

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Cubicula diurna, nocturna - revisiting Roman cubicula and sleeping arrangements

Nissinen, Laura Helena

2009

Nissinen , L H 2009 , ' Cubicula diurna, nocturna - revisiting Roman cubicula and sleeping arrangements ' , Arctos : Acta Philologica Fennica , Vuosikerta. 43 , Sivut 85-107 .

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/166688>

publishedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

CUBICULA DIURNA, NOCTURNA – REVISITING ROMAN CUBICULA AND SLEEPING ARRANGEMENTS

LAURA NISSINEN

Introduction

One third of the human life is spent sleeping. It is thus timely that sleeping arrangements, sleeping conditions and sleep related problems have attracted attention in recent years; indeed, research into sleep is becoming one of the fastest advancing branches in science. Alongside the study of the medical, physiological and psychological aspects of sleep and dreaming, social science has also taken an interest in the sociological characteristics of sleeping arrangements. The major theme within sociological research of sleeping is "that how we sleep, when we sleep, where we sleep, and with whom we sleep, are all influenced by social, cultural and historical factors".¹ From the point of view of cultural history, some pioneering work on sleeping in the Greco-Roman world has been done as well.² Yet many issues remain un-addressed; in particular, the ways sleeping was arranged in ancient Roman houses, or cultural and sociological aspects this reveals of the society in case. To find out the factors defining the sleeping habits in Roman society, an extensive analysis of the written evidence in comparison with archaeological material is needed.

This paper is concerned principally with Roman *cubicula*, the most common term for resting spaces in Latin literary sources. First, it is necessary to establish what can be concluded of the different functions and users of *cubicula* known from the literary record. Secondly, a brief re-assessment of archaeological

¹ E.g. *The Sociology of Sleep group* at University of Surrey: www.sociologyofsleep.surrey.ac.uk and S. J. Williams, *Sleep and Society, Sociological ventures into the (un)known...*, London – New York 2008.

² Especially T. Wiedemann, "The Roman Siesta" and K. Dowden, "The value of sleep: Homer, Plinies, Posidonius & Proclus", in T. Wiedemann – K. Dowden (eds.), *Sleep* (Nottingham Classical Literature Studies 8), Bari 2003.

material serves to highlight some of the problems concerning the archaeological evidence about sleeping arrangements in the Roman house. The archaeological material for this article is chosen primarily from Pompeii and Herculaneum, since in the city of Rome little evidence of private housing has survived.

In the case study, two Pompeian houses, the *Casa del Fabbro* (I 10,7) and the *Casa dell'Efebo o di P. Cornelius Tages* (I 7,10–12/19) have been selected due to the better archaeological record relating to their excavation, but also as the domestic assemblages of these houses have been the subject of recent re-examination. This paper is hence a preliminary methodological case-study of my work concerning Roman sleeping arrangements in the light of both literary evidence and the archaeological evidence in the Vesuvian area.³ In the context of this paper, *cubiculum* is treated primarily as a bedroom though a review of its other functions is also presented. I will also consider the physical aspects of this type of room. As the archaeological evidence will show, besides rooms traditionally called as *cubicula*, also the use of other types of spaces used for resting has to be taken into account in the study of the arrangements of sleeping.

The discussion on types of space inside the Roman *domus*⁴ should be seen as a part of a larger context; the way a society arranges domestic space reveals

³ I have treated the written evidence of *cubicula* in my MA thesis "*Cubicula diurna, nocturna: cubiculum-makuutila latinankielisessä kirjallisuudessa*" (University of Helsinki, 2008) in which the functions, physical aspects and use of this space in Latin literature were examined. E-thesis: <http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi-fe200804251275>.

The material finds from the *Casa del Fabbro* (I, 10,7) and the *Casa dell'Efebo* (I 7,10–12/19) have been investigated by P. M. Allison, *Pompeian Households, An Analysis of the Material Culture*, Los Angeles CA, 2004 with a Companion website at www.stoa.org/pompeian-households (Allison, On Line Companion). *Casa dell'Efebo*: <http://www.stoa.org/projects/ph/house?id=7> and <http://www.stoa.org/projects/ph/house?id=8>; *Casa del Fabbro*: <http://www.stoa.org/projects/ph/house?id=10> and by R. Ling and P. M. Allison, with a contribution by T. Giove, *The Insula of the Menander at Pompeii. Vol. 3: The finds, a contextual study*, Oxford 2007; Pompeian evidence is considered also more generally based on these studies. Some observations on the material from Herculaneum are presented as well, mainly based on S. T. A. M. Mols, *Wooden furniture in Herculaneum: form, technique and function*, Amsterdam 1999.

⁴ Latin literature shows that *cubiculum* as an appellation is quite flexible: it can be used not only of rooms in an *atrium* house owned by a wealthy Roman, but also of rooms in more modest dwellings. The name appears very often also in *villa* descriptions and in connection with imperial residences. However, this paper deals mainly with the town house of a wealthy Roman citizen. Whether this should be called a Roman house, an Italic house, an old Roman house, a Roman *atrium* house, a Pompeian house or even an *atrium* house according to Vitruvius I am not going to commit on within the limits of this article; see discussion e.g. B. Tamm, "Some notes on Roman Houses", *ORom* 9 (1973) 53.

the underlying values and structures of the society in question. It is known that to a certain extent social complexity determines the organization of space: the more complex a society is, the more segmented its architecture becomes.⁵ Indeed, the complexity and stratification of Roman society is reflected in the houses owned by its wealthiest citizens; houses were designed to suit both the manifold private rituals and also the demands of public life. Movement inside the Roman house and its spatial use was guided with the help of structures, decoration and servants. Though emphasis on the functioning of the house has been on the representative purposes and the level of privacy in the dwellings owned by private citizens, the more mundane aspects of life, such as water use and toilets inside houses have also been surveyed.⁶ Yet sleeping areas have been largely explored only in passing.⁷

Different roles of the *cubicula*

The term *cubiculum* has aroused interest in recent years and its wide range of definitions and different functions in Latin literature are well-known.⁸ Here I will

⁵ S. Kent, "Introduction" and "A cross-cultural study of segmentation, architecture and use of space", in S. Kent (ed.), *Domestic architecture and the use of space: an interdisciplinary cross-cultural study*, Cambridge 1990, 2–3, 127.

⁶ Especially E. Dwyer, "The Pompeian Atrium House in Theory and in Practice", in E. Gazda (ed.), *Roman Art in the Private Sphere – New Perspectives on the Architecture and Décor of the Domus, Villa and Insula*, Ann Arbor 1991, 25–48; J. R. Clarke, *The Houses of Roman Italy, 100 BC – AD 250: ritual, space, and decoration*, Berkeley 1991; A. Wallace-Hadrill, "The Social Structure of the Roman House", *PBSR* 56 (1988) 43–97 and A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and society in Pompeii and Herculaneum*, Princeton 1994; K. M. D. Dunbabin, "The use of private space", in *La ciutat en el món romà: actes XIV congrés internacional d'arqueologia clàssica*, Tarragona 1994, 165–76; articles in R. Laurence and A. Wallace-Hadrill (eds.), *Domestic space in the Roman world: Pompeii and beyond*, (JRA Suppl. 22), Portsmouth 1997; S. Hales, *The Roman House and Social Identity*, New York 2003; F. Pesando, *Domus: edilizia privata e società pompeiana fra III e I secolo a.C.*, Roma 1997; N. de Haan – G. Jansen (eds.), *Cura aquarum in Campania* (BABesch Suppl. 4), Leiden 1996; G. Jansen, "Private toilets of Pompeii", in S. E. Bon – R. Jones (eds.), *Sequence and Space in Pompeii*, Oxford 1997, 121–34.

⁷ Especially Clarke (above n. 6) 13; Dwyer (above n. 6) 26–8; Wallace-Hadrill 1988 (above n. 6) 59 (n. 44), 78, 81, 86–7 (n. 130), 92–3; Wallace-Hadrill 1994 (above n. 6) 95–7, 113–4; Dunbabin (above n. 6), 171–2.

⁸ A. Riggsby, "'Public' and 'private' in Roman culture: the case of *cubiculum*", *JRA* 10 (1997) 36–56. Article divides functions of *cubicula* as rest, sex (especially adultery), controlled display of art, murder, suicide and reception: 37, 38, 39, 41–2; E. W. Leach, "Oecus on Ibycus: In-

comment most importantly on its role as a place for the reception.

According to the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* and the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* the use of the word *cubiculum* can vary from animal shelter or grave to a term used in connection with construction techniques (e.g. Vitr. 4,2,4; Pallad. 1,25). The main and most important function of the space, however, is resting as the name implies⁹ and actions well-suited for a sleeping area, such as day and night rest, sexual activities and staying in bed while being ill are well represented in literature; as a resting place *cubiculum* appears in Latin texts starting from Plautus (*Amph.* 808; *Most.* 696) continuing even in the medieval and modern writings.¹⁰ This meaning is corroborated in funerary inscriptions, in which *cubiculum* is often used as a reference to an eternal resting place.¹¹ In the late antique texts some figurative meanings for the word appear,¹² but mainly it refers to a room. Other activities are also well-known; A. Riggsby has drawn attention to descriptions of murders and suicides committed inside *cubicula*.¹³ It seems that especially the latter is usually depicted as very schematic: suicide is care-

vestigating the Vocabulary of the Roman House", in S. E. Bon – R. Jones (eds.), *Sequence and Space in Pompeii*, Oxford 1997, 50–73 and A. Anguissola, "Persone e oggetti nel *cubiculum*: la costruzione letteraria della privacy nella casa romana", in F. de Angelis (ed.), *Lo sguardo archeologico. I normalisti per Paul Zanker*, Pisa 2007, 149–67. Also dictionaries, such as *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (TLL), IV,1266,46 ss. and P. G. W. Glare (ed.), *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (OLD), Oxford 1992 (sv. *cubiculum*) list different functions quite extensively. See also chapters dealing with *cubicula* in A. Zaccaria Ruggiu, *Spazio privato e spazio pubblico nella città romana*, Rome 1995, 394–409 and M. Carucci, *The Romano-African Domus: Studies in Space, Decoration, and Function*, Oxford 2007, 73–82.

⁹ *Cubiculum* is derived from the same root as the verb *cubare* combined with the suffix *-culum* which points to a place, such as in words *auguraculum* (place for observing the flight of birds), *cenaculum* (a dining-room, usually in an upper storey) and *receptaculum* (reservoir); TLL IV, 1279, 72; A. Ernout – A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine, Histoire des mots*, Paris 1959⁴, s.v. *cubo*; M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* (HGAW II:2,1), Neuausg. München 1977, 313.

¹⁰ Medieval and modern texts, see e.g. M. Plezia (ed.), *Lexicon Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis Polonorum*, vol. II C, Wrocław 1959–1967, s.v. *cubiculum*; J. W. Fuchs – O. Weijers – M. Gumbert, *Lexicon Latinitatis Nederlandicae Medii Aevi*, vol. II C, Leiden 1981, s.v. *cubiculum*; J. F. Niermayer – C. Van De Kleft, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*, vol. A.-L., Leiden 2002, s.v. *cubiculum*; O. Prinz – T. Payr – P. Dinter, *Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch bis zum ausgehenden 13. Jahrhundert*, München 1999, s.v. *cubiculum*; J. A. Simpson – E. S. C. Weiner (eds.), *The Oxford English Dictionary*. Vol. III, Oxford 1989, s.v. *cubicle*, *cubiculum*.

¹¹ TLL IV,1268, 76: e.g. *CE* 1563,9; *CIL* X 1870, 2015, 2338, 2533, 3300, 4035; *CIL* XIV 158, 715, 1383, 3323; see also Ps.Quint. *decl.* 8,22.

¹² E.g. Rufin. *hist.mon.* 23,3,3; Hier. *in Is.* 16,58,5,17; Ambr. *Cain et Ab.* 1,9,35,370,5.

¹³ Riggsby (above n. 8) 39–40.

fully prepared inside a *cubiculum* but actually committed later in the baths (*bal(i)neum, balnea*).¹⁴ According to A. Zaccaria Ruggiu, there is another space closely connected to *cubiculum*, namely the dining room, *triclinium*.¹⁵ This notion goes together well with the theme found prevailing in literature from Cato on: the host or a guest leaving a banquet ends up in *cubiculum* (by himself, possibly with a companion, or carried by others).¹⁶ Besides these activities found in connection with *cubiculum*, some rare occasions point to an interpretation, that *cubiculum* could act also as a place for dining, religious activities, storage and ablutions.¹⁷

Cubiculum is also seen to belong among the reception areas of a Roman *domus*, at least on an intimate scale.¹⁸ This function is however quite complex and requires re-assessment. There are some clear references to reception (e.g. Cic. *ad Q.fr* 1,7,25; Plin. *nat.* 15,38) and *cubiculum* is mentioned especially as a place for private negotiations (in imperial context, e.g. Sen. *clem.* 1,9,7; Tac. *ann.*

¹⁴ Sen. *dial.* 6,22,6, Tac. *ann.* 15,64; 15,69; 16,11; Apul. *met.* 1,23; see also Sen. *epist.* 77,9.

¹⁵ A. Zaccaria Ruggiu, "Abbinamento *triclinium* - *cubiculum*: Un'ipotesi interpretativa", in M. Verzár-Bass (ed.), *Abitare in Cisalpina: l'edilizia privata nelle città e nel territorio in età romana*, Trieste 2001, 59–101; In Romano-African context: Carucci (above n. 8) 81; According to Zaccaria Ruggiu, the connection between *cubicula* and *triclinia* can be seen also in archaeological material, and especially in several Pompeian houses where *cubicula* are placed next to dining rooms. This hypothesis seems credible enough, though it needs some correctives: e.g. her identification of room 21 in House of Marcus Lucretius (IX 3,5/24) as dining room (p. 80) is based purely on study of floor plan of the house: this room does not belong to the dining rooms of the house (E. Falkener, "Report on a house at Pompeii Excavated under Personal Superintendence in 1847", in *The Museum of Classical Antiquities: being a Series of essays on Ancient Art*. Vol. II, London 1860, 80: *oecus*; See also discussion on rooms of the house in P. Castrén (ed.), *Domus Pompeiana: una casa a Pompei*, Helsinki 2008 and P. Castrén – R. Berg – A. Tammisto – E.-M. Viitanen, "In the Heart of Pompeii – Archaeological Studies in the *Casa di Marco Lucrezio* (IX, 3, 5.24)", in P. G. Guzzo – M. P. Guidobaldi (eds.), *Nuove ricerche archeologiche nell'area vesuviana, scavi 2003–2006: atti del convegno internazionale, Roma, 1–3 febbraio 2007*, Roma 2008, 331–40.

¹⁶ Riggsby (above n. 8) 37; *TLL* IV, 1267, 48; Cato *or. frg.* 57,2; Cic. *off.* 2,7,5; *Deiot.* 21 and 42; Liv. 1,58,1 and 40,24,6; Curt. 8,6,13, and 8,3,8; Sen. *epist.* 12,8; Suet. *Aug.* 69; Hist. *Aug. Ver.* 4,9.

¹⁷ Dining: Apul. *met.* 2,10; Sen. *dial.* 5,8,6; 6,22,6; Plin. *nat.* 15,38; religion: Varro *frg. Non.* p. 480M; Suet. *Dom.* 17,5, possibly also Plin. *nat.* 15,38; ablutions: Sen. *epist.* 77,9; Apul. *met.* 5,1–2; storage: Plin. *epist.* 2,17; Ps. Quint. *decl.* 1,3; Tac. *ann.* 15,55, Suet. *Aug.* 73.

¹⁸ E.g. Wallace-Hadrill 1988 (above n. 6) 59 n. 44; Wallace-Hadrill 1994 (above n. 6) 44, 58; Zaccaria Ruggiu (above n. 8) 407; Riggsby (above n. 8) 41; discussion on audience and its place in a Roman *domus* see also C. Badel, "L'audience chez les sénateurs", dans J.-P. Caillet – M. Sot (eds.), *L'audience – Rituels et cadres spatiaux dans l'antiquité et le haut Moyen Age*, Paris 2007, 147.

11,2; private context, e.g. Plin. *epist.* 5,1,5 and even as late as in Amm. 28,4,26). However, for some of the often cited passages an alternative interpretation could be presented: for example The Verrine orations of Cicero (e.g. 4,79; 6,26–28), which have been used as the basis for placing *cubiculum* among the representative areas, seem to me to show rather how unusual and condemnable it was for Verres to handle his dirty business inside a bedchamber. Only an immoral and lazy man would do so. Also Tacitus (*hist.* 4,24) mentions this kind of suspicious action when describing a commander who leads his men from his bedchamber. The Roman concept of morality can be seen in the attitude towards sleeping. As said by K. Dowden: "Wakefulness is in principle a supererogatory and commendable activity which distinguishes great, almost heroic, men ... from ordinary people".¹⁹ Morally suspicious men slept during days and partied all nights; sleeping too long was regarded the mark of an overindulgent lifestyle.²⁰ As it is the purpose of Cicero to show the judges how rotten Verres was it is clear that he is presenting this dishonorable and lazy man in the shady light of a *cubiculum*.

When *cubiculum* was used as a place for reception, it depended more likely on some specific circumstances, such as the illness of the master of the house or the absolute need for secrecy than an ordinary custom.²¹ The ordinary *cubiculum* was rather a private office for working and conducting literary activities than an open (or even a semi-open) place for representative purposes. Several passages emphasize this; e.g. Quintilian (*inst.* 10,3,22–29) recommends working in the privacy of a *cubiculum* during night-time in the light of one single source of light (*lucubrare*). Lucubration was practiced also by such men as Varro, Cicero and Pliny as it was considered being "high-status sleep deprivation" well suited for the virtuous Roman men.²² Among the archaeological material we can find at least one interesting instance which could point towards the interpretation of *cubiculum* as a study: among the finds of a first floor room of *Casa del Sacello in legno* (V 31) in Herculaneum, along with the bed, also a bench and a chest with wax tablets were found.²³

¹⁹ Dowden (above n. 2) 150.

²⁰ Wiedemann (above n. 2) 131; Dowden (above n. 2) 149–50.

²¹ Tac. *ann.* 4,69, Cic. *fam.* 7,1,1; Val.Max. 2,5,2; Plin. *epist.* 3,7,4; Suet. *Claud.* 35; See also: Plin. *epist.* 1,22,4 and 1,12,7. Physicians do not seem to have used *cubiculum* as place for reception except for in the Plinies (Plin. *nat.* 30,52 and Plin. *med.* 2,13); some sick calls at *cubicula* are however known: e.g. Apul. *flor.* 23.

²² Dowden (above n. 2) 141, 150–4. *cubiculum* as working place: Plin. *epist.* 3,1; Petron. 129,3; Suet. *Dom.* 17,1–2, Hist.Aug. *Comm.* 9,3; Hist.Aug. *Alex.* 21,6; even Cic. *Scaur.* 26 and Sen. *dial.* 5,8,6 could be interpreted as such.

²³ A. Maiuri, *Ercolano: i nuovi scavi (1927–1958)*, Roma 1958, 255; Mols (above n. 3) 129.

The users of *cubicula*

In addition to the supposed function as a place of reception mentioned above, in some cases, *cubiculum* is interpreted being more or less populated also by the *familia* of the house.²⁴ Both Riggsby and Anguissola tend on the other hand to restore at least relative privacy for the *cubicula*.²⁵ In my opinion the literary passages mentioning *cubicula* seem to show that upper class Romans could afford privacy among the inhabitants as well, if needed. This is revealed notably in the descriptions of movement inside one's *cubiculum*. These descriptions include, as expected, neutral words such as *venio*, *intro*, *digredior* and words that contain hints of people coming in invited, lead or even carried by another person (such as *deduco*, *admitto*, *immitto*, and other derivatives of *ducere* and *mittere*).²⁶ Besides these there is also a third group of verbs depicting movement inside a *cubiculum*. This group is composed of violent terms such as *irrumpto* and *invado*, which tell us that in some cases it was necessary to use force getting inside a *cubiculum*.²⁷ This is confirmed by the descriptions of the physical aspects of the room as well: a typical trait of this space was the possibility that it could be closed: the mentions of doors and closing the door are pervasive.²⁸ In the light of this evidence I con-

In this one case the evidence is not conclusive enough and it cannot be attested that this room was used both for working and for sleeping. However, there is evidence of similar kind of arrangements in other parts of Herculaneum as well, such as in House V 22 (Maiuri 443; Mols [above n. 3] 135, 160–1, 255–6). These arrangements seem very interesting and need to be studied further.

²⁴ E.g. Wallace-Hadrill 1988 (above n. 6) 78.

²⁵ Riggsby (above n. 8) 43–5. Though Riggsby sees *cubicula* as relatively secret areas, he seems not to question the idea that the presence of servants in *cubicula* might have been taken for granted by the aristocrat slave-owners. Anguissola (above n. 8) 154, 156, 160; See discussion also in Zaccaria Ruggiu (above n. 8) 407–9 and Carucci (above n. 8) 83–94. Of lovemaking scenes with attending servants see for example: J. R. Clarke, *Looking at lovemaking: constructions of sexuality in Roman art, 100 B.C. – A.D. 250*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London 1998, especially 93–107.

²⁶ Latter group: cf. Vit. 6,5,1.

²⁷ E.g. *introrumpo*: Apul. met. 2,26; Gell. 15,22,9; *invado*: Apul. met. 4,26; *irrumpto*: Sen. contr. 1,4,11; Ps.Quint. decl. 8,22; Suet. Claud. 37; Suet. Otho. 11,1; Apul. met. 9,2; Vir.ill. 9,3; Hist.Aug. Pert. 11,3; *irruo*: Quint. decl. 310, p.222,8; see also: Bell.Afr. 88: ... *impetu facto in cubiculum...* and Ps.Quint. decl. 2.intr / decl. 2,19: *intravit familia in cubiculum domini ... Ecce cubiculi vestri fores trepidae festinationis effringuntur impulsu*. Cf. also verb *excubo* meaning "to lie out on guard".

²⁸ Doors: *foris*: Cic. Tusc. 5,59; Val.Max. 9,13, ext. 4; Curt. 8,6,18; 8,6,22; Ps.Quint. decl. 1,9; Tac. ann. 3,5; 14,8; 14,44; Suet. Iul. 81; Suet. Aug. 82,1; Gell. 2,2,2; Apul. met. 2,30; *ostium*:

clude that *cubiculum* gave a *possibility* for peace and privacy, though, in practice, moving inside a house and accessing one's bedroom was probably quite easy. As seen in the various descriptions of homicides happening in *cubiculum*, murderers and other wrongdoers were able to commit their deeds in spite of closed doors and possible guards.

The actual users of *cubicula* have been under examination in studies where the number of *cubicula* in certain Pompeian houses has been used as the basis for calculating the amount of inhabitants living in it. For example, the amount of people living in the so-called *Casa del Labirinto* (VI 11,8–10) has been under investigation by counting the possible places of beds in the rooms identified as *cubiculum*.²⁹

Such estimations are doomed to remain in several respects hypothetical because of the difficulties in the interpretation of the only partially preserved evidence. The limitations of this kind of estimations have been pointed out by several scholars, for example, not all the sc. *cubicula* were used as bedrooms and if they were used as such, places of beds cannot be discerned with certainty. We don't even know how many people might have slept in these beds or bedrooms. Possibly some of the beds were not slept in, and also dining couches could have been used for sleeping. Especially the sleeping areas of servants are difficult to discern in Pompeian context.³⁰

Latin literature does provide us with some information about the users of a *cubiculum*. Besides the free Roman adults, in some rare cases children are mentioned in connection of the *cubicula*. Couples are depicted sharing the bedroom but it was possible for the spouses to sleep separately as well.³¹ In archaeological remains this is not easy to distinguish: for example the beds in Herculaneum are

Apul. *met.* 3,21; *valvae*: Plin. *epist.* 2,17; thresholds: Cic. *Cluent.* 15; Curt. 8,6,22; Ps. Quint. *decl.* 1,11; 2 intr.; 2,6; Plin. *epist.* 7,23,1; Apul. *met.* 2,15; Doors were able to be closed from either side: descriptions of *cubiculum* with door being locked from outside: Tac. *ann.* 3,15, Apul. *met.* 2,24; 9,2; 10,20; Hist. Aug. *Heliog.* 25,1. See discussion in Anguissola (above n. 8) 159 and n. 26.

²⁹ V. M. Strocka, *Casa del Labirinto (VI 11,8–10)*, München 1991, 87–93, 135–6.

³⁰ Wallace-Hadrill 1994 (above n. 6) 95–7, 114; Mols (above n. 3) 126, Dunbabin (above n. 6) 171; Carucci (above n. 8) 82; Discussion of servants in Roman house: M. George, "Servus and Domus: the slave in the Roman house", in R. Laurence – A. Wallace-Hadrill (eds.), *Domestic space in the Roman world: Pompeii and beyond*, (JRA Suppl. 22), Portsmouth 1997, 15–24.

³¹ Riggsby (above n. 8) 42, 46; *TLL* IV, 1268,1; also: Quint. *decl.* 306 p. 203,19; Auson pp. 214, 404 (Peiper); Aug. *civ.* 6,9; Arnob. *nat.* 4,7; Dig. 35,1,15; *cubicula* belonging to women: Varro *frg. Non.* p. 480M; Tac. *ann.* 13,13,2; 13,44; 14,8; Apul. *met.* 8,11; Sen. *contr.* 7,6,4; Petron. 77; *cubiculum praegnantium*: Plin. *nat.* 26,153.

difficult to define as belonging to one or more sleepers.³² Gender segregation in organizing domestic space was not typical for the Romans.³³ According to Wallace-Hadrill even age was not an important "axe of differentiation" and therefore specific rooms for children cannot be discerned in archaeological material; infants are said to have slept probably with their nurses and teachers. This would coincide with Riggsby's notion of *cubicula* belonging exclusively to adults: according to him, no *cubicula* can be attested to belong to a child.³⁴ Some texts do, however, mention children sharing the *cubiculum* with their parents.³⁵ Also in one case a special nursing place (*nutrimentorum locus*) is described.³⁶ The sleeping arrangements of infants and older children remain dubious in archaeological context: only two beds belonging to children have been found in Herculaneum: a small bed along with a larger one in *Casa a Graticcio* (III 13–15) and a cradle in *Insula Orientalis* I 1a.³⁷ The case of *Casa a Graticcio* does provide a hint that solitary sleep for infants might not be practiced among Romans though one instance is not enough of evidence for a definitive conclusion. Older children could have had their own bedrooms; and though L. Nevett states that in literature there is no evidence of the inhabitants of a *domus* having their own rooms,³⁸ it seems that an opposite interpretation is also possible. For example some crime scene descriptions show youths in their own chambers. Also the descriptions of using space in imperial households support this view: e.g. the switching of the golden statue of Fortuna between the *cubicula* of sons of Septimius Severus – a story told in *Historia Augusta* – suggests that the boys had own rooms in permanent use.³⁹ It seems probable, that in the Campanian houses the sleeping areas were fixed. The wooden beds used in the houses were probably not very easy to be moved around the house, though using some lighter arrangements instead of beds especially in

³² Wallace-Hadrill 1994 (above n. 6) 113–4.

³³ Vitr. 6,7,4; Riggsby (above n. 8) 42; Wallace-Hadrill 1988 (above n. 6) 51–2, Wallace-Hadrill 1994 (above n. 6) 8, 113.

³⁴ Riggsby (above n. 8) 42; Wallace-Hadrill 1988 (above n. 6) 52; Wallace-Hadrill 1994 (above n. 6) 10, 113.

³⁵ For example in Sen. *contr.* 7,5,1 and Aur. Fronto p.234 v.d.H.

³⁶ Suet. *Aug.* 6.

³⁷ Maiuri (above n. 23) 345, 419; Wallace-Hadrill 1994 (above n. 6) 96, 113; Mols (above n. 3) 43, 149, 163.

³⁸ L. Nevett, "Perceptions of domestic space in Roman Italy", in B. Rawson – P. Weaver (eds.), *The Roman family in Italy: status, sentiment, space*, Canberra – Oxford 1997, 297.

³⁹ Ps.Quint. *decl.* 1,7; *decl.* 2 passim and *decl.* 328, p. 287, 3–7; Hist.Aug. *Sept.Sev.* 23,5; see also Tac. *ann.* 11,11; Petron. 86,5–6.

the servile context was probably common.⁴⁰ The epigraphic evidence attributing rooms to specific persons seems relatively rare in Pompeii, but the matter would merit a closer study.⁴¹

Having fixed places for sleeping and routines in daily (or in this case nightly) activities point to the need for security, which could be understood as a natural factor in choosing one's sleeping place. There are other factors associated with the sleeping habits which differ clearly between different societies from the more primitive ones to the modern Western world. Besides security, these factors are mainly the physical and social settings such as the use of bedding and presence or absence of fire, as can be seen in the detailed list of nine factors of sleeping habits in non-Western and Western societies created by C. M. Worthman and M. K. Melby.⁴² Romans seem to belong in this rough categorization closer to modern sleepers than among primitive ones. The physical settings are elaborate; private houses were designed to provide secure physical surroundings for sleepers though the small threats such as unwanted animals (snakes, scorpions and cockroaches) were unavoidable in *cubicula*. Also ghosts and nightmares were known to haunt sleepers.⁴³ The worship of the *Lares cubiculi*, could be interpreted as a protective act to guarantee safety in a bedroom.⁴⁴ Furthermore, the written evidence of *cubicula* reveals that solitary sleep (except for the spouses sleeping together) could have been more common than sc. social sleep.

⁴⁰ Cf. the verb *sterno* (to spread), in context of preparing a bed.

⁴¹ Cf. the graffito in *Casa degli Epigrammi greci* (V 1,18), where the inscription *Rufini cubiculum s* was found "in peristylia pariete sin., ad sin. exedrae", see more on inscription and Rufinus in *CIL* IV 4049 and IV 3409 (by A. Mau).

⁴² C. M. Worthman – M. K. Melby, "Toward a Comparative Developmental Ecology of Human Sleep", in M. A. Carskadon (ed.), *Sleep in Adolescent sleep patterns: biological, social, and psychological influences*, Cambridge 2002, safety issues: 71–2, 80–82; 106, table 6.2: list of factors conducting sleeping habits:

Western: Solitary [sleep], darkness, silence, climate-controlled, use of mattresses and pillows, absence of fire, stability, physically secured, bounded vs. non-Western: Social [sleep], darkness, noisy, No/human climate control, no mattresses, pillows, presence of fire, dynamics, socially secured, fuzzily bounded.

⁴³ Snakes: Cic. *off.* 3,54; Gell. 6,1,3; Tac. *ann.* 11,11; a scorpion in bed: Aur. Fronto p.73 v.d.H; cockroaches: Aug. *c. Faust.* 19,24,525; ghost: Val. Max. 1,7,7; ominous dream: Suet. *Iul.* 81.

⁴⁴ E.g.: Suet. *Aug.* 7: *inter cubiculi Lares colitur* [sc. *imaguncula Augusti*] and Suet. *Dom.* 17,5: *Puer, qui curae Larum cubiculi ex consuetudine assistens*; See also Plin. *nat.* 15,38; small figurines interpreted as *lares cubiculi* have been found in Pompeii and Herculaneum in rooms identified as *cubicula*, see A. M. Small, "Urban, suburban and rural religion in the Roman period", in J. J. Dobbins – P. W. Foss (eds.), *The World of Pompeii*, New York, 2007, 191–2; see also Mols (above n. 3): *aediculae* in bedrooms of Herculaneum, 132–3; For this idea I owe thanks to M. Carucci.

In the light of all this it would be surprising if sleeping habits were as "promiscuous", as the arrangements in Roman houses have sometimes been interpreted.⁴⁵ The segmented organization of space points to a society where the possibility for privacy was granted when needed or wanted. The Roman concept of privacy is clearly not comparable directly with modern views, but it seems that the Roman house offers a possibility to privacy in far greater level than in several other societies before and after in history. This is apparent if the Roman house is set against – even superficially – for example the palaces of Renaissance Italy or of some later monarchs, such as the Austrian royal family, which express a totally different way of arranging space: instead of the Roman *atria* or *peristylia* in which the other rooms of the house open, they feature usually long series of rooms arranged sequentially in a row, accessed through one another.⁴⁶

Identification of a sleeping area: physical aspects of *cubicula*

Latin texts do not give a definitive picture of the location of *cubiculum* inside a private house.⁴⁷ For example, not a single passage mentions a *cubiculum* situated in the area of a peristyle in a private town house, though texts do confirm that *cubicula* could be located in the inner parts of the *domus*; the word has such additional definitions as *interius* and *superius*,⁴⁸ which could imply that *cubiculum* could be situated in inside of a *domus* or on upper floor, but its typical location was in the front part of the house as is traditionally believed.⁴⁹ Indeed, Varro's description of the house places the *cubiculum* among the rooms around the *atrium*: *Circum cavum aedium erat unius quousque rei utilitatis causa parietibus dissepta; ubi quid conditum esse volebant a celando cellam appellarunt; penar-*

⁴⁵ Eg. Wallace-Hadrill 1994 (above n. 6) 57, Allison 2004 (above n. 3) 167.

⁴⁶ See, for example, the floor plans of Palazzo Doria Pamphilj in Rome, Villa d'Este in Tivoli and Hofburg, the Imperial Palace of Vienna.

⁴⁷ Some considerations of the place: Riggsby (above n. 8) 40–43, 51; Anguissola (above n. 8) 153–4.

⁴⁸ *Cubiculum interius*: Phaedr. 3,10,21; Quint. *decl.* 328, p. 287, 3–4: *Iuncta erant cubicula ... in interiore parte domus*; Apul. *met.* 3,21; 4,12: *superius cubiculum*.

⁴⁹ E.g. A. Mau, *Pompeji in Leben und Kunst*, Leipzig 1900, 244–55; O. Elia, "I cubicoli nelle case di Pompei, Contributo alla Storia della *Domus*", *Historia* 6 (1932) 394–421 and Zaccaria Ruggiu (above n 8), 398–401; Also in the early excavation reports and publications (such as *Notizie degli scavi di antichità* and G. Fiorelli, *Descrizione di Pompei*, Napoli 1875) labels derived from Latin literature are used in referring to different spaces.

*iam ubi penus, ubi cubabant cubiculum, ubi cenabant cenaculum vocitabant.*⁵⁰ However, from the context it is clear that Varro is referring to living conditions long before his own time.⁵¹

If texts do not reveal the location of *cubiculum*, could archaeology be of help? In Rome little evidence of private housing has survived, so the research of the Roman house has largely concentrated on the evidence of Campanian towns Pompeii and Herculaneum. In the traditional interpretation of a typical Pompeian *atrium* house, Latin names found in literature have been applied to different spaces, such as *atrium*, front hall, *tablinum*, master's office, *triclinium*, dining room and *cubiculum*, bedroom. Traditionally *cubicula* have been identified in certain places inside the *atrium* house, typically around the front hall, especially flanking the entranceway (*fauces*), or the peristyle. This convention derives particularly from the studies of Pompeii done by A. Mau and O. Elia and repeated in several studies afterwards.⁵²

The typology of the Pompeian house with its Latin nomenclature has proved to be a useful tool in scholarly context in referring to different spaces inside the houses. For example the traditional *cubicula* around *atrium* or peristyle are often dim, closed rooms, corresponding to the description of this type of room in literature. However, there is a risk, that straightforward combining of literature with archaeological remains produces a simplistic and even misleading picture of the housing of ancient world. The labeling of different types of rooms is traditionally based only on the architectonic elements of the rooms leaving out the artefactual evidence. For example, *cubicula* have been identified solely by recesses and mosaics showing the place for the bed. However, to identify a

⁵⁰ Varro *ling.* 5,162; Cf. Quint. *inst.* 11,2,20.

⁵¹ Already Mau (above n. 49) 257, points this out in another chapter of Varro describing the spaces of a Roman house: "The period to which Varro [frg. Non. p. 83M] refers antedates that of the oldest houses at Pompeii. The room which we call tablinum was then a deep recess at the rear of the atrium, open at the front, as now, but enclosed by a wall at the rear; against this wall was a veranda opening into the garden, toward which the board roof sloped. People took their meals in the veranda in summer, and to it the name tablinum was naturally applied. In the recess at the rear of the atrium, corresponding to the later tablinum was the bed of the master of the house, called *lectus adversus* because 'facing' one who entered the front door. As late as the reign of Augustus, long after it became the custom to set aside closed apartment for the family room, a reminiscence of the ancient arrangement still remained in the couch which stood at the rear of the atrium or in the tablinum, which was called *lectus adversus* or even *lectus genialis*" (English translation in A. Mau, *Pompeii: its life and art*, translated by F. W. Kelsey, London 1907).

⁵² Mau (above n. 49); Elia (above n. 49); 394–421.

bedroom, the traces of beds should be also sought after, at least in the Pompeian context where it is possible.⁵³ Valid criticism against labeling the rooms of Pompeian houses with the conventional names known from literary sources has been presented especially from 1990's on.⁵⁴ On the other hand, it would be misleading to neglect completely the information of the written sources in the context of domestic space. However, it is important to bear in mind that even if the typology of rooms in Roman house might be accurate and Latin nomenclature a useful tool, the labels do not tell us how the rooms were actually used.

Recent studies have concentrated more on studying the remains of furniture and household artifacts which have set the activities of the houses in a new light. It must, however, be stated that the problems of studying artifacts in the Pompeian context are numerous; early excavations lack careful documentation of finds and their exact provenance, organic material is poorly preserved, the inhabitants of Pompeii had time to gather their valuables while fleeing the town and post-eruption disturbance is wide-spread. Also seismic activity prior to the eruption might have caused considerable changes in customary distribution of household artifacts.⁵⁵ By studying beds it should be possible to avoid at least some of these stumbling blocks: beds were not likely among the objects to be easily carried away from the town in confusion of the eruption and even if the wooden beds of Pompeii have perished, at least their metal fittings should have survived, though at least in some cases they must have escaped the notice of early excavators. The situation in Herculaneum where the wooden parts have endured carbonized is slightly better.

S. T. A. M. Mols has examined all the remains of wooden furniture in Herculaneum and among these finds recorded thirteen wooden beds. Of these seven seem to be used for sleeping (including two beds for infants), others for

⁵³ In Latin literature beds are commonly mentioned in connection with a *cubiculum*: *Cubile*: Cic. *Cluent.* 15; *cubitus*: Apul. *met.* 10,20; *grabatum*: Apul. *met.* 1,16; 2,15; *lectus*: Plaut. *Amph.* 808; Cato *agr.* 10,4; Cic. *Tusc.* 5,59; Cic. *rep.* 1,17; Cic. *Verr.* 4,79; Cic. *Cluent.* 14; Liv. 1,58,7; Val. Max. 9.13.ext.4; Phaedr. 3,10,26; Quint. *decl.* 347, p. 368,13; *decl.* 328, p. 288,28; Plin. *epist.* 2,17; Tac. *ann.* 14,8; Suet. *Iul.* 49; Gell. 6,1,3; Apul. *met.* 9,3; Apul. *apol.* 75; Apul. *flor.* 23; Auson. p. 214 (Peiper); Hist. Aug. *Pert.* 11,3; *lectulus*: Val. Max. 1,7,7; Plin. *epist.* 3,7,4; 9,7; Ps. Quint. *decl.* 1,9; 1,13; 2,6 (bis); 2,19; Tac. *ann.* 16,11; Tac. *hist.* 4,24; Apul. *met.* 4,12; 5,2; Auson. pp. 215, 404 (Peiper); Val. Max. 4,3,3; Plin. *paneg.* 8; Suet. *Dom.* 11,1; Apul. *met.* 4,12; 4,26; 4,27; 5,4. See also: Riggsby (above n. 8) 40, note 25; Mols (above n. 3) 41–2; Nevett (above n. 38) 290–1; Anguissola (above n. 8) 161–2.

⁵⁴ Leach (above n.8); Allison 2004 (above n. 3) 11–4; Nevett (above n. 38) 283.

⁵⁵ Allison 2004 (above n. 3) 15–26; J. Berry, "Instrumentum domesticum – A case study", in J. J. Dobbins – P. W. Foss (eds.), *The World of Pompeii*, New York 2007, 292–3.

dining. Typologically the beds identified as being used for sleeping belong to group called "beds with boards". It appears that this type with panels on three sides was gradually replacing the earlier type, bed with a board only on one side (*fulcrum*) in the times of the eruption AD 79. According to Mols, the beds seem to have been of more or less standard size; the length of surviving examples varies from 204 to 222 cm and in width from 106 to 125 centimeters. To locate one in an already existing room, a recess was sometimes needed.⁵⁶ Also Wallace-Hadrill has observed the plentiful evidence of beds in several rooms in the houses of Herculaneum; according to him the sleeping arrangements could be revealed through studying distribution patterns of artifacts in the these rooms.⁵⁷ Pompeii also yields evidence of beds. According to Mols, plaster casts of beds were made in five houses, while Allison lists remains of ninety beds or couches from eighteen different houses, more than half of the houses in her survey.⁵⁸ Bedding has rarely survived in archaeological context, but in some instances it can be found as well.⁵⁹ Literary evidence of bedding is common.⁶⁰ Otherwise, *cubiculum* furniture mentioned in literature consists of seats, storage utensils and in couple of cases tableware.⁶¹ Many of the so-called *cubicula* in Pompeian houses, especially the

⁵⁶ Mols (above n. 3) 6, 35–41; information of fragmentary or lost pieces of beds in the early (especially 18th century) excavations: 22, n. 69 and appendix 1 (221–64); It must be noted that the functional distinction between beds and couches, presented in p. 6 seems to be begging the question: pieces of furniture are differentiated by the context of find i.e. the room without questioning whether this categorization of rooms is accurate; see also E. De Carolis, *Il mobile a Pompei ed Ercolano: letti, tavoli, sedie e armadi: contributo alla tipologia dei mobili della prima età imperiale*, Roma 2007; description and typology of beds: *lectus tricliniaris*: 80–5, 157–9, "letto a spalliera alta" (bed with boards), probably identifiable as *lectus cubicularis*: 86–93, 160–3.

⁵⁷ Wallace-Hadrill 1994 (above n. 6) 95–7, 113.

⁵⁸ Mols (above n. 3) 266–9; Allison, On-line Companion (above n. 3): in this case the query was made in section of "artiftype" with entry "Bed/couch" and hence the database refers to both beds and couches. Also at least one masonry platform possibly used as bed (VI 15,1, g) is mentioned, which is not included in a search results for query of "Bed/couch".

⁵⁹ Allison, On-line Companion (above n. 3): *Casa dell'Efebo* I 7,10–12 rooms (4) and (UF); Mols (above n. 3) 35.

⁶⁰ Bedding (in *cubicula*): *culcita*: Suet. *Claud.* 35; *pulvillus*: Apul. *met.* 10,20; *pulvinus*: Suet. *Otho* 11,1; *stratus*: Auson.p. 214 Peiper; *stragulum*: Suet. *Claud.* 35; Suet. *Nero* 47,3; *stroma*: Hist.Aug. *Ver.* 4,9; *tapete* (*tapetum*), n. or *tapes*, m.: Liv. 40,24,7; *vestis*: Petron. 26; *vestis stragula*: Apul. *met.* 4,12; 10,20; see also a brief listing in Anguissola (above n. 8) 162.

⁶¹ Seats: *cathedra*: Plin. *epist.* 2,17; Sen. *clem.* 1,9,7; *scabillum*: Cato *agr.* 10,4 *scamnum*: Cato *agr.* 10,4; *sella*: Cato *agr.* 10,4; *solium*: Cato *agr.* 10,4; *solium* as bathtub: Sen. *epist.* 77,9. Storage: *arcula*: Apul. *met.* 3,24; Cic. *off.* 2,7,25; *armarium*: Plin. *epist.* 2,17; *pyxis*: Suet. *Nero* 47,3; *sarcinula*: Apul. *met.* 1,23–24; Suet. *Tib.* 43; see also Suet. *Tib.* 3,3,4; functioning as stor-

undecorated ones, seem to have been used as a place for storing personal items,⁶² which does support some of the references to storage function of this room.

Other features concerning the identifying of *cubicula* are lighting and heating. Vitruvius states that a *cubiculum* should be located to that side of the house which received sun light in the morning. In the same vein Columella (1,6,1) recommends organizing the spaces of the *pars urbana* of a villa according to the different seasons; *cubicula* which were to be used during winter, should face south-east to profit from the morning sun at the winter solstice and summer chambers were to have an opening to the south for receiving sunlight at midday during summer time. This way *cubicula* had different orientation than, for example, the dining rooms. The shifting of bedrooms according to the time of the year seems not to have been uncommon for Romans: at least the villas of wealthy owners could boast having separate winter bedrooms.⁶³ In contrast, Suetonius mentions Augustus using the same *cubiculum* all the year round during several decades.⁶⁴ Even though changing the bedroom according to season might seem to contradict the idea of permanent settings for sleeping areas, there is evidence from other known societies that these two practices can coexist. For example in the old rural Finnish farmhouses some of the outdoor storehouses were especially designed for young girls to sleep in during warm summer months. During wintertime everyone had their own place to sleep inside the main house according to the status and gender of the person who used the bed. Beds were not interchangeable.⁶⁵

In some cases, Latin texts mention windows in connection with *cubicula*;⁶⁶ such *cubicula* especially appear in villas or upstairs bedrooms, which could reflect the reality: town houses were usually surrounded by neighbors, so ground floor (or in many cases even the upper floor) windows could have been difficult to locate, unless they were facing the streets or inner courts. Indeed, *cubicula* are often described as dark places; Varro uses the word *caecum* (blind) to define a *cubiculum*

age: Ps.Quint. *decl.* 1,3; Tac. *ann.* 5,55. Dining: *calix*: Apul. *met.* 2,15; 8,11; *lagoena*: Apul. *met.* 2,15; *mensula*: Apul. *met.* 2,15; *oenophorum*: Apul. *met.* 8,11; See also Sen. *dial.* 5,8,6. See also a brief listing in Anguissola (above n. 8) 162.

⁶² E. Dwyer, *Pompeian domestic sculpture: a study of five Pompeian houses and their contents*, Roma 1982, 116; Dwyer 1991 (above n. 6) 28; Allison 2004 (above n. 3) 72, 76.

⁶³ Cic. *ad Q.fr.* 3,1,2 ; Plin. *epist.* 2,17.

⁶⁴ Suet. *Aug.* 72,1.

⁶⁵ L. Sammallahti – M.-L. Lehto: *Suomalainen sänky: kansanomaisten vuodekalusteiden historiaa*, Helsinki 2006, 13–4, 76, 78, 187–8, 190.

⁶⁶ Varro *ling.* 9,58; Sen. *dial.* 6,22,6; Plin. *epist.* 2,17 (*saepe*), 5,6,23; Apul. *met.* 1,16; 4,12; 6,21; Cic. *fam.* 7,1,1, Tac. *ann.* 4,22; Dig. 9,3,5,2.

and expressions such as *opacum* and *obscurum* can be found in this connection.⁶⁷ This aspect goes together well with the small closed rooms of Pompeian houses which usually are quite dark spaces. Besides sunlight, lamps were also used to enlighten the *cubicula*.⁶⁸ Otherwise the lighting and warming of private houses was carried out in couple of ways; stationery settings for fire are found for example in kitchens and baths, while natural light was provided through the openings of *atrium* and peristyle. As H. Boman has shown, the stationery installations for heating were not enough to assure warmth in surrounding rooms, so heating and lighting was left in many cases to portable objects: mainly braziers and oil lamps. Lamps were very likely used according to varying needs fairly evenly and distributed throughout the houses, so there are no indications that they could be used as a criterion for the identification of a room as a *cubiculum*. It is quite improbable that charcoal braziers were used in closed rooms, and Allison's survey shows that these have been found mainly in the open peristyle area. Besides problems caused by smoke, there was also the risk of fire. A contradiction between the need of heating and ventilating or lighting a room occurs as these actions exclude each others: especially in small, closed rooms warmth escapes while light or fresh air is let in room through openings.⁶⁹ The dating of the eruption of Vesuvius in AD 79 later in the autumn instead of the hitherto preferred dating to the 24–25th of August remains disputed, and it seems uncertain whether the distribution of braziers can be used as an argument in favour of either alternative.⁷⁰

⁶⁷ Plin. *epist.* 7,21; Suet. *Tit.* 1,1; of dimness of a *cubiculum*: Tac. *ann.* 14,8; Hist. Aug. *Tac.* 4,7.

⁶⁸ Quint. *inst.* 10,3,25; Curt. 8,6,22; Phaedr. 3,10,26, 29–30; Tac. *ann.* 14,44; Ps. Quint. *decl.* 2,19; Val. Max. 1,7,7.

⁶⁹ H. Boman, "White light – White Heat. The use of Fire as a Light and Heat source in an atrium House in Roman Pompeii", *Current Swedish Archaeology* 13 (2005) 59, 64–69, 72; J. F. Fitchen, "The Problem of Ventilation through the Ages", in *Technology and Culture* 1981, 488; Allison, On-line Companion (above n. 3) lists 12 cases of braziers: most commonly in room types 9 (peristyle), some cases where a brazier has been found in a closed room, Allison interprets these as storage spaces: *Casa delle Nozze d'Argento*, room (c), *Casa dell'Efebo* room (18) and *Casa del Menandro* room (A).

⁷⁰ G. Stefani, "La vera data dell'eruzione", *Archeo* 260 (2006) 10–14, proposes again the already earlier suggested later date with reference to archaeobotanical remains and as new evidence to a silver denarius by Titus found in 1974 with the tribunicia potestas XV, which by other inscriptions is datable after the 8th of September. However, the reading of the number XV remains disputed as Prof. Heikki Solin kindly informs me. Solin reads XIII instead of XV, as suggested by him at a lecture at the meeting of the Academia Europaea in Naples in 25 September 2009, and later discussed also at a public lecture arranged by the *Expediatio Pompeiana Universitatis Helsingiensis* at the University of Helsinki, October 21, 2009.

In the archeological context distribution patterns of lamps or braziers might not reveal the sleeping areas, but in specifying the conditions of sleeping areas in Roman houses, the orientation of supposed bedrooms, ventilation as well as lighting and heating conditions need yet a closer investigation.

Pompeian reality in the *Casa del Fabbro* (I 10,7) and the *Casa dell'Efebo o di P. Cornelius Tages* (I 7,10–12/19)

In order to take an even closer look in the situation of Pompeii and to see if the distribution of the finds could reveal the actual sleeping areas of the private houses, I have chosen a couple of well-documented houses, in which the artifactual evidence has been carefully studied.

The first example is the *Casa del Fabbro* (I 10,7).⁷¹ This is in its last phase one of smaller *atrium* houses in Pompeii, situated right next to a larger complex, the *Casa del Menandro*, to which it had been attached in an earlier phase. The house has thirteen rooms of which four have been identified as *cubicula*.⁷² The floor plan follows the traditional *atrium* house type with *fauces-atrium-tablinum*-axis, even though there are rooms only on other side of front hall, due to the small area of the house.⁷³ The house seems to have been occupied in the time of the eruption, but the finds indicate that at least in some degree, the traditional household activities had been replaced by more utilitarian or even industrial activities.⁷⁴

Room number 2, flanking the entranceway, has been traditionally identified as a *cella ostiaria* or *cubiculum*, because its size and decoration are seen to be suitable for a *cubiculum*, while the location and a specific opening to *atrium*, "a spy hole", point to a function as *cella ostiaria*.⁷⁵ However, the room's finds tell a

⁷¹ This chapter is based mainly on the recent re-documentation of the house, which has already been excavated earlier between 1928–31: R. Ling (general editor), *The Insula of the Menander at Pompeii*, Oxford – New York 1997–2006; Volumes used here: R. Ling, *Volume 1: The structures*, Oxford – New York 1997, 150–70 and Allison 2007 (above n. 3) 158–213, 337–49. The original publication of the house: O. Elia, "Pompei – Relazione sullo scavo dell'Insula X della Regio I", *NSA* (1934) 264–344.

⁷² Ling (above n. 71) 163.

⁷³ Dwelling belongs to the Quartile 3 of Pompeian houses in the classification by Wallace-Hadrill 1994 (above n. 6) 81.

⁷⁴ Allison, On-line Companion (above n. 3).

⁷⁵ Elia (above n. 71) 279; Ling (above n. 71) 152.

different story; the only remains of furniture belong possibly to a chest, and other items are associated more with personal activities, such as toilet and dress and also spinning.⁷⁶ Another possible *cubiculum*, room number 5, has a recess suitable for a bed but no finds pointing to a usage of this room as bedroom. Finds include e.g. tools for needle work and a chest where the tools were held, but no remains of furniture identifiable as bed.⁷⁷ The third possible *cubiculum* is the room (8). Elia identifies this room as a *triclinium*, which had served as a *cubiculum diurnum* in an earlier phase. Ling, on the contrary, considers the room a *cubiculum* in the last phase, while Allison sees downgrading in the function based on the room's finds.⁷⁸ There is also a high recess applicable to a bed in room (4), but very few finds have been recorded here. Only one room of this house contained a bed, namely the room (9), which has been identified as a *triclinium* rather than a bedroom.

In Regio I we find also the *Casa dell'Efebo* (I 7,10–12), which together with the annexed house I 7,19 features at least five rooms labeled as *cubicula* (02, 03, 09, 12 and f, as well as 11 and 22).⁷⁹ They all lack remains of beds. Evidence of beds has been found elsewhere in the house: in rooms (04), (15), (17), another, perhaps from the upper storey of the *Casa dell'Efebo* and in rooms (a) and (r) of

⁷⁶ Allison 2007 (above n. 3) 160, 338; finds: bronze: a jug, button and loop fastener, ring and disc, mirror fragment, strap hinge (and wood), three ceramic jugs, 3 glass unguentaria, bone spoon and two spindles, iron hoe (*zappa*), two circular bosses and a clay lamp, according to Allison the presence of iron hoe suggest escape activities or eruption / post-eruption disturbances.

⁷⁷ Allison 2007 (above n. 3) 170, 340; Allison, On-line Companion (above n. 3): "The finds included the apparent remains of a chest, a bronze jug, a small bronze amphora, one glass unguentarium and the foot of a glass stemmed cup, seven bronze needles, and a bone implement. These finds are conceivably associated with needlework and toilet activities"; Finds catalogue in Elia (above n. 71) 297.

⁷⁸ Elia (above n. 71) 282; Ling (above n. 71) 152; Allison 2007 (above n. 3) 174–9, 342 and Allison, On-line Companion (above n. 3): "Finds include: pieces of worked and partially worked bone and one bone-decorated, iron furniture foot (possibly from bed!). An iron ladle, two iron wedges for woodcutting and lead lamina were found with these. Remains of a chest were which contained a number of iron tools: a scraper, a knife, and a palo, and the remains of a bronze measuring rod. Also: another scraper, a spade, and a chisel, as well as two whetstones, two ceramic pots, further bronze measuring rods, an iron ladle, and the remains of four ceramic lamps." Finds catalogue in Elia (above n. 71) 808.

⁷⁹ Allison, On-line Companion (above n. 3); A. de Vos, "I,7,11 Casa dell'Efebo o di P. Cornelius Tages", *Pompei: pitture e mosaici*, vol.1, Roma 1990, 619–727, 750–89. The dwelling belongs to the Quartile 4 houses in the classification by Wallace-Hadrill 1994 (above n. 6) 81. Original publication: A. Maiuri, "Pompei – Relazione sui lavori di scavo dal marzo 1924 al marzo 1926", *NSA* (1927) 32–83 and A. Maiuri, "Pompei – Relazione sui lavori di scavo dall'aprile 1926 al dicembre 1927", *NSA* (1929) 354–79.

House I 7,19. However, according to Allison, room (17) might have acted as a dining room later converted as storage space, while room (15) is interpreted as storage room in its last phase. The identification of bed remains found in the upper levels is a bit uncertain: they might have been from a dining couch belonging to a *cenaculum*. Room (4) deserves special attention: in the early documentation it has been identified as a *tablinum*, later changed to an *exedra*. However the bed remains suggest that it was used either for sleeping or eating, or perhaps for both. This room has a large opening into front hall and another opening toward courtyard (6) and therefore the identification as sleeping room has been ruled out.⁸⁰ Of the supposed *cubicula*, room (11) is especially interesting; it is closely connected with a dining room (10) and they have similar cocciopesto floors. A. de Vos and Z. Ruggiu suggest that this belonged to those double rooms consisting of a dining area and a room for repose after meal.⁸¹ Also the finds from the room seem to indicate that this room was a place for personal activities and that it was either associated with the dining room, or used for storage. The upper floor of the house was inhabited in the time of the eruption and a bed with associated bedding and a human skeleton were recorded among the finds.⁸²

In the house I 7,19 two bedrooms can be established. Room (a) is a small closed room situated in the area of the front hall flanking the entranceway. It contained a decorated bed with a human skeleton, some luxury items, and objects for grooming. In room (r) there seems to have been a temporary bed made of wood and used in the last phase of the house. Two rooms (d and f) with recesses could have been used as bedrooms, but they had virtually no finds. Allison may be right in concluding from this that they were not in use at the time of eruption but this can obviously not be regarded as certain.⁸³

This brief survey of a couple of houses shows that locating sleeping areas in Pompeian houses is problematic yet possible in some cases at least, and that it is necessary to try to estimate the degree of probability of various instances, case by case. Not all of the so-called *cubicula* were necessarily used as bedrooms. In the case of *Casa di Fabbro* it is not possible to reconstruct with certainty the actual sleeping arrangements of the house in its last phase. The lack of beds might be due to the change of the house into more industrial usage than traditional housing or the sleeping was just arranged in a way that cannot be detected anymore.

⁸⁰ Maiuri 1927 (above n. 79) 34-35,37; Allison, On-line Companion (above n. 3).

⁸¹ De Vos (above n. 79) 651; Zaccaria Ruggiu 2001 (above n. 15) 71.

⁸² Allison, On-line Companion (above n. 3).

⁸³ Maiuri 1929 (above n. 79) 372; Allison, On-line Companion (above n. 3).

The possibility that room (9), which is usually interpreted as a dining room, could have served as sleeping area cannot be fully ruled out.

Room (a) in the *Casa dell'Efebo* seems, however, to have been a *cubiculum* in the traditional sense; this small room off the *atrium* contained a bed. Yet, some sleeping arrangements seem more temporary, such as in room (r). Four possible bedrooms (2, 3, 9 and a) all have windows towards a street; the first ones have access to a relatively low-activity street on the Eastern side of *Casa dell'Efebo*, but the window in room (a) faces the so called *Vicolo del Menandro* and is situated in the crossroads,⁸⁴ which must have been a relatively noisy place night and day. This feature is strikingly contradictory to the literary passages which describe the *cubicula* as quiet and tranquil places.

The documentation of the *Casa dell'Efebo* also reveals that upper floors might have been used as sleeping areas in Pompeian houses, though the survived bed found in upper floor area might have been also a dining couch. Allison has recorded seven other instances, where upper floor finds have contained a bed or couch fragment; of the beds in Herculaneum, at least three were situated in first floor rooms, one along with the child's bed.⁸⁵ Some indications towards locating bedchambers in upper floors can also be found in Latin literature, such as *Apul. met.* 4,12 and *Petr.* 77,4.⁸⁶ Some of the further references are more allusive but even so it seems that there is enough evidence to conclude, that in the Roman *domus*, upper floors also included bedrooms. In Roman villas the upper floor *cubicula* seem to be more clearly attested.⁸⁷

⁸⁴ R. Laurence (*Roman Pompeii – Space and Society*, London – New York, 1994, 89) divides the Pompeian streets into four categories according to the social activity of the street based on the number of doors opening to the street. The eastern side of *Casa dell'Efebo* belongs to his category 2 and the *Vicolo di Menandro* to category 1 (which has the highest level of activity). The eastern side of *Casa dell'Efebo* must, however, be considered to have been slightly less active street than this categorization presents, since the openings of the houses belong mainly private houses and not to commercial establishments.

⁸⁵ Allison, On-line Companion (above n. 3); Mols (above n. 3) 147, 149, 151, 160; Appendix 1 (221–64) includes several other references to beds located in upper floors.

⁸⁶ Anguissola (above n. 8) 155; *Petron.* 77:... *aedificavi hanc domum. ... habet quattuor cenationes, cubicula viginti, porticus marmoratos duos, susum cenationem, cubiculum in quo ipse dormio, viperae huius sessorium, ostiarii cellam perbonam; hospitium hospites capit...* and *Apul. met.* 3,21: *...ad illud superius cubiculum suspenso et insono vestigio me perducit ipsa, perque rimam ostiorum quampiam iubet arbitrari, quae sic gesta sunt.*

⁸⁷ *Tac. ann.* 4,22, *Sen. dial.* 6,22,6, *Aug. serm.* 229E,3; *Dig.* 9,3,5,2; The passages referring to upper floor bedrooms are unfortunately a bit difficult to interpret: for example Apuleius' *cubiculum* is placed in the Greek world and cannot be taken to represent the Roman world as such (though the way Apuleius uses the word *cubiculum* possibly mirrors the usage of this room in

What is seen more generally in Allison's survey of the material culture of Pompeian households is that relatively many of the so-called *cubicula* lack remains of beds. Allison suggests that these typological *cubicula* ("small closed rooms off the front hall" in her vocabulary) were inclined to variation of functions and acted as "boudoirs" more likely than as bedchambers and that the recesses seen in many of these rooms were multi-purposed and used to serve different functions. One interesting detail occurs in Allison's study on material culture: relatively more evidence of beds has been found in rooms known as *tablina* ("open-sided room opposite the main entrance or leading to garden") than in the so-called *cubicula*.⁸⁸ In this perspective the case of *Casa dell'Efebo*, where a bed was placed in a room (4) usually interpreted as *tablinum* is not unique. Further comparison of these two spaces is also interesting: as shown, *cubiculum* could function also as a study, which is an activity usually combined with *tablinum*. Also the historic place of the master's bed was in the back of the *atrium* facing the main entrance.⁸⁹ In addition, the word *tablinum* itself is somewhat artificial in the sense that it is quite rare in Latin literature and that it occurs very seldom in connection with any activities.⁹⁰ In the light of this it seems tempting to interpret some of these rooms from their functional point of view as *cubicula* or maybe even *cubicula diurna*.⁹¹

his own context), the Petronius passage from *Cena Trimalchionis* 77 does not point to an upper floor (*susum*) chamber with certainty and the chapters from Augustine and *Digesta* refer possibly an upper floor apartment in an *insula*, not to a town house (*domus*); Villas: e.g. Cic. *ad Q.fr.* 3,1,2; Plin. *epist.* 2,17,10.

⁸⁸ Allison 2004 (above n. 3) 43–8, 63, 71–6, 80–2, 92, 95–6; see also Hales (above n. 6) 127. About a similar situation at the House of Marcus Lucretius in Pompeii (IX,3,5/24): Dwyer 1982 (above n. 62) 25–31, 50–1, 115–6 and R. Berg, "Mobili e arredi della casa Romana", in P.Castrén (ed.), *Domus Pompeiana: una casa a Pompei*, Helsinki 2008, 105–26.

⁸⁹ *Lectulus adversus*: Ascon. *Mil.* p.43,12; Mau (above n. 49) 239–40, see also n. 50.

⁹⁰ Leach (above n. 8) 52–4; *OLD* (above n. 8) s.v. *tablinum*; Badel (above n. 18) 147.

⁹¹ This term has to be used carefully, since it appears only once, in Plin. *epist.* 1,3 in a context of a *villa* description; In the texts of the Plinies, however, the word *cubiculum* has other similar additional definitions as *dormitorium* (Plin. *epist.* 5,6,22; Plin. *med.* 2,13; Plin. *nat.* 30,52) and *noctis et somni* (Plin. *epist.* 2,17). It can be possible that in their times the meaning of *cubiculum* had evolved to such that these additional definitions were needed in referring to spaces used different times of the day.

Conclusions

The aim of this paper has been to illustrate some of the issues concerning sleeping arrangements in Roman households. However, further extensive analysis based on both literary and archaeological evidence is needed in order to determine how these practices worked in the society and how they can be identified in material culture.

I will address these questions in my doctoral thesis. My task is two-fold: First, I aim to analyze how sleeping arrangements are depicted in Latin (and relevant Greek) literature. I am mainly interested in what is said of the actual spaces and sleeping conditions, and who are described using the spaces, and also how privacy was perceived. We already know that Romans practiced lucubration and regarded excessive sleeping a sign of shameful behaviour. Hence, it is crucial to examine the moral issues related to sleeping habits in Roman culture. It would also be interesting to discuss how security matters and sleep-related problems, such as sleeplessness, sleep walking, nightmares and vermin were dealt with. Second, I will try to identify the actual sleeping areas of these houses by reviewing archaeological and architectonic material from Pompeii and Herculaneum, including the finds indicating sleeping in a room. I will reinvestigate the orientation of the rooms and their lighting, heating and ventilation conditions, as well as the architectonic remains, such as possible bed recesses, floor decorations and structures, and analyse epigraphic evidence. Observation will be extended also beyond the walls of the household: if bedrooms were located near streets, an analysis of the traffic and other activities on these streets is crucial to our understanding of these arrangements.

By combining evidence from several different sources I hope to provide a comprehensive picture of sleeping practices in Roman antiquity. The evidence from Pompeii could reveal a synchronic situation of sleeping arrangements in an early imperial provincial town: what was the role of the typological *cubiculum*, and where did the inhabitants of private dwellings sleep in reality? The diachronic changes in the usage of houses and their rooms in particular in the last decades before the eruption of 79 AD in the evidence in Pompeii and Herculaneum and elsewhere in the Vesuvian area are to be examined thoroughly. Among these, especially alterations done after the earthquake of 62 AD, and/or other earthquakes are of particular interest. A more general picture of the sleeping habits of Romans can be detected in literature, which might also illustrate why these arrangements were made.

Bedrooms deserve special focus, not only because they are seen to belong among the reception areas of private houses. The results of such a survey from the point of view of cultural history would be useful in several contexts: not only in the field of Classical Studies, but also more generally in scientific research on sleep and sleeping.

In this paper I have suggested that the inhabitants of Roman households might have had routine-based nightly activities and more or less permanently fixed sleeping spaces, and also that (at least the wealthiest) Romans had a possibility to use peaceful and private bedchambers, and that receiving guests or other outsiders in one's *cubiculum* depended on circumstance rather than custom. However, the locations of sleeping areas seem to have changed according to season. The settings for sleeping among upper class Romans are more likely to have been solitary rather than social. These are, of course, mainly hypotheses based mostly on evidence of *cubicula* in literature and on a brief survey of some examples of the Pompeian evidence. They must and will be tested in a wider literary and archaeological context.

University of Helsinki