

INNS AND TAVERNS

John DeFolice

Sun DeFolice's 'Pader (Erdeda)

(London: Routledge 2005)

As in many small Roman cities, Pompeii and Herculaneum had their share of hospitality businesses. However, several of the best examples remain at Pompeii. In many of Pompeii's *insulae* and around most of the city gates there were numerous taverns, inns and little restaurants to greet visitors. These probably also served Pompeii's indigenous lower-class population as well, providing food, wine, entertainment and shelter. They were an important part of Pompeii's economy and society.¹

DEFINITIONS

It is generally agreed that there are four basic categories of hospitality businesses. These include *hospitia*, *stabula*, *tabernae* and *popinae*.² *Hospitia* were establishments that offered rooms for rent, and often food and drink to overnight guests. This term originally had an abstract meaning, referring to the guest/owner relationship that existed between a stranger seeking overnight accommodations and a host.³ According to Packer, *hospitia* appear to have been expressly fabricated for business purposes, although a number of them represent secondary uses of existing private homes in Pompeii.⁴

A *canpona* was also an inn that provided meals, drink and lodging.⁵ It may have catered to a lower class of customer than a *hospitium*, but some appear to have been comfortable places.⁶ Often the analogy is made that a *hospitium* corresponded to a hotel while a *canpona* referred to an inn, often with a bar and snack shop. However, in most cases it is difficult to distinguish between them. A *hospitium* seems at times to have served as a lodging house for travelers as well for long-term guests. The term *canpona* gradually came to indicate a place of bad reputation and it was used less as time progressed by innkeepers themselves.⁷

Stabula were *hospitia* with facilities to shelter animals. They usually possessed wide sloping entrances on the street curb which allowed the passage of carts, and often included stalls for animals as well as rooms for guests. It was common to find these just outside the city, or just within the city gates. Businesses within the city gates had to make the most of their available room, and tended to be smaller than those in the country.⁸ They tended to follow the same general plan, with the kitchen, latrine and bedrooms surrounding an open court with stables at the rear.

The term *taberna* referred to either a shop or a tavern in the first century AD. Its usage eventually came to mean a tavern in the traditional sense.⁹ *Tabernae* varied in size and quality of food and drink served. This term also became linked with *canpona* (*canpona taberna*) to indicate a shop that sold food and drink and provided lodging.¹⁰ Unfortunately, in many publications, the term *taberna* has come to refer to almost any kind of shop, so there is a good deal of confusion when compiling a list of such establishments from secondary sources (cf. also Pirson, Ch. 29).

Tabernae and *popinae* (in their first-century sense) served a variety of simple foods and drink. They usually contained a simple L-shaped marble counter, about 6 to 8 ft long, with a simmering pot of water and shelves of other food on the back wall of a tiny room, often just large enough for the proprietor and several assistants (cf. Jones and Robinson, Ch. 25; Figure 25.14). Wine and food were usually served from *dolia* embedded in the counter. Roman drinks were usually served warmed. Most bar counters were equipped for heating both food and drink.¹¹ For example, the Taberna of Fortunata (VI.3.18–20) was located strategically at a busy intersection next to a public fountain (Figure 30.1; Map 3). This establishment boasted four *dolia* sunk into an L-shaped marble-faced counter, a stove at the end of that counter, and two storage niches set into the base of a connecting plaster-capped counter set against the building wall. Additional cooking facilities and a latrine were located behind the counter, and a possible eating area off to the side.¹² Up the street in *insula* VI.1,



Figure 30.1 Taberna of Fortunata (VI.3.18–20), view southeast through the service counter at no. 20. Photo: P. W. Foss.

there is evidence for the development of the food service industry in the first century BC (cf. Jones and Robinson, Ch. 25). *Popinae* were suited for a quick sit-down meal, which was boorish and distasteful to upper-class Romans.¹³ The Roman custom was to recline when dining, eating leisurely on a *triclinium*. Occasionally, eating and drinking establishments had indoor as well as outdoor facilities set in small gardens (e.g. I.8.8 (Figure 20.8); II.5 (Figure 31.6(e))).

It is difficult to distinguish between a *canopha* and a *hospitium*. Some *hospitia* possessed dining rooms, a garden *triclinium*, numerous bedrooms, a sophisticated kitchen, and occasionally *atria* (sometimes covered), *tablini*, *exci*, or an *impluvium*.¹⁴ For example, inn (I.2.24) in Pompeii boasted both an *impluvium* and an outdoor *triclinium*. It is possible that after the earthquake of AD 62 a number of private houses were converted into *hospitia*. For instance, the house at (I.9.12) was connected to the *canopha* at (I.9.11) and its *atrium* was used to store amphoras. The inn at (I.10.13) seems to have used the *porticum* of the connected house at (I.10.14) for the same purpose.¹⁵

LODGING AND LODGERS

The hospitality businesses at the entrances to a city such as Pompeii were placed there for the sake of travelers, such as merchants and sailors who came to trade and sell, or those who were stopping overnight along the way to other destinations. Not all travelers required their services. Those with high social standing had friends in several cities, and developed a network of *hospitae* ("hosts"), where they would stay when business needed to be transacted away from home. Rooms for rent were also available in private homes.¹⁶

Inns along major roads and at the city gates gained a reputation for attracting less socially significant travelers. Inns had a reputation for bedbugs, discomfort, violence and danger.¹⁷ Apuleius and Petronius portrayed inns as dangerous places, full of low-class and poverty-stricken tenants.¹⁸ The quality of the staff also varied. One guest wrote on the wall of Pompeian inn (VIII.6.6): "We peed in the bed. I admit we did wrong, innkeeper. If you should ask why—well, there was no chamber-port!"¹⁹

Long-term guests probably stayed in Pompeian *hospitia*, perhaps at locations closer to the heart of the city. This may have contributed to the poor reputation of *hospitia*, as guests shared them with those of humble circumstance who found it difficult to lease a home.²⁰ In the *Satyricon*, Petronius offers a glimpse of an inn with both long-term tenants and short-term guests.²¹

The *graffiti* record provides some human insight into tavern life (cf., in general, Franklin, Ch. 33). One patron wrote on the wall of inn (I.2.24), "Curses on you, innkeeper! What you sell us is water, and you keep the wine for yourself!"²² Another guest, in tavern (VI.10.1), made a sly request for just a single drop of water to dilute his wine, on the wall above a picture of a soldier holding out his cup to a slave.²³ However, not all innkeepers shared this reputation. At tavern (VI.2.44–45), the *coepa* Hedone offered good wine for one *as*, better wine for two *asses*, and the precious *falernum* vintage for four *asses*.²⁴ The same establishment was also the regular meeting place of the late-night drinkers, the *terribili iuvenes*, who, whether in jest or seriousness, supported a political candidate with a political notice bearing their name.²⁵ Another visitor conflated the verses of both Ovid and Propertius on the wall of tavern

(I.11.10–11) to proclaim "A fair skinned beauty taught me to despise dusky women. I will spurn them, if I can; if not . . . I will love them reluctantly."²⁶ Amorous verses are common on the walls of inns and taverns.

POMPEII: REPRESENTATIVE REMAINS;

Map 3

Hospitia and *canophae*

One famous example is the so-called House of Sallust (VI.2.3–5). This was an old Samnite house later converted into a hotel on a grand scale.²⁷ This *hospitium* has several interesting features. At entrance no. 5, the counter is accessible both from the street and the *atrium*, perhaps to increase business. Several bedrooms are grouped around the *atrium*. Several other large spaces could have allowed guests to dine, such as indoor spaces (2.2.35) off the northeast corner of the *atrium* and the west side of the peristyle, and an outdoor masonry *triclinium* (2.5) covered by a pergola on two plasters at the north end of the garden. A hearth nearby was installed to prepare food for outside dining.²⁸ Jashemski observed that guests could view the garden through a large picture window in *tablinum* (1.9). It was three steps higher than the floor of the house, and could be entered at either end of the colonnade. It was small, only 20 by 70 ft, but had a garden painting on the back wall. It showed a continuation of the real garden, with columns, gartlands, three fountains and birds.²⁹ Jashemski noted that great care was exercised in the remodeling of this Samnite house to preserve its aesthetic characteristics, a view shared by Richardson.³⁰ Another old Samnite house (VI.2.18–19) was converted into a *stabulum* of a more rustic variety.³¹

At (VII.1.44–45) was a modest but better-equipped establishment. It was located across the street from the large *hospitium* at (VII.11.11, 14), and though too small even for a garden, the owner boasted of his *triclinium*.³² In front was found a painting of an elephant entangled with a serpent—and being rescued by a pygmy.³³

Just inside the Porta Ercolano at (VI.1.1) was a small *canopha* with a garden *triclinium* (Figure 25.1). Many small establishments made the most of limited space. This example was built adjacent to the wall, with three or so rooms to rent on the upper story.³⁴ It lacked a counter with *dolia*, so food was either served cold or brought in from another establishment.

Stabula

Less elegant is the *stabulum* run by Hermes at (I.1.6–9), so named because of a picture located on the entrance's left wall depicting the innkeeper Hermes emptying an *ambora* into a *dolium*.³⁵ This picture is no longer extant.³⁶ The *stabulum* entrance leads into a courtyard. A row of stalls lines the back east wall. This *stabulum* has an associated tavern, with a separate room for eating at no. 9. Rooms for lodgers included three above the stalls, reached by stairs along the north wall of the courtyard. It is interesting that despite the humble nature of this establishment, the second floor even had a latrine directly above that of the first floor. Three additional rooms for lodgers, presumably, surrounded the courtyard.

Tabernae and popinae

Numerous examples exist for *popinae* and *tabernae* throughout the city. Over a dozen are scattered along the strada Stabiana and via dell'Abbondanza, and almost as many along the strada Consolare and via di Nola. More are near the amphitheater, forum or baths. Around fifty are located at the corners of major intersections.

A simple single-room *taberna* with an upstairs apartment (I.10.13) was formerly connected to the House of the Menander next door (I.10.4). Raddell notes that although there were no *ambonae* found at this site, a number were found in the house next door. The walls were stuccoed and the floor was paved with *opus signinum*. The low masonry counter, with two *dolia*, was once painted red. The shop also contained a small hearth. This represents the most basic design, with little room for sit-down dining.³⁷ Somewhat larger is tavern (VI.15.15), which had an L-shaped counter with three *dolia* and a stove. Apart from the front room with its counter, was a back room, perhaps for dining or drinking. Both rooms had doors on their western walls connecting them with the House of the Maron next door (VI.15.14), so named for a mosaic portrait *emblemata* from room (m).³⁸

Mixed establishments

The number of establishments that incorporate two or more hospitality businesses is significant. La Torre, for example, has noted over forty establishments that appear to have rooms for overnight guests as well as facilities for food and drink.³⁹ One of the more remarkable can be found at (VI.1.2-4). It seems to have been at once a *popinnum*, *carpona*, *stabulum* and *taberna/popina*. See Jones and Robinson, Ch. 25, for details of its development.

At entrance no. 2 were the counter and stove usually associated with a *popinatalaberna*, as well as display shelves. Three rooms were to the left of the serving room. Behind the counter was a passage to a latrine. Entrance no. 3 led to a staircase that reached the second floor, and a connecting passage under the stairs connected to the inn at entrance no. 4. This inn, labeled by various scholars a *carpona*, *popinnum*, or *deversorium*, possessed two rooms and a *tridinium* in the front. Food from next door was probably brought through the passage under the stairs at no. 3 for patrons. Against the north wall at the back of this business was a watering trough and three additional guest rooms. The back wall had a covered area for carts, and stalls for animals. Together with the establishment across the street, it comprised the meeting place for the wagon drivers (*statio milionum*).⁴⁰ This is one of several hospitality businesses that made the maximum use of available space near the city gates. In this case the Porta Ercolano, to service both visitors and those transporting goods to the city.⁴¹

Food and cannadervie

Food in these establishments probably included simple stews, soups and other basic fare.⁴² Customers probably ate sitting, not reclining, at tables. Inn (VI.10.1) in Pompeii has five preserved painted scenes that show travelers standing or sitting around wooden tables in an inn, being served by a *puer carponis* ("serving-boy").⁴³ Both masonry dining tables and benches for public use are preserved at the upscale *Prædita*

of Julia Felix (II.4.7); see Parslow, Ch. 14; Nappo, Ch. 23; Figure 23.11) and inn (I.8.15-16).⁴⁴

Food quality must have varied. Horace described *popinae* as greasy (*uncta popinae*).⁴⁵ Sometimes foods were displayed outside, perhaps in water-filled glass bowls, providing an illusion of size.⁴⁶ Foods such as eggs, goose liver pâté, sow vulvas, fowl, game, pork, cheese, *cicer* (chick peas), vegetables either fried or in a porridge (*pulvis*), beans, cabbage, twice-cooked cabbage (*crambe rusticata* or *repasata*), raw vegetables with vinegar, and beers may have been available in some eateries, perhaps smothered in garlic, pepper and sauces.⁴⁷

Tiberius, Claudius, Nero and Vespasian all passed laws restricting the sale or display of certain prepared foods, especially meat and wine.⁴⁸ Casson suggests that these may have been first-century attempts to decrease traffic in inns and taverns towards promoting better "public morality." Hermansen believed that these prohibitions could have been introduced to smother potential political agitation in inns and taverns (lodging houses for travelers may have been exempted from these laws).⁴⁹ There was probably little effect on the many busy establishments of Pompeii. Evidence is fragmentary, but in the mid-fourth century AD, taverns were still the places where poorer people are said to have gathered after dark for revelry, eating and drinking. Among the problems that plagued the Rome of his day, Ammianus Marcellinus listed the poor in the city of Rome spending the entire night in wineshops (*in tabernis*).⁵⁰ Inns and taverns were probably never really outlawed as gathering places for any length of time.

Moral geography and prostitution

Roman literature assumed taverns and snack shops were places of moral turpitude.⁵¹ Ray Laurence and Andrew Wallace-Hadrill have examined the distribution of these businesses at Pompeii towards plotting a moral geography for the city.⁵² Both have assumed that a moral geography existed. Wallace-Hadrill notes, "for every area of positive charge there must be an area of negative charge set against it."⁵³ Laurence works along the assumption that Pompeii can be "examined to identify the areas in which deviant behavior was tolerated, and those in which it was restricted."⁵⁴ Both have chosen areas that contained a large number of these businesses as areas of "negative charge" and "deviance." Both assume that these places would only cater to customers so crude and vile that they would have to exist well out of sight of Roman matrons and children.

In Roman moralistic literature (particularly Seneca), some locations seem clearly associated with virtue and others with pleasure:

Virtue is something lofty, elevated, regal, invincible and indefatigable; Pleasure is something lowly and servile, feeble and perishable, which has its base and residence in the brothels and the eating-houses (*popinae*). Virtue you will meet in the temple, the forum, the senate house, stranding before the walls, stained with dust, with callused hands.⁵⁵

Certainly within the mind of this moralist, there was a clear division between places characterized by pleasure and those characterized by virtue. But this passage is, at

best, only a Stoic mirror that reflects the values of a few Romans. Stoic ideas, with their emphasis on social equality and the humanity of slaves, reached a limited audience even among the elite. To extend Seneca's comments to postulate zoning along moral lines is quite a leap.

Laurence includes gambling as an indicator of deviance. Certainly there was gambling and the potential for violence in some hospitality businesses. This is graphically shown in a series of wall paintings at *paphna* (VI.14.35–36), which comically warned patrons that fights over gambling would not be tolerated.⁵⁶ Dice were found in tavern (VII.15.4–5), and a wall painting of men throwing dice was recovered from (VI.10.1), but such finds cannot automatically be associated with all *paphnae*.⁵⁷ Furthermore, gambling was not limited to *paphnae*. It is not unusual to find gaming boards cut into the pavement of the forum or sidewalks in any Roman city.⁵⁸ Even emperors were known to gamble.⁵⁹

Allegations were also not limited to taverns. In the House of the Moralists (III.4.2–3), stern admonitions are written on the walls of *nichinum* (12) prohibiting fighting, adulterous glances and putting muddy feet on the table.⁶⁰ This does not mean that all dining rooms were places of deviance, dirt, adultery and violence. In fact, these were exactly what the owner of a tavern or inn wished to avoid.

Inn and tavern workers, as most working people in Roman society, were considered little better than slaves as far as social status was concerned, if we take Cicero seriously.⁶¹ But using *paphnae*, *caupona* and *taberna* as an index of deviance is problematic. Laurence's simple definition of deviance is, "In effect, the deviants in a society are those people who contravene the rules of that society."⁶² But in Pompeii (as in other Roman cities), slaves, freed people and poor citizens—the large base of a steep social pyramid—represented the majority of the population.⁶³ His model of deviance requires revision in order to account for class and gender antagonism in the primary sources that may skew the concept of deviance as defined.

Finally, when observing the graph provided by Laurence, which marks streets as deviant if *tabernae* or *paphnae* are present, one is struck with the large number of streets considered deviant.⁶⁴ Well over 50 percent of the city would be deviant by this analysis. This theory of deviant zones or negative zones clearly needs reconsideration, although its approach to city patterns and planning may be sound. It must use criteria other than all *paphnae* or *tabernae* as major indicators. Perhaps certain types of bars and snack shops would lend themselves better to a revised definition of deviance. But the positive value attached to areas that Laurence and Wallace-Hadrill consider as non-deviant must also be reconsidered. Plautus, for example, considered the forum—seen so positively by Seneca—as a place where one met perjurers, the vicious, liars, wasters, harlots and their customers.⁶⁵ Seneca, himself, knew that this was the case. He wrote, using the same metaphor of an urban landscape:

As far as regards sensual pleasure, though it flows around us on every side and seeps through every opening, though it softens the mind with its charms and leaves no avenue untried in its attempts to seduce us in whole and in part.⁶⁶

Seneca saw vice and pleasure as fluid entities. While he delineated certain places as centers for low living, he believed that the vice of pleasure could be found everywhere. His moral geography represented an internalized battle. He did not advocate an

urban moral zoning program but, rather, a disciplined mind. Though belonging to the ranks of the Roman elite, he himself lived above the baths in a "deviant zone."⁶⁷ Another reason why inns and taverns lend themselves to such analyses is because of the assumption that women who worked in taverns and inns were usually prostitutes. The result is that historians often labeled tavern and snack shops as *libanaria* (brothels) when initial reports followed excavation, and that label persisted through the centuries on very flimsy evidence. I will limit myself to two examples.

First, there is the notorious tavern of Asellina, located at (IX.11.2) on via dell'Abbondanza. It was first excavated at the turn of the century by Della Corte, and immediately identified as a *caupona-libanaria*. The reason for this identification would at first appear to have been because of the names of four women whose names adorn election notices painted on the front wall of the shop today.⁶⁸ The names are exotic and foreign: Smyrna, who would appear to come from the Near East; Aegle, from Greece; and Maria, who possibly was a Jew. Asellina was derived from an old Roman name, but her status can only be guessed at.

The tavern itself is unremarkable. It did have a complex phallic lamp, and on the right doopost excavators found an odd drawing of Mercury with an ape-like head and a large phallus. It is not clear if the discovery of phalli contributed to Della Corte's identification of the location as a *libanaria*. The saying *Hic habitat felicitas* (here dwells happiness), often found below it, simply means that unhappiness has been driven away by this magic, apotropaic symbol.⁶⁹ But Della Corte seems to have identified this business on the most subjective criteria, and in ephemeristic fashion: "an Asellina, perhaps the owner of the establishment, in which, according to custom, not only food and drink were served."⁷⁰

For the second example, a *graffito* is often cited from the exterior face of the *caupona* at (I.12.3). An election notice reads: *A(ulm)u) Trebim aed(iti)u) o(ro) v(oi) f(aciatis) Soterius*, "I, Soterius, ask that you make Aulus Trebius (Valens) aedile."⁷¹ Within the "O" is another *graffito* in tiny letters, perhaps written by a passer-by: *Fuisti coponam*, "I fucked the barmaid."⁷²

This comment was not even located within the tavern, but as late as 1996, it was cited as proof that taverns and inns universally employed prostitutes.⁷³ That taverns were occasionally associated with prostitution is an assumption of later Roman law, but caution must be used when using later sources to draw conclusions about Pompeii.⁷⁴

As evidence is handled more critically, the list of taverns and inns described as brothels grows shorter. Part of the reason is that the modern world no longer equates all sexual activity outside of marriage as prostitution. Every *graffito* that refers to sexual activity may indicate any one of a number of informal sexual relationships. Concentrations of coarse *graffiti* may sometimes indicate that a brothel was located on the premises. The *caupona* run by Hermes at (II.1.1.13) has its share of such *graffiti*: A female worker named Palmira is called *siferax*, a term which can be translated as "horny animal," and another unknown worker is described as *cilithon*, or "hot ass," a term Evans equates with anal sex.⁷⁵ These descriptions may indicate prostitution or sexual activity, but this location is not listed as a *caupona libanaria* in the guidebooks or in Eschebach's listing.⁷⁶ Several inns and taverns do have that label, however. For example, we find an Acria listed at the price of four *asses* and Epaphra listed for ten *asses* at tavern (V.2.b-c). Someone named "Firm" (abbreviated for Firmilia?) is also listed as available for three *asses* in this location, as well as in

the tavern at (I.12.5).⁷⁷ In the tavern at (I.10.2), a woman named Prima, perhaps referred to in another *graffito* as Prima Domina, sold herself for one and one half *asses*.⁷⁸ Beyond that, there is at Pompeii only the *graffiti* record to suggest sexual activity occurring in several (but not all) inns and taverns. Indeed, many businesses probably had little space for such activities.

Furthermore, if one takes coarse *graffiti*, such as those containing the words *Hic fuit*, "here I fucked" (and its grammatical derivatives) and plots them on a map, one finds them centered mainly in the well-known brothels in town.⁷⁹ These terms are not common in inns and taverns, though other romantic and sexual terms often are. A benchmark of more critical scholarship is when different types of sexual *graffiti* are distinguished from one another. Even a *graffito* with a price of a prostitute's services on a tavern's outside wall may only be the work of a passerby, or may indicate the price for services charged by a woman who walks the streets in the area. Other signs of prostitution, such as a masonry bed, a *cella meretricia* or rooms designated by pictures of different erotic acts (as is evident in the large *libanator* found at VII.12.18, 20) and more recently revealed in the Suburban Baths, must also be considered (figure 35-3).⁸⁰ Even then, an element of doubt may remain. At the large *hospitium* complex at (VII.11.11, 14) a *cella meretricia* can be found at entrance 12 under a flight of stairs. However, there is no direct connection between the one-room prostitute's quarters and the large establishment. Furthermore, the *carpinus* next door at (VII.11.13) has no direct entrance to the *cella* either. On the contrary, the inn possesses an outdoor sign that forbids loiterers.⁸¹

The complicated lives of the women who worked in these establishments cannot be discussed in full here (cf. Bernstein, Ch. 34), but there was, according to later legal sources, the potential for limited social mobility. A woman could start as a tavern servant girl, or perhaps even a slave prostitute, and eventually gain her freedom, get legally married, have a husband and legitimate children and even be a slave and tavern owner herself. It is short-sighted to see these women as prostitutes and prostitutes only.⁸² The evidence of non-dile Roman lives, so richly concentrated in the inns and taverns of Pompeii and Herculaneum, at last have the chance to be seen against the background of the Roman society of their era, and not our own. I do not wish to over-criticize the idea of moral geography in Roman city planning. It is one of the many ideas that have recently been introduced by scholars expecting both criticism and dialogue when attempting to interpret Pompeii and Herculaneum on a citywide basis, and it has sparked useful responses. But as long as the very identification and number of *popinae* and *tavernae* remain uncertain, new approaches, such as the scientific analysis of food and other organic residues, are badly needed.

NOTES

1 The number of these establishments is subject to speculation. A. Wallace-Hadrill, "Public honor and private shame: the urban texture of Pompeii," in T. J. Cornell and K. Lomas (eds), *Urban Society in Roman Italy*, London, 1995, p. 46, cites G. F. La Torre, "Gli impianti commerciali ed artigianali nel tessuto urbano di Pompeii," in *Pompeii. L'inspugnata al servizio di una città antica*, Rome, 1988, p. 78 as giving a figure of 130 *carpinos* and eighty-nine *thermopolis*, twenty-nine of which functioned as *carpinos* as well. Wallace-Hadrill doubts the fantastic number of hospitality businesses for such a small town, but La Torre lists some of these establishments several times in different categories and confuses several inoperative addresses

with current ones (pp. 92-3, nn. 16-18, 20). He also uses the term *thermopolium*, which is an inaccurate term. My present count is ninety-four businesses that served food and/or drink (*popina* or *taverna*), but had no facilities for overnight guests. Another forty-two served overnight guests and possibly food and drink (*hospitium* and *carpinus*) and nine businesses served overnight guests and had access to facilities for horses (*gradilium*). Another forty-seven structures have been frequently described as hospitality businesses but have questionable identifications and are not included.

2 T. Kleberg, *Hädel, restaurants et cabarets dans l'antique romaine: étude historique et philologique*, Uppsala, 1957, pp. 8-11, 31ff.; S. Ruddlell, *The inn, restaurants and tavern business in ancient Pompeii*, M.A. thesis, University of Maryland, 1964, pp. 1-5; J. Packer, "Inns at Pompeii: a short survey," *ComPompeii*, 1978, vol. 4, p. 5. Ruddlell's thesis, though often cited, is difficult to obtain. See J. DeFelice, *Roman Hospitality: the professional women of Pompeii*, Warren Center, PA, 2001, pp. 176-306 for a master list of hospitality businesses in Pompeii with bibliographic information on each one.

3 L. Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World*, London, 1974, p. 352; Kleberg, *Hädel*, pp. 5-7, 14; J. H. D'Ams, *Romans on the Bay of Naples*, Cambridge, MA, 1970, p. 49.

4 Packer, "Inns at Pompeii," pp. 44-5.

5 Ruddlell, *Tavern Business*, p. 2. Pilon, *HN* 9.154 uses the term *carpinorum*.

6 W. F. Jashemski, "A Pompeian cop's," *CJ*, 1964, vol. 59, pp. 337-49.

7 Kleberg, *Hädel*, pp. 27-8.

8 Casson, *Travel*, pp. 205, 207; Kleberg, *Hädel*, pp. 18, 28, 34-5; Ruddlell, *Tavern Business*, pp. 7-8; Packer, "Inns at Pompeii," pp. 7-9.

9 Ruddlell, *Inn, Restaurants and Tavern Business*, p. 9; Kleberg, *Hädel*, pp. 19-23.

10 See *Digg.* 23.2.43.1 (*Talabona carpinos*).

11 Casson, *Travel*, pp. 211-12; Packer, "Inns at Pompeii," pp. 30-2; Ruddlell, *Tavern Business*, pp. 9, 15.

12 L. Eschebach, *Gebäudeverzeichnis und Stadtplan der antiken Stadt Pompeii*, Köln, 1993, p. 165.

13 W. F. Jashemski, *The Gardens of Pompeii*, New Rochelle, NY, 1979, p. 167; Martz, 5.70-3.

14 Ruddlell, *Tavern Business*, pp. 72-5; Packer, "Inns at Pompeii," pp. 12-14, 44.

15 DeFelice, *Roman Hospitality*, pp. 199, 201. The *ambrosia*-filled *atrium* of (I.9.12) can be seen in J. Berry, "Household artefacts: towards a reinterpretation of Roman domestic space," in R. Laurence and A. Wallace-Hadrill (eds), *Domestic Spaces in the Roman World: Pompeii and beyond*, JRA Suppl. Ser. no. 22, 1997, p. 184.

16 See *ILS* 6039 = *CIL* II, 4284, from Tarraco in Spain: *Si nitidus vivis, acrum domus exornata est, si vorax, portio, et pudet hospitium*. "If you're clean and neat, then here's a house ready and waiting for you. If you're dirty—well, I'm ashamed to say it, but you're welcome too." transl. Casson, *Travel*, pp. 204, 353. See also below, n. 19, for a house at Pompeii that seems to have

let rooms.

17 A particularly amusing account of bugs in taverns is found in the apocryphal *Acts of John* 60.1. Pity the Elder refers to the parasites that dwelled in *carpinos* (*HN* 9.154), and a poem attributed to Hadrian, addressed to the comic poet Florus, notes the far, round insects plaguing inns and cook shops (SHA, *Hadri.* 16.3-9).

18 For example, see Petron., *Sat.*, 95-98 and Apul., *Met.* I. See also H. Rowell, "Satyricon 95-96," *CP*, 1957, vol. 52.4, pp. 217-27.

19 *CIL* IV, 4957, from the exterior of house (VIII.6.6), to the left of the entrance: *Miximum in lecta, fovea, pecaninus hospes. Si dies quare, nulla matella fuit* (transl. P. Foss).

20 B. Eriq., "The rental market in early imperial Rome," *JRS*, 1977, vol. 67, pp. 27-37.

21 Petron., *Sat.* 95.

22 *CIL* IV, 3948. See also Petron., *Sat.* 39; Martz, 1.56.

23 *CIL* IV, 1291: *Da fridan pusillum*.

24 *CIL* IV, 1679; cf. addenda on pp. 210, 463, 704.

25 *CIL* IV, 581.

26 *CIL* IV, 9847: *Gandida me domini nigrae q[ui]sique pulchra. Oculis, si patere, si non, fiantis amabo*. Several instances of the same lines were found at the House of the Scientist (VI.14-43); see *CIL* IV, 1520, 1523, 1526, 1528. The lines borrow from Prop. 1.1.5 and Ov., *Am.* 3.1.35; for commentary, see: A. Keith, "Corpus eroticum: elegiac poets and elegiac puellae in Ovid's

- Amores*, CW, 1994, vol. 88, pp. 27-40; M. Wyke, "Reading female flesh: *Amores* 3.1," in A. Cameron (ed.), *History as Text: the writing of ancient history*, London, 1989, pp. 111-43.
- 27 G. P. Carratelli and I. Baldassarre (eds), *Pompeii, pitture e mosaici*, vol. 4, Rome, 1993, pp. 87-147; Jashemski, "A Pompeian copra," pp. 339, 349; M. Della Corte, *Cave et abitant* at Pompeii, 3rd edn, Naples, 1965, pp. 38-40.
- 28 Ruddell, *Tavern Business*, pp. 4-5, 88.
- 29 Jashemski, *Garden*, vol. 1, p. 169. This was originally published in F. Mazois, *Les ruines de Pompeii dessinées et mesurées pendant les années 1809-1810-1811*, Paris, 1824, vol. 2, pl. 37, fig. 1.
- 30 I. Richardson, jr, *Pompeii: An architectural history*, Baltimore, MD, 1988, pp. 108-11.
- 31 Jashemski, "A Pompeian copra," p. 343.
- 32 CIL IV, 807: "Hoplithum hic locatur tridinium cum tribus lentis." See Jashemski, "A Pompeian copra," p. 346.
- 33 CIL IV, 806 possibly identified the innkeeper as Sirtius, who boasted that he had restored the elephant. See Jashemski, "A Pompeian copra," p. 346.
- 34 Jashemski, "A Pompeian copra," p. 339; Ruddell, *Tavern Business*, pp. 3, 86. See also now Jones and Robinson's systematic study of *Insula* (VI.1) in Ch. 25.
- 35 Ruddell, *Tavern Business*, p. 70.
- 36 Packer, "Inns at Pompeii," p. 8, n.9.
- 37 Ruddell, *Tavern Business*, p. 78; Packer *Inns at Pompeii*, pp. 30-3. See now R. Ling, *The Insula of the Menander at Pompeii, vol. 1: the structures*, Oxford, 1997; P. M. Allison, *The Insula of the Menander at Pompeii 3: the finds, a contextual study*, Oxford, 2006.
- 38 Richardson, *Pompeii*, p. 423; Ruddell, *Tavern Business*, p. 95; Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society*, pp. 214-15.
- 39 La Torre, "Gli impianti commerciali," pp. 92-3.
- 40 CIL IV, 97, 113.
- 41 Richardson, *Pompeii*, p. 424; Ruddell, *Tavern Business*, p. 86; See also H. B. Van der Poel (ed.), *Corpus Topographiarum Pompeianum*, Rome, 1977-1986, vol. 2, p. 245; vol. 5, pp. 249-51.
- 42 Many had small kitchens and stoves. Their customers came on foot, they were considered poor, and prices were low. The price list from the *atrium* of *hoplithum* (IX.7.24-25)—see CIL IV, 5380—may either be a daily menu or shopping list. Basic commodities are listed: cheese, bread (with a lower grade for slaves), wines of varying quality, oil, onions, wheat, porridge, leeks, dates, sausage and soft cheese. See A. E. Cooley and M. G. L. Cooley, *Pompeii: A sourcebook*, London, 2004, p. 163.
- 43 See Carratelli and Baldassarre, *Pittura e mosaici*, 1993, vol. 4, pp. 1005-19; T. Frühlich, *Latrines und Festsitzstühle in den Varrustätten. Untersuchungen zur "volkshinlichen" pompejanischen Malerei*, RM-EH, 32, Mainz, 1991, pp. 214-22. Compare these to scenes of reclining diners from the House of the Triclinium (V.2.4); cf. Carratelli and Baldassarre, *Pittura e mosaici*, 1991, vol. 3, pp. 797-8, 811-18. See also Ruddell, *Tavern Business*, pp. 35-6; Jashemski, "A Pompeian copra," p. 338.
- 44 Carratelli and Baldassarre, *Pittura e mosaici*, 1991, vol. 3, pp. 184-95; 1990, vol. 1, p. 844, respectively. For (I.8.15-16), see also V. Castiglione Morelli del Franco and R. Vitale, "L'insula 8 della Regio I: un campione d'indagine socio-economica," *RSPompeii*, 1989, vol. 3, pp. 209-8.
- 45 Hor., *Sat.*, 2.4.62. The use here is unclear. However, in *Epist.* 1.14.20 he clearly uses the term pejoratively.
- 46 For magnifying foods, see Macrobi., *Sat.* 7.14.1 (noted by E. Gowers, *The Loaded Table*, Oxford, 1993, p. 24, n. 107).
- 47 See CIL IV, 5380 at (IX.7.24-25); cf. above, n. 42. See Ruddell, *Tavern Business*, pp. 40-2; W. C. Fitchebaugh, *The Inns of Greece and Rome*, Chicago, IL, 1929, reprint, 1972, pp. 205-10; see also M. Della Corte, "Le iscrizioni di Ercolano," *RendNap.*, 1958, vol. 33, pp. 307-7, no. 837; J. J. Deiss, *Herculaneum: Italy's buried treasure*, rev. edn, Malibu, CA, 1989, pp. 117-24.
- 48 Suet., *Tib.* 34, *Claud.* 38, *Ner.* 16; Dio Cass. 60.6.7, 62.14.2. See Ruddell, *Tavern Business*, pp. 65; Klebeeg, *Händl.*, pp. 101-2.
- 49 Klebeeg, *Händl.*, pp. 105-7; Ruddell, *Tavern Business*, pp. 61-2; Casson, *Traffic*, pp. 217, 354; G. Hermanns, "Roman inns and the law," in J. A. S. Evans (ed.), *Paths and imperium: studies in honor of Eduard Togo Salmon*, Toronto, 1974, pp. 167-73.
- 50 *Ann.* Marc. 14.6.25.
- 51 See P. Green (transl.), *Juvenal: the sixteen satires*, Harmondsworth, rev. edn, 1974; Suet. VIII, p. 190 n. 17. See also Gowers, *Loaded Table*, chs 1 and 3, although she is more concerned with satire concerning meals held at home. See also Cic., *Phil.* 6.13.
- 52 Wallace-Hadrill, "Public honor," pp. 39-63; R. Laurence, *Roman Pompeii: Space and society*, London, 1994, pp. 70-87, to which the discussion below refers. Laurence's book has now been revised in a second edition (2006); *non vid.*
- 53 Wallace-Hadrill, "Public honor," p. 39.
- 54 Laurence, *Roman Pompeii*, p. 70.
- 55 Sen., *De vita beata* 7.3, transl. Wallace-Hadrill, "Public honor," p. 39.
- 56 MNN, inv. no. 111482; CIL IV, 3494. See E. Todd, "Three Pompeian wall inscriptions and Pteronius," *CR*, 1939, vol. 80, pp. 5-9; H. Tanzer, *The Common People of Pompeii*, Baltimore, MD, 1939, pp. 47-51; Packer, "Inns at Pompeii," p. 36, n. 75. In the third "cartoon" panel, two men gamble at a game, perhaps XII *scripta*. The first cries out: *exi*, "I'm out" (i.e., "I win"), but the other objects: *non vris; dicit eis*, "That's not a three, it's a two!" In the fourth panel, the two come to blows; the first man claims: *maxe a me vris ego fui*, "You've wronged me, it was a three; I was out!" The second retorts: *ore fallitur, ego fui*, "Son of a cocksucker! I was out!" The proprietor shoves both of them to the door, saying: *hii foris vixisti*, "Get out, do your fighting outside!" (transl. P. Foss). See G. P. Carratelli and I. Baldassarre (eds), *Pompeii, pitture e mosaici*, vol. 5, Rome, 1994, pp. 366-71.
- 57 Ruddell, *Tavern Business*, pp. 43-4.
- 58 These have been found in Rome, Philippi, Timgad, Ephesus, Britain and Lepcis Magna, among others. See R. MacKullen, *Roman Social Relations*, New Haven, CT, 1974, pp. 64, 170 n. 23; U. Schäfer, "XII Scripta. Alea Tabula—new evidence for the Roman history of Backgammon," in A. J. de Voogt (ed.), *New Approaches to Board Game Research*, Leiden, 1995, pp. 73-98.
- 59 Suet., *Aug.* 71.
- 60 CIL IV, 7698. *Abibat unda pedes pueri ad deterget nudo, mappae varam vult, linta nostra caret. Latrinas vilibus et blandas autfert ocellis conitige ab alteris, sit tibi in ore pudor. Uere blandissimi odiosaque iungit differ si pueri aut gressus ad tua tectis rigor*. "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. Put aside lascivious looks and alluring eyes at the wife of another man; let decency reside in your speech. Speak pleasant words and avoid troublesome quarrels if you can; otherwise take steps to your own house." (transl. P. Foss).
- 61 Cic., *Off.* 1.150. Note in Pompeii for example, CIL IV, 9339b. See MacKullen, *Roman Social Relations*, pp. 119-20, 138.
- 62 Laurence, *Roman Pompeii*, p. 70.
- 63 MacKullen, *Roman Social Relations*, pp. 88-101.
- 64 Laurence, *Roman Pompeii*, p. 85.
- 65 Plaut., *Cure*, 461-85.
- 66 "Nani quid ad voluplatem peritiam, licet circumfundatur ambigue et per omnis vias trifidat caninunque blandimentis suis leniter oblique ex alibi admovent, quibus totos parvasque mantri sollicita" (Sen., *De vita beata* 5.4), transl. C. Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge, 1993, p. 173.
- 67 Sen., *Ep.* 56.1-2.
- 68 CIL IV, 7863; 7864; 7873; 7862; 7866; 7221.
- 69 For the use of the phallus, see Plin., *HN* 19.19.1; Varro, *Ling.* 7.97; Poll., *Onom.* 8.118. See also J. R. Charles, *Roman Sex, 100 BC-AD 250*, New York, 2003, pp. 95-105, 108-11. For primary sources in translation concerning amulets, phallus magic and Ptaipus, see D. Ogden (ed.), *Magia, Witchcraft, and Ghosts in Greek and Roman Worlds: a sourcebook*, Oxford, 2002.
- 70 M. Della Corte, *Pompeii: The new excavations*, Vale di Pompeii, 1927, p. 23.
- 71 CIL IV, 7432; J. Franklin, *Pompeii difficile et*, Ann Arbor, MI, 2001, pp. 89-90, 186; Della Corte, *Cave et abitant*, p. 348. Cf. Nappo, Ch. 23, for a discussion of the architecture of this building.
- 72 CIL IV, 8442.
- 73 D. E. E. Kleiner and S. B. Matherson (eds), *I Claudia. Women in ancient Rome*, New Haven, CT, 1996, p. 90 n. 2. I do not wish this small flaw to mar the reputation of an extraordinary

- exhibit and book concerning women and Rome. See also J. Evans, *War, Women and Children in Ancient Rome*, London, 1991, p. 134.
- 74 *Dig.* 23.2-43, pp. 6-9.
- 75 Evans, *War, Women and Children*, p. 134; J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, Baltimore, MD, 1990, pp. 110-12.
- 76 H. Eschebach, *Die städtebauliche Entwicklung des antiken Pompeji*, RM-EM 17, Heidelberg, 1970, p. 122.
- 77 Address (V.2.b-c) is used in Carratelli and Baldassarre, *Pittura e murale* and Eschebach, *Die städtebauliche Entwicklung*. It is listed as (V.2.C-D) in Van der Pool, *CTP*, vol. IIIa, p. 73. For the *grafitti*, see *CIL IV*, 4259, 8454.
- 78 *CIL IV*, 8241; 8248.
- 79 Wallace-Hadrill, "Public honor," pp. 51-2.
- 80 L. Jacobelli, *Le pitture envidie delle Terme Suburbane Pompei*, Soprintendenza Archeologica di Pompei, Monografia 10, Rome, 1995, pp. 154-66. For critical treatments of this subject, see now T. A. J. McGinn, "Pompeian brothels and social history," *JRA Suppl.* Ser. no. 47, 2002, pp. 7-46; T. A. J. McGinn, *The Economy of Prostitution in the Roman World*, Ann Arbor, MI, 2004.
- 81 *CIL IV*, 813; *Oratio laeti hic non est. Discede morator*, "This is not a place to idle. Shove off, loiterer" (transl. P. Foss).
- 82 See J. DeFelice, *The Women of the Roman Inn: A study of law, occupation and status*, Ph.D. thesis, Miami University of Ohio, 1998; DeFelice, *Roman Hospitality*, ch. 3.

CHAPTER THIRTY-ONE

GARDENS

—♦—
Wilhelmina Jasbrenski

Gardens had an important place in the life of ancient Campania. Approximately 626 have been found in Pompeii, Herculaneum, and the surrounding villas, preserved by the eruption of AD 79.¹ Gardens were associated with many public buildings, and even with tombs (cf. Cormack, Ch. 37),² but the most were found in homes. The garden was the heart of the house, whether large or small, furnishing light, air, and ease of communication to rooms opening onto it. It was a place of work and play, a place to cook, eat and worship.³ A large house might have three or more gardens, a small house perhaps only a tiny light well that contained plants. These gardens differed greatly not only in size, design, function and plantings, but also with respect to the role of water, sculpture and garden furniture.

The garden was a significant factor in the development of the house. The most elegant houses in Pompeii were built by the Samnites in the second century BC (cf. Wallace-Hadrill, Ch. 18). It has often been said that the house of this period was created by adding the peristyle of the contemporary luxurious Hellenistic house to the rear of the old Italic *atrium* house. But when the Italians added the peristyle to their *atrium* house they transformed the peristyle by making it a garden, instead of leaving it as a beaten clay court, or paving it with cobblestones, cement or mosaics, as was done in the Hellenistic house.

The garden might be enclosed by a portico on one, two, three or four sides. Houses with porticoed gardens, however, were not as universal as has been thought. Only about 300 such houses, some very small, have been found thus far in the entire Vesuvian area. There were also houses with interior courtyard gardens, but no portico. Sometimes wide windows gave a view into these gardens.

Some of the luxurious houses built over the city wall in the southwestern and western part of the city (after Pompeii became a Roman city and the wall was no longer needed for protection) even had roof gardens (cf. Tybout, Ch. 20).⁴ Seneca scathingly deplored such unnatural practices as planting the tops of buildings with trees, with their roots where the roofs should be.⁵

Houses were by no means as uniform as is often thought. There were many smaller homes of irregular plan occupied by more humble citizens, but even the poor, if at all possible, made place in their modest homes for a tiny garden. Many homes were