

Dr. Anna Anguissola

Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa

Social and intimate: the case of the 'urban villas' on the south-western slopes of Pompeii

The paper deals with the broad issue of privacy from an archaeological perspective, through a set of examples from Pompeii: the multi-storeyed houses along the western and southern slopes of the site (Insulae VI.17, VII.16, and VIII.2). There, luxurious terraced residences exploited the solid structures of the old city walls to expand their spaces for leisure and household tasks. Their excellent position provided a priceless commodity: a broad view on the seashore and the countryside. In these buildings, the type of the atrium house was adapted to the underground development without apparently undermining representativeness and functionality. Some of these dwellings had their own passageways outside the city walls, which enabled their inhabitants to leave the town without passing through the gates. Often staircases connected directly the lower floors to the public street, a solution which seems to have been chosen both to facilitate maintenance and to create independent reception quarters. The possibility to isolate various levels allowed for a highly efficient distribution of people and activities. To make the most of this potential, however, layout had to be planned accurately, complying with some major concerns: to guarantee easy access to each floor and to communicate light and air to otherwise dim basements, lacking large courtyards. From this perspective, the terrace houses on the southwestern slopes of Pompeii are an excellent case in point to investigate the social construction of space in the domestic architecture of the Romans, as well as to challenge long-held assumptions over the dichotomy between public and private (or between outsiders and insiders). Besides, their architectural peculiarities provide several arguments to escape the simplistic notion of a 'prototypical Roman house', and expose the ductile nature of its elements and its points of reference.

Dr. Deborah Chatr Aryamontri

Adjunct Professor, Department of Classics and General Humanities
Research Associate, Center for Heritage and Archaeological Studies
Montclair State University

Public display of private life: the emperor's house

Among Roman houses, the ones of the emperors stand out for having specifically been designed to serve both as public and private spaces, and therefore for exemplifying at its best the harmonization of the Roman ideals of *otium* and *negotium*.

Nonetheless, our perception of the two-fold nature of the imperial living conditions has been strongly influenced by biased interpretations of archaeological evidence and literary materials. The result is a conventional and rigid image of the imperial *domus* with its 'residential' areas and 'civil' spaces, in which the latter included amenities such as amphitheaters and circuses that were meant not only for the emperor's entertainment, but also, and foremost, for political display of his personal life. Nonetheless, such a deep standardization and dichotomy in the designation of the various spaces is less accurate than we might picture. In truth, the architectonic concept of such a structured, monumental large estate to be the idyllic place of living for the emperor is the result of a development which occurred over time, and not in a straightforward manner.

This paper aims to broaden our knowledge on the concept of imperial monumental residences as places for both personal recovery and playground for active public life, how it developed, and how different rooms might have presented diverse functions in a more osmotic and interactive way. It will analyze in particular the different imperial residences in the surrounding of Rome, from Anzio to Sperlonga to Arcinazzo and Tivoli, evaluating personal taste and objectives of each emperor at issue, from Augustus to Commodus, also in comparison with the architecture of the *palatium* in Rome.

Through a critical reevaluation of the archaeological evidence and a reassessment of literary sources, the paper will define a more accurate reconstruction of the life of the emperors in their private and social sphere.

Lea K. Cline

Assistant Professor of Art History, Illinois State University

Dr. Sandra R. Joshel

Professor, Department of History, University of Washington

Public/private, slave/owner: Locating the Slave at Oplontis

As a place in which the seeming dichotomies of leisure and production, of personal retreat and social display, and of private and public arenas are evidenced in both the literary sources and archaeological remains, the Roman villa provides an ideal context for examination of the relationship between an owner and his slaves. While most scholars of the Roman house have privileged the perspective and experience of the elite owners, we propose to invert this perspective by examining one particular villa, Villa A at Oplontis, in terms of its slave occupants.

We will begin our discussion by examining the work of slaves, both domestic and agricultural, in the environment of a suburban villa. This discussion, based on literary and legal evidence, is combined with a close examination of the villa's remains in order to explore how slaves contributed to the material production of the *negotium* and *otium* enjoyed by this villa's owners and their guests. Inside the villa, we identify slave locations in two categories: places where slaves must have been present in order to fulfill their duties (i.e. the *triclinium*) and places that appear to have been designed for the proper performance of slave tasks (i.e. kitchens).

One of the most distinctive features of the villa at Oplontis is its zebra-striped fresco paintings that cover the wall of the service peristyle; these stripes have long been argued to reflect the presence of the villa's slave occupants. But these striped walls represent only one small part of a complex system of decoration and organization of space that accommodates, and in some cases instructs, a slave's movements. By seeking these elements of the villa's construction and decoration, we come closer to understanding the dynamic relationship that existed between owner and slave in the contexts of a working villa, and challenge the idea that spaces in a Roman villa had one function and one audience.

Dr. Elisabetta Cova

Assistant Professor of Classics, Department of Foreign Languages and Literature
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Closets, Cupboards, Pantries, and Shelves: Storage in the Roman House

Within the Roman *atrium* house, little is known about the symmetrical spaces lateral to the *atrium* traditionally called *alae*. While recent studies have challenged the rigid nineteenth century Vitruvian-based definitions and highlighted the flexibility and multifunctional nature of Roman domestic space, the *alae* have been largely overlooked or dismissed simply as spatial and functional extensions of the *atrium*. Moreover, their use as spaces for storage and display has been noted, but never properly investigated. In particular, the remains of low masonry structures and/or holes in the walls of the *alae* have been interpreted as evidence for *armaria*, or built-in cupboards. Little has been written about the exact nature and form of these storage installations, the many variations, how they functioned, or what they contained. Based on an architectural survey of roughly fifty houses in Pompeii's *Regio VI*, completed in 2011, this paper presents the archaeological evidence for *armaria* and other storage strategies found in *alae* and thus seeks to contribute positively to the larger discussion of the use of space in Roman houses of the late Republic/early Empire. Far from being of a single type, the evidence suggests forms of storage that range from simple (open?) shelves to freestanding cupboards and/or walk-in closets. The multifunctional nature of the *alae* will be stressed, as well as their potential for blurring the distinction between private and public spaces within the house. Like the *atrium*, the *alae*'s role as reception areas for guests and clients and for the display of family wealth seems entwined with their more practical and private use as storage spaces for the household.

Dr. Raffaella Cribiore

Professor of Classics, NYU

Multifunctionality of spaces in a Roman House in Egypt

Around the Mediterranean, houses responded to different environments so that classical partitions were adapted and spaces did not have only a single use. A Roman villa in Amheida (in the Dakhla Oasis in Upper Egypt, the ancient city of Trimithis), whose excavation is under the auspices of New York University, shows that the relationship between private and public was quite dynamic. This villa, which was occupied approximately from 340 to 365 AD, belonged to a wealthy property owner, Serenos, who was a member of the local City Council. The polyvalence of his roles (as head of a family, father, businessman and political person) informed the polyvalence of the roles of the house. In the villa a large room painted with various mythological scenes functioned as dining room and reception space. Those who were having dinner could contemplate classical scenes from the *Odyssey* and a banquet scene with a flute player. Two smaller rooms, also heavily painted, have been identified as bedrooms and yet many chicken bones were discovered embedded in the floor and point to multi-use. In addition, in the north side, in the second quarter of the fourth century, the house shared walls with a school building, which numbered at least 3 rooms. A door joined the two constructions. On the walls of the schoolrooms, literary texts referring to education (a rhetorical text, Homer, and Plutarch) were written in red. It is quite likely that the school was not open only to Serenos' children but to about ten students. In a second phase, Serenos appropriated the school and though he used those rooms for storage he maintained the writing on the walls. The villa and the school were abandoned soon after 365 AD for reasons that are still unclear.

Raffaella Cribiore, Paola Davoli, and David M. Ratzan, "A Teacher's Dipinto from Trimithis (Dakhla Oasis)" *JRA* 21 (2008) 170-91.

Harriet Fertik

Ph.D. candidate, Classical Studies

University of Michigan

Privacy and Power in Neronian Rome

Recent studies have considered the complex relationship between the private life of the emperor and public affairs.¹ While ancient sources criticize emperors, especially Nero, for allowing private concerns to influence public business, these critiques do not reflect only on particular rulers: instead, they demonstrate that the emperor's privacy, or his ability to avoid scrutiny and act without public consequence, was considered problematic because of his unique role. I focus on Seneca's *De Clementia* and the Domus Aurea to show how lack of privacy became central to the understanding of absolute power in the early imperial period.

The *De Clementia* and the Domus Aurea both draw attention to the emperor's visibility. For Seneca, an essential difference between ruler and subject is that the ruler cannot escape public view (*Clem.* 1.8.1-5, 1.15.4); even as the ruler acts in the gods' stead (*Clem.* 1.1.2), his position subjects him to the gaze of the people he rules. The publicity endured by the powerful is also a theme of earlier discourse (e.g., Quintus Cicero 44, Velleius Paterculus 2.14), but the singularity of the emperor's power amplifies public attention and the impact of his actions on the community. While an imperial residence might offer refuge from public life (e.g., Tiberius's retreat to Capri), it could also facilitate the emperor's exposure. It has been argued that elements of the Domus Aurea complex (especially the Stagnum Neronis and its porticoes) were designed to resemble a coastal villa and were intended for public use.² As a setting for the emperor and his subjects to enjoy aristocratic luxury and retreat, the Domus Aurea offered access to a part of the emperor's life that was traditionally removed from the public sphere. In Seneca's philosophy and in Nero's palace, the emperor not only lived in the public eye, but could have no truly private life.

¹ Kristina Milnor, *Gender, Domesticity, and the Age of Augustus: Inventing Private Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Aloys Winterling, *Politics and Society in Imperial Rome* (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009).

² E. Champlin, *Nero* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003); A. Carandini, *Le case del potere nell'antica Roma* (Rome, 2010).

Dr. Rachael Goldman

Adjunct Professor

Graduate Center, City University of New York

Looking back in color: The Roman system of interiors and polychromacity

The interior of the Roman house in the 1st century B.C. through the 2nd century A.D. was brightly colored in all of its elements from its wall paintings, mosaics on the floor and decorative arts, presenting a complex set of issues and their interior decorative program. How the Romans indicated public and private space as well as distinguishing masculine from feminine space is indicated through certain designs and a rigid color scheme. Previous scholarship (Wallace-Hadrill, 1996; Swift, 2009) has addressed the need to understand iconography and its placement in Roman interiors, but has not addressed the specific use of color and its unique placement. The colors and decorations used upon entering into the house and on the first level followed a complex system of decorations with wall-painting and mosaics. These decorative plans would have been readily understood by the patrons as well as the guests of the time against the historical context. In this discussion I argue that there was a whole systematic development regarding decoration especially from foreign influences that were readily adopted into the *domus* program. Compared with the limited evidence from literature, these interiors present a lively view and rich source of information about the upwardly mobile class and freedmen. I suggest that this theory would work as seen from the attire and association of gender with color, such that rooms with yellow were brighter and created a mood of optimism, further associating it with the feminine sphere. Further owners could assert their dominance over their houses through their interior decoration.

Dr. Anne Hrychuk Kontokosta

Visiting Assistant Professor, Pratt Institute

Research Associate, Institute for the Study of the Ancient World, NYU

Making the private public: from elite horti to imperial thermae

In the Middle Republic, the construction of over sixty *horti* (elaborate garden estates) by the city's elite signaled a new trend in urban domestic living with long-lasting impacts on the art, architecture, and city-plan of Rome. An alternative to the traditional *domus*, opulent *horti*, which may have been inspired by Hellenistic royal palaces, were constructed on the outskirts of the city - distant and private enough to be unconstrained by traditional social codes, while close enough for their owners to stay involved in public life and advertise their immense personal wealth. The ambiguous nature of *horti* (suburban/urban; public/private; Roman/Hellenistic) was reflected by its nomenclature ("vegetable garden"), which offered positive, traditional connotations for a provocative, new architectural type.

Not until the end of the Republic can literary sources and archaeological evidence fully attest to the function of *horti* as private enclaves for Rome's most influential public residents (Caesar, Pompey, Lucullus, Maecenas, Sallust). This paper proposes that while private *horti* continued to act as retreats for the city's elite, in the imperial period they also became architectural, decorative, and - in some ways - even functional models for the city's new public *thermae*. Imperial *thermae* offered Romans new types of urban experiences (luxurious gardens, foreign art, libraries, etc.) previously associated with the socially-restricted spaces of Roman *horti*. To the ancient viewer, the connection would have been visually explicit when M. Agrippa built the first imperial bath (25BCE) directly adjacent his own private *hortus*. By the construction of the revolutionary Baths of Nero in 60 CE (famous for their axial plan and elaborate decoration) many features of *horti* were permanently established in imperial *thermae*. Using a variety of archaeological and textual evidence, this paper traces evidence for the unusual influence of private residences on one of the most public institutions of Imperial Rome.

Adlai Lang

MA 2012; PhD to commence Spring 2013

Department of Archaeology, University of Sheffield

GIS approaches to visibility and circulation in the Roman houses of Pompeii

Discussions of Roman domestic architecture have considered the house in a civic context as a reception space for patrons and clients with decoration and the use of space communicating a sense of grandeur to impress visitors. In a model of household privacy that views a visitor's path of travel through the house as essentially linear, privacy is constructed as gradually increasing or decreasing on a linear axis (Wallace-Hadrill 1994; von Stackelberg 2009; Dickmann 2011). However, this model does not take into account the effects of courtyard layouts for both traffic and surveillance (Cooper 2002) or the way elite architecture manipulates point of view. Computational analysis can identify how native properties of the physical architecture promote or discourage privacy, visibility and social interaction. This paper will consider the archaeological application of GIS and Space Syntax tools to study visibility and circulation in the Roman houses of Pompeii. While the two approaches are related theoretical and practical issues differ. A major methodological issue for these tools is the lack of precision when applied to the microtopography of interiors. The erasure of furnishings and decorations can give a misleading impression of how the space affected visitors (Gillings and Wheatley 2001; Ellis 2002). While such methods have been successfully applied to modern environments, a primary issue for archaeology is the disappearance of this type of evidence and the difficulty of incorporating it into a cadastral computational analysis. However, the main problem of computational analysis in archaeology is its undertheorization – how do metrics influence human behavior, and how is this behavior culturally determined? By discussing how the different types of analysis can be combined with other archaeological evidence, this paper considers both theory and method to suggest ways in which the social effect of house space can be modelled in more particular terms.

Jason Linn

Ph.D. candidate, History

University of California at Santa Barbara

Snuggling with your identity: Beds in Roman culture

What attitudes did Romans have about beds? They had beds for different life circumstances: the birth bed, the marriage bed, the sick bed, the death bed. In this paper, however, I focus on its most frequent and private function—the sleeping bed. Using literary sources from the first century BC to late antiquity, I argue that Romans believed beds indicated who you were—your civilization, your social status, and even your character.

Beds distinguished the civilized from uncivilized. Romans considered peoples who slept without beds to be uncivilized. The Huns slept on horses; the Cynegi in trees; Iberian mountaineers on the floor. Beds separated humans from animals. In fact, Romans disdained anything linked with animals, such as using skins as covers or hay as mattress stuffing. Thus, Romans believed in a correlation: the more unnatural the bed, the greater degree of civilization achieved.

Beds could also be luxury items, reinforcing elite identity by separating them from commoners. A change in bed could connote a demotion or promotion in status, such as Nero's squalid sleeping arrangements after he became a fugitive. Contrary to locally-made commoner beds, elite beds were foreign-made. Tyrian purple sheets, Leuconian mattresses, and many small pillows marked an elite bed.

Beds also revealed an individual's and a society's character. Although beds were often shared, the one place that connoted private space—underneath the pillow—disclosed a person's character. Plutarch envisaged Spartans designing their austere beds to create battle-hardened men. Romans debated how beds affect the body. Some writers chided soldiers for sleeping in soft beds, believing that comfortable sleep effeminizes. Medical writers posited that hard beds caused disease, while moralists asserted that beds did not affect one's constitution. In short, I contend that Roman beds were divisive objects.

Laura Nissinen

Ph.D. student, Classical studies

University of Helsinki

Public aspects of Roman cubacula

Vitruvius' well known and frequently cited passage 6,5 reveals how the spaces in the Roman house were divided into two opposing categories, *communia* (common, public) and *propria* (not common with others).¹ According to Vitruvius, *cubiculum*, which best translates as bedroom, belongs to the latter one alongside with baths and dining rooms. Those areas where one could enter without an invitation were *vestibula*, *atria*, *peristylia*.

However, some researchers, such as Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, have argued that *cubiculum* belonged among the reception areas of a Roman *domus*.² The twofold nature of *cubiculum* makes it a very interesting target for studies on public and private in the Roman house. My paper concentrates on the public aspects of the Roman *cubacula* and by reviewing the written evidence I aim to give a comprehensive picture on the public activities which took place there.

In Latin literature, there are some fairly clear references to reception in *cubacula* (e.g. Cic. *ad Q.fr* 1,7,25; Plin. *nat.* 15,38) and it was a place for private trials and negotiation, especially in imperial context (e.g. Sen. *clem.* 1,9,7; Tac. *ann.* 11,2). However, it seems often that when *cubiculum* was used as a place for reception, it depended on some special circumstances, such as the illness of the master of the house or the absolute need for secrecy (e.g. Val.Max. 2,5,2; Plin.epist.1,22; Suet. *Claud.* 35; Tac. *ann.* 4,69). Some passages suggest also, that *cubiculum* was used as a study for working and conducting literary activities (e.g. Cic.fam.7,1,1; Quint. inst. 10,3,22?29, Plin. epist. 2,17; Suet.Dom. 17,1?2; Hist.Aug.Comm. 9,3).

¹ *Namque ex his quae propria sunt, in ea non est potestas omnibus intro eundi nisi invitatis, quemadmodum sunt cubacula, triclinia, balneae ceteraque, quae easdem habent usus rationes. Communia autem sunt, quibus etiam invocati suo iure de populo possunt venire, id est vestibula, cava aedium, peristylia, quaeque eundem habere possunt usum.*

² Wallace-Hadrill: *The Social Structure of the Roman House*, in PBSR 56, 43-97, 1988.

Daira Nocera

Ph.D. student in AAMW, University of Pennsylvania

The Domus Flavia and the Domus Augustana: an interpretation of public and private spaces in the imperial palace on the Palatine in Rome

Plutarch's "Life of Publicola", attributes the incessant activity that characterized Domitian's rule to a diseased, insane desire to build. One of its most striking products is his imperial residence on the Palatine. Traditional interpretations sharply divide an "official/ public" Domus Flavia (DF) and a "private" Domus Augustana (DA). These are our labels, not ancient ones. In this paper, I will read the articulation of palace space differently, arguing for more permeable *limites* between the palace's two halves, with a new awareness that it is made of landscaped open vistas as much as of solid rooms. This will change our understanding of how the compound was experienced with relation to administration, official ceremonial and the emperor's hospitality. That re-description has important consequences for interpreting Domitian's public face as well as his famous residence.

Conventional interpretations read the layout along two parallel NE-SW axes. While the main buildings of the so-called DF are along one of these, separation from the DA is difficult to discern in the plan and elevation. Yet, it is easy to identify other axes of motion which are perpendicular to the two NE-SW ones, that show a less rigid articulation of the space, indeed connecting the two demarcated halves. In fact, the passage between the two peristyles is characterized by a large opening which visually connects the two open spaces suggesting unity not strict division. The only definitely screened area is in the SE, with restricted access to a lower courtyard level whose intricate net of rooms clearly labels it private. My new reading suggests more subtle divisions between palatial zones graded according to variable degrees of formality, rather than sharply segregated as public/ private.

Dr. Matthew Perry

Assistant Professor, Department of History

John Jay College, CUNY

The Paterfamilias and the Family Council in Roman Public Law

Throughout Roman history, the *paterfamilias*—often in conjunction with a council made up of family members (*consilium propinquorum* or *necessarium*)—possessed both the legal right and the social imperative to regulate the conduct of members of the household, especially in matters relating to morality and vice. Grounded in the idea of the Roman household, and indeed located the physical house itself, Roman authorities treated this mode of coercion and control primarily as a family concern, and, one could argue, as a private matter. Nonetheless, the corrective efforts of the *paterfamilias* (and the larger family council) fulfilled an important regulatory role in Roman society and effectively operated as a complementary judicial system to the public law courts. As such, this “private” body functioned as a critical public institution. The blending of public and private interests became more pronounced by the reign of Augustus, when the state acquired greater authority over the moral conduct of citizens, most notably the offense of adultery. Despite the growing inclusion of morality cases within the framework of Roman public law, the role of the *paterfamilias* and family council remained enshrined in the criminal procedure. Roman law recognized that the private mechanisms of moral regulation served a public function—that they were essentially complementary (or even alternative) modes of punishing criminal behavior.

This paper will explore the recognized role of the *paterfamilias* and the family council in regulating public—including criminal—transgressions. In doing so, it will examine the role of the *paterfamilias* and the family council as “private” elements of social control and legal regulation. Ultimately, it will interrogate the notions of public and private within the governance of the Roman household and within Roman law more generally.

Evan Proudfoot

PRS (Probationary Research Student) in Archaeology

Lincoln College, University of Oxford

Non Item Valvata: *The Seasonality of Physical Boundaries in the Pompeian Domus*

Seasonality was an important consideration in the layout of rooms and the design of their closures (*i.e.* doors and windows) in antiquity. Vitruvius (*De Architectura*, VI.4.1-2) observed that rooms should be orientated based upon their daily functions and seasonal use, and modern scholars have sought confirmation of these principles in the (groundfloor) layout of houses at the Vesuvian sites. Yet the spatial and organizational constraints on an urban *domus* with a long architectural history must have necessitated the adaptive use of rooms in these houses throughout the year, and so specific examples of seasonal orientation are seldom identifiable.

Given such constraints, how did ancient inhabitants adapt pre-existing and newly built rooms to take advantage of seasonal changes in light, temperature, display, and social function? Varro (*De Lingua Latina*, VIII.29) gives one indication when he states that “we do not install the same types of doors and windows in our winter and summer *triclinia*.” An all-too-narrow assumption has been that Varro refers to solid-panel doors of varying widths. Likewise, scholars have tended to regard wide reception rooms as closed mainly by curtains, or fully exposed, bounded by ‘visually arresting’ mosaic thresholds. But the internal boundaries of the Roman *domus* were not merely symbolically demarcated, they were physically constituted.

Drawing upon newly compiled evidence, the results of a comprehensive ‘*threshold research project*,’ this paper will examine the fascinating variety of closures used in Pompeian houses. From the widespread existence of secondary *fauces* entrance doors, to folding *valvae*, wheeled latticework screens, track-guided sliding doors, and fully glazed peristyles and *triclinia*, it will seek to understand the *domus* as the dynamic, seasonal environment it must have been, while negotiating the ever-present boundaries between public and private.

Samuli Simelius

Ph.D. student, History

University of Helsinki

Peristyle as a place of juridical activity and administration

Vitruvius tells that a magistrate's dwelling should have a public part,¹ so the image of the administrative work happening in a Roman private house is quite obvious. It is more difficult to find out where in the house exactly this activity occurred, but some speculation can be done. For example Francesco de Angelis writes: "We could easily imagine a trial taking place in a library or even in a *pinacotheca* (not to speak of the atrium or the peristyle) if need be, provided that they were sufficiently accommodating and that their decoration met the standard requirements of *decorum*."²

This presentation concentrates to the one of the spaces mentioned by de Angelis, the peristyle. First under the examination is why it is easy to imagine a trial or some other juridical activity happening in the peristyle. What connects the peristyle to the trials and other juridical activity? Second part of the presentation studies what we actually know about juridical and administrative activity in the peristyle. References to the legal or administrative use of the space are exceptional. Also the variation of terms, peristyle, portico and garden, used in the literature makes it unclear, if the cases actually happened in a peristyle of private property or in a garden or even in a public portico. The rare literary mentions raise a question, if the peristyle was utilized at the juridical or administrative purposes at all, and if these know cases were merely exceptions. Lastly the examination moves to Pompeii. The private peristyles of the city are observed in the light of juridical activity or its absence. The aim is to see, if the archaeological evidence can support the theory of juridical or administrative use of the peristyles, this case at Pompeii.

¹ Vitr. 6.5.2.

² Francesco De Angelis, *Ius and Space: An Introduction*, pp. 1-25, in *Space of Justice in the Roman World*, ed. Francesco de Angelis, Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition, Volume 35, ed. William V. Harris, 2010, Leiden Brill, p. 15.

Simon A. Speksnijder, MPhil

Ph.D. student, Ancient History

University of Groningen

Salutationes: the display of social relationships in the Roman domus

On an average day in Late Republican or Early Imperial Rome, thousands flocked to the *domus* of the elite to participate in the ritualized morning greetings known as *salutationes*. In this paper, I argue that the *salutatio* functioned as a vehicle to create, strengthen, and contest social relationships in full view of the whole city. As such, *salutationes* were neither ‘private’ nor ‘public’.

This paper consists of three parts. The first is a short introduction to the social functions of the *salutatio*. Visitors automatically engaged in an exchange-relationship with the *dominus* simply by showing up. Their social position vis-à-vis each other, the host and his slaves was further (re-)defined and strengthened during the morning greeting through various ‘sub-rituals’ involving the actual greeting and other exchanges.

Secondly, I turn to the highly visible nature of *salutationes*. They were purposely staged to allow a large number of people (the visitors themselves and other onlookers) to witness the social ritual. For example, visitors had to wait in the *vestibulum*, an area in front of the house bordering the street, where they were subdivided into groups by slaves to enter the house in the right order.

Thirdly, a study of the *salutatio* shows that ‘public’ and ‘private’ are unhelpful categories to characterize spaces in Roman *domus* and their various uses. The spaces used for *salutationes* (*vestibula*, *atria* and also *cubicula*) were employed for different purposes by different individuals during the day. It makes more sense to determine the level and control of *access* (for the visitor and by the host respectively) and the level of *visibility* of whatever was played out (at any given moment in any given space) in order to distinguish between more ‘open’ (accessible, visible) and ‘closed’ (inaccessible, less visible) spaces within *domus*.

Dr. Jeffrey Tatum

Professor of Classics

Programme in Classics, School of Art History, Classics and Religious Studies

Faculty of Humanities, The Victoria University of Wellington

Contio domestica: canvassing for voters at home

The centrality of the *domus* in republican political campaigns is a familiar matter. Emphasis has rightly been placed on the *salutatio*, *deductio*, and *adsectatio* (e.g. Q. Cic., *Comm. Pet.* 34-38; Cic. *Mur.* 44-45; 70-71; *Planc.* 21; 66; *De or.* 1.200; 1.239; 3.133; Cic. *Att.* 1. 18. 1). The actual mechanics of electioneering during the *salutatio* remain mostly hidden from us, but the prevailing assumption of modern scholarship has been that any exchange between candidate and voters took place along the lines of *clientela*: that is candidates ingratiated themselves, in more or less private dialogues, with individuals in attendance at the *salutatio* (e.g. F. Goldbeck, *Salutationes: Die Morgenbegrüßungen in Rom in der Republik und der frühen Kaiserzeit* (Berlin 2010), 52-58; R. Laurence, *G&R* 41 (1994), 62-74). But there may be another dimension to canvassing at home, not described per se but nonetheless perceptible in Cicero's criticisms of the consular campaigns of Murena and Catiline, passages in which the orator conjures domestic oratory intended to sway voters (esp. *Mur.* 50, whence the expression *contio domestica*). Candidates in Rome were discouraged from public speechifying. The correct posture during electoral campaigns emphasised actions over words and encouraged each candidate to represent himself not as an exponent of a policy or political platform but instead as a sound and virtuous leader rightly seeking the gratitude of a public whose support he had already earned by way of public service and private benefactions. Nothing, however, prevented a candidate from addressing visitors to his home, and this tactic, it is here suggested, offered candidates a means of disseminating criticisms of their rivals and exhibiting their aristocratic soundness, a claim underscored in the case of some by the grandeur of the very *domus* in which he received visitors and addressed them.

Summer Trentin

Ph.D. candidate, Art History

University of Iowa

Space in Transition: Public and Private in the Pompeian Domestic Peristyle

Peristyle gardens were standard features in the largest and most luxurious houses of Pompeii, providing the prestige and grandeur of public porticos within the comfort of the private home and offering a variety of visual and conceptual cues for the public and the invited guest alike. In this paper, I use evidence from a sample of Pompeian peristyles along with case studies of the House of the Vettii and the House of Marcus Lucretius to demonstrate that these visual cues can assist in understanding the degree to which the peristyle and its adjoining rooms were publicly accessible.

The transformational and transitional nature of peristyles, as well as their suitability for sculptural and hydraulic presentation, made them ideal centers of display, both public and private. The convergence of sculpture, fountains, pools, architecture, greenery, and wall painting within peristyles allowed for a wide variety of carefully orchestrated vistas designed to appeal to various audiences, from the general public to invited guests who understood, and perhaps shared, the homeowner's taste and values. These vistas, which varied in formality, composition, complexity, and associative value, drew attention to specific areas of the peristyle and away from others while remaining open to a variety of interpretations based on the background and social standing of the viewer. This examination of public and private in the domestic peristyle as seen through the physical and conceptual arrangement of decorative elements reveals how peristyle decoration helped shape the experience of the viewer, enhance the prestige of the owner, and affirm social hierarchy.