

A. ANGISSOLA (ED.), *PRIVATA LUXURIA: TOWARDS AN ARCHAEOLOGY OF INTIMACY: POMPEII AND BEYOND: INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDIES, LUDWIG-MAXIMILIANS-UNIVERSITÄT MÜNCHEN (24-25 MARCH 2011)* (Münchner Studien zur Alten Welt 8). Munich: Herbert Utz Verlag, 2012. Pp. 239, illus., plans. ISBN 9783831641017. €59.00.

In 1965, the United States Supreme Court ruled in *Griswold v. Connecticut*, a case concerned with an individual's access to contraception, that privacy is a constitutionally protected right. Though never mentioned specifically, the court found that the right to privacy did exist because it was assumed and enacted in other aspects of the constitution. Similarly, the Roman concept of privacy has no formal and explicit definition, yet we believe it can be seen in any number of potent proxies: in space (accessibility and connection to exterior space v. seclusion and isolation), in decoration (how refined or humble) and in literary discussions (who has access and who is excluded). *Privata Luxuria: Towards an Archaeology of Intimacy: Pompeii and Beyond* explores these proxies in residences, rental properties, retail shops and workshops to question how Romans understood and how they enacted the concept of privacy. Moving beyond dichotomy, contributors explore privacy along a series of spectra — from resident to stranger, among classes of residents and among functions of the spaces — that treat the concept of privacy with the fluidity with which we experience it.

The bedroom seems the most private of domestic spaces and thus seems the firmest footing to explore such fluidity. It is therefore appropriate that the book begins with Nissinen's chapter examining the nature of sleep and how humans do it. To provide a point of comparison, Nissinen defines modern Western notions of sleep and finds significant overlap with how Roman élites desired sleep and how they arranged their sleeping environments. Not surprisingly, how people sleep shows privacy as an expensive and exclusive commodity that was yet another way in which élites separated themselves, yet another form of mastery over time and space. Anguissola focuses on a fascinating suite of rooms found in two large houses at Pompeii. Ostensibly, these rooms adjacent to, or facing onto, the peristyles are *cubicula*, yet they show a remarkable array of interconnections reflecting the complex interplay of apparently public, but actually private functions. The description of these suites sets up a larger discussion of the rôle of the peristyle, who uses it and along what paths. Carucci explores similar phenomena in North Africa, nicely connecting literary sources and the plans of large residences, while Schwaiger finds little evidence at Ephesus for similar articulations of small spaces. Together, these four chapters form an intriguing examination of the uses, decoration and architectural arrangements of the *cubiculum*, which is perhaps the most common and most generic of Roman spaces.

Flohr's chapter on workshops in atrium houses generates a useful compliment to, but also tension with other chapters of the book that seek to explore privacy through strictly domestic settings and activities. The standard assumption, based on a 'domestic-centric' perspective, is that inhabitants should want to hide economic activities, preferring to project the image of a more purely domestic setting. Flohr finds instead that there was a 'spectrum of responses' to inserting a workshop into a house that differed not only because of how Romans defined privacy, but also by how much privacy different strata of Romans could afford. Such a conclusion muddies the water for defining privacy in other contexts, as it demonstrates that we may be implicitly treating the domestic evidence as an ideal rather than it being an equally constrained expression of Roman privacy.

Certainly the most novel archaeological approach to privacy is Lauritsen's examination of doorways in twenty-seven houses in Pompeii and Herculaneum. Through an archaeological survey of the mechanisms of closure, most often found in threshold blocks, as well as an innovative use of painted doorways and casts of doors, Lauritsen inserts a new method into the discussion. His results, moreover, add necessary nuance to the simplistic dichotomy of the front of the house as public and rear as private. Additionally, this research begins to undermine the facile critique levelled against some methods for studying the Roman house (e.g., Space Syntax, viewshed or access analyses): 'but what if the door(s) were closed?' Hopefully, knowing which doors could be closed and which could not will encourage further methodological exploration.

Several chapters of the book have substantial descriptive cores, but unfortunately are flawed in one or more minor ways. The most common problems concern assumptions of chronology (Calabro, Helg), clarity of the data used (Calabro, Helg) or that the content seems less directly related to the subject of the book (D'Auria, Maratini). Perhaps the most troubling are the chronological concerns as they seem to rely on outmoded notions of Pompeian history, show an over-reliance on

painting styles for dating, ignore recent excavations and assume that a more idealized residential space necessarily preceded the changes that are discussed. Still, these challenges should be seen as a caution in using the interpretations rather than any outright rejection. A final critique of the book, which stems ironically from the overall high quality of the contributions, is the absence of a summarizing chapter. Similarly, there were many missed opportunities to link chapters together within the book, particularly Lauritsen's.

Nonetheless, when viewed as a whole, Anguissola and her collaborators have produced a fine volume on the question of Roman privacy. Through close reading of a number of spaces in Pompeii and beyond, some over-simplistic models are given nuance, new archaeological methods are elaborated and those assumptions and enactments of privacy built into Roman life that help us to define it are brought under sustained scrutiny.

University of Massachusetts Amherst
epoehler@classics.umass.edu

ERIC E. POEHLER

doi:10.1017/S0075435815000799

W. VAN ANDRINGA, H. DUDAY and S. LEPETZ (EDS), *MOURIR À POMPEI. FOUILLE D'UN QUARTIER FUNÉRAIRE DE LA NÉCROPOLE ROMAINE DE PORTA NOCERA (2003–2007)* (Collections de l'École Française de Rome 468). Rome: École Française de Rome, 2013. 2 vols: pp. 1451, illus. ISBN 9782728309139. €540.00.

As the first fully published account of the stratigraphic excavation of imperial period tombs from Pompeii, this is a landmark in Roman funerary archaeology, but it is of much more than specialist interest. Exceptional preservation conditions have allowed the authors to describe rituals and their setting over three quarters of a century by the Porta Nocera with a detail unequalled for the ancient world. Students of epigraphy, social history and law as well as of mortuary rituals will find discussion of significant interest here.

The fieldwork was undertaken in five monthly campaigns from 2003 to 2007, examining a c. 110 m² area centred on the mausoleum of the freedman Publius Vesonius Phileros by the road running west from the crossroads by the Porta Nocera towards the Stabian Gate. Save for removal or damage of some epitaphs and degradation of monument superstructures, the excavated area escaped mostly unscathed from earlier clearance. The protective overburden of volcanic debris and the short duration of funerary activity, mitigating the disturbance and spoliation otherwise characteristic of Roman urban burial grounds, also explain the remarkable survival of tombs. Excavation of a cluster of walled plots and their environs documented sixty-four burials, many pyres and associated debris deposits, *in-situ columellae* (anthropomorphic burial markers) as well as larger monuments, and cemetery surfaces in which residues of commemorative and profane activity were embedded. Good preservation of cremated bone enhanced the osteological analysis of individuals (age, sex, pathology) and of the treatment which their remains had undergone. Inspired by Scheid's reconstruction of the funeral as a structured sacrificial process, the project defines itself as a mortuary *archéologie du geste*, aimed at establishing as full as possible a reconstruction of the sequence of actions from pyre to interment and subsequent commemoration. It draws especially on the condition of cremated human bone and its depositional history as evidence for ritual process.

After discussing research context, fieldwork methods and previous work in and around the plots concerned, the first volume presents a detailed stratigraphic account of each enclosure and cremation area (sections 1–3). The second volume documents the finds, from the monumental to the artefactual and biological. Most readers, however, will first turn to the summaries (vol. I, section 4) of the burial plots' development, of the rituals documented within them and of the skeletal remains. The funerary activity reported here dates from the later decades of the first century B.C. to A.D. 79. Within individual plots, use for burial alternates with episodes of abandonment and of landscaping in anticipation of new ownership. The later phases are more fully documented than the earlier, especially in relation to the largest plot (23), taken over in the Neronian period by Phileros and perhaps previously belonging to the family of his patron, Publia Vesonina. For individual burials, the funerary sequence can be reconstructed with extraordinarily high resolution, enabled by meticulous documentation of individual deposits and successful linkage between pyres, debris deposits and graves. The wealth of detail and of variety of practice is almost overwhelming, but nonetheless striking commonalities characterize most burials, illustrated by the example of Bebryx, a six-year-old slave. His grave