper class from investing in bars (p. 91). Instead, implementation of *cauponae* would not have required major investments and these installations could well be combined with residential space, even in medium- and smaller sized complexes. While this may well explain the presence of *cauponae* in such modest complexes, it still does not sufficiently account for their absence in the largest houses: maybe these bars were simply not profitable enough (depending also upon the urban context and location of the largest houses) for wealthy house owners, and perhaps they preferred other money-making businesses?

M. Taylor Lauritsen (chap. III.1, pp. 95-115) summarizes the results of his PhD dissertation, defended in 2013, and of the *Doors of Pompeii and Herculaneum Project*, which examined 31 houses and the design of their doorways (in total 571). He is concerned with the role of houses as “practical living spaces” (p. 96), commonly neglected in scholarship, and with boundaries that are crucial to precisely this aspect. After a discussion of the different boundary types (doors, among which the most prominent were those with two leafs, partitions, and curtains), he investigates how these boundaries structured domestic space. The study intriguingly shows that closable doors were concentrated around atria, the “most public spaces,” which required particular control. Similarly, in most houses with a view axis between atrium and peristyle the boundary between these two areas could be fully or at least partially controlled, suggesting that view could be granted as a privilege and was not a self-evident option. Privacy here, while not expressively stated by Lauritsen, is obviously spatially equated with a room that could be closed by some boundary, thus potentially providing visual and physical protection. As such, privacy becomes quantifiable on a straightforward basis,¹¹ but this naturally says little about the use, function, and perception of these rooms or about the nature of privacy as experienced and exploited in them. While the paper is overall well-argued, one would have appreciated some case-studies, illustrated with detailed plans that

¹¹ Quantification is mentioned in the title of the section, not in that of Lauritsen’s paper.

show the distribution of all different boundary types in one house (including particularly the design and location of thresholds). The single plan, p. 110, fig. 6, of the Casa del Menandro (I 10,4) includes no details at all, and the many photos of (mostly well-known) doors are of little analytical value. Also, the comprehensive and succinct summary of this project raises one central question:¹² what other questions were investigated by this project? Are the insights presented in this paper the main results or just some results? How and when will the study, including all of the evidence, be published?

Chiara Maratini's (chap. III.2, pp. 115-128) paper, presenting preliminary results of her PhD dissertation, is the only contribution in this volume that focuses on the use of GIS technology for an assessment of several insulae in Pompeii. Unfortunately, comprehensibility is significantly impeded by deficient and convoluted language, but also by a lack of clearly structured questions, arguments, and results. A major aim of the underlying larger project obviously is to reconstruct the history and development of these insulae from the 4th/3rd century BC to 79 AD, attempting to assess significant changes in layout, function, and use (particularly residential versus commercial; different types/levels of houses). No phase plans are included in this paper, however, which would demonstrate how GIS technology enhanced this enterprise. Also, it remains unclear how the architectural types marked in color plate 1 are identified (by size, certain architectural elements, plans, decoration etc.). The observation that peristyle courtyards are commonly much farther away located from streets and are more secluded and articulated in depth than *tabernae* at the front of houses is banal and hardly innovative, and it is unclear what is gained heuristically by expressing this phenomenon in numbers (Index of Relative Asymmetry, pp. 120-122; figs. 5a-b show only two different levels of Relative Asymmetry). Most intriguing is the assessment of the sensory impact of workshops on neighborhoods, identifying the range of sight, hearing, and smell of various types of bakeries (color plate 2). This could well have been correlated with Flohr's and Calabrò's papers, but none of these three authors refers to the papers of the other two, and Maratini unfortunately does not really exploit the potential meaning offered by her color plate 2.

Dora D'Auria (chap. IV.1, pp. 131-142) presents the preliminary results of the excavation of the Casa del Granduca Michele (VI 5,5) that has been carried out by the important Project Regio VI since 2003.¹³ She focuses on the second

¹² This question is also not answered by the website of the project: <http://doorsofpompeiiandherculaneum.blogspot.de/>.

¹³ The excavation of the Casa del Granduca del Michele has been published exemplarily in several preliminary reports, with D'Auria as one of the authors or single author. The concluding 2011 campaign yielded results that are not yet taken into account here, but were published in:

phase of the so-called Protocasa, which was originally built at the end of the 3rd century BC and significantly remodeled in the mid-2nd century BC, and analyzes the different degrees of intimacy and accessibility as well as the perception of visitors. This major first remodeling entailed the installation of a small atrium-peristyle house: an atrium with two rooms and vestibule in the front/west, three small rooms in the south, and four rooms in the back/east, as well as a four-sided peristyle with four columns, surrounded by rooms in the west, north, and maybe also east; water supply was obviously expanded in this phase to endow the house with a total of two cisterns and one well. Unfortunately, no plan of the entire house is provided, only an extract of its central part (peristyle courtyard with rooms in west and north; p. 138, fig. 3).¹⁴ While the largest room of the house, *oecus* 9a, opened to the peristyle courtyard, the house owner concentrated his ambitions and efforts in decoration of the atrium section, which emulates that of elite houses; this is most obvious from the finds of colored terracotta slabs that depict oriental captives, alluding to heroic victories and military virtue.

Most intriguing and important is the series of rooms to the north of the peristyle (9d-9g or rather 9i), identified as a bath suite with at least 3-4, if not 5 or more rooms. The establishment of such an extended bath suite in a comparatively small house (ground floor area of about 370 sq. meters) is highly astonishing; even if contemporary bathing culture in the local context cannot be fully assessed because of insufficient evidence, some comparative remarks are possible. For example, the Casa del Fauno (VI 12) was built in the second quarter of the second century BC and remodeled shortly after this to include a tiny bathroom (a; 1.50 x 2.50 m), located far away from the peristyle courtyard in the service section and providing space for a single bathtub.¹⁵ Much more extended and lavishly endowed suites with sophisticated bathing programs can

D. D'Auria, La casa del Granduca Michele a Pompei. Campagna di scavo del 2011, *RStPomp* 22 (2011)[2013] 95-101;

http://www.fastionline.org/micro_view.php?fst_cd=AIAC_141&curcol=sea_cd-AIAC_4055;

¹⁴ For a reconstructed plan of the Protocasa in its second major phase, see F. Pesando/D. D'Auria/M. Giglio, Le ricerche dell'Oriente di Napoli nella Casa del Granduca Michele (VI, 5,5) e nel settore settentrionale dell'Insula IX, 7. [Attività di ricerca nell'area vesuviana], *RStPomp* 21 (2010)[2011] 106, fig. 4. Currently, there is no (reconstructed/state) plan available that shows and integrates all remains of the second phase because D. D'Auria, La casa del Granduca Michele a Pompei. Campagna di scavo del 2011, *RStPomp* 22 (2011)[2013] 98, fig. 4 again shows only the peristyle section, including now the most recently excavated room 9i.

¹⁵ A. Faber/A. Hoffmann, *Die Casa del Fauno in Pompeji (VI 12) 1. Bauhistorische Analyse. Die stratigraphischen Befunde und Funde der Ausgrabungen in den Jahren 1961 bis 1963. Archäologische Forschungen* 25. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2009, 44, 49, 106-107 Beil. 9.

be found in various Late Hellenistic houses of Sicily, but similar evidence so far has been lacking in Pompeii.¹⁶

Despite its obvious importance, interpretation of the bath suite of the Protocasa del Granduca di Michele still raises a number of questions and problems. Room 9e is recognized as a well-decorated *cubiculum*, accessible probably only from the peristyle courtyard. The accessibility of 9d, identified as a *sudatio* because of a bench and hydraulic plaster, is not discussed, but the plan p. 183, fig. 3 suggests the existence of a door in the west, with access to the atrium. Rooms 9f and 9g were connected by a narrow door, but their accessibility (from the courtyard, room 9e, or a room to the east) is unclear; 9g possibly provided facilities for rinsing the feet, whereas 9f included a bathtub and a *louterion*, thus resembling the traditional *caldarium* of Roman baths.¹⁷ Unfortunately, the circulation pattern, crucial to the reconstruction and (“public” vs. “private”) function of this bath suite, is not discussed. In comparison with other bath suites, one would expect a row-type arrangement, with bathers progressing from room 9d to 9g (or 9i), or a distributive pattern, with 9e giving access to 9d on one side, and 9f to 9g (or 9i) on the other side. The features of room 9d would also be appropriate for an apodyterium, especially if the room had two doors in the west and east, thus qualifying it as a passage room. With accessibility from 9e, room 9f also would have served as a passage room, thus lacking the seclusion and prestige that is typical for *caldaria* of later domestic bath suites in Pompeii.¹⁸ The position of the bathtub in 9f, presumably set up along the west wall, is remarkable because in this position it could neither have been heated (from the west, south, or east) nor could it easily and directly have been supplied with water. While the above-mentioned Sicilian baths boasted much more sophisticated solutions (immersion bathtubs heated with hypocausts and supplied with pipes from water boilers set up in adjacent rooms), contemporary domestic bathing culture in Pompeii may still have been in a much more experimental and rudimentary stage. As a result, the question has to remain open to what extent the owner of the Protocasa del Granduca di Michele would have used and proudly presented his bath suite

¹⁶ M. Trümper, *Bathing Culture in Hellenistic Domestic Architecture*, in: S. Ladstätter/V. Scheibelreiter (eds.), *Städtisches Wohnen im östlichen Mittelmeer. 4. Jh. v. Chr.-1. Jh. n. Chr.*, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2010, 529-572; M. Trümper *forthcoming*, *Sanitary Installations in Hellenistic Houses of Sicily: A Reassessment*, in: A. Haug/D. Steuernagel (eds.), *Hellenistische Häuser und ihre Funktionen*.

¹⁷ In 2011, the fragment of another room with opus signinum floor (9i) was found about 1.10 m to the east of room 9g; its accessibility and function, however, cannot be safely reconstructed; see D. D'Auria, *La casa del Granduca Michele a Pompei. Campagna di scavo del 2011*, *RStPomp* 22 (2011)[2013] 98-100, fig. 4.

¹⁸ *Caldaria* were usually the most lavishly decorated rooms and “destinations,” located at the end of a route, and not small, modestly decorated passage rooms.

when receiving guests, as suggested by D'Auria (pp. 141-142). Despite potential flaws in circulation and the modesty of caldarium 9f, this bath suite may still have constituted a striking novelty and major prestige symbol in the local context. This status was short-lived, however, for during yet another remodeling around 100 BC the bath suite was completely buried under 0.70 m of fill for the construction of an even larger peristyle courtyard with rooms at its eastern end that no longer included sophisticated bathing facilities.

Riccardo Helg's (chap. IV.2, pp. 143-161) well-written and argued paper examines the response in building activities to an increasing population and new demands for commercial premises during the last decades of the Vesuvian cities.¹⁹ This need was basically met by a vertical extension of properties, a phenomenon that is well known from contemporary Rome and Ostia, but so far little exploited for the Vesuvian cities. Based on a few carefully chosen case-studies, Helg shows that vertical development had no major impact on the traditional layout and function of ground floors in Pompeian houses, whereas this practice entailed more radical changes in Herculaneum, sometimes causing a complete functional transformation of the ground floor. He does not, however, discuss the possible causes for these crucial differences. The new dimension of intimacy, alluded to in the title of the article, is reflected, for example, in the visual connection of atrium and upper floor apartments through windows; if the latter were not used by members of the household, the inhabitants would have been exposed to observation by their tenants when performing activities in the atrium. This phenomenon is well known from Late Hellenistic houses in Delos, where inhabitants of ground floors had to put up with further "invasions of their privacy/intimacy" from upper floor tenants, for services such as water supply, wastewater disposal, or communal use of sanitary facilities. These aspects remain to be studied in much more detail for the evidence examined by Helg.²⁰

While the last two papers (Section V) extend the chronological and geographical perspective of this book, the chance for a comparative examination of "privacy" and "intimacy" in different socio-cultural settings is not really explored.

Margherita Carucci's (chap. V.1, pp. 165-185) analysis of the intimacy in the *cubiculum* in the houses of Roman Africa and Iberia is clearly based on her dis-

¹⁹ This contribution is based on his Italian dissertation, completed in 2009; in addition, he has published at least four more articles in Italian and French on related topics.

²⁰ Meanwhile, for the most comprehensive analysis of rental space in Vesuvian cities, on ground and upper floors, see F. Pirson, *Mietwohnungen in Pompeji und Herculaneum. Untersuchungen zur Architektur, zum Wohnen und zur Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Vesuvstädte. Studien zur antiken Stadt* 5. Munich: Verlag Axel Pfeil, 1999.

sertation, published in 2007,²¹ and there are significant overlaps between this article and the earlier book. Iberia is represented only by a single example, discussed in a single paragraph, which does not add anything to the argument and could easily have been left out. More crucially, there is no further visible engagement with literature that has appeared since 2007, most notably Anguissola's book on the very topic of *cubicula*.²² Carucci clearly defines intimacy and then examines three main aspects of intimacy correlated with three main functions of *cubicula*, notably withdrawal, sex, and reception. Since recent research has been increasingly focused on issues such as local identity and intercultural exchange in multi-cultural settings like the provinces of the Roman Empire, it is somewhat astonishing to read, without further comments, that social practices, values, and norms of the elite in Roman Africa and Iberia were uniform with those of their peers in Rome; nonetheless, Carucci, without commenting at least upon the significant chronological gaps, exploits early Imperial Roman authors like Pliny and Seneca for an assessment of the archaeological evidence in Roman Africa of the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD.²³ Why certain houses were chosen to represent the use of their *cubicula* for withdrawal, sex, or reception, is not explained; thus, how representative these examples are remains as unclear as the question of whether or not one of the houses would have sufficed to demonstrate the use of *cubicula* for all three functions. Furthermore, only decorated *cubicula* with the characteristic clearly identifiable alcove are taken into account; but a house such as the Maison à la Mosaïque de Vénus in Volubilis includes numerous other small rooms that would have been appropriate for withdrawal, sex, and reception; thus, one would have appreciated a much more detailed discussion of the entire plan and the possible use of rooms for "intimate" social activities. In the end, Carucci argues that the Romans were like us in their concept and evaluation of intimacy, but differed from us in their use of intimate space.

Helmut Schwaiger's paper (chap. V.2, pp. 187-202), the only one to deal with a site in the eastern Mediterranean, attempts too much, comparing houses in Ephesus of the Imperial period (terrace houses) with those of late antiquity (in various locations, most notably in the harbor area). Such a comprehensive approach must necessarily remain on a very general level; instead, the terrace houses that are well-known and published should have been left out in favor

²¹ M. Carucci, *The Romano-African Domus. Studies in Space, Decoration, and Function. British Archaeological Reports. International Series 1731*. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2007.

²² Anguissola 2010 (see above n. 7), referred to her in one single note p. 168, n. 6, but without any real discussion or consequences for the argument. Reference to Dickmann's previous important assessment of *cubicula*, Dickmann 1999 (see above n. 8), is also missing here.

²³ It does not help that the chronology of the houses referred to in this article is hardly ever discussed; for this, one has to consult Carucci's book, see above n. 21.

of a much more detailed discussion of the later houses, which are far less well known, and also are the focus of Schwaiger's dissertation research.²⁴ More detailed plans (pp. 191-192, figs. 2-3 are barely readable) and a close reading of one or two houses would have better demonstrated the distribution of spaces and decoration in late antique houses. Obviously, in Ephesus house owners never invested in *privata luxuria*, in lavish decoration of remotely located rooms, because in all periods these ranked far behind the more accessible spaces. A notable exception seem to have been well-appointed rooms in the upper story that, according to Schwaiger, may have been secluded rooms, "which were of exclusively private nature" (p. 199).

In sum: provocative topic – great idea – most likely a lively workshop, but should it have resulted in a traditional book? Would some other, more modern format with much more flexibility and freedom for experiments not have been much more appropriate for the aim and purpose of this workshop? A truly innovative format with a clearly focused argument and approach would have been a real discourse or discussion board. For example, all participants could have been obliged to examine a set of clearly defined questions, such as: how do I define privacy and intimacy in my research; how do I examine these parameters in the evidence, and what does the evidence of my (dissertation) research contribute to an investigation of these parameters in the ancient world; in which aspects do I agree or disagree with the other participants; where does my research confirm or contradict that of the others, which could have been demonstrated in one or two conclusive and comprehensive case-studies, including detailed discussion of the relevant evidence and appropriate complete illustration. These individual studies could then have cumulated in a joint conclusion, unfortunately missing here and not adequately supplied by the brief preface: a critical, intellectually much more aggressive debate of whether privacy and intimacy are useful heuristic categories for an analysis of domestic space in the ancient world.

Prof. Dr. Monika Trümper
Institut für Klassische Archäologie
Freie Universität Berlin
Otto-von-Simson-Straße 11
D-14195 Berlin
E-Mail: monika.truemper@fu-berlin.de

²⁴ According to <http://www.oelai.at/index.php/381.html>, the topic of his PhD dissertation is "Spätantiker und frühbyzantinischer Wohnbau im westlichen Kleinasien".