The handle http://hdl.handle.net/1887/33706 holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

**Author:** Mol, Eva Martine  
**Title:** Egypt in material and mind: the use and perception of Aegyptiaca in Roman domestic contexts of Pompeii  
**Issue Date:** 2015-05-27
CHAPTER 5: DOMESTIC CONTEXTS,
CASES OF EGYPT

5.1 From household archaeology to place-making

5.1.1 Introduction

As argued in the concluding parts of chapter 4 it is important to obtain a better insight of the choices made regarding Egypt-related artefacts and acquiring a firmer grip on the context in which they served. It is not only necessary to know what the basis of selection was for certain objects and how they were cognitively entangled in the visual atmosphere of Pompeii, but also, on a smaller scale, it is important to examine how these objects were socially embedded in the physical context of the house. Because if the objects did not signify ‘Egypt’ per se, what did they do? The significance of the artefacts needs to be disentangled more elaborately within the social and physical context they were actually used: the house. Only by carefully contextualising the objects from the database it is possible to reflect upon its affordances. The object’s use and perception is formed within a web of social exchange, power relations, religious and social obligations, ideologies, and pretentiousness; it entails a complex environment. Albeit not completely absent, a detailed contextualisation of the Egyptian objects from Pompeii has as yet not been considered a point of departure within research on Aegyptiaca. Therefore the focus of this chapter concerns (a) the interaction between the way an object behaves within its environment and the way people valued it, (b) the choices made concerning an object in order to transmit certain values, (c) the intentions of the owner and (d) the unintentional effects the interaction has on the viewer.

This means that an important goal of this chapter (in addition to the social embeddedness and choices which will guide this chapter) is the further scrutinising of the social rules and restrictions concerning the use of certain Egyptian objects. Although a large variety in use and understandings of Egyptian artefacts has been discussed in chapter 4, certain patterns regarding the use and appropriation of Egyptian-related objects in domestic
contexts could be established. For example, the green-glazed statuettes of Bes, Ptah-Pataikos, and a variety of animals were never attested in houses of those assured to be devotees of the Isis cult. On the other hand objects directly linked to the Isis cult (statues of Isis, Harpocrates, Anubis, and Serapis) were never seen in the spaces in the house destined for leisure activities (e.g., the garden), while Venus and Dionysus occur quite frequently in these contexts. Such observations need further contextualisation in order to see how such patterns might have behaved; if Isis was not used in a particular house for a decorative function, what was used for this instead? In which part of the house were the religious manifestations of Egypt to be witnessed? In order to answer such questions, two case studies of houses were selected: that of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati (VI 16, 7/35) and the Casa di Octavius Quartio (II 2, 2). The two houses were selected because they both represent cases in which ‘Egypt’ as a concept seems to have been consciously present in the mind of the owner when he used the objects. Both employ a multitude of objects, forms, and materials referring to Egypt. The Casa degli Amorini Dorati in the form of a shrine with a painting displaying the Isiac deities, but also in the form of an alabaster statuette of Horus and a green glazed lamp depicting Anubis, Isis and Harpocrates. The Casa di Octavius Quartio has three different spaces in the house in which Aegyptiaca were attested by scholars: a painting of an Isis priest in one of the cubicula, a group of faience statuettes in the peristyle, and a marble statue of an Egyptian sphinx next to a water feature. Not only the idea that Egypt as a concept somehow played a part within the use of the objects was important for the choice of these particular case studies, the difference in use of Aegyptiaca between the houses is astonishing and demands a detailed comparison. Comparing these houses, and analysing carefully the exact use of the objects in the way that was discussed in chapter 2, will enable us to elucidate the choice for objects and meaning of the objects in a context, and their social significance. This implies that various concepts of Egypt will be scrutinised, together with their social embedding and the choices made regarding the material, using the house as holistic unit of analysis and using place-making as a methodological toolbox. Which choices were made regarding location and the objects? How were the objects embedded in the visitor-inhabitant relationships which were so significant in Pompeii? The two above case studies can shine a light on these questions, as they both made use of objects with a conscious concept of Egypt in mind. These case studies will subsequently inform about the use of Roman houses by showing
the way Egyptian objects serve within social contexts and how their significance is accompanied by certain social conventions, structures and restrictions. In the end, this chapter will therefore not only present further knowledge regarding the use of Egypt as a specific concept, and the use of Egyptian artefacts, it will also elaborate on the Roman house itself and provide a re-evaluation of the associated social behaviour by means of an analysis of these objects.

Due to its vast scope, it is of importance to this introduction to engage in a few fundamental discussions concerning house and household studies in Pompeii. The way Roman houses functioned in general has largely been constructed upon the evidence sourced from the villas and houses found in Campania and therefore feature in a vast quantity of scholarly literature and debates. These historiographical themes, which have become the central issues when regarding Pompeian houses, will be discussed below and re-evaluated by means of the approach adopted here: place-making.

*Houses and Egypt*

By means of an introduction, an overall picture of Aegyptiaca and houses will be presented first, in which the quantitative analysis appeared to be especially interesting as a general result. From the total number of excavated houses (359 in total), seventy-one contain artefacts deemed Egyptian (meaning all the objects from the database). Of course, as chapter 4 indicates, this number is not really of any value as it puts all artefacts connected to Egypt in one group. Concerning quality therefore - the meaning of these numbers and the concept and perception of Egypt - it is not a relevant number. In terms of quantity however it can be stated that, considering the overall presence of objects, it is a quite low number. It implies that 19.8% of the houses contains something that in the broadest sense could be connected to Egypt. When specified to individual objects the number is much lower. From those dwellings that specifically contain wall painting, it becomes clearer how low their number is that houses Egypt-related imagery.

---

735 Seventeen partially and 342 fully, numbers taken from Hodske 2007, 23.
Fig. 5.1) The distribution of houses containing Nilotic or Isiac scenes compared to the total number of houses with wall paintings.

The percentage for houses containing blue/green-glazed figurines (7) is 1.9%, 7.8% of the houses with wall paintings contain Nilotic scenes (twenty-eight houses), 5% of the houses (eighteen) contain Isiac statuettes, and 3.3% (twelve) include artefacts or paintings in a pharaonic style. As discussed above, although Egyptian paintings might be a quite well recognisable genre to a present-day scholar or a visitor to the site and museum, their actual number is relatively low. Furthermore, after GIS-analyses, it appeared that the spatial distribution of artefacts is random. This also showed up from the database analyses dealt with in chapter 4 when discussing the separate object-categories. Taking objects such as the blue-glazed figurines, or Nilotic scenes, it was noted they appeared both in wealthy and modest houses. Although decoration in the form of wall painting or architectural features might be a more obvious sign of wealth, Isiac, pharaonic, and Nilotic scenes are equally randomly spread. On a more general note, the social texture of Pompeii consists of a complex social

736 See 4.2 for a comparison of paintings portraying Venus, and of those portraying Isis or Isis-Fortuna.
737 For distribution maps of particular groups of objects, see Appendix B.
738 Here the case studies of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati and the Octavius Quartio are put in the broader perspective consisting of houses and Egyptian artefacts found in Pompeii. The previous case studies give a thorough treatment on how Egypt could be applied in houses i.e., the Casa di Cei, the Casa di Caccia Antica, the Casa del Fauno, the Praedia di Giulia Felice, the Casa del Frutteto, the Casa del Menandro, the Casa del Nozze d'Argento, the Casa del Bracciale d'Oro, the Casa dell'Efebo, the Villa dei Misteri, and the Villa San Marco di Stabiae. As the GIS analyses only produced random results with regard to the distribution of houses containing various types of artefacts linked to Egypt, it was decided not to include them in the present thesis.
situation of which it is known that members of the elite did not segregate their place of residence from the place of residence of others of lower status. Thus even if a certain socio-economic separation would exist (which chapter 4 in most cases rejected) within the use of certain objects, these would not become apparent by means of spatial distribution. Therefore, in accordance with the above observations, accompanied by the results presented above on houses and Aegyptiaca, it is considered of greater use to analyse two case studies carefully instead of trying to provide a general overview, as it is argued this yields a further in-depth picture of artefact use and therefore provides more results concerning the perception and use of Egypt within domestic contexts.

5.1.2 Roman households

*Households and archaeology*

As this chapter will focus on the social aspects surrounding Aegyptiaca in the context of the Roman house a specific social group with specific material remains: households, will now be dealt with. This implies it is necessary to engage in the discussion on household archaeology as an approach, as it has become an important perspective within archaeological practice. Household archaeology is an orientation within archaeology which, in its current form, especially concerns subjects such as social change, gender relations, and social stratigraphy but from a clearly bounded unit i.e., the household. Acting as the loci of small-scale social action that embody the complexity and dynamics of everyday life, households can be approached by means of household archaeology. This orientation claims to merge the spatial, social, and material components of the house, hereby rendering it an attractive pattern of thought with regard to the Egyptian contents of Roman houses. Not only as a perspective combining material and social practice is it an appealing framework, it takes a social group as a starting point to furthermore allow a focus on a bounded entity presenting the opportunity to

---

740 Robinson 1996, 135-44. Wallace-Hadrill and Grahame (applying space syntax) proved spatial zoning did indeed existed, but only when looking into small discrete samples and the combination of both finds, wall paintings and house plans. Laurence 1995, 17; Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 88-9; Here the finds are most indicative for the presence of wealth.

741 See Laurence 1995, 199.

742 For a discussion on household archaeology as an archaeological perspective, see Allison 1999: Ashmore and Wilk 1988: Bergmann 2007, 224-43; Parker and Foster 2012; Madella et al. 2013.

743 See Allison 1999, 57-77. For a general view on household archaeology as a perspective, see Souvatzi 2012, 16-7.
study material dynamics in a contextualised way. Household archaeology as most often applied, is aimed at daily practices, economic production, skills, subsistence strategies, and its material and immaterial resources. This is also reflected in the way it has been applied to the archaeological site of Pompeii which is familiar with renowned pioneers within this specific field, the most paramount being Penelope Allison. While artefact studies in Italy and Campania had a longstanding tradition, prior to Allison’s study the catalogues consisted of very distinct categories (e.g., bronzes, sculpture, and wall painting) exponents of the western aesthetic perception of ‘art’. They were always discussed when removed from their original contexts, mainly concentrating on luxury items. Allison’s (and also that of Berry) research was the first to illustrate the potential of the artefactual evidence from Pompeii. Furthermore, by focusing on a distinct physical and social setting, they successfully created a more balanced and more dynamic picture of the Roman house as a home and a place of industrial production. Their work can be considered a watershed in Roman artefact studies; the contextualisation of artefacts especially is an important development in the field of Roman archaeology. It can be argued, however, that as to the current endeavour in adopting a strictly functional methodology as emphasised by household archaeology is not considered an optimal approach in order to study the complexity of Egypt-related artefacts and their use and perception. For this research it is most important that the use of Aegyptiaca is properly contextualised. Therefore applying household archaeology in the sense of economic values, storage, and consumption patterns in the case of this research is of less value. As a perspective, however, in addition to contextualisation, household as a focus is significant as it represents a social, spatial, and material unit in which the use, values, and intentions concerning Egypt-related artefacts can be explained. The variety and

744 This is significant on a larger scale, too. Being a small-scale unit for social change, the household represents important mechanisms of social reproduction. Here the actions of household members are transformed into specific rules, constraints, and dispositions. See Souvatki 2012, 17; Bergmann 2007, 224-43.

745 See Chesson 2012, 49.

746 The employment of the approach developed from (a) a sensed neglect of analytical treatment of the artefactual evidence at Pompeii, (b) the prominence on the study of architecture and (c) the constant emphasis on wall painting decoration of only the largest and most elaborate houses. Allison 1999; 2001; 2004.


748 See Berry 1997, 194. In addition, Allison was able to demonstrate the complexities of the domestic environment and the tension between the ideal of the Roman house expressed in Roman literary practice (e.g., in Vitruvius) and the reality demonstrated in the houses of Campania.
complexity involved with the experience of Egyptian objects can be given a more nuanced place in this way. Moreover, all the objects were valued for their aesthetic appeal and always studied as a separate category while in reality they formed a part of a house and of a household’s dealings. It is important for these artefacts as well that they are contextually approached, as they form an important social marker within the social unit of the Roman house, for the decorative and aesthetic aspects can shed light on values and value-making. Household archaeology gives space and materiality a significant place in its interpretations, however, it does not do so from an ontological viewpoint, but forms a methodological perspective which is different from the theoretical framework as proposed in this research. The strategies deployed in the present dissertation will commence from the vantage point that the physical world and the social world do not present a separate duality, but are in fact enmeshed entities. For this reason they have an equal share in creating realities and affordances. In this case, the concept of place-making is a more appropriate methodological framework in comparison with household archaeology. Furthermore place-making does not present us with a perspective but with a toolbox, giving room to various kinds of analyses all meant to merge spatial, social, cognitive, and material aspects of the house as a social and a physical place.

Houses: art, luxury, and wealth
As this thesis deals with objects and their value to Pompeian citizens, it is important to introduce here the former research and discussions surrounding the topic of Roman decoration and luxury. Also, Egypt often serves as an example of eastern luxury within discussions on wealth and decadence in Roman houses. In addition, on a slightly different note, the Roman literary discourse surrounding luxuria has had a significant impact on the way in which scholars have regarded the objects and decoration (including those originating from Egypt) of Roman houses. The debate that emerges when discussing the assumed decadence involved with the embellishment of Roman houses is therefore of a dual nature: with an archaeological and a literary aspect. To start with the latter: in early imperial

749 In addition to all the complex discussions intricately related to household archaeology one will involve oneself in after using household archaeology as a perspective (gender studies, Marxism, economic theory, etc), this research deals foremost with the reappraisal and contextualisation of specific sets of artefacts. This implies, that although the social group is important to consider, the household as a social group is not the main focus, but considered an equal force amongst others.

750 I.e., within the context of Egyptomania.
writings on *luxuria*, this term generally served to refer to a moral judgement towards overtly lavishly adorned *horti*, enormous villas, the possession of great amounts of books and art objects, extravagance in clothing, behaviour and copious dinner parties in the context of the Hellenistic moral laxity of the Late Republican elite.\(^{751}\) In this guise it has served as a political argument in the context of Augustan propaganda. In literature Augustus’ modesty and aversion of luxury was used to personally and physically reinforce his political distance from the Republic.\(^{752}\) Such political-historical developments found tantamount expressions in the literary discourse of the Late Republic and Early Imperial period, especially in satire.\(^{753}\) Excessive luxury in the context of the discourse was, at least, considered an example of bad taste and a threat to Roman morality rather than an expression of wealth.\(^{754}\)

The other side of the debate covers the material remains, which at first sight seems to confirm the presence of excessiveness as scorned in the literary sources. Looking at the houses of Campania and their contents, it is not difficult to deem these as luxurious, packed with marble statues, fountains, large gardens and lavish, colourful walls; some of the Egyptian objects would easily fit the concept of *luxuria*.\(^{755}\) When it comes to interpreting the contents of these houses, the early imperial writings had a large effect. Both Zanker and Wallace-Hadrill note that luxury of concept is well employed in the houses of Pompeii and, herein following the sources, that the excessive decoration that is attested in some of the domestic contexts of Pompeii can be considered kitsch and a case of bad taste.\(^{756}\) Through scholarship houses were deemed as idiosyncratic Walt Disney worlds, decadent, kitsch, or as bizarre fantasy worlds.\(^{757}\) Within this discussion the use of exotic materials (as the majority of the Aegyptiaca were viewed) have been considered an

\(^{751}\) See Hales 2003, 22.

\(^{752}\) Suetonius describes and praises for instance the house of Augustus as: "It was remarkable neither in size nor elegance; it had short colonades with columns of Alban stone and the rooms were bereft of any marble or remarkable floors." Suet. Aug. 72.1.

\(^{753}\) Juvenal’s Satire (14.303.9), for instance, criticizes the ivory table legs of a dining table. A well-known example is the scornful account of former slave Trimalchio’s dinner party in Petronius’ Satyricon, and the main character’s misplaced extravagance exemplifying a lack of taste within the new rising class of wealthy freedmen.

\(^{754}\) See Tronchin 2012, 336; Zanda 2011.

\(^{755}\) The case study on the Casa di Octavius Quartio will deal with Egyptian artefacts such as *luxuria*.


\(^{757}\) See 5.3.1.
important part of this concept of kitsch and elite domestic luxury.\textsuperscript{758} However, when bringing together the literary and archaeological discussions on \textit{luxuria} it should be noted, that it is hazardous to repute the relation between a literary discourse and archaeological remains as factually, and that the presence of ‘abundant’ decoration in Roman houses says little about their perception.\textsuperscript{759} The term ‘luxury’ should be treated with the utmost care when considering the material culture within Roman houses. A value determination of how Egypt might have fitted within the decorative schemes of domestic culture cannot be made in advance on the basis of such a strong politically influenced literary theme. This issue notwithstanding, an interpretation of the sculptures, flooring, architectural and wall decoration has to be provided for. Even if ‘luxury’ is not useful as a descriptive term, the houses of Pompeii and their embellishments illustrate that decorating homes was an important concept in order to socially distinguish oneself.\textsuperscript{760} The house was the prime locus of social behaviour. Objects and decorations were indeed of relevance within social gatherings inside the house, for example within the \textit{salutatio} ritual, or the \textit{cena}.\textsuperscript{761} Furthermore, for the study of societies, luxury items do provide a valuable tool because its demand, exchange, and consumption were socially determined; it formed to be an active participant in shaping social relations and culture.

Two further important terms scholars often implement in order to explain material culture and social values within Roman households are ‘eclecticism’ and ‘social emulation’. Eclecticism describes the contents of Roman houses

\textsuperscript{758} As put forward by means of the theory of Egyptomania; other Eastern objects also belonged to this concept e.g., commodities shipped from India, see Parker 2002, 40-95.

\textsuperscript{759} Although these descriptions of Roman extravagance in housing might have been based on examples from real life allowing people to recognise it (e.g., in the case of the house of Trimalchio) it should not be taken as a literal example that can be found beneath the soil, nor can it be superimposed as a shared perception on rich housing. See Bagnani 1954, 19-39; Treggiari 1998, 33-56.

\textsuperscript{760} The tradition of socially distinguishing oneself by means of display was ingrained in Roman culture. Especially gardens and sculpture continued to be important markers of status both in the Republic and in imperial times. Even if ancient authors complained against lavishly decorated villas, it did not cause this tradition to disappear.

\textsuperscript{761} In Rome, the dinner became the focus of social life. \textit{Cena} was to Romans what the Symposium was for Greeks. However, during a \textit{cena}, one was more focused on the consumption of food. For more information on \textit{cena} and its social implications, see Gowers 1993, 1-49. The important hierarchy involved with such dinner parties is testified by the following well-known Pompeian graffito: ‘\textit{The man with whom I do not dine is a barbarian to me (at quem non ceno, barbarus ille mihi est).}’ Gowers 1993; Clarke 1991, 225-6. For a discussion on \textit{salutatio} rituals, see Saller 1982, 829-30; Laurence 1991, 158-9; Gardner 1986, 1-14.
in a more neutral manner than decadence, wealth, or luxuria.\textsuperscript{762} Eclectic practice (or visual heterogeneity), as dealt with by Tronchin et al., is described as the practice of collecting items from different origins in order to make it a new whole.\textsuperscript{763} It therefore points to an informed practice of people collecting a variety of styles and objects on purpose and its social implications. Tronchin points, for instance, to the intellectual abilities required not only to carry out a version of antiquarian research, but also to combine earlier models in an innovative manner.\textsuperscript{764} Although it is true that employing the term ‘eclectic’ does not place a clear value-claim on the objects in houses, it also denies the fact that the objects in houses might have been experienced as quite different concepts than something decorative, while eclecticism assumes that it is all meant as something decorative and all part of a collection. It further places too much emphasis on the buyer, his agency to consciously acquire ‘eclectic things’ and thereby dismisses the significant social and historical processes underlying the choice for a certain object.\textsuperscript{765} It also makes the decision-making process notably intentional. As was mentioned before, objects become selected from different choice-scenarios, and cannot be put away as sheer eclecticism. Another interpretation of the use of objects within Pompeian homes comprises of social emulation. This refers to a processual explanation in which classes were stimulated to imitate higher social groups by for instance acquiring objects.\textsuperscript{766} It was an imitation of the elite in order to enhance one’s own social status. Zanker writes: “\textit{...although the owners of these houses made use of different forms –and achieved differing degrees of success– they all sheared the same aim, namely, to create the illusion of a villa. They all

\textsuperscript{762} For further information on the concept of eclecticism and collecting, see Arethusa 45 2012.
\textsuperscript{764} We read: “\textit{The pleasure associated with variety in reading and with selecting models in oratory is attested in the written sources; the domestic ensembles that survive in the archaeological record suggest that a similar delight in choosing from a range of imagery and materials and subsequently arranging them in a personal way likely also existed.}” See Tronchin 2012, 262.
\textsuperscript{765} For an explanation of what is acquired and what is considered a luxury item is a combination of a piece’s rarity, its provenance, material, craftsmanship and the owner’s personal taste, see Bartman 1991, 73.
\textsuperscript{766} We read: “\textit{As a social process, luxury functions as the attempt to mark or assert a place within a network of social relationships by the display of consumption of material goods; in this process the goods are valued in proportion to their relative inaccessibly outside the social circle that is employing them.}” Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 145-6.
envisioned their ideal as a world of luxury. Wallace-Hadrill likewise argues for a strong case of social emulation to be witnessed in the houses of Pompeii, acclaming Zanker's idea on the Roman ideal of the villa. The goods are relative to the practice and the intensity of the practice; the more something is imitated, the less the objects are valued as uplifting their status and the less luxurious it becomes. The process can be attested in the houses of Pompeii, in objects as well as wall painting. It might not be surprising given the dynamic society such as Pompeii with the competitive nature of local politics and the openness of houses, that trends would catch on quickly. Although as a social process it is an interesting theory, the social emulation process has likewise been used to show that certain houses (such as the house of Octavius Quartio) were copying the decoration of villas of their in a naïve and tasteless way. The presence of these artefacts in houses is not only reserved for the wealthy, nor is the number or quality of objects and decoration in general a straightforward sign for wealth and education.

The use of space in Roman houses
In addition to objects, the use of space is considered an important parameter when studying social values in Roman domestic contexts. As the contextualisation of Egyptian objects will extensively deal with its spatial features and as it is a much discussed topic both from a household and a social emulation perspective it is relevant to discuss it here. In the case of artefacts, answering questions such as what is displayed where? What do locations of objects and decorations inform us on the functions of rooms? What do they tell us about issues of public and private use of space? They contain vital clues on how objects - Egyptian and non-Egyptian - were used and valued. Furthermore, the use of space ties in closely with the previous debates on objects, luxury and social values. The way a concept of privacy is acted out in space, for instance, has much to do with wealth and status, just

---

767 See Zanker 1995, 193. Although this view is attenuated, it is argued that the debate only serves to illustrate that architecture can play as much a part in creating fantasy as wall painting but that the villa had as much need for fantasy as the domus, see Hales 2003, 138.
769 See Hales 2003, 137.
770 See Petersen 2006, 129.
771 In the end it is not luxury or decadence that was considered bad taste or excessive; the concept of social emulation led the ancient authors to exclamations of bad taste, see Elsner 2007. The best argument for a case of social emulation is the presence of luxury items in all social strata of Pompeii. This could also have been observed with the Egyptian objects from the database, such as the green glazed statuettes.
as how the structure of the roman house and its decoration is related. A pivotal study which has shed light on these issues with regard to the houses of Pompeii specifically has been published by Andrew Wallace-Hadrill and is titled *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum*.\(^{772}\) In his view the function of decoration and space is capable of saying something significant about the social activities taking place; decoration thus informs us of the social use of space.\(^{773}\) This can be observed to be reflected in Pompeii, where the use of decoration displays a distinct hierarchical character.\(^{774}\) Almost every house (large and more modest) counts similar patterns of a more lavishly furnished and highly decorated peristyle in order to impress guests; while the less frequented (or visited by guests of a lower social status) areas of the house are less excessively furbished and this hierarchy functions on both a space and a time level. It is a hierarchy of social actions, where in the morning the atrium and the tablinum could host the *salutatio* ritual, while the late-afternoon *cenae* took place in the deeper space of the triclinium and peristyle.\(^{775}\) A note must be made in conjunction with the general progress of household archaeology (of which the use of space forms a significant part), because an important development has been made with regard to the use of spaces.\(^{776}\) The socio-spatial hierarchies therefore contain somewhat generalised views of the functioning of space in houses. The presence of material and spatial nuances on the social use of space as will be employed in this chapter should demonstrate the cases being more complex. Nonetheless, the Roman house reflects important psychological concepts including spatial and material aspects. The concept of privacy is an example of this as it is not only central to understanding environment and behaviour relationships but also one of the most important social parameters applied when bringing together the social and the spatial.\(^{777}\) The pattern of Roman social life admitted numerous and subtle grades of relative privacy. The house was differentiated according to increasing degrees of intimacy along an axis that ran from the public space of the exterior to the private interior.

---

\(^{772}\) See Wallace-Hadrill 1994.


\(^{774}\) See Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 39-44.


\(^{776}\) While these were once viewed in a very static way whereby a peristyle only and automatically served for a *cena*, a triclinium always served for dining, the atrium for the *salutatio* ritual, and the cubiculum for sleeping, it has been revealed by means of a contextual analysis of household artefacts that many spaces could be used in a variety of ways and that they were quite flexible and functioned much more dynamically than previously argued. See Allison 2004; Leach 1997, 50-75; Riggsby 1997.

\(^{777}\) See Altman 1975, 6; Hanson 1999; Cieraad 1999, 1-12; Pennartz 1999, 95-106.
space.\textsuperscript{778} In it greater privacy implied an ascent in privilege as well as an advance toward intimacy with the paterfamilias. Social behaviour was acted out in space and structured by space, but also materialised in situational clues such as decoration of walls, thresholds, and flooring.\textsuperscript{779}

To conclude the introduction on the existing ideas on Roman housing, it seems that the issues reflect a continuous debate on Roman housing and their decoration - household, aesthetics, and the use of space are all aided not only by providing a better archaeological context and taking into account the physical rooting of an object, but also by a more social-psychologically embedded approach. Value-making should be analysed from a bottom-up perspective and considered a social process and a material process alike. Both the object has agency, as well as the environment in which it is used. This implies terms such as ‘luxuria’ an ‘eclecticism’ are not really useful, as they are superimposed concepts in which the artefacts under scrutiny play no active role in the establishing of values. Social emulation is important to consider as a process. However, it also does not provide a bottom-up argument for artefact-meaning, nor does it take into account the agency object itself and the ability of changing contexts of objects. The aim of this chapter should therefore be to contextualise Aegyptiaca in a way that provides room to both the physical and the cognitive aspects that surround these objects. All these social aspects of the physical space and objects (issues of privacy, hierarchy, social emulation, luxury, social groups in a household context) will be analysed by means of a series of tools classified under the heading ‘place-making’.

5.1.3 Place-making

As introduced in the methodological outline (see 3.7), the houses will be analysed according to ‘place-making’. This can be defined as the creation of a meaningful context for social interaction by means of studying the agency and the relation between objects, decoration, aesthetics, architectural design, ritual and social performance, and psychology.\textsuperscript{780} Bringing these


\textsuperscript{779} Affordances in this cues are put up by the owner of the house in accordance with his personal preferences. In order to get a better grip on how issues of privacy and matters of social distinctions are mediated in a house, the present research is greatly aided by adopting a social-psychological orientation. When houses and their contents are examined on how they affect people as a physical environment and how the environment to shape social interaction is applied.

\textsuperscript{780} See Fischer 2009, 184.
concepts together within a methodological framework aimed at an embedded perception and experience study of Aegyptiacum, it was chosen to classify the analyses and interpretations under the heading of ‘place-making’. The justification of adopting place-making as a method in order to investigate the Roman house is the way it incorporates the thoughts on human experience, human actions, and the physical world as an immersed phenomenon. It therefore corresponds well with the theoretical framework as presented in chapter 3 (i.e., the central ontological assumption that people as well as their worlds are integrally intertwined and the perception-hermeneutical approach that tries to disentangle the way objects work in relation to the way people think about objects).

Before describing the analytical applications that make-up the tools of place-making, clearer characterisation of what place and place-making entail within the scope of this research should be provided for. As became apparent from the process of dwelling (3.7.1), the term ‘place’, denotes something more than just a location, but is a totality consisting of concrete things with a material substance, shape, texture, and colour. On the other hand, place is not a physical environment separated from people associated with it, but rather the invisible, normally unnoticed and unintentional phenomenon of people-experiencing-place. This dialectic between the physical and the social implies that as a phenomenological concept, place-making offers a way to articulate more precisely the experienced wholeness of people-in-world, the everyday world of taken-for-grantedness. It is therefore an excellent tool to approach the perception of Egyptian artefacts. This taken-for-grantedness in relation to objects and to habits (see chapter 3), occurs because the house as a dwelling allows routinised practices governed by specific schemata of structures, preferences, and prescriptions. This

---

781 As discussed, place-making means the methodological heading of several place-making tools which attempt to allow a description of a dwelling and its physical and cognitive components. It is thus not identical to a place creation, which is a descriptive term, explaining the way of dealing with the environment as an active and conscious intervention, see Seamon 2013, 16.

782 See Seamon 2013, 11-12.

783 Relph states: “It [place] is not a bit of space, nor another word for landscape or environment, it is not a figment of individual experience, nor a social construct. It is, instead, the foundation of being both human and nonhuman; experience, actions, and life itself begin and end with place”, see Relph 2008, 36; Seamon 2012.

784 Mol 2013.

785 See Knorr-Cetina 2001, 184; Bourdieu 1990, 52-6. Relph refers to this experience of place as existential insideness: a situation where one feels so completely at home and immersed in a place that its importance of in the person's everyday life is not usually noticed unless the place dramatically changes in some way, see Relph 1976, 55. As can be added here that this corresponds with Heidegger's theory on broken-tool-theory as the
corresponds on a cognitive level to the responsive and intuitive system as explained in part 3.2 (brain type 1, or ‘the fast brain’, which recognises an environment and responds to it without consciously having to think about the rules, structures and interpretations). It means that the objects and decorative aspects in the house are no longer consciously experienced; they have blended in with the routinised practices of everyday life. It also implies that those unconscious aspects of the house influence these practices, in the way people act and interact, both with themselves and within their environment. As can be observed, this ties neatly in with the previous thoughts on the agency of objects and the environment and forms a situated context for affordances and materiality. Place as a concept catches the complexities of the various layers of perception and offers a stage to unravel these. It recognises the reality of the world (although inaccessible) and the things as agencies of power, and the way people think about this world and its objects. Things are regarded as totalities. This also accounts for the way ‘place’ is conceptualised in the method of place-making. It is a unity of practices, ideas, and world, and while its workings cannot be reduced to properties, as a methodology it can investigate different properties in order to see how they act within the whole.

How does ‘place’ becomes a locus of study? How does it transform itself into a method? A house is not just a collection of things, it is lived space. However, the house does not merely consist of people acting; they act in a space. Therefore the space should be taken into account as a structuring force of behaviour within a place-making method. It should also reckon with its social dynamism, social constructions, actions, and rituals and with its materiality and the way objects, architecture and space are able to influence social behaviour. The method of place-making should be considered a toolbox including a set of analytical and interpretative techniques in order to

unconscious taking-for-grantedness of functional daily things that are not consciously noted until they break down.

786 Kahneman 2011. On a theoretical level place-making corresponds with the ideas of Merleau-Ponty’s body-subject referring to the pre-cognitive, normally unnoticed, facility of the living body to smoothly integrate its actions with the world at hand, see Merleau-Ponty 1962.

787 See Seamon 2013, 12; Graumann 2002, 95-113; it is therefore a concept which can help unravel the ‘a-priori layers of perception’, see Mol 2012.

788 As Norberg-Schulz argues: “A place is therefore a qualitative, ‘total’ phenomenon which we cannot reduce to any of its properties such as spatial relationships, without losing its concrete nature out of sight”, see Norberg-Schulz 1980, 8.

789 The properties that add up to experience of something, or the uncovering of the a priori layers of perception, see Mol 2013, 120.
investigate the negotiations between the cognitive and the physical world. Place-making therefore consists of a way of incorporating the concepts of materiality and the social interaction in the analysis of a house. It brings together environmental psychology, cognitive sciences, and archaeology. Although the terminology of place-making is originally applied in the field of environmental design, as a collection of tools it is of use to archaeology as well. It has the benefit of complementing the rather static and quasi topological tools such as access analysis in space syntax with the study of more symbolically charged phenomena of the house. In this way it can provide objects that do have a cognitive connection with Egypt (which as the former chapter explained, is not necessarily the case) a position within the material and social dynamics of the house, which can subsequently clarify what an object could mean in a social space.

5.1.4 The amalgamation of materiality and psychology in the home: the threshold as an example of place-making

To give an example of how techniques of materiality and psychology can be incorporated as place-making into a holistic analysis of the house, the threshold with hieroglyphs from the Casa del Doppio Larario (see fig. 5.3) serves as a good example in order to introduce the analysis of place-making with regards to Egyptian artefacts. In a general way the threshold is an important artefact, as it is one of those features in a dwelling with significant psychological effects on both inhabitants as well as visitors. Furthermore, the way it is physically shaped and symbolically charged through the way it appears is important for the way it was experienced. The doorway as a

---

790 As described in chapter 3, place-making has as its ultimate goal to describe the house as a holistic unit and to give room to the social values connected to the house and its use as a social space. In addition, as discussed above, its materiality and environmental sources that shape and influence behaviour accordingly must be taken seriously.

791 This term is adopted when referring to research on monumental buildings dated to the Late Bronze Age Cyprus, incorporating space syntax analyses and social encoding by means of Rapoport’s 1990 study on environment-behaviour and non-verbal communication, see Fischer 2009a; 2009b.

792 Examples of these are for instance pattern analysis, material and object analysis, cognitive mapping, spatial behaviour, personal space, individual and group territoriality (i.e., the mediation of public and private space), access analysis, agent analysis, and visibility analysis. For more information on how the psychological concept of thresholds functions in architecture, see Alexander 1974, 277, 333-4 on the concept of entrance experience. Martin has discussed this for Roman society in which she states that the architectural evidence indicates that the experience of entering the house was very important to the Romans. With a slight variation, almost all examples use several elements which accentuate the act of transition from the street to the house. It consists of a spatial sequence from the entry to the entrance room; a prominent frame around the entry doorway, a change in level at the entry, a change in the level of light. In many cultures the entry, particularly to a house, is
psychological concept means access to the other. It shelters the revelations of the Self and the Other referring to issues of privacy as discussed above.\textsuperscript{793} With the respectful (and ritual) hesitation at a doorway as the demarcation of change, one provokes a life of community, of being together with others, but at the same time set boundaries and rules to it.\textsuperscript{794} The threshold therefore symbolises a pause between two worlds, both for the users of the house and those visiting it. To the house owner a threshold implies the change of space from public life to the safety of one’s home as well as a change of atmosphere. Within the house it denoted a change of activities.\textsuperscript{795} Moving from living room to bedroom will affect emotions because the functions of the rooms are different. However, the threshold is also a dialogue between those who live (and their social positions) in the house and those visiting. The threshold embodies in this respect social access and accessibility and it structures relationships between people. In a relatively ‘open’ society such as can be witnessed in Pompeii these rules might have been of even more importance than in present-day (western) more closed societies, in which boundaries are more strictly demarcated. The pause indicates a moment in which a person has to reflect his relation and status (can a slave enter a cubiculum when he does not have a clear task there?) or is forced to ask for permission and the pause becomes an important articulation of power relations (for instance when a guest asks the owner whether he can enter the tablinum from the atrium). The threshold has the physical appearance of the psychological boundary. If refused admittance to the interior space, the door takes on the character of substantial matter and barrier. It is transformed from an inviting foreshadowing of a pleasant meeting into a massive piece of lamented wood.\textsuperscript{796} The threshold’s agency is therefore profound, because its physicality defines social relationships. This is why its material properties are important to study.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{793} Jones 1959; Watts 1987; for specifically boundaries in Pompeian houses, see Lauritsen 2012, 95-114; 2011, 59-75; Staub 2009, 205-21.
\item \textsuperscript{794} See Lang 1985, 211.
\item \textsuperscript{795} See Alexander 1974, 277, 333-4.
\item \textsuperscript{796} See Lang 1985, 210.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
The house in which a threshold plays a fundamental role, both physically and with respect to this research is the Casa del Doppio Larario (VII 3,13). As mentioned above, a greywacke slab was found here, a so-called *mensa sacra*, which once was a dedication of the sacred banquet of Psammetichus II (594-589 BC), sovereign of the 26th dynasty of Egypt (see fig. 4.1 and fig. 5.3). Unfortunately, the house cannot be considered for a comprehensive case study as it is too damaged; it no longer contains any wall paintings, and its finds were too haphazardly recorded to be of any service. However, the excavation reports clarify that the slab once served as a threshold to the triclinium. Therefore it is a fine example of a small-scale example of place-making within a domestic context. Why would the slab served as a threshold? And why was it placed at the entrance to the triclinium? Observing the ground plan (fig. 5.2) it can be noted that the house is reasonably small and modest. In addition, there was not much space for any differentiation of functions, most likely the rooms had multiple functions.

Not much is known about the furnishing and decoration of the triclinium (g) apart from its location and the threshold. It can be observed, however, that while visibility-wise it is the deepest space in the house, it was not configuratively the most segregated. Rooms p and q (fig. 5.2 a-c) were carefully hidden from sight. The triclinium was visible from the street if all the doors were open although it seems to be the deepest and most segregated space. Rooms with a serviceable function occupy a more segregated position in the house and are also hidden from view. This corresponds to issues of privacy, hierarchy and display as discussed above. Rooms with a representational but private character had to seem inaccessible but visible at the same time in order to display the extent of the house. The isovist (see fig. 5.2) illustrates how far a person could look into the house when standing in the entrance. If the house permitted it, this was a good way to visually optimise its status (a vista provides the illusion of one’s house being larger than it is, while in theory many spaces could still lie behind). This visual trick show one’s wealth (or hides the lack of it).

---

797 It is generally assumed that the slab is derived from this house. However, according to Fiorelli, it originates from the neighbouring house VII 3, 11 (Pappalardo 2001, 86). The slab belongs to the same pharaoh as the *Horologium* obelisk from Heliopolis in Rome, placed near the Ara Pacis by August in 10 BC.
798 Allison 1999.
799 As mentioned in 3.7, an isovist is defined as the set of all points visible in all directions from any given vantage point in space and can serve to determine view areas and how these affect movement and behaviour.
800 The first account of a visual axis or see-through (*Durchblick*) in the Roman house was offered by Drerup 1959 147-74. For a more comprehensive account of how vistas work...
No doubt looking at the ground plan room $g$ represented the most important space in the house. Nonetheless, the most visible position to place the slab under investigation was of course the threshold leading into the house from the street. Why was the slab not located there? If the slab had to reflect the wealth of the inhabitants, or the possession of knowledge of strange and (maybe) magical signs (assuming one was unfamiliar with hieroglyphs), or an extra symbolic boundary, would it not be more sensible to position it in a location where as many passers-by as possible would see it? The workings of social conventions and spatial layout in the Pompeian *domus* are more complex as argued above. The Egyptian slab was placed specifically in this room because the position it took in the house and the functions that were carried out there. It was the most significant space of the house, and might have been used to receive guests, or work relations; more importantly, it was used to receive people that were invited into the house.

![Diagram of Casa del Doppio Larario](image)

Fig. 5.2 a-c) a: Ground plan and spatial configuration of Casa del Doppio Larario (VII 3, 13). Left (a) the ground plan from *PPM VI*, the triclinium is space $g$; (b) the configuration of the rooms with the root node (red) and the triclinium (green) and (c) an isovist indicating the visibility of the triclinium.

Not every visitor passing by the house needed to see the slab, only those considered sufficiently important by the owner and carefully selected before invited to view it. Three options as to why the threshold was located here can be formulated; first, the slab was placed there because people wanted to create a boundary especially for this room, second, because it was their only

space for receiving of guests and way to display their status. So the impression that needed to be made was focused on that room. The third reason could be that the slab was placed there because the main entrance was not in need for such a punctuated boundary. Visitors would not have been explicitly reminded of a boundary as they would not have entered without encouragement. It was therefore more important to utilise specified thresholds in the house. In spite of persistent theories stating that the Roman domus was accessible to all members of the public, this was probably merely a visual permission, not an actual invitation to physically enter someone's house.\textsuperscript{801} Furthermore, the doors of Pompeii, in general huge and pompous (especially for the small houses) already caused a grand visual impact on the visitor or passing pedestrian. Although the doors were probably opened during the light hours of the day (also to allow for vistas), social restrictions forbade the passing of the threshold, and if need be solved by physical means (e.g., doorman, a dog, or an image of a dog).\textsuperscript{802} Therefore putting extra visual restrictions may not have been necessary at this point of entering the house, but only in a later stage when social distinctions became more substantial. A final option for placing the slab in the door to the triclinium instead of at the entrance, albeit contested, is to not display too openly one's cultic preferences. However, this would assume one was familiar with the significance and the associations of hieroglyphs with Isis. With the possible exception of a small minority, this can be seriously doubted.\textsuperscript{803}

The second question is why the slab was re-used as a threshold. First of all, as discussed in part 4.5 it could be established that the religious meaning of the slab might have been of significance to the owners and may even have had a cultic importance with reference to Isis, whose temple also housed a slab containing hieroglyphs (table 4.17). It has been determined that the owners of the house might have held a special significance to the Isiac cult, not only the demonstrated by the slab: the lararium also included a bronze

\textsuperscript{801} See Beard 2008, 84-5.
\textsuperscript{802} Of which the renowned 'cave canem' mosaics reminds.
\textsuperscript{803} Only those familiar with the Isis cult and those who visited the temple (which housed a limestone slab including hieroglyphs) or those who when in Rome recognised the same writing on the slab as was encarved on the obelisks. The latter might have been difficult because the objects (form, material, and context) are very different, and the recognition would have been solely based on remembering the hieroglyphic script.
What is however even more interesting, also with respect to the previous chapter in which was stated that cognitively, exotica are selected for their familiarity rather than their strangeness, is how the slab - which was never intended as such in its original setting- fits in with normal thresholds attested in Pompeii. It has the same colour, size, and appearance as the type of stone most often utilized for thresholds: lava. Lava thresholds were frequently applied for the transition to larger open spaces such as triclinia or tablina. Conceptually, therefore, the slab fits in with the idea of how many other thresholds in Pompeian houses looked like, which could have well dictated its final use in the door opening to room g. It cannot be assumed it was especially chosen or imported as it, of course, had the likeness of a Pompeian threshold. However, the way it appeared to the owners might have associated them with thresholds in this case dictating the final application of the object as a threshold. This example indicates that not only selection (as argued in the previous chapter), but also the uses of objects somehow depend on that which is accustomed from existing schemata and cognitive frameworks present in society.

However, except for its physicality which reminded people of thresholds, the hieroglyphs set it apart as an object, rendering it something special to behold. Again, familiarity and otherness go hand in hand within the selection, perception, and use of an object. Thresholds to important rooms of houses often contain mosaics that differentiate the space inside and outside the room in order to mark a difference. However, hieroglyphs never served that purpose in Pompeii except in the present case. Indeed not any other parallel is to be found in Italy. This implies it is certainly remarkable that a threshold contains such features, but in fact it would be for every object in a Pompeian house, for the only other known hieroglyphs present in Pompeii originates from the slab in the Isis temple. Only this other slab could have served as a reference. This poses a problem, however, with relation to the 'Egyptian' perception. Would only those familiar with the cult have known that hieroglyphs could be associated with Egypt? According to Swetnam-

---

804 We should however, be careful not a priori consider such objects to be specifically cult-related, as they could be kept in a household shrine without a connection to the cult, but only as an affiliation to a certain quality of Harpocrates.

805 Lava is most frequently applied for stone thresholds and in all building phases of Pompei, but during later periods mainly for simpler rooms. Travertine started to come into use contemporarily with the late First- and the Second Style decorations. We do not find marble until the early Imperial period mainly with regard to side plates only, see Staub 2009, 207.

806 It was the most common, but also cheapest threshold material. The more expensive travertine was applied mainly for smaller door openings.
Burland, laying down the slab as a threshold definitely had religious values (albeit not necessarily Isis cult-related) because of the “placement at the critical juncture of exterior and interior—a liminal space which, according to Augustine, Romans invoked at least three deities to safeguard—illustrates the power attributed to this object and its sacred script to protect the home and household within.”

Fig. 5.3) The slab, (probably made out of greywacke) once dedicated to the sacred banquet of Psammetichus II became used as a threshold in the Casa del doppio Larario (VII 3, 13).

Although it could be observed that the cultic association might not have been the only reason for the owners to utilise the slab as a threshold, the argument that the hieroglyphs were perceived as sacred by the owners (if they had knowledge of this) could be valid. A further argument could be made in favour of the existence of a link between this house and the temple, and that the reason why the owners purchased the object was related to cult preferences. The remark Swetnam-Burland makes with regard to the not necessarily cultic association is, however, somewhat problematic: “The Egyptian nature of an object would strike even a viewer with no cultic association as potent, as the use of largely indecipherable Egyptian phrases in curse tablets and other ‘magical’ documents attest.” If the viewer was unfamiliar with the cult, how would he or she have recognised ‘The Egyptian nature’ of the object? How could a Pompeian have known it concerned writing? In Rome, one might have been aware of the connections between Egypt and hieroglyphs and Isis, because of the profuse presence of obelisks

---

808 This was the result of the link to the Isis temple which contained the only other reference to hieroglyphs and, unlike many other Egyptian objects, was publically displayed next to the temple on the sanctuary space.
there; however, we cannot assume that it is therefore exactly the same for Pompeians as well. In the case of a substantial number of people not travelling outside Pompeii or Campania, the only other visual connection were the hieroglyphs present in the slab of the Isis temple, also not necessarily known and seen by everyone. For those people unfamiliar with the hieroglyphs, without a necessary association to Egypt or Isis, the unfamiliarity with the signs might however, have catered the same effect? This leads the discussion to the more intentional processes concerning the reason why the slab was used as a threshold. As discussed above, the threshold is a physical boundary with a large psychological impact. However the properties of this particular boundary possessed extra qualities, causing a more profound moment of pause, not only caused by the way it appeared but also by the presence of hieroglyphs. As Heidegger noted (as discussed in 3.4) when things break and seem out of the ordinary as ready-at-hand (Zuhandenheit) equipment, they become present-at-hand (Vorhandenheit) and human attention is suddenly aroused. One becomes aware of objects instead of non-consciously applying them. The ‘foreignness’ of the hieroglyphs on the threshold created a perfect moment of pause in which the relationships within the contexts of the house were defined. The threshold of the Casa del Doppio Larario is imbued with extra qualities rendering the boundary even stronger than normal boundaries would have done and not because of its Egyptianness per se. Only on those with certain knowledge of the cult, however, would it presumably also have a profound impact caused by the fact it was unknown.

5.1.5 Research objectives
This example of place-making as the bringing together of physical, spatial, social, and psychological data not only served as an explanation of how place-making works, it also demonstrated the practical merits of combining several tools within the interpretation of these objects (especially concerning their social values). Space syntax’ access analysis, for example, is a rewarding method in order to get a grip on the use of space, but can be considered a rather one-dimensional tool if one does not include wall painting, floors, lighting, and artefacts in order to study space. It can be argued that the owners made a link to the Isis sanctuary because of the association with hieroglyphs; however, as we do not have other finds or wall paintings to sustain this thought it remains an assumption. However, the way the object was treated through place-making, carefully looking at how
something ends up in a certain context, how it was used and how it was regarded by different viewers, added exactly that which was missing from the previous part: gaining a further insight in the choice people made for a specific object and the social aspects of use and with more detail to the exact locations. In this way the object becomes embedded in the context in which it was used, still making use of the same underlying premises that were discussed in chapter 3 -the cultural embeddedness and the cognitive associations- but in this case the extra step is taken to analyse also the social embeddedness and significance. When there is access to more data than this example can provide, as will be demonstrated in the next paragraphs, this will become even clearer.

5.2 Case study I: the Casa degli Amorini Dorati
5.2.1. Introduction
The first house to be discussed in order to provide an example of the uses of Egypt in domestic contexts is the Casa degli Amorini Dorati (VI 16, 7.38). It has been selected because of a shrine which seems to have been entirely devoted to Isis and her cult which was found in the peristyle area of the house. It therefore exemplifies a case of domestic religion in which Egypt as a concept served to express certain values. These values will be analysed according to the place-making principles as set out in 3.8 and 5.1. The Casa degli Amorini Dorati provides an excellent case study because of its archaeological and historiographical richness. It was carefully excavated in 1902 by Antonio Sogliano. His work presents present-day scholars with a proper contextual representation of the finds of the house. Furthermore, the house was extensively published in the Häuser in Pompeji series by Florian Seiler in 1992 and was the subject of Jessica Power’s dissertation.810 Moreover, it is listed in Penelope Allison’s online database, which includes all the finds of the house and a detailed description of the rooms.811 A comprehensive contextual approach directed at the Egyptian objects in the house can thus be carried out as envisioned in the introduction of this chapter.

811 Jacheschemski 1979; Anguissola 2012, 29-36; Sogliano (1903; 1904; 1907, Casa degli Amorini Dorati, NSA 4, 549-593); Lipka 2006, 335-9. For the online database project concerning Pompeian household inventory, see http://www.stoa.org/projects/ph/house?id=21
All the Aegyptiaca in this case are connected to the shrine, which was attested in the southeastern corner of the peristyle of the house (fig. 5.4a). The shrine consisted of an alcove (of which the pavement has now disappeared) above which on both the south facing and the east facing wall we see two painted panels in yellow within a red frame. On one panel (south), four Hellenistic-Egyptian deities (Anubis, Harpocrates, Isis, and Serapis) are portrayed, the other (east) wall portray objects related to the cult. The shrine also attested a statuette of the falcon-deity Horus (see tables 4.1, 4.2, 4.16). This 42 cm. high alabaster statue once stood on one of the shrine’s wooden shelves (see fig. 5.4b). Within discussions on Isis or Aegyptiaca, this shrine has always been treated as an isolated example.

![Fig. 5.4 a-b) Left: (a) the Egyptian shrine in the peristyle of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati (photo by the author). Right: (b) the alabaster Horus statue found in the shrine. From D’Errico 1992.](image)

However, there is another find which makes this house important as a case to explore the social values of Egyptian artefacts in context. This is the presence of a second shrine in the peristyle, which housed bronze statuettes of two lares, the Capitoline triad of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva and a statue of Mercurius (fig. 5.5a-b). This ostensibly juxtaposition in one space, between Egyptian deities on the one hand and Roman on the other, is a clear starting point in this case study in unraveling the boundaries between first of all the categories of religion, social status, and display and secondly: the appearance of cultural boundaries between Egypt and Rome. To avoid confusing cultural classifications and difficulties concerning the term of lararium the two domestic sanctuaries will henceforth be referred to in the
text as the ‘Isis shrine’ and the ‘Capitoline shrine’. Matters concerning research can now be formulated to contribute to answering questions on the use and value of the Egyptian objects: why are these shrines kept apart from each other? How do they differ from one and other? What does that tell us about cults or attached social values? How did the Isis shrine function in relation to the remaining part of the house? Were more objects in the house linked to Egypt besides those found in the shrine? How did the owners deal with these items? This paragraph attempts to show the meaning and use of the shrine and its related objects. This can only become clear if these artefacts are regarded within the network of social and material connections incorporated in the house.

The present case study will be structured as follows: a brief outline of the history of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati will first be provided for, along with a description of the rooms and their contents. Subsequently the analytical part of the ‘place-making’ shall be carried out. This will consist of a re-evaluation of the objects in relation to the use and experience of the house as well as its spaces by means of the application of space syntax and adopting pattern language as a phenomenological descriptive tool. Attention will further be paid to the configuration, movement, and visibility of the house in relation to the two shrines, as well as a comparison of all the objects, wall paintings and spaces in order to determine the position ‘Egypt’ occupied in the house. The implication of the analysis for the use of Egypt.

812 An Egyptian opposing Roman shrine would be a dangerous assumption as it denotes cultural connotations which may not have been apparent. For a further discussion on the terminology of household shrines, see 4.2.
and the Egyptian shrine in its social and religious context will be discussed lastly.

**5.2.2 History of the house**

Antonio Sogliano excavated the Casa degli Amorini Dorati in 1902. He excavated and restored the house, the progress of which was partly documented in the *Giornali degli Scavi* in 1903 and 1907 and later published in the *Notizie degli scavi di antichità*. The name Amorini Dorati first appears in the *Giornali degli Scavi* 1905 and is derived from the golden inlaid cupids adorning the walls of one of the cubicula (Room I) of the house. The main entrance of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati was situated on the ancient *cardo maximus* (the present-day via Stabiana), close to the Vesuvian gate. During its final phase the house had an entrance on the west side of the street (between Insula VI 16 and the unexcavated Insula V 6) and one on the east side of the street (between Insulae VI 16 and VI 15). Its ground floor measured c.800 m², implying that with reference to atrium house dimensions in Pompeii it was thus of a medium to large size. According to Seiler, the house consists of three distinctive historical phases: a Late Samnitic, a Republican, and an Imperial phase which span almost 3 centuries. The first phase consists of a forerunner of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati, atrium House no. 7 (250-150 BC). This phase is only determinable by means of a limestone wall that runs from Cubiculum C (see fig. 5.6) to Room E. Examples of First Style decoration are preserved, however, in Room C. This causes the date of the first phase to fall in c.150 BC, while the wall technique itself could be dated to the late 3rd to the beginning of the 2nd century BC. Another forerunner of the house is the atrium House 38, located at the *Vico dei Vettii*, which had an adjoined taberna (no. 5).

During the second phase of these houses (150-80 BC), as far as can be seen, House 38 is expanded slightly to the south. House 7 included a Tuscan atrium without any side rooms. The most significant changes in the house plan layout can be witnessed during the late Republican period, when the two houses are joined together. It was not a complete reconstruction because the owner applied both the former ground plans as foundation for his new house. The new centre of the room was formed by the peristyle, to which

---

813 *Notizie degli Scavi*, Sogliano 1905, 85-6; 1906, 374-83; 1907, 345-51; 1908, 26-43
815 See Brandt 2010; the house belongs to Wallace-Hadrill's so-called Quartile 4, see Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 81.
many less recent rooms were now exposed to. The main way in is formed by the entrance of House 7, while this opens to a more important street. The atrium behind this entrance, however, did not seem to have changed much. After this major reconstruction the house remains more or less the same in terms of construction. The final building phase before the renovation done after the earthquake (imperial 30 BC- AD 62) also saw important reconstructions and renewals of decorations, although not as major as the previous phases. In this phase a novel water pressure system was installed throughout Pompeii and richer houses could therefore develop elaborate waterworks and fountains, something which also occurred in the peristyle of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati. Some of the repaired walls and stylistically interpreted walls date from the period of Caligula and the Claudian phase (AD 30-40). Seiler also notes major work and restoration after the earthquake in AD 62. The damage it caused to this house seems to have been relatively small; however, certain rooms (e.g., Exedra G and Atrium B) were renovated. Notable too are the redecorated rooms in a second phase of the Fourth Pompeian Style which are maybe due to bad renovation or another earthquake. This makes that the house possessed a layout and decoration of a relatively late period in the final phase of Pompeii’s history.

5.2.3 Description and discussion of the Egypt-connected objects from the Casa degli Amorini Dorati

A description of the shrine and its contexts will be presented prior to the analysis in order to clarify the angle for investigation. The shrine was situated in the southeastern corner of the peristyle and consisted of a painted background (fig. 5.4a): two yellow panels (one on the eastern wall, the other on the southern wall) with a red border decorated with a white figurative design. The panel on the southern wall includes the Egyptian deities: Anubis on the left wearing a dark red chlamys (a Greek type of short cloak often worn by young soldiers and messengers, and by Hermes, the deity Anubis was associated with) and boots with red laces; in his right hand we see a palm branch and in his left a caduceus. He is flanked by Harpocrates in a white garment and holding a cornucopia. Only his head and a part of the shoulder are preserved. Isis is also dressed in a long white garment.

---

816 The floor is raised to level with the new height of the peristyle which is 30 cm. higher. See Seiler 1992, 78.
818 This staff also connected Anubis to Hermes-he was referred to as Hermanubis in this guise.
garment with long sleeves; a red and black band runs from shoulder to her waist. She holds a sistrum in her right hand; her left hand is no longer visible (it may have held a situla or an ankh). Serapis on the far right is dressed in a long white garment, too. He holds a sistrum in his right hand and a cornucopia in his left hand. Below them, a group of figures are discernible. Due to their bad condition it is not exactly clear what they represent. They may have depicted an Isiac procession or an offering scene. According to Boyce (1937) one of the figures portrays an anthropomorphic ‘blue-coloured Egyptian idol’, its head is covered by means of a green nemes. We can also see the end of a green wooden table on which a metal krater is placed. The upper part on the eastern wall depicts attributes of the cult of Isis. It was created in order to resemble a cupboard on which the objects were placed; other objects are created to look as if they were suspended from the painting’s small green frame. Marks on the wall indicate a real shelf was also present. The above objects comprise of a sistrum, an offering dish (described as a patera umbilicata) and a situla. Below the painting we see a large cista made of reed. It depicts a crescent moon, a smaller cista resembling the first but without a crescent moon and with two indistinguishable red objects flanking it, and at the end a coiled ureus snake in reddish-brown and black colours. Similar to the southern wall, the eastern wall also includes pictures on the lower side of the panel. They are now hardly visible, but possibly represent two ducks with water plants (most likely a lotus). Finally, the snakes on the lower zone of the shrine should also be mentioned. Their inclusion is traditionally associated with domestic shrines. Nonetheless, they are absent from the other shrine and depicted on the Isis shrine. A number of finds linked to the shrine are all found in situ and seem to belong to the altar. They are described in Sogliano, Boyce, Seiler, Allison and Powers and listed in table 5.1. The objects as listed below were probably placed on the shelves attached to the walls of the shrine and could therefore be directly linked to a cultic context. It is important to consider all these objects within the reconstruction of the use of the shrine, thus including artefacts associated with Egypt or directly with the cult of

---

819 See Boyce 1937, 55-7.
820 See Boyce 1937, 56.
821 A cista is a box to safe keep for instance jewelry; a so-called cista mystica is known to especially serve during the Mystery cults and was believed to have housed snakes, see Alvar 2008, 260.
822 As discussed in 4.6, the duck holding a lotus flower might connect Isis and Nilotic scenes, indeed a rare combination (see 4.5).
Isis. All the objects together made the final impression on the viewer, and all of the objects played a part in the religious practices of the inhabitants involved with the cult.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statuette of Horus</td>
<td>Alabaster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statuette of Fortuna</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Seated on a throne, head missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot stepping on a toad</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Broken off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two plates</td>
<td>Porphyry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>Parts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disks</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small bottle</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cylindrical vase</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamp</td>
<td>Green glaze</td>
<td>Depicts Harpocrates, Isis, and Anubis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>Neronian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1) The objects belonging to the Isis shrine in the peristyle at the Casa degli Amorini Dorati.

The majority of the items make sense within the context of Roman religious practice such as offers (a coin and disks), sacrificial paraphernalia (e.g., lamp, porphyry plates, bottle, small vases) or containers holding ritual ointments or sacred water. The marble statue of a seated female deity is interpreted as Fortuna. She was also mentioned in 4.3.2 where it was concluded that the choice to represent the Hellenistic-Egyptian deities, and Egypt without the characteristics of Fortuna, were mainly found in the wealthier houses, its separation from other Roman deities denoted a social decision rather a cultic one. Another object from this shrine to catch the attention was a lamp depicting the same Anubis, Harpocrates, and Isis (minus Serapis). It was also mentioned within the discussion on green-glazed...
material from 4.4 (and shown in fig. 4.18a). The case is of relevance to the discussion of this shrine and the cognitive links between various concepts of Egypt, because the lamp not only depicts Isisic deities, it also consists of a green glaze which could be associated with Egypt. The material is similar to the Egyptian faience-like statuettes of Ptah-Pataikos and Bes found in several houses and imported from Memphis. It was argued that the owners consciously selected this lamp for iconographical and material reasons. In this case they might have deliberately opted to ‘Egyptianise’ the shrine and linked several concepts of Egypt to it.

The final and most important object from the shrine comprises a statuette of the Egyptian deity named Horus. Once set in a rectangular white marble base no longer present,\textsuperscript{825} it was cut out of a yellowish-pink alabaster and portrays this falcon-headed deity in an Egyptian style. This implies that the statue has a characteristic, formal and rigid pose, one foot before the other and his arms pushed against his side. He wears an Egyptian headdress \textit{(nemes)} and an Egyptian kilt-like garment \textit{(shendyt)}. Next to the divergent iconography and style, this statue stands out because of the alabaster which is an unusual material with regard to statuettes, at least in Pompeii. Discussions on this statue link to its connections with the Isis cult and the debate on Egyptian/Egyptianised objects and the concept of authenticity as introduced in part 2.3.1. The question that rises in this context is whether the statuette contained a genuine import from Egypt. Did one know who or what this statue was evidence of? Concerning its possible value as an import, it is difficult to establish the exact provenance of the material. As mentioned before, the source of the material is disputed. While Di Maria and Falanga believe the statue is an accurate Roman copy, Swetnam-Burland and Sogliano deem it an Egyptian import.\textsuperscript{826} Further, although many objects in Egypt are made from alabaster, in the Roman period other sources to procure alabaster are in use next to Egypt, such as in Asia Minor, Tunisia, Algeria, and Italy itself.\textsuperscript{827} However, even then it contains a unique piece, because as far as is known, not only it is the only Horus-statuette is in

\textsuperscript{825} See Sogliano, in \textit{Notizie degli Scavi} 1907, 549-93, fig. 7; In Sogliano’s view the marble base was added later, which may be an argument for it originally being an Egyptian import.\textsuperscript{826} See Swetnam-Burland 2002; Di Maria 1989, 140-1, no. 14.7; Falanga 1989, 302; Sogliano 1907, 549-93, 556. The argument for the statuette being an import from Egypt is endorsed by the Egyptologists Kaper and van Walsem. Based on the material, technique, proportions, execution (the way in which the back pillar ends on the shoulders) and iconography, they opine that the statue beyond any doubt originates from Egypt and most probably date from either the Late- or Ptolemaic period. Kaper and van Walsem, pers. comm., april 2012 (Examination carried out by means of photographic evidence).\textsuperscript{827} Borghini 1989, 136-52; Ward-Perkins 1992, 159.
Pompeii, but on the whole Italian peninsula Horus statues are unfamiliar (except for one object described below). Even in Egypt there are no artefacts displaying this combination of size, material, type, and iconography. Horus would normally occur on an amulet or in bronze statuettes, but never as a larger stone sculpture. Furthermore, although alabaster was frequently utilised during the entire Egyptian antiquity, it never served to create statues of deities. The only iconographical parallel was found in Rome, however, the size and material diverge considerably. This Horus statue comprises of an almost life-size (1.63 m.) statue of consisting of black granite and was, found near the Iseum Campense and currently on display in the Glyptothek München.828 Just as with the slab of Psammetichus II (see 5.1), the discussion on this specific find raises important questions concerning the adaptation of Egyptian artefacts into Roman contexts and the social interaction between inhabitant and visitors of the house. Would the latter have considered the statue to be Egyptian? Would they have recognised it as a statue of Horus? This last notion would be doubtful, as there was no parallel in Pompeii. In addition Horus was unknown to Roman Italy. Even to the Isis initiates and priests, the Egyptian Horus was either unfamiliar or of a too minor significance to display. There is not a single reference to him in the sacral paintings of the sacra rium (where all the related cult animals and deities were portrayed), nor is his name to be found anywhere in Latin epigraphy.829 If the depiction is unknown, matters such as style, material, or distance would have been the decisive features on which any acquisition was finally based, not iconographical meaning.830

It can be argued, on the basis of the description and the questions it generated, that objects in the shrine and in particular the Horus statuette are able to shine a light on the perception and use of Egyptian objects and the social values surrounding these objects; beyond their possible value as a

828 This statue (black granite, 163 cm., imported from Egypt and dated to the 29th Dynasty) belonged to the Iseum Campense. It was found near the Santa Maria sopra Minerva in 1635, implying that both statues were found in an explicit cultic context. However, it cannot be assumed that the statuette of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati was purchased because of the knowledge of this particular statue, see Roullet 1972, 90, no. 113.

829 See Bricault 2005,

830 Of course, knowledge of the deity could have been present. A number of the inhabitants of the house was clearly somehow connected to and, at least, followers of the cult and had a uniquely profound knowledge as to Pompeii of the cult and its associations. This knowledge becomes apparent by means of multifarious features found in the shrine: (a) the implicit use of Nilotic imagery i.e., of two ducks and lotus flowers (and thus the conceptual connection to the Nile and Isis), (b) the statuette of Fortuna (c) the connection between Isis and Fortuna, (c) the portraits of Isis with all the other connected deities of the Isiac pantheon and (d) the choice for the green-glaze lamp portraying these deities.
sacred object they also carried important social values. Showing off Egyptian deities could enhance one’s social status, by expressing an intimate knowledge of and access to the Isis cult. Furthermore. Displaying a rare, exotic and beautiful object in one’s house could have made a strong impression on visitors. These are also values that could be directly perceived, while the fact that it was an imported object from Egypt needed to be communicated. The question is in which manner these two concepts, social status, and display and sacred value and religious practices interact inside the house? Was the statue prominently displayed and visible? From where? Was it accessible from the visitor’s perspective or from the inhabitants? These issues are well approachable by means of configuration, visibility, and agent analyses.

5.2.4 Description and discussion of the house and remaining finds in relation to the Egyptian shrine

The house, its finds, layout, wall paintings, and contents will now be described. The main focus will lie on the part of the house which accommodates the Isis shrine, the peristyle. Special attention will be given to the other shrine in the peristyle, as it forms an interesting juxtaposition with the Isis shrine, with regard to subject, representation, and position in the space. The rooms will be referred to with capital letters as indicated on the plan (see fig. 5.7). On the basis of decoration patterns and configuration, they can be divided into the atrium zone, peristyle zone, and service zone (fig. 5.6).

The atrium zone

Located at the north edge of the house the atrium therefore does not produce a straight line of vision into the deeper spaces of the house, as often witnessed in atrium houses. With the reconstruction during the late Republican period, the representational function of the house probably shifted from the atrium to the peristyle. As to the configuration and

---

831 This, however, was not a quality immediately visible to anyone who did not purchase the object. Would this have been communicated explicitly? The value of distance, or perceived distance, is an important issue which needs to be discussed within a social and religious context. The workings hereof are further discussed in 5.2.6 in accordance with Mary Helms’s theory and the perception of geography and geographical distance.

832 The various zones, or suites of rooms, are not only indicated by means of the difference in function, but are also differentiated in colour, location, wall painting, and flooring. All rooms cluster as a zone because of the repetition of patterns, see Watts 1987, 153.

833 See 5.1; Wallace-Hadrill 1994.

834 See Dwyer 1991, 25-6, 40; McKay 1975, 41, 46; Boëthius and Ward-Perkins 1970, 313.
decoration of wall painting, four rooms belonging to the atrium zone: the two Cubicula (C and D), the Tablinum (E), and the Exedra (G). They are all physically attached to the atrium and all slightly closed off from the peristyle area.

Each contain similar wall paintings when compared to other spaces in the house. The doorways to the peristyle and to the exedra could be closed off as was presumably also the case with the doorway to the tablinum. According to Maiuri, the impluvium was out of use at the time of the eruption.\textsuperscript{835} The atrium was decorated in Third Style and never redecorated, merely restored. This implies that several walls do not exhibit a true Third Style rendering, but a Fourth Style imitation of Third Style paintings. This could be a conscious decorative choice. However, it could also be claimed that it was carried out as a cost-effective act. Interestingly, too, the First Style incrustations present in the two cubicula C and D were in all probability left here on purpose and carefully restored, not repainted. The effort made in order to recondition incrustation style rules out the possibility of cost-effective renovation, at least in these rooms. Only the lower walls were newly decorated in a Fourth Style.\textsuperscript{836} Rooms C and D were interpreted as cubicula. Room C furthermore was decorated with Fourth Style paintings and displayed alternating red and yellow panels divided by means of a black

\textsuperscript{835} See Powers 2006, 48, following Della Corte’s notes that the area was disturbed at the time of excavation, see Giornale degli Scavi 1899-1904, 171, 175.

\textsuperscript{836} Powers 2006, 162-3; Laidlaw 1985, 236-7; Seiler 1992, 26, 28, 95.
Room D had the same style of decoration as cubiculum C, with red and yellow panels. First Style cornices framed the ceiling. Room C counted two panels with a white frame as pictorial painting, whereas the walls of Room D consisted of floating figures.

All remaining rooms in the atrium zone with the exception of the cubicula displayed large mythological paintings connected to Trojan mythology. The majority hereof display a Third Style imitation applied after AD 62. The west wall of the atrium has a black base with linear geometric decoration and middle zones in red and black. There are no pictures here, but at the very right (against the northwest corner) there is a niche. The north wall contains original Third Style paintings on the east side. At the left side we again see a Third Style imitation. The south wall is largely faded and also restored after

---

837 On the north wall we see Leda and the Swan. The painting on the south wall is no longer visible. It was described by Sogliano and seems to have portrayed Narcissus, see PPM V, 728; Sogliano NSc 1906 379; Seiler 1992, 27.
838 On one wall Mercury flanked by two Eros figures is still visible.
839 See fig. 5.7 for the location and description of these scenes.
AD 62. However, in the centre, a part of a painting portrays Paris herding on Mount Ida. On the north wall a badly visible scene probably depicted the romance between Achilles and Polyxena. 

Room E represents the tablinum. It measures 15.75 m² and shares its north wall with that of the atrium. Its floor consists of an *opus signinum* with a mosaic representing a geometric emblema in the middle. The tablinum, as with most Pompeian atrium houses, has an entrance to the atrium and to the peristyle, functioning as a transitional room. The present situation does not entirely agree with the past. The entrance to the garden is now demolished and a large opening to the garden where there was once only a window and the doorway which is still visible. Both open up to the tablinum from the atrium and the exit to the peristyle could be closed off. The tablinum has Third Style wall paintings, and also includes scenes from the Trojan myth. This painting knows another parallel in the house of Giasone (IV 5,18), as does the painting of Achilles and Polyxena en Jason and Pelias. The painting in the tablinum is probably the first scene one’s gaze is directed at after entering the house. It lies straight ahead and one’s gaze will only be distracted when a glimpse of the peristyle is seen. The panel on the north side has, however, disappeared. The Exedra G had the most elaborate paintings. Along with the way the floor was decorated, its position within the house and shape, this gave rise to the view it had originally served as a dining room. The figural scenes in Third Style painting portray, on the east wall (the rear of the room) Jason and the Peliads. Jason stands before a table on the right while a man with a bull

---

840 This painting could be interpreted in analogy of the painting in the Casa di Giasone (IX 5, 18) which is better preserved. The painting of the atrium is nowadays located in the National Archaeological Museum of Napels: *Museo Nazionale di Napoli* Inv. no. 20559. Polyxena was Priam’s, King of Troy, youngest daughter with Hecuba. According to myth, Polyxena and her brother Troilus visited a fountain where Achilles fell in love with Polyxena and killed Troilus.


842 The west wall shows a Trojan scene: Paris convincing Helena to accompany him to Troy. Behind him we see Aphrodite. Between Helena and Paris stands a small nude Eros figure. Paris is dressed in an oriental costume and is seated to the left, Helena to the right. Aphrodite stands behind Paris had helps him to convince Helena to leave, Helena is aided by a servant. Eros points to the open door, see PPM V, 738, fig. 42.

843 The narrative, however, could only be seen in its entirety when standing right in front or in the tablinum. For a further discussion on the paintings, see Hodcke 2007 190-1, taf. 80, no. 374.

844 See Seiler 1992, 35, 97-9. Although Seiler believed the exedra to be for dining purposes, it is uncertain if this function existed until the final stages of the existence of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati.
approaches him from the left. The Peliads stand on the stairs above. The painting on the south wall represents the release of Briseis. We see her standing to the left, while Agamemnon is seated on the throne in the middle. Achilles stands behind him to the left, recognisable by means of his posture. The painting on the north wall depicts Thetis in Hephaistos’ forge, picking up weaponry for her son Achilles. It is claimed the exèdra served dining purposes, it is uncertain if this function was carried out until the final stages of the existence of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati.

The peristyle zone

The Peristyle (F) was without a doubt the most important part of the house, being the central, the most richly furbished, and (see fig. 5.7) the largest zone in the house. This implied that the principal area of the house was dedicated to private affairs (i.e., living and entertainment) and not for labour related activities. The artefacts attested in the peristyle at least remind us to be careful with linking notions of wealth solely to the size of a house. Whereas this house was not one of the largest estates, with more than thirty marble items, reliefs, theatre masks, herms, and other sculptures found, the peristyle possessed the largest quantity of marble sculpture of all domestic contexts within Pompeii. The majority was arrayed around a large rectangular pool in the centre of the garden (fig. 5.13e). Rectangular plaques decorated with masks are set on pilasters in the garden, and theatrical masks and disks hang between the surrounding columns of the portico. Additional marble reliefs were positioned in the wall of the colonnade around the garden, including the representation of a satyr depicted in a classicising style. Around the pool in the centre of the garden were small herms as well as statues of a rabbit, a boar and a dog, and a bird and a dog.

845 Only one similar painting was found in Pompeii to wit on the west wall of the triclinium of the Casa di Giasone (IX 5,18). It is almost an exact copy of the painting in the exèdra of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati.

846 The scene depicts Briseis, Patroclos and Achilles, see Schefold 1952, 54. For issues concerning this interpretation, see Seiler 1992, 111; Powers 2006, 56.


848 According to Allison, the limited quantity of finds from Room G suggests the presence of a storage container (as in Room 10 in the Casa della Venere in Bikini, Room 11 in the Casa del Menandro, and Room E in House I 7,19). A ceramic jar which seems a rather utilitarian vessel for this formal area is also noted. Perhaps the function of a dining room was replaced by means of the triclinia at the other side of the peristyle. However, there may have been a differentiation in the use of dining rooms and that a gathering in Room G was meant for a specific public to recline. Seiler states that, after the earthquake, the exèdra was repaired. Next, an extra entrance to the exèdra was built in order to give access to the room from the atrium which would probably have now and again served as a reception room.

849 For a complete list of all the finds, see table 5.5 in section 5.2.5.
Moreover, a marble sundial, double-sided herms depicting Bacchus, children alternated with sculpted and painted marble plaques (pinakes) showing tragedy masks and ritual Bacchic scenes were placed here. Numerous marble fragments including remnants (spolia) of earlier reliefs hint at an abundance of styles and subjects including Oriental themes such as the Libyan queen Omphale wearing Hercules’ lion skin. Another important object was a relief depicting Venus and Cupid. It was attributed to a 4th century BC Attic workshop in Greece (fig. 5.13b).

The garden was enclosed by a portico, in which the two shrines were attested. The background of the walls of the peristyle were coloured black, and was moreover polished with marble dust to reflect light, would have made the two yellow and red shrines which are the centre of our discussion two outstanding features within the portico. Two other prominent decorative features on the walls were two obsidian mirrors immured in the east wall (fig. 5.13c). The floors of the portico, which consisted of cocciopesto pavement, also counted a large number of inserted pieces of coloured marbles (fig. 5.13d). The ‘Capitoline’ altar was placed against the north wall of this garden between Rooms I and J. Standing out against the wall it was immediately visible on entering the peristyle. Next to the bronze statuettes of the Capitoline Triad, the lares and Mercury, the shrine consists of a bronze jug and cylindrical bronze container, a lead vase, and an inkwell. The shrine’s core coloured base is painted in imitation of giallo antico, a yellow limestone with pronounced red veins. Its large red circular form on the front probably imitated porphyry. Ten rooms were situated adjacent to the peristyle, which are considered part of the atrium zone: the cubicula (I, M, N, Q, R), Triclinium (O), Latrine (K), and store rooms (J, L). The cubicula were all richly decorated by means of Fourth Style paintings. However, Room I was the most outstanding space of the area because of the decoration and presumably the most important cubiculum of the peristyle. It did not include any mythological scenes, but a red and yellow pattern with golden inlaid cupids in the walls. The large triclinium was situated on a raised platform.

---

850 For location and description of the statuettes see fig. 5.7 and table 5.5. For a discussion of their iconographic theme, see Bergmann, 2008, 56-7.
851 See Seiler 1992, 123-4. Another Attican votive relief of Aphrodite was found in house V, 3, 10 see Sogliano 1901, 400-2; Bragantini 1991, in PPM III, 935-7. For more general information on the import of Greek votive reliefs into Pompeii and Italy, see Froning 1981, 55-6.
852 It even intruded into the much frequented circulation space of the portico, see Powers 2006, 109.
overlooking the garden. Garden P behind the room may have merely served as a source of light for the triclinium.

The service area
The service area with its kitchen and a few adjacent rooms presumably housed servants and storage. Like the atrium, it was rather closed off from the peristyle zone and also had its own entrance to the street. It consisted of a small undecorated courtyard (S) and a simple floor made of beaten earth (*terra battuta*). A wooden stairway along the north side of the room led to an upper floor. The rooms adjoining to the courtyard are V, X, T, and Y, of which a corridor U led to the street through entrance 38. Of these rooms, Room V may well have been used as a kitchen, while it had a circular *fusorium* and a bench along the north wall. Room X functioned as a latrine; rooms T and Y are more difficult to ascertain. The latter is a simple room and was identified by Seiler as a cubiculum. The finds of the room, which consisted of bronze ornaments of furniture ornaments, a foot, and a marble bust of a young woman, suggests that it functioned as a storage room. Since the stairs to the upper stories are situated in the service area, they might belong to the same zone, however, they could also have belonged to separate tenants and thus consist of apartments of which the entrance was in the service area of the Amorini Dorati.

5.2.5 Place-making in the house: configuration, visibility, and movement

Configuration of the rooms
As discussed in chapter 3 the analysis of the house will be analysed in several parts, of which the first will be devoted to analysing the configuration of the rooms. This implies that the relation between the spaces of the house will be studied e.g., how many adjoining spaces a certain room has, the degree of integration a certain space has in relation to the rest of the house, the level of control a space bears over other parts of the house, and how many spaces must be traversed in order to reach certain spaces. This will present us with an indication of the way in which the rooms were utilised in terms of interaction, accessibility and spatial hierarchies. The spaces will be divided according to convex spaces i.e., spaces where no line between any of two of its points crosses the perimeter.

---

853 See Seiler 1992, 68-9, 73, 94.
854 See 3.7.3 for a discussion on the exact methods.
First the results from the access graphs and its calculations (fig. 5.8) will be discussed. Access graphs are most helpful when analysing complex

---

The access graph or justified graph, is described in the space syntax glossary as a graph restructured so that a specific space is placed at the bottom, “the root space”. All spaces located one syntactic step away from root space are positioned on the first level above it. All spaces two spaces away on the second level, etc. Justified graphs offer a visual picture of the overall depth of a lay-out seen from one of its points. A tree-like justified graph has the majority of nodes many steps (levels) away from the bottom node. In such a system the mean depth is high and described as deep. A bush-like justified graph has most nodes near the bottom. Its system is described as shallow, see Klarqvist 1993.

### Table Access Graph of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Real Relative Asymmetry value</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Control value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIN.</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>MAX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph</td>
<td>0,27</td>
<td>0,79</td>
<td>1,27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrium (3)</td>
<td>0,49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peristyle (8)</td>
<td>0,27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service area (18)</td>
<td>0,47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maximum RRA value is represented by Rooms 21 and 24 in the service quarters; the minimum Control value belongs to all cubicula in the peristyle and the garden.

---

855 The access graph or justified graph, is described in the space syntax glossary as a graph restructured so that a specific space is placed at the bottom, “the root space”. All spaces located one syntactic step away from root space are positioned on the first level above it. All spaces two spaces away on the second level, etc. Justified graphs offer a visual picture of the overall depth of a lay-out seen from one of its points. A tree-like justified graph has the majority of nodes many steps (levels) away from the bottom node. In such a system the mean depth is high and described as deep. A bush-like justified graph has most nodes near the bottom. Its system is described as shallow, see Klarqvist 1993.
domestic settings or urban layouts where the configuration can extract complexities not noticeable at first glance. The configuration of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati does in this respect not deliver many surprises with regard to the identity of the individual rooms. For instance, calculating the spaces indicates that the atrium, peristyle, and Room S (the courtyard) are the main dividers of access (i.e., the highest control over other spaces), with the peristyle as the most powerful space in terms of control and interaction. This is not really surprising, as they also occur on the map as central areas, with the peristyle as the most important and largest space. It is the most integrated room in the house. According to space syntax theory it is the space where one is most likely meet other people, and controls the most access to other rooms (a high control value and a high integration value). 856 The cubicula situated in the atrium present another picture, they have the lowest control values within the house and therefore represent the most passive spaces, albeit not very segregated with regard to the overall structure. 857 These rooms were probably utilised for storage, daily activities, and business interactions with clients of a lower status than the house owner.

The area calculated to be the most segregated space also follows the established pattern, which is represented by means of the service quarter. These were located at the very rear of the house (the most syntactical steps removed from the entrance) and meant to be invisible and tucked away in a corner of the house. People who would visit the service quarters from entrance 38 would not have entered any other space in the house but these quarters, as it had its own entrance. 858 Domestic servants furthermore should have easy access to all rooms in the house, as their proximity to the triclinium and peristyle is required, nonetheless, at the same time they

856 Calculated by means of the justified graph are (a) connectivity measuring the number of immediate neighbours directly connected to a space, (b) integration describing the average depth of a space to all other spaces in the system; these spaces can be ranked from most integrated to most segregated, and (c) control value measuring the degree to which a space controls access to its immediate neighbouring spaces taking into account the number of alternative connections each of these neighbours has; see Klarqvist 1993.

857 On the social consequences of higher or lower control values, see Hanson and Hillier 1984; Hanson 1999. For control values applied to an archaeological case study, see DeLaine 2004, 157-63.

858 It seems that the structure of the house is even more easy to enter if accessed from this area, for the peristyle becomes even more integrated and its control over other spaces even greater than when accessed from Entrance 7.
should also be invisible. 859 These quarters were therefore visually concealed, but configurationally, too, it was the most segregated space. When reviewing the visitor’s perspective entering from entrance 7, one should actually omit the entire service area, because it was a self-contained space that if needed to be visited, it was approached from the other entrance.

As to the overall structure (captured by means of the Mean Real Relative Asymmetry value, MRRA), it counts 0,79. 860 On its own this is not a very helpful value, only when compared to other houses it carries value. However, as the general integration measure of building structures within space syntax Access’ calculations approximately lies between 1 and 3 and with only six syntactical steps from the entrance of the house to the deepest spaces, the house as a whole can be considered a well-integrated, accessible, easily penetrated, and open structure. Once inside the peristyle, one could reach all the adjacent rooms which were only one step away from that space. Not a single room is more than one step away from the central courtyard (in both Atrium B, Peristyle F and Courtyard S), implying the house accounts for a notably open structure without much hierarchy present within or between the zones. There are also almost no rings to be seen in the configuration (meaning that one can take two different routes to a space), which means there was little choice in routes. 861 The only course where choice was possible is the ring atrium-tablinum-exedra and this was not a very likely route to take.

An absence of rings in a house denotes there was little choice to take various routes and a high degree control on people and activities. This makes sense with regard to a Roman house, as it partly had a public function and as its front doors may have been opened granting a relative openness in access (at least visually) on certain moments of the day which needed to be controlled. The tablinum in this case played an important spatial role in providing access to other spaces. When comparing the atrium, peristyle, and service area, they seem to be hierarchically positioned. When argued from a social

859 Recalculating the graph from the service quarter and including all the spaces of the house would provide the perspective of those inhabitants living in the quarters (not the visitors).
860 The average integration value calculated lies around 1, with the lowest at 0,68 and the highest at 1,49. See Grahame 2000, Appendix 3, 197-9.
861 The pattern of space becomes intelligible through parameters such as depth and rings within the structure of space: “Depth among a set of spaces always expresses how directly the functions of those spaces are integrated with or separated from each other, and thus how easy and natural it is to generate relations among them. The presence or absence of rings expresses the degree to which these relationships are controlled, or marked by an absence of choice, forcing permeability from one space to another to pass through specific intervening spaces.”, see Hanson 1998, 78.
context however they include more complexities. The atrium zone was the
first area to be entered, but only with a special purpose and permission.
Next one could proceed to the most open space (again, only with permission)
i.e., the peristyle space. Granted access to the peristyle one had already
acquired a better social position. Nonetheless, in this space a visitor was still
not free to move, as it was mainly a divider to other rooms and not a goal in
itself. The service quarters were the most private zones in the sense that they
were remote from the main entrance. However as mentioned, it had its own
entrance in order to prevent a certain class of people trespass the peristyle
and arrive at these quarters. Segregation is a spatial device which not only
removes important formal functions from the public eye but also excludes
the reception of guests from the intimacies of informal social intercourse.

As to the link between spaces in the house, the results present normal
outcomes with regard to other atrium houses in Pompeii. The courtyard
space as the most integrated and most controlling (along with the peristyle
being the most dynamic of the three) spaces could also be deduced from the
plan and does not show any anomalies when compared to other atrium
houses in the town. Of interest, when the shrines are taken into account,
both are situated in what seems to be the most accessible and most public
space of the house. Neither could thus be classified as syntactically more or
less ‘private’, and both served an equally public function regarding their cult
activities.\textsuperscript{862} However it might be argued that compartmentalisation within
functional spaces had a temporal character where during rituals connected
to one of the shrines, no access was granted to visitors. The Roman house,
as advocated by Allison, was a dynamic space, the uses (e.g., household
activities, private meetings, children’s tuition, performing rituals, and
receiving guests) of which changed during the day.\textsuperscript{863} In the same peristyle,
furniture could be moved, and various people were allowed in, changing
functions of spaces. This means access analysis alone cannot infer
behavioural patterns and social structures in Roman houses.

\textit{Visibility}

The visibility analysis uses a different technique to analyse space. It looks at
patterns of visibility as well as movement and is targeted at the space as one

\textsuperscript{862} Although Anguissola states that there might have been a fence blocking the passage
between the North and East portico, marks for any system are lacking. It is not mentioned
by either Seiler or Powers. See Anguissola 2012, 43; 2010 29-36.
\textsuperscript{863} Allison 2004.
unit instead dividing it into topological convex spaces.\textsuperscript{864} Therefore it may form a substantial addition to the configuration by means of taking account of the individual parts of the rooms such as the shrines. That which could be seen from the Egyptian shrine and the locations from which one could see the shrine, can present an image of its use and relevance. Within visibility a differentiation should be made between space that can be moved through (which will therefore generate more people in a certain location) and space that can be seen but is not very likely to be crossed. Fig. 5.9a represents the visibility in terms of possible movement, whereas 5.9c reconstructs the gaze of someone inside the house. Furthermore, fig. 5.9a points at where most people would likely gather/meet each other, while fig. 5.9c clearly illustrates that the main point of visual direction is placed on the garden in the peristyle. As soon as one enters this space, and wherever one moves in this space, the garden attracts constant visual attention.

In general terms, the Casa degli Amorini Dorati does not illustrate the traditional 'visual axis' important within Roman housing, which consisted of a sight line from the entrance until the rear of the house.\textsuperscript{865} Did that have any consequences as to the pattern of the house? Without an axis, the house would have been experienced as less open, both by visitors and the inhabitants. The extreme decorative emphasis placed on the peristyle might be a consequence of this. The impression had to be made here and therefore the impact needed to be more elaborate. Another interesting observation that affects movement and visibility in this house is that it can be witnessed that during the most recent renovations, the entrance leading from the tablinum to the peristyle zone was significantly narrowed. The doorway (once as wide as the tablinum), was reduced to 70 cm. However, the remaining part of the opening was not covered and turned into a window space implying a conscious decision in order to exclude access, but maintain visibility. People located in the tablinum could see that which was inside the peristyle, but were clearly denied any access. This may have to do with strong social distinctions, which went hand in hand with the development of the peristyle into the most prominent space of the house.\textsuperscript{866} People visiting the tablinum space were clients, not guests. Clients should be visually impressed

\textsuperscript{864} For a discussion on the use of VGA (Visibility Graph Analysis) and isovists, see part 3.7.3. See also Turner and Penn 1999, 1-9; Benedikt 1979, 47-65.

\textsuperscript{865} This could be partly corrected when one was granted access to the peristyle through the Exedra G, see Anguissola 2012, 45.

\textsuperscript{866} As discussed by Dwyer 1991; McKay 1975; Boëthius and Ward-Perkins 1970.
(something important concerning negotiations and transactions) but physically denied access, informing them that their status did not allow them to enter the more private areas.

The guests of a higher status were, of course, directly lead into the peristyle from the atrium or through the exedra G, which was (in contrast with to the tablinum) not closed off during the renovation of the house and provided an appealing view on the peristyle next to its paintings. Entering the peristyle area in this way also created a visual axis to the Triclinium O. The paintings of room G, as mentioned, consisted of large Third Style mythological scenes on a white background. They were that well visible that the scene of Pelias and Jason could not only be seen, but even recognised as such when viewing it from the western portico and the triclinium O at the other end of the peristyle. Whatever remained of the function of the exedra after the construction of Triclinium O, it remained an important showcase.

The peristyle zone in terms of visibility shows a large open space with separated rooms in the form of cubicula suited for private affairs and small scale interaction. In terms of visibility it is notable that there is no single way of looking into another cubiculum space from any of the cubicula surrounding the peristyle, while there are no direct sight lines between door openings. This implies that while the cubicula are syntactically quite open and shallow spaces (as the above configuration showed) a considerable amount of privacy could be accounted for in these rooms since no one could see one another from another room. Only from Room N could one theoretically view into other rooms and be seen from other rooms. However, the narrow doorway which could be closed off prevented this, while the garden and its columns made it furthermore difficult to look beyond the garden inside another cubiculum.

What can furthermore be inferred when observing integration patterns from visibility analysis from DepthMap? Fig. 5.9a illustrates that the most visible spaces, those marked in red, consist of the entrance to the peristyle and three corners of the peristyle, excluding all those in which the Isis shrine is located. This means that from these points, it can be seen by most other spaces. It is most likely, too, that if any routes exist in the house, they will have passed through these spaces as fig. 5.9b confirms. The longest straight lines (in red) will generate the most movement, and it can be observed that they run between the red areas of fig. 5.9a. This means that the Isis corner is
a visually less integrated space and allows for a relative amount of privacy within both vision and movement. However, from the cubicula, people were able to see the Isis shrine while the Capitoline shrine remains hidden from sight. It should of course be stated that this only denotes a relative form of privacy, because if the shrine was really meant to be private, the remote spaces of the house would have been more suitable for this. However, when the two shrines are compared, the Capitoline shrine is situated on the axis of the two most visible points of the house and evidently took a more prominent position in terms of visibility and movement.

Fig 5.9 a-g) Visibility in the Casa degli Amorini Doraì. a) Visibility in terms of movement. b) Fewest line map of the house. c) Visibility without taking into account movement. d) 360° isovist from the northeast corner (position of the Capitoline shrine) of the peristyle. e) 360° isovist from the southeast corner (position of the Isis shrine) of the peristyle. f) 360° isovist from the position of the Triclinium (O). g) 360° isovist from the position of the Tablinum (E).
Furthermore, the Capitoline shrine was the first thing one would see when entering the peristyle from the atrium. The visual emphasis on such shrines is not uncommon to Pompeian atrium houses. They are often situated at the end of the central vista that runs from the entrance to the rear of the house (Casa del Larario del Sarno I 14, 7), or they take up prominent positions in either atria (e.g., the Casa del Menandro) or peristyles (Casa di Giulia Felice), where in both cases large elaborate architectural shrines were constructed. The statuettes placed in the shrine and the shrine itself were of high quality and would have made a notable first impression on visitors.

After entering the peristyle area the view would be directed towards the garden, which, as illustrated in fig. 5.9c, was visually the prime focus of the space. However, as was also witnessed in the example of the tablinum window and the access to the peristyle, it was configurationally one of the lesser accessible spaces. The reason for this is that the entrance into the garden was located opposite the triclinium. Only after arriving at the upper part of the portico (or had been invited here) one could descent via a stairway to the garden. This is an effective way in order to socially distinguish between the spaces in a certain zone. The permission granted to spaces and entrances, would cause the guest to realise his or her visit was appreciated and his was status high, however, due the structure it placed the control at the inhabitant, which had to grant the access. Furthermore, although a peristyle garden has a functional meaning of providing light into the house, the garden was also the best place for visual display, as it was the central space of the area and the majority of the visual attention was drawn to it. The main view from Triclinium O is directed to the garden (fig. 5.9f), while the rest is invisible from this room.

It appeared from the agent and visibility analysis that the shrine dedicated to Isis seemed to have been situated in the more private area of the public space of the peristyle. This means one could visit the shrine in relative privacy, be seen by people, but not be passed by physically. It was not considered an interaction zone. However, this poses an interesting query concerning the visitor-inhabitant relations. The route for visitors did not move along the shrine dedicated to Isis but along the Capitoline shrine: but how visible was the Isis shrine from that route? Because of its colours (bright yellow and red against a black background) and the size of the shrine which was larger than average, it was easily noted. Was the size of the shrine larger because people could still see it while not being able to pass it by
directly? While the shrine could easily be distinguished, it might be questioned whether the particular paintings of the deities were recognised. And could the statue of Horus be seen in walking along the other side? The painted figures are fairly large (Anubis, the only deity fully preserved measures 43 cm., the image of Harpocrates is smaller, but the other deities are of equal size), an knowledgeable visitor may have recognised the deities. Furthermore, from the side of the Isis shrine which visitors would actually see in passing from the other side of the peristyle looked upon the deities and not on the cult items, which might have been deliberately done in order to recognise it more easily. The statuette of Horus is more difficult to recognise, albeit with its 42 cm. of equal size to the painted deities, one was unfamiliar with the statuette from an iconographical point of view. Although one could see the statue’s outstanding material and colour, the other shrine and its bronzes, and the marble explosion in the garden would have probably drawn more attention at the first gaze. Does this imply that this statuette of Horus was less meant for public display than expected? Were the shrines used in different ways? Was the Capitoline adopted for ‘public’ display while the Isis shrine had a more purposeful cultic function? Studying movement might give more clues on these matters.

Movement
Looking at movement through the house allows for a different way of detail than the visibility analysis can provide. An agent analysis by DepthMap was carried out in order to acquire a first glance of the possible routes through the house. Regarding the movement in general (fig. 5.10a), this agent analysis shows the same axis attested in the isovist analysis. The most important route runs around the peristyle and ends in the principal triclinium. It illustrates that the main routes were around the peristyle garden, the portico space. However, all the cubicula are clearly not part of this route and seem to have a more segregated position when it comes to movement. Like the configuration, the movement also ignores the service area, except when the route was started from that position (fig. 5.10c). Interesting also is fig. 5.10b, which presents the route from the position of the main entrance.

867 Although the painting is well preserved, it is not that clear as it once was. On the other hand, the white figures against a yellow background are less visible in general than for example, those against a white background. The recently restored paintings in the Exedra (G) are well visible. The frame depicting Pelias and Jason can be recognised from the other side of the house.
This would be the most likely route to be taken by visitors to the house. It can be witnessed from the figures that it does not make much difference if one commences from the main entrance or from the atrium to the peristyle, which might indicate that there was no social differentiation between these spaces, emphasizing the public function of the atrium. The atrium itself, however, is relatively segregated from movement as can be concluded from all analyses. Further, the house not show any differentiation which route around the portico could be taken, the route of b (visitors) and c (servants) are both directed along the south-west side of the portico, while the northeast is not clearly marked as a route. This implies that when one was approached from the entrance and went to the triclinium O, the main route went along the Capitoline shrine and the cubicula and did not pass the Isis shrine.

Looking at the general axis of the house it can be seen that this runs along the north side of the portico, while the sight line is diagonal. In a ‘normal’ atrium house the sight axis runs in a straight line from the entrance to the rear of the house, while the route to that same rear end takes along the edges (along the atrium, the peristyle etc.). This house does not allow for this kind of use of space, because its layout deviates from ‘normal’ atrium houses. However, it provides the north side of the house with a more private character than usual. Is this the reason why we see the Isis shrine in this corner? It was not hidden from sight, but it is also situated off the main route likely taken by inhabitants and visitors.
Remarks
By means of these spatial analyses (i.e., configuration, visibility, and movement) an attempt was made in order to get more grip on the house and its functioning. The argument of space syntax causes social rules to be embedded in the structure of space.\textsuperscript{868} This proved to be difficult however, to discern from configuration alone for the Casa degli Amorini Dorati, most probably due to the multi-functionality of many spaces in this house (and Roman houses in general), and to the dynamics and versatility of functions in the house.

5.2.6 Place-making in the house: pattern language
This section will seek to refine the view of social organisation and the utilisation and experience of place by looking at the material nuances of place-making. This means that the house as a whole unit is taken in order to observe what the various parts do. Pattern analysis, as it adheres to the way in which people unconsciously structure their environment, shares numerous similarities with space syntax. However it takes notice of more than just the structure or the graph visualisation of space, and also includes decoration, colouring, light, height difference etc.\textsuperscript{869} Pattern analysis, as explained, aims at a holistic description of the house regarding all things important in experiencing a house in addition to spatial and configurational structures. Nuances that remained invisible during the space syntax analysis can in this way be brought to the surface. The parts that will be explored are colour and composition schemes, pavement types, lighting, and level changes as was explained in section 3.7.3.

Colour and composition schemes
Firstly the colour schemes in the house will be dealt with in order to infer whether any patterns evolve concerning use and experience of the rooms. Studying colours in this sense is significant, as a repetition of the same colours can visually (and therefore cognitively) relate certain spaces or single out units of use.\textsuperscript{870} Colour schemes can also present an inference on the way in which the room was experienced such as rooms to traverse or stay in. Studying the composition of paintings is able to illustrate such details.

\textsuperscript{868} Hillier and Hanson 1984; Hillier 1998; Hanson 1999.
\textsuperscript{869} It takes place at higher level of investigation as well. As a comparison between houses, however, here the focus of the pattern analysis will lie on the structures of the house, rooms, and various components hereof.
\textsuperscript{870} See Watts 1987, 281.
walls in rooms could either be (a) centralised, in a 3x3 composition style with a central picture, or (b) consist of multiple (four or five) vertical divisions without a central emphasis, whereby (a) often points to non-circulation and static rooms (to-movement) and (b) to rooms with movement (through-movement).\footnote{This is seldom the case in rooms with a circulation function.} Regarding colour and composition, the three areas that were noted in the previous section can also be separated in terms of decoration: the atrium has Third Style paintings with large central figures portraying mythical scenes, the peristyle is decorated in the Fourth Style and therefore has an entirely different atmosphere, and the service area has no decoration at all. However, more can be discerned from the decoration.

The predominant colours for the lower, middle, and upper zone for each room indicates that red and yellow are the most common colours in all styles, followed by white and black as secondary. Table 5.2 illustrates the details per room. First, the atrium zone not only has a different execution in style and themes on its walls, the colours of the atrium are different than in the remaining part of the house too, to wit mainly red and yellow. Rooms C and D in this case clearly also belong to the same zone because, although they were redecorated at a later stage in the Fourth Style, they tie the space together in similar red and yellow panels. This means that in this respect both rooms form an extension to the atrium and are not decoratively separated.\footnote{Although the focus of attention in houses in general shifted from the atrium to the peristyle space within the later phase of the town’s existence, it is not a constant or repetitive rule for houses in Pompeii. Certain owners put more effort into the decoration of their atrium when compared with the peristyle. If we compare it to the Casa del Poeta Tragico (VI 8.3-8), which also had many Fourth Style paintings in the atrium space, we see that the predominant colours for example do not contain yellow, but are mainly black, red and white. For the house and its paintings, see Bergmann 1994, 225-56.}

Looking at the peristyle much differentiation in colouring can be noted. Although red and yellow are still used, white and black rooms are also seen; green and blue colouring (which are the most expensive colours) are only used in very few occasions and only to apply certain details.\footnote{On colours, prices and techniques, see Béarat 1997, 65-9.} Cubiculum I has the most blue and green, however, the Capitoline shrine also has some blue, and lastly, some details of the mythological scenes in the exedra G have them. Interestingly, these rooms are all placed together and again, they form the first visual impression a guest receives when he is allowed to the peristyle. It marks all three spaces as special to the inhabitant.
As to the shrines’ analysis of the colour these also reveal patterns. The main colour of the portico walls in the peristyle were black with small architectural details and several small landscapes, below which we see panels depicting plants. The walls on the north side included doorways to the cubicula (the west and south sides were adorned with inserted marble reliefs and the east side with obsidian mirrors). The black paint created a clear contrast with the two shrines, which were both brightly painted in yellow and red. This must have indeed, as also argued above, visually singled out both shrines as well as that they became experienced as a different part of the portico. The black of the portico unified the garden space expressing no differentiation in that particular area except for the shrines. The shrines were not a part of the peristyle, albeit situated in that space. There was clearly a need to distinguish both shrines from the remaining part of the space. Shrines such as these, are normally situated in visible locations of the house, as they also comprise an element of social display in addition to their religious function, as mentioned in section 4.3. However, in order to separate the cultic activities from all the other more ‘worldly’ activities going around in the peristyle, they were segregated by means of colour in order to be experienced differently. Furthermore, by means of their colours the shrines visually refer to each other, as they are painted in similar colour frames. This may also have caused the shrine of Isis to be more recognisable as a shrine (quicker than when deciphering all the figures) and a cultic place of domestic worship from the other side of the peristyle.

The fact that the portico walls isolated and separated the two shrines by colour, is all the more interesting because by means of its paintings it attempted to draw the garden into its sphere of experience. This can be determined from the paintings with plants and from the landscapes as figural details that were situated along the black frames of the wall, as to connect the plants and waterscapes in the garden to the garden itself. Bergmann shows an identical use of such paintings for Oplontis noting that: “in the landscapes, distant islands, boats, and porticoes (like the one in which the observer moves) thematically mirror the views through the columns and trees, suggesting that the self-referential nature we noted in Varro’s text

874 Following Brandt 2010.
875 The experience of privacy and function within Roman houses varies. It can clearly be observed in this case that applying space syntax’ access analysis does not suffice to expose all the details in the complex social conventions within the Roman house. Conclusion: as the spatial layout of Roman houses was shallow, open and integrated, there was a larger need to differentiate privacy, social rules in terms of decoration and not in the configuration of space.
typefies the villas themselves. In fact, landscapes are ubiquitous on the walls of Roman porticoes, and are specifically recommended in Vitruvius handbook published in 20 BC.\(^{876}\) By means of applying such scenes (as shown in figs. 5.11 a, b) in the porticoes of peristyli, they were able to not only expand the actual frame of reference but also connect the garden and portico space. The landscapes observed on the walls are vistas similar to the garden as a vista. They could feature as a continuation of the garden spaces on the walls.\(^{877}\) In effect these paintings created a larger garden. At the same time, by means of their repetitive character, they frame the portico as one unit.

![Fig. 5.11] West wall of Room F, west portico. Two of the (probably) four landscape paintings from the peristyle. The left is in situ above the door opening to Room Q, the right painting is situated above the door to Room R. Photographs by the author.

As to the rooms surrounding the peristyle, when comparing these to the atrium zone, they are mainly characterised by means of a huge differentiation in terms of colour instead of framing them together as a single unit (see table 5.2). Only Room M displays the same colour scheme as the portico. Furthermore, the diversity between the rooms is seen in both colouring and composition. Sadly nothing is known about the decoration of Room O, but Room I was mainly yellow, J was red, M was black, R was yellow, Q mainly white and N yellow again.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Predominant colour</th>
<th>Secondary colour</th>
<th>Iconography</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fauces A</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Still life (birds)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Multiple vertical divisions without a central emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrium B</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mythological</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Multiple vertical divisions without a central emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubiculum C</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Figures</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3x3 composition style with a central picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubiculum D</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Floating figures</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3x3 composition style with a central picture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{876}\) See Bergmann 2002a, 98; Pappalardo 2009, 64-82.

\(^{877}\) See Bergmann 2002b, 15-46.
Table 5.2) The analysis of the paintings at the Casa degli Amorini Dorati.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Primary Colour</th>
<th>Secondary Colour</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Composition Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tablinum E</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Mythological</td>
<td>3x3 composition style with a central picture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exedra G</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Mythological</td>
<td>3x3 composition style with a central picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peristyle F</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Landscapes, obsidian mirrors</td>
<td>4 Multiple vertical divisions without a central emphasis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exedra H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Centralised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubiculum I</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Gilded cupids</td>
<td>4 Centralised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubiculum J</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrine K</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage room L</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubiculum M</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 3x3 composition style with a central picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubiculum R</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 3x3 composition style with a central picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triclinium O</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubiculum Q</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Centralised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubiculum N</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 3x3 composition style with a central picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtyard S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isis shrine</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Centralised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitoline shrine</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Centralised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of secondary colours and small details is different for all the rooms, of which Room I is the most unique. It is painted in yellow and red (common colours within Pompeian wall paintings) but in a unique pattern and intricate design. It also contains gold as a decoration use for the four gilded inserted cupids. The other spaces in the peristyle are also (as deducted from the main and secondary colours) deliberately singled out as individual spaces. Each cubiculum therefore contains a unique and individual spatial unit. Whenever an individual would enter one of these spaces he would experience another world. This makes sense when it is related to the organisation of space in Roman houses. When the peristyle became the core of the house instead of the atrium, there was a larger emphasis on creating privacy than before, and the function and status of rooms should be demarcated clearly. As the Roman house did not allow for this in terms of spatial configuration, demarcation was established by means of decoration. Making the cubiculum a distinct unit separated from the open and dynamic space of the peristyle, privacy and tranquility could be experienced. Social
conventions were also attached to such decorative demarcations, which in its experience as different unit provided a boundary for people to enter except they were of certain status, were granted permission or had specific tasks.

**Pavement types**

Also through pavement the use of a house and the perception of spaces can become clearer. In addition to the experience of related and separated spaces it can also inform us on movement. Related rooms often share similar pavements. Circulation spaces are frequently unified by means of identical or similar pavement. A distinction within pattern analysis concerning pavement types is also made by Watts, who divides pavements into centralised, bordered, background, directional and utilitarian types. Utilitarian examples are the simplest and are often found in service spaces. Background pavements are slightly more decorative and often include solid white mosaics with a white border and overall geometric patterns in black and white. Bordered pavements also tended to emphasise the centre of the space, however, the centralised pavements contain a real central feature with a background pavement. Such features may be an emblema or a central area of opus sectile, or a centralised pattern with an opus signinum floor or a carpet of a geometrical pattern. Pavements can also contain what Watts calls a ‘Marker’, a way of treating the pavement which modifies the space, marks particular features, or stimulates particular directions or behaviour.

The various pavement types are shown in table 5.3. In the case of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati the pattern of pavements complements the previous observations. The three structures are also maintained in flooring; a simple pavement in the form of a battuta in the service area, where only room Y consisted of a cocciopesto floor, lavishly paved floors in the peristyle area, and lesser elaborate pavements in the atrium zone. Starting with the atrium zone, the pavements of the Exedra G and the tablinum had mosaic emblemata. They represent Watts’ centralised pavements, often found in

---

878 See Watts 1987, 156.
879 See Watts 1987, 297.
880 They include impluvia and patterns marking the table and couch positions in a triclinium, both are also centralised. Thresholds between sub-spaces or scendiletti (i.e., patterns marking bed positions) serve to divide a space. Other markers include raised platforms, designs indicating a direction or movement, and figural compositions. As to outdoor spaces, water channels form a special type of border around the edge of a space. In the peristyle, blocks of stone often serve to mark the corners, see Watts 1987, 298.
rooms which formed the destination of a visit. The clear change in pavement between the atrium and the tablinum also signified a different function and a social demarcation. One may presume that permission was required in order to enter the tablinum by certain groups. The change in flooring was an effective way to break up the movement and present a room with a higher status. The remaining rooms in the atrium all have resembling cocciopesto floors and are meant to move through.

The pavements in the peristyle contain an elaborate pattern which separates the portico space from the adjacent rooms even more markedly than the painting. First, the floor of the portico will be discussed. The quality of this pavement is of exceptionally high and unique value, consisting of a large number of imported limestones (fig. 5.13d). Although scattered pieces of marbles within flooring has been used since the Republican period (in the case of Villa dei Misteri and the Casa del Fauno - the largest houses of Pompeii), it was never applied as abundantly, nor were stones of such a large size used. Although on the whole the portico pavement (i.e., the most important route for movement in the house) shows a similar decoration, an opus signinum floor inlaid with pieces of marble, more attention has been payed to the western part (the part in front of the triclinium O) than to the pavement on the northern, eastern, and southern sides. It seems furthermore, that the southern side (i.e., the side of the portico with the least number of rooms) displays the least bit of quality out of the four parts of the portico. In the western part, the marble pieces are larger and cut into distinct shapes and are surrounded by a white tesserae pattern, whereas the other parts of the portico exhibit opus signinum with merely irregularly shaped pieces of marble in a lower quantity and quality. Although the entire portico should be considered a dynamic space and a through-route, a distinction is made between the most important part (where the triclinium was located) and less important parts. It structures both movement and as well as it shows hierarchy. Although the portico space seems to be one open and integrated segment of the house in terms of the configuration, the pavement points to a significant compartmentalised and differentiated use including specific patterns of movement in order to structure experience behaviour for both visitors and inhabitants. This culminates in the west side of the portico, where the pavement actually consists of the afore-mentioned

881 When marble stones are found they are usually attested in enclosed rooms or atria. See Powers 2006, 153.
'Marker', almost literally leading people to the Triclinium O by means of diagonal lines of similarly cut marble fragments. It also connects the triclinium to the garden by the creation of a route between those spaces through a deliberately designed tesseræ pattern. In this case the pavement is therefore clearly directional. This is interesting, as most circulation spaces in particular are frequently unified by means of adopting the same or a similar pavement in order to stimulate through-movement, as for instance the atrium illustrates. This portico as a circulation space did the opposite in the western part through its pavement, it made people stop.

Next to this, the portico pavement seem to connotate an extension of room O, denoting that its experience was directed outwards and extended into the peristyle. This was very different in comparison to the cubicula, which pavements created a room in which activities were pointed inward. The floor of the portico stimulates movement through it while together cognitively shutting off any access to the other rooms causing those rooms to be experienced as more private. Rooms Q and R are related in the sense that they share similar ‘carpet’ floors while O is crafted in another manner. Rooms Q and R could therefore be considered as similar spaces in terms of hierarchy. However, besides Q and R, each room presents us with a unique pattern pavement scheme. This indicates again the way in which these rooms are supposed to be experienced: as different, independent, and private units.

Although the shrines contained similar colour schemes, when it comes to flooring differences can be observed. The space in front of the Capitoline shrine at the north side of the peristylium does not demarcate any boundaries by means of a different pavement, however, the floor of the Isis shrine diverged from that of the portico. Although the original pavement is lost, the hole in the corner clearly demarcates the shrine from the remaining space. Of course, as the other shrine is an architectural feature, there was no negative space available that could demarcated the space if that was desired. However, the effect is that the Capitoline shrine appears to be a more integrated part of the peristyle than the Isis shrine, which again establishes a distinct breaking with the surrounding spaces and thereby formed an individual, privatised corner.

---

882 See Watts 1987, 156.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Type (Watts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fauces A</td>
<td>Cocciopesto with white marble inlay (0.5 cm.) irregularly distributed</td>
<td>Directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrium B</td>
<td>Red coloured cocciopesto with even distributed marble pieces (same size as the fauces)</td>
<td>Directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubiculum C</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubiculum D</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablinum E</td>
<td>Black and white mosaic; white background black band, and emblema in the centre with four floral motifs; coloured tesserae used for small details</td>
<td>Centralised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exedra G</td>
<td>Black and white mosaic, with large emblema in the centre depicting a black and white geometric figure</td>
<td>Centralised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peristyle F north</td>
<td>Cocciopesto with marble inlay, large pieces and various types of marble with no particular shape; between the marble pieces are bands (horizontal and vertical) of smaller white rectangular stones</td>
<td>Directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peristyle F east</td>
<td>Cocciopesto with marble inlay, large pieces and different types of marble with no particular shape; between the marble pieces are bands (horizontal and vertical) of smaller white rectangular stones</td>
<td>Directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peristyle F south</td>
<td>Cocciopesto with marble inlay, large pieces and various types of marble with no particular shape; between the marble pieces are bands (horizontal and vertical) of smaller white rectangular stones; the stones are smaller than the east and north side</td>
<td>Directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peristyle F west</td>
<td>Different pattern, white tesserae in geometrical pattern (circular alternated with rectangular patterns), in between carefully cut marble pieces; one diagonal band with diamond shaped marble, one diagonal band with square and hexagonal shapes white marble and one with coloured marbles</td>
<td>Directional, with the inclusion of markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exedra H</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubiculum I</td>
<td>Black and white marble, two bands (one with floral, the other with geometric patterns) are put in vertical and horizontal position creating a square just after entering the room</td>
<td>Directional, including markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubiculum J</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrine K</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage room L</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubiculum M</td>
<td>Grey cocciopesto floor with tesserae geometrical decoration</td>
<td>Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubiculum R</td>
<td>Grey cocciopesto floor with tesserae geometrical decoration, the area near the threshold has a different pattern</td>
<td>Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triclinium O</td>
<td>None preserved</td>
<td>Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubiculum Q</td>
<td>Same as Cubiculum R (but with different patterns) grey cocciopesto floor with tesserae geometrical decoration, the area near the threshold has a different pattern</td>
<td>Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubiculum N</td>
<td>Cocciopesto floor inserted with larger marble stones</td>
<td>Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtyard S</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3) Analysis of the pavements of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati.
As was discussed before in part 5.1, openings between spaces were not all treated equally; important rooms have special attention drawn to them by means of the door openings and elaborateness of their thresholds, while public spaces show wider openings than private ones. Because of this hierarchy it is possible to trace the experience of rooms. Table 5.4 shows the different boundaries between spaces within the house. The boundary between rooms is as important as the rooms themselves, as they cause the psychological effect of moving into a different space and experiencing being in a different space. The boundaries between spaces in Pompeian houses in general were emphasised in a variety of ways, by means of material, size and decoration, as witnessed in the example mentioned in part 5.1. In the case of the present case study it is possible to assess all the boundaries in order to get a better grip on the functioning of the house. As many Roman houses possessed open layouts, the boundaries helped to reinforce the distinction between spaces, and put a halt to the flow of movement from one area to another. The boundaries are marked not only by means of thresholds, but also by means of frames and the size of openings, and a differentiation in decoration. They all influence the sense of accessibility to the room, its status and the way in which the user experienced it. Large frames are experienced as more open and public than narrow ones. Important transitions are more prominently marked. Does a threshold consisting of mosaics cause another reaction, another experience than one made of travertine? The material that was used might say something about the importance of the room in contrast to other rooms. In addition, it also provides another clue about the way in which people moved through the space. The boundaries in the Casa degli Amorini Dorati, corresponding to the general usage of boundaries in Pompeian houses, are of diverse nature. They exist of thresholds, doors that could be shut, or sliding doors. The entrance to the Tablinum (E) for example could be closed, presumably by means of a sliding door. The thresholds in the atrium are all made of travertine.

---

883 For more information on boundaries, see 5.1. On boundary as a concept, see Jones 1959, 241-55; Lauritsen 2012, 95-114.
884 See Watts 1987, 182.
885 As discussed in 5.1.4.
886 For a discussion on privacy and doorways, see Wallace-Hadril 1988.
887 See Laurence 1994, 102-5.
Being of a similar material and size, they thereby reinforce (together with the floors and red and yellow colouring) the experience of the atrium zone as a unity. The only exception here is the entrance to the tablinum, which deviates in being larger but also consisted of a more elaborate mosaic.

---

888 Consecutively (from left to right) a figure seemingly cut off and no longer recognisable, a bird (swan), flower, cornucopia, cornucopia, flower, flower, fish (dolphin).

889 Storage Room L contains a loose marble/travertine threshold.
threshold. This pattern was also observed in the Casa del Doppio Larario (see 5.1). The tablinum was the most important room to enter in the atrium, but also a point in which visitor-inhabitant relation became notable. Although perhaps not as unique, and therefore not such a strong symbol, as the slab with hieroglyphs, this threshold aimed for a similar psychological effect.

Further, the demarcation between the atrium and the peristyle zone again becomes emphasised by means of putting up boundaries. There is only a narrow frame in the form of a doorway between the two spaces. The other entries from the atrium to the peristyle consist of similar small doorways via the Tablinum (E) and the Exedra (G). This is uncommon to Pompeian houses, as they mainly possess larger frames. However, it could be carried out in order to create a vista towards the rear of the house and glance at the peristyle from the atrium (pointing to the owners most valued possessions). As the design of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati did not allow for a vista from the main entrance it may not have been necessary to place a larger frame from the atrium to the peristyle area. In order to allow light (and a view on the peristyle), the tablinum possessed a window on the south side (see plan in fig. 5.7) as well as a small door from the tablinum to the peristyle which could be closed off.

Concerning the boundaries in the peristyle area, they repeat the pattern witnessed in painting and flooring, of bounded and private rooms. All rooms have thresholds, many have decorative features to emphasise them visually, all could all be closed off, and not one is identical.\textsuperscript{890} Room I, the most important cubiculum, had an extra indoor boundary in the form of a scendiletto in mosaic-form (a rug-like demarcation of the bed space, see fig. 5.12). Even when access was granted to this room, one was confined to the mosaic boundaries. Other such boundaries could be found in Rooms R and Q, which contained different motifs behind a marble threshold. Interesting, too, is that all thresholds consist of travertine, except for Room Q and R as well as the entrance to the garden, which were made out of white coloured marble. Again this bound the rooms together, emphasizing the importance of the rooms on the west side, and on the portico, and the garden.

\textsuperscript{890} This is confirmed by means of the argument that in comparison with the atrium, the thresholds located around the peristyle are characterized by means of an individual design, which the room it belonged to defined, aiming for the space to become a uniting entity, see Staub, 2009, 217.
Door openings can also be assessed. The most significant case in terms of accessibility and openness is the Triclinium O. This room was highlighted to a large extent by means of its doorway. It had both a higher and wider opening than the two adjacent rooms. Its function as the most important room in the peristyle became apparent from the very moment one entered the space. The portico itself enforced this by means of the framing of the triclinium by two square columns (while the other columns were round), the only columns present on the western side of the peristyle. The entrance to the garden also has a boundary in the shape of a small staircase. Interestingly, the fact there was an entrance to the garden only became visible from the western part of the portico space, thus after when one was located in or near the Triclinium O. The stairs suggest it was possible to enter the garden and that it was closely linked to the use of the triclinium and west side of the portico. The cubicula on the other sides of the peristyle are all smaller, denoting their private character and again providing a boundary from the dynamic and open space of the portico. Rooms L, and K (interpreted as a latrine and storage room respectively) on the north side are equally small and lower than Rooms M, J and I.\footnote{The reason why Room J was equal in height and width to Room I could have had to do with its function, but also with the size of the room. The reason for this is that whereas Rooms L and K were similarly sized, Room J was almost as large as Room I, only narrower. Therefore it might have needed more light from outside.} I also had a window and although the doorway of room M was slightly lower than J, it was also wider than J and I. It seems clear from this survey, that the construction of doorways in the case of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati was depended to a large extent on the importance and the function of the room.\footnote{In this way it corresponds with Laurence, 1994 and Wallace-Hadrill, 1988; 1994.}
**Light**

Analysing the light, lighting conditions and variations within a Pompeian house, provides a further clues in the way in which the house was experienced. The effect for instance when traversing from the bright street into a darker corridor and then into a brighter atrium is makes a visual impression and accentuates the transition from moving from a public into a private domain. Light furthermore dictates the way in which spaces could be used. Brighter rooms were spaces with more activity, while darker spaces allowed for more tranquility. Moreover, the experience of a space is affected by means of the interplay of surface colour and reflectance with the amount and source of light.

The three direct light sources when entering the house are the atrium, the peristyle and Room P which by its lack of a door, seems to be primarily used as an extra light source. The fact the owners could devote an entire room to this informs us of the wealth of the family and the importance placed on lighting. The extra source of light (and garden to look out on) might even have created a more striking impression than an elaborate wall painting. It certainly presented the location not only with more light, but also had an enlarging effect. In this case Room P plays an important role in providing an extra light source for Rooms O and Q. This effect would have probably also have directed visual attention to the area behind the garden space, immediately seen when one would enter the peristyle. This denotes a clear indication where the final destination of the walk through the peristyle should end. It also places Room Q slightly higher in the hierarchy of rooms than Room R, as was also indicated by the distance of Room R to the service area. The deprivation of a light source is also indicative of the function and reception of various spaces, as it can hide rooms from sight. The hallway (Room 01) to the upstairs apartments is for example dark and easy to ignore when one is in the peristyle. The service area likewise would not have generated the amount of light that the Rooms Q and O would have. In this way the owners could make up for the lack of axially and symmetry in the

---

893 Whether Room S was also open or not remains undetermined. There must have been a light source in order to make the labour possible. However, it is quite plausible to assume that the apartments were located directly above the rooms considering the two sets of stairs in the area. Therefore the incoming light would in no case be really intense. Seiler 1992 (fig. 89) does include an opening above Room S.
house. The visual axis in this way was shaped in a diagonal direction by means of light.

Level change

Level change is a final phenomenon to observe with regard to the experience of space. Within Roman housing, it is an important tool to hierarchically define spaces. This starts already at the entry to the house from the street. When entering a house, usually the visitor has to go up, either sloping up the length of the fauces or stepping at the juncture of the fauces to the atrium. In the domus, the fauces often had a level change, not necessarily constructed for the reason of making an impression to visitors, but nonetheless contributing to the experience of entry. The use of a slope to is characteristic for dynamic through routes, as static rooms never slope. However, in the case of the Amorini Dorati the level change also occurs within the house. At the end of the north side of the portico (behind the entrance of Room M) a staircase ascends to the western side of the portico space and to Triclinium O and the Rooms R and Q. The upward movement contributes to the sense of importance of the space. Interestingly, too, is that although the pavement is raised at the south side of the portico leading to the west, no stairs were constructed here. A flow of movement was allowed on the south side while movement on the north side was obstructed. The stairs on the north side therefore pointed to an extra cognitive boundary directed at guests. Clearly, the circulation was forced to stop here in order to make the visitor aware of one extra moment of permission in which the relation between guest and host was dispatched. After these stairs and the raise in level, one had visual access to the entire peristyle, and all its the secrets. Moreover, as the garden was situated on a lower position than the western portico space, when viewed from the entrance to the peristyle the western part resembled a theatre stage, something that became endorsed by the use of the square columns and the opening of Triclinium O.

Pattern analysis

Including the patterns and nuances of decoration, frames, thresholds, and lighting issues, provided a much clearer picture of the functioning of this house than could be inferred from configuration alone. The concept of

---

894 This might also have had the initial functional reason of draining the water from the impluvium onto the street. See Jansen 2002.
895 See Watts 1987, 311.
pattern analysis assumes that patterns were locally (culturally) shared and were followed unconsciously by all involved in the design of a building.\textsuperscript{896} Many things became clear in this way on the individual uses and experiences of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati. Within the side of the portico for instance, the Isis shrine took a rather segregated position within the portico space when regarding decoration, the main movement emphasis was put on the western side of the portico, and the visual emphasis was placed on the garden. As to the frames, lighting, and the level change, all the attention in the peristyle was supposedly aimed at the large triclinium, resembling a theatre in the way it stood out in the space. The cubicula could be considered as separated, small universes which had nothing to do with neither the outside space nor the other spaces in the peristyle area.

5.2.7 \textbf{Place-making in the house: object analysis}

The previous analysis of place-making dealt with the decoration and the internal structures of the house. Much was learned about the way in which the house was used and experienced. However, for the final step it is necessary to combine the information acquired in the above analyses with an analysis directed towards the objects present in the house. As stated in 5.1, the focus is placed on the analysis of those objects with aesthetic value for the owners. Therefore, the emphasis of this section lies on the peristyle area of the house, because it was here one wished to make an impression and express their values through objects. Where were such objects located, from where could they be seen and what did that signify? What effect did the objects create? Specifically, this section is interested in the statuette of Horus and the other objects in the shrine and the way in which they should be regarded within the context of the remaining part of the house and its contents. Not only is it important to retrieve the personal choices and intentions of the owners, it is of equal relevance to observe how the objects and their material worked in order to create a certain atmosphere and allow for unintentional effects on the space. A viewer is not always meant to capture and analyse the iconology of all individual paintings and sculptures, all things together served to create an atmosphere and make an impression on a visitor.\textsuperscript{897}

\textsuperscript{896} See Watts 1987, 353.
\textsuperscript{897} In general, painting, space, and objects are analysed separately resulting in a too narrow focus on the iconographical understanding of Roman wall painting. This was the main critique point forwarded by scholars such as Berry and Allison who opted for a more
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Objects</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>Iconography/decoration</th>
<th>Pompeii Inv. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oscillum</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td>Portico north between columns 1 and 2</td>
<td>Female mask</td>
<td>55405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Candelabrum</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td>North portico near Room I</td>
<td>3-legged base in the form of lion's paws</td>
<td>55555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lamp</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td>North portico near Room I</td>
<td><em>Firmalamp</em> with a single nozzle and a ring handle</td>
<td>55554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Plaque</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td>West part near the central pilasters</td>
<td>Dog's head</td>
<td>55282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Oscillum</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td>West portico near the first intercolumniation</td>
<td>Dancing maenad and naked youth</td>
<td>55404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Patera</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td>West portico between doors of Rooms R and O</td>
<td>Concentric incised rings</td>
<td>55561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Oscillum</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td>South portico, second intercolumniation</td>
<td>Bearded centaur looking at a Corinthian helmet on one side; reverse: bearded centaur on a rock preparing to throw a stone</td>
<td>55403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Oscillum</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td>Portico near the southwest corner column</td>
<td>Male theatrical mask</td>
<td>2953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Two-sided relief</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td>West wall of the south portico</td>
<td>Front: female tragic mask, back: satyr mask</td>
<td>20465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Two-sided relief</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td>South wall of the peristyle on the east side of the door to room N</td>
<td>Front: a female tragic mask; reverse: mask of satyr</td>
<td>20462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Two-sided relief</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td>South wall west of the Isis shrine, between columns 9 and 10</td>
<td>Front: theatrical mask with a bearded slave; reverse: young satyr</td>
<td>20464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Relief</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td>South wall, opposite between columns 10 and 11</td>
<td>Attic grave relief showing Venus and Cupid in a grotto</td>
<td>20469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Two-sided relief</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td>South portico, opposite space between columns 11 and 12</td>
<td>Front: five theatrical masks; reverse: mask of beardless satyr and bald Silenus</td>
<td>20463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td>South wall of the peristyle</td>
<td>Bacchus</td>
<td>2973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Relief panel</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td>South wall of the peristyle</td>
<td>Naked satyr</td>
<td>20472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pedestal</td>
<td>Grey marble</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td>Southwest corner of the peristyle</td>
<td>Cylindrical</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td>South portico near column 12</td>
<td>Corinthian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Oscillum</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td>South portico</td>
<td>Mask of a female</td>
<td>55513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

contextual approach within the analysis of material culture of domestic contexts resulting in the perspective of household archaeology. See also Bergmann 2002b, 15-46.
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Peristyle</td>
<td>South portico between columns 11 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Puteal</td>
<td>Travertine</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>North portico on the stylobate between columns 4 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Cista</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>North portico on the stylobate between columns 4 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>North portico on the stylobate between columns 4 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pilaster and base</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>North side of the garden between columns 3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Column base</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>North side of the garden corresponding to column 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Furniture leg</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>North side of the garden corresponding to column 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sun dial</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>North side of the garden between columns 2 and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pedestal</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>North side of the garden between columns 2 and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Part of a colonnet</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>North side of the garden between columns 2 and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Two-sided relief and pilaster</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>North side of the garden opposite space between columns 2 and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Two-sided relief, base and pilaster</td>
<td>Grey marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>North side of the garden between columns 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Square base</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Northwest part of the garden opposite column 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Square base</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Northwest corner of the garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Three-legged base</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Northwest part of the garden corresponding to column 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Table support</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Northwest part of the garden corresponding to column 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Rectangular base</td>
<td>Gray marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Northwest part of the garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Two-sided mask relief and pilaster</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Northwest part of the garden corresponding to column 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Herm and pilaster</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Northwest part of the garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Trumpet-shaped base</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Northwest part of the garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Statuette</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>West side of the garden between the steps leading to the west portico and the pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Two-sided mask relief and pilaster</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Southwest part of the garden in front of the intercolumniation between the southwest corner column and column 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Herm on pilaster</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>South side of the garden corresponding to the intercolumniation between columns 12 and 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Portrait head and pilaster</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>South side of the garden near the central basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Statuette</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>South side of the garden near the central basin corresponding to the intercolumniation between columns 12 and 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Two-sided herm on a pilaster</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>South side of the garden corresponding to the intercolumniation between columns 11 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Statuette</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>South side of the garden corresponding to the intercolumniation between columns 11 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Statuette</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>South side of the garden corresponding to the intercolumniation between columns 11 and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Rectangular base</td>
<td>Travertine</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Herm on a pilaster</td>
<td>White marble</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>South side of the garden between</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which objects were placed in the zone serving as a route for visitors as reconstructed in the above section? The first visual confrontation entering the peristyle was the Capitoline shrine displaying bronze figurines of a profound quality. It was smaller than the Isis shrine, and contained fewer items than the Isis shrine (five against thirteen). The placing of the shrine, on the right side of the peristyle, can be held as a quite common position for such objects. The owner could express his piety and the way in which his house was protected, meanwhile presenting him with an opportunity to show his wealth. The fact, however, that the peristyle area was not symmetrical, rendered the shrine much more prominent than usual. It even obstructs the flow of movement from the atrium to the other spaces. As to the visitor-inhabitant relationship, it establishes this particular shrine as an important first point of impression after entering the peristyle. The quality of the statuettes (all of bronze which and of exceptional quality), and the careful crafting of a miniature temple, added to this.

Following the usually followed route through the house, as was inferred from the visibility and agent analyses, the objects that caught the attention of a passer-by after the shrine were the marble sculptures placed in the garden (5.13e) and on the north side of the portico. These have been found more or

---

898 The small finds were not included in this table. For a complete survey on the finds in the Casa degli Amorini Dorati, see Powers 2006.
less in situ and are described by Sogliano. It powers made further refinements on the position and objects within the house. It is interesting to note that although many reliefs were inserted into the south and west part of the portico walls, the walls of the portico on the north side are empty. The reason for this could be that the cubicula were situated on that side. However, both the west and east parts have rooms on their sides and these do count a number of reliefs and relief marks. The east side included no marble reliefs, but did have two inserted obsidian mirrors.

A noticeable fact is that all the objects in the garden and portico were made of white coloured marble, indicating that object-wise, the garden and the portico also were linked together next to the paintings. A very large quantity of marble was present in the garden, in fact, this house included the highest number of sculpture of all Pompeian houses. They seem to include a predominant Bacchic Leitmotif according to Seiler as the sculpture displays theatre masks, maenads, saters, wild animals, and busts of Dionysus. Seiler describes the sculpture stylistically as Attic, Hellenistic, or Neo-Attic. This theme is not uncommon to the decoration of gardens, as Bacchus is often associated the wild outdoors, and otium, two themes closely connected to Roman gardens. The majority of the statues do not show any sign of paint, some have minor traces. As the garden was situated on a lower level, those crossing the portico space would have had a good view on the garden and its contents. The description of the garden sculpture will commence at the north side of the garden and the portico, which is considered the main route.

It first displays a marble sundial with a bronze gnomon. Further it included a marble puteal for water, a marble altar which could have belonged to the Capitoline shrine, marble bases and a several double-sided herms. The number of marble objects on the north side (twenty) is slightly less than the south side of the garden and portico (twenty-four). The difference in quality is, however, more noteworthy. Several herms and reliefs were encountered on pilasters, but only one oscillum. The majority of the marble objects consist of furniture or bases of some kind (twelve out of

---

899 See Sogliano 1906, fig. 5; Sogliano 1907, figs. 18-32; Seiler 1992, 530-625.
900 See Powers 2006, fig. 3.
902 See Von Stackelberg 2009, 94.
903 Similar to the sundial found in Oplontis, see Bergmann 2002a, 118. For more general information on Greek and Roman sundials, see Gibbs 1976.
904 One herm may depict Jupiter-Ammon.
Was the marble as material and its quantity on its own already sufficient to make an impression? Did the quantity matter more than the quality of the objects? On the one hand, the interior of the house contained a lavish number of marble objects that seemed to have been specifically grouped together. The inhabitants must have valued the marble as material too, next to what the marbles displayed in subject. However, it would probably be stretching the argument too far to remark that only the marble mattered, and not the subject of the sculpture. That this also mattered can be observed when the sculptures at the south and north sides of the portico are compared. Whereas the north side of the portico did not include any high quality sculpture, the south side did. The difference witnessed between these two sides cannot be set aside as a mere coincidence. There must have been an intentional decision behind the positioning of the sculpture. The south side only has two marble bases or furniture, but has no less than eight reliefs (out of which six were secured in the wall), six statues, and four herms. The southwest and south side counts the most Bacchic themed sculpture, wild animals, herms of Bacchus and Maenads. Not only the number and quality stand out on the south side, it also provided the most exclusive pieces found in the house: a 4th-century BC Attic grave relief, the alabaster statuette of Horus and a statue of the Lydian queen Omphale. The latter was in a Hellenistic styled statue which reminded of Rhodian sculpture (no. 29 in table 5.5). It was found just after descending the stairs of the garden on the south side (see fig. 5.13a). Was the value of these pieces on the basis of their style and age a qualification equally important to the owners than to the archaeologist? Although valid to question, this assumption does seem to hold ground. Firstly the statue of Omphale was made of an expensive kind of marble (possibly Parian) and was placed on a base made out of black stone. Furthermore, it was placed more or less in the centre of the garden, and most importantly it was the first object to be witnessed from up close after descending to the garden.

---

905 The total amount of the oscilla counted five, all made of marble. The majority of oscilla were made of wood, or even of wool. Oscilla were hung up as offerings to various deities, either for propitiation or expiation or in connection with festivals and other ceremonies. The fact that these consisted of marble presents them with a prominent decorative purpose over their original religious value, see Dwyer 1981, 247-306.

906 See Seiler 1992, 124-5. It is noted here that the statuette of Omphale contained stylistic and technical similarities to late Hellenistic sculptures from Rhodes. It is dated to the 1st century AD, see Mastroberto 1992, 106; Powers 2006, 155.

907 Omphale’s base has been identified as black limestone, see Seiler 1992, 117, no. 8. It was not further specified and is now missing.
All these factors, compared with the position and quality of the other marble sculptures in the garden seem to denote that this statue was of added significance to the owner. This also counts for the Attic grave relief secured in the south wall of the portico. Because of its deviant style (as the analysis of section 4.5 indicated, it could be recognised by viewers) and the way in which it was inserted into the wall (being positioned in the centre of the south wall and standing out from all the other reliefs, which consisted of double-sided theatre masks), it seems that the owners were aware of the value of its antiquity. The most lavish pieces of sculpture and reliefs seemed to have been deliberately placed on the south side. How to interpret this divergence between the two sides of the portico? It could be that the north side of the portico, visited by guests and inhabitants more frequently and housing more everyday activities, did not include the most important artefacts, which were preserved for the more private and less traversed south side. This may shed an interesting light on the use of the south side and of the Isis shrine. Because the space was more private, it also might have been an additional step towards intimacy for visitors. Presumably within the social gatherings in the context of the house, this space was used for ambulatio, to walk around during dinner parties.\(^{908}\) In addition to the landscape paintings and plants discussed above, the marble reliefs in the portico also aided in drawing the portico space into the garden, as the north side also included marble reliefs inserted in the back wall referring material-wise to the sculpture in the garden. When walking around the portico, the attention was drawn towards the garden and its sculpture, with the marble reliefs serving as a visual reference between them. Through the marble sculpture a cognitive connection was created between two spaces. It is significant to note that the Isis shrine was deliberately not part of this dialogue.

\(^{908}\) A popular pastime during dinner in order to establish social interaction, see O'Sullivan 2012, 98.
The east portico has no marble sculptures, however as said, two obsidian mirrors were placed in the walls (Fig. 5.13c). The east side was not important in the sense of rooms or specific functions. Room H may also have stored objects, as a wooden cupboard was attested in that space, but it seems to point to a storage room rather than space for explicit display. The west side, supposedly the most important space of the portico has unfortunately not preserved its reliefs. They have perhaps been looted, as the area of the triclinium O was clearly disturbed after the infamous eruption. However, marks in the wall still indicate that reliefs were present on this side. Interestingly enough, the marks next to the Triclinium O are placed directly on the line of the pavement change. As with the pavement it emphasises the change in atmosphere, initially set by means of walking up the stairs and witnessing a change in pavement to a more luxurious type with large varied pieces of inserted marble. Next on eye-level by way of the reliefs and on ground level by means of the pavement, one experiences walking into another zone of the house; a zone of social gathering and dining.

909 The space contained a wooden cupboard. However, no finds were attested, see Seiler 1992, fig. 278.
910 The marble pavement of the room has been removed, see. Giornale degli Scavi A,VI,4:171. According to Allison’s website entry on the discussion of the rooms of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati evident breaches suggest this room had been heavily looted. Allison, Pompeian households, an on-line companion.
Finally, when the south-east corner is reached, one could see the shrine of Isis from up close and one could view the paintings and its contents in detail. This was, concerning the regular route through the peristyle, the last space in which any display took place. In the mornings, rituals may be performed. It was indeed maybe more important as cult a place for the inhabitants, judged by its size and contents, however, it might also have been part of the ambulatio during which the most prominent sculptures were revealed to guests. What were the owner’s intentions with regard to acquiring and displaying this statue? As to the Casa degli Amorini Dorati a conscious choice for objects related to a concept of Egypt could be established with a fair amount of certainty. However it could not thereby not be stated that the shrine in the corner of the peristyle was intentionally ‘Egyptianised’ in any cultural sense.911

Interesting in this case of ‘Egypt’ as a concept, is the link between that what is on display and the material it is made of. This is not only the case with the statue of Horus, but also with the green-glazed lamp portraying Egyptian deities referring in both ways to Egypt. As discussed in 4.4, green glaze was frequently connected to Egyptian iconography. Although this connection might have grown weaker over the years, the owners of the house of the Amorini Dorati appeared to be aware of it. Choosing for green glaze may therefore have been intentional. The conscious decision in these cases could have been to acquire and exhibit a statue especially, but also a lamp, which would enhance the sacredness, the importance of origin, and Isis’s old age. The owner was able to accomplish this by means of the statue.

In addition to the intentions of the owners of the statue and the shrine, which impression would the shrine and its contents have made to a viewer? Of course, it might not have been as frequently visited as the other spaces, and when it was seen up close it was at the end of a route full of visual astonishment. In this way its afore-mentioned uniqueness must be nuanced. However, in addition to the owner’s cultic intentions (to be further discussed below) it was certainly also a part of public display. The shrine made an impression as a whole visually, because it was such an isolated feature in the space and evidently did not belong to the garden and portico space.

---

911 If the term ‘Egyptianisation’ should be applied, this seems to have been by association rather than by intent. Egypt was integrally connected for the owners to the concept of Isis, because they knew she was Egyptian in origin.
However, at short range individual artefacts caught the eye, of which the most prominent was the statuette of Horus, because its unusual iconography, but also because of its physical properties such as height and material. Although alabaster objects are present in Pompeii, it is rarely utilised when producing statuary.\textsuperscript{912} The height of the statue is also extraordinary when compared to ‘regular’ house shrine statuettes. The statue is carefully polished, providing it with a coating no marble could have achieved. By means of this treatment the stone developed a translucent effect and made a soft, almost malleable, appearance. Whereas marble translucency evokes a visual depth resembling human skin, the polished alabaster exceeds the marble effect to arrive at an experience transcending human ‘realism’. Lastly, the colour resulting from the transparency of the alabaster can be considered an important property. In relation to other statuary in Pompeii this should also be considered atypical. Depending on the absorption and refraction of light, it occasionally seems to be yellow, orange, or pink. These latter traits are not consciously noted by the viewer, as was made clear in part 3.3. However, they were the first to catch one’s eye, causing them to be perceived as extraordinary. Looking into all these properties, and comparing them to that which is usually found in house shrine-statuary in Pompeii (where the majority of statuettes are made of bronze or marble), one can assume that Horus was an eye-catcher, standing out in ‘otherness’. A cognitive link between Egypt and alabaster might already have existed, and although Horus was unfamiliar, its rigid pose could also have been recognised as Egyptian. The style would also have added to its otherworldlyness perhaps even to notions sacredness.

\textit{Remarks on place-making in connection to previous interpretations}

Configuration, visibility, pattern, and object analysis as place-making could add something valuable to the previous discussions of the house and its sculpture. Petersen for instance connects the sculpture from the shrines and the peristyle together, linking the Bacchus to the other shrines.\textsuperscript{913} She establishes an explicit religious link between the presence of the relief portraying Venus to Isis and her shrine has been established: “Despite

\textsuperscript{912} Although alabaster is sporadically attested in Pompeii, its use is not an uncommon phenomenon. In fact, other Egyptian artefacts made of alabaster are found in Pompeii in the shape of four alabaster canopies. Although their exact find spot is unknown, they probably played a role in a funerary context, see Di Maria 1989, 134, 138. It may be remarked here that alabaster is only encountered in vases and bottles, never in statuary, see Allison 2004.

\textsuperscript{913} See Petersen 2012, 323-4.
Seiler's reservations about the relief's connection to religion in its new domestic context (perhaps Seiler was influenced by Cato's complaints), I believe that it can be affiliated with household religion and ritual in a number of ways. Some scholars have linked this depiction of Venus with Venus Pompeiana, the patron deity of the city (Jashemski 1979.2.163; also see the discussion in Seiler 1992.131). If she can be understood as such, then she together with the gods in the sacellum directly across the garden represent imperial, city, and domestic deities watching over the domus. It may be of some significance that Venus is placed in relative proximity to the Isis shrine, perhaps also evoking the syncretic Isis-Venus.914 Although the south wall of the portico consists of marble relief plaques connecting the garden to the portico, the shrine in the southeast corner is clearly not a part of this space as the study of the painting, sculpture, and flooring indicated. One should be cautious to automatically link sculptural programs to religious connotations; the relationships in the case of Petersen are assumed without taking any account of the experience and use of the space. Firstly there is no necessary connection between all the 'religious' sculpture in the house and the peristyle general. Secondly, the analyses indicate that the shrine was experienced as a separate unit. Moreover, one should take care not to lump all seemingly religious images together, as there is a difference between religious sculpture belonging to cult practice (as in shrines), and religious sculpture part of a decorative scheme.915 Everything in the Roman material world is in one way or another religious, however, not everything is cult-related.

5.2.8 The shrine in context
First of all, in a general argumentation the house included a careful spatial segregation with a functional basis, as three clear areas could be discerned from the access analysis. The social position of the person and nature of the meeting determined in which of the three zones one would end up and how that goal should be reached. Such nucleated and specialised divisions integrated within a house emphasises the organic solidarity.916 As to the shrine and its objects, and especially concerning the Horus statue, it seems that when scholars reviewed this object it was always analysed

914 Petersen 2012, 330.
915 As noted in Dunbabin 1999 and discussed in 4.2.
916 As social cohesion which depends on the interdependence arising from specialisation of work and the complementarities between people and is bound together by means of occupational differences rather than worldview. See Durkheim 1893.
together with all the other Aegyptiaca found in Pompeii and not in its own use-context. This was counted as problematic as it does not provide the actual environment in which it was appropriated. Within the discussion on Aegyptiaca, the statue of Horus was said to stand out for its unusual material, iconography, and height. It was deemed an import, a case of longing for the exotic, part of the ‘Egyptomania’ and a link to the Isis sanctuary. Or, as mentioned above, deliberately used in order to ‘Egyptianise’ the cult of Isis. Facing the facts, the statue is indeed exotic and unique, in Roman Italy as well as in Egypt. In the context of Roman Italy it does not concern a familiar subject (Horus), has no parallels in iconography or in material. Its only connection to the Isis sanctuary is, as with objects from the temple, that it was most likely imported from Egypt. It has never been mentioned in this discussion on Aegyptiaca, however, that when looking into the context of the house, the statue was not an anomaly at all. It did indeed fit in very well with the owner's personal taste, values, and preferences when acquiring exotic objects. The alabaster statuette of the falcon-headed deity and the manner in which it exhibited, corresponds with other objects found throughout the house. The owners of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati seemed to have put a lot of effort in acquiring outstanding objects in every setting of their house. Six points of interest stand out in particular when contextualising this. (1) After the earthquake of AD 62 when most of the house was refurbished, the atrium of the house was not rebuilt but carefully restored, thereby preserving the first style incrustation of the two cubicula. (2) as was noted above, the garden in the peristyle contained the highest number of marble sculptures found in a Pompeian house. This peristyle consisted of a floor with a huge amount of pieces of imported marbles of outstanding size when compared to other flooring in Pompeii (fig. 5.13d). (3) two obsidian mirrors located in the south wall of the peristyle (fig. 5.13c) described as: 'extremely rare in these contexts'. (4) the use of gold for the cupids in room I. (5) the marble Attic relief (fig. 5.13b) is an ancient piece which seems to have been acquired especially for that

918 De Vos 1981.
919 Prof. dr. O. Kaper and prof. dr. R. van Walsem, personal communication, February 2012.
920 Following the research presented in Seiler 1992 and Powers 2006.
921 See Seiler 1992, 95; Powers 2006, 163-4. Although the restoration of the paintings may have been carried out because it was less expensive than applying a new painting. This does not count for the incrustation in the cubicula, which it would have taken less effort to remove and redo.
reason, considering its location. Lastly, (6) the statue of Omphale (5.13a) indicates they valued Eastern motives, quality marble as outstanding individual sculpture to adorn the garden. Reviewing this evidence the statuette can be placed within the a network of objects and of personal values and tastes instead of being viewed as an isolated exoticum. The inhabitants of the house were in general interested in acquiring special objects, material, and antique pieces. Possessing imports or deviantly styled objects such as the Horus statuette may have belonged to this habit.

However, although the owners went to great length in creating a lavish collection to display their status, they did not include Horus within the context of garden display and otium, something which could be observed in other houses.\textsuperscript{923} Clearly, the owners of the Casa degli Amorini had a different concept of Egypt in mind –associated with the cult of Isis- which meant that it was not considered appropriate to use Egypt in the context of leisure and otium. This is a significant conclusion for three reasons: first of all this means that there were underlying rules considering the use of Egypt in this case (when someone took Isis seriously as a deity it meant it could not be used as exotic display), secondly, the Horus statuette is pulled out of the context of the exotic, and thirdly, it means that there were indeed different concepts of Egypt present which could be materialised through similar looking objects (objects referring to Egypt), however, they were differentiated through use and context. The habit of creating a leisure space was one of ingrained social learning, something that people naturally did (habitus), but how that was filled in dependend on personal preferences. For the owners of this house it was the marble sculpture, Bacchus, the theatre, together with the portico paintings, the plants and waterscapes that created the desired otium, leisurly, and playful atmosphere of the garden.

Turning to its position in the house and the way it was used, was the Isis shrine more isolated because of the practices and belief structure that deviated from other ‘normal’ and ‘Roman’ cultic practices? Probably not, as many shrines encountered in houses included Isis-statues and paintings in a non-isolated way (as observed in part 4.3). Although its separation from the other Roman deities did not have a cultic motive, the cult was evidently important to the inhabitants, and played an active role in their lives not only

\textsuperscript{923} Such as Section 4.4 and 4.6 demonstrated, and as following case study will also illustrate. As discussed by Zanker 2010 and von Stackelberg 2009, and in 4.5.
as aesthetic display. Regarding the cult of Isis it is difficult to reconstruct the rituals performed in the house, for hardly anything is known about private veneration of Isis. Comparing it in the light of public rituals may overgeneralise the events taking place in the privacy of a Roman house.\textsuperscript{924} The Isis cult knew some differences in structure and outlook from other cults, but it is not known how much this played a part in Pompeii and within domestic contexts.\textsuperscript{925} The objects that are found in connection to the shrine however, elucidate part of its use. There was an oil lamp in green glaze depicting the Isiac deities that could be lit, while the many offering bowls present in the shrine concur with the notion that libations and lustrations were of importance during rituals for the Isis cult. From what is known through historical sources offerings were mostly done with Nile water, wine, or with milk and that the animal most important for offering rituals was the goose.\textsuperscript{926} However again, nothing is known concerning required offerings and intervals and its affect on everyday life.

In which way did the statuette of Horus serve as a cult object? Swetnam-Burland interprets the presence of the statue as a clear case of sacred practice, she states: “A statuette of Horus found in the Isiac shrine of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati (fig. 6) recalls the ushabty found in the sacarium shrine of the Temple of Isis. Just as images of the genius and lares from shrines were cult objects, this statuette would have been the focus of family veneration.”\textsuperscript{927}

Would Horus have been the focus of private veneration or was he placed there in order to evoke an Egyptian atmosphere? Could the statuette have been venerated as a god? In general Romans could simultaneously conceive a representation of a deity to be both a statue and a god.\textsuperscript{928} This is not

\textsuperscript{924} It is, for instance, unknown whether hymns for Isis (so-called aretologies) were also sang during private rituals or that they could only be chanted in public in attendance of an official priest.

\textsuperscript{925} There was a strong focus placed on ethics. Aretologies left to historians seem to represent invocation of ethical norms. These would have been known by initiates and offered clear rules for everyday life. The main rules could be subsumed under being morally pure, chaste, and focused on abstention. Misfortune and illness or personal wrongdoing led to rituals of public and private contrition, Deviating practices from other cults concerned the open confession of the cause of the misfortune, presumably the result of a consultation of priests. See Alver 2008, 181.

\textsuperscript{926} On religious systems concerning Isis, see Alvar 2008, 305-44. More than merely purificatory, water from the Nile was a much applied mediator turning offerings into assimilable material for the gods, see Alvar 2008, 314.

\textsuperscript{927} See Swetnam-Burland 2007, 70.

\textsuperscript{928} See Weddle 2010, 228. Statues in Greek texts were were frequently referred to as ‘the deity’ rather than ‘an image of’. Platt also assumes that the difference between image and concept is often obscure. See Platt 2011, 78; Gordon 1979, 5-34.
limited to the cult image, but to each and every representation of the deity which could manifest itself in the object in order to listen to the worshippers wishes and partake in the rituals. For this to take effect for Horus, one should assume that the owners knew that Horus belonged to the Egyptian pantheon, either as ‘Horus’ or (more probable) a the ‘falcon-headed deity’, as the name Horus seems to have been unknown in this period and place. However, a more problematic issue than whether the owners knew which god they were dealing with, is: would they venerate an animal-headed deity? Although not necessarily true in an Egyptian context Romans believed that Egyptians worshipped animals, and this was considered a characteristic un-Roman and uncivilised act; the Egyptian deities often served as an example in literary discourse to show barbarism on the part of the Egyptians. To an initiate of the Isis cult, this may have been less problematic, being familiar with the jackal-headed deity Anubis (present in the shrine in the shape of a painting) and Apis, a bull. However, it is has as yet not been established with absolute certainty that they were the subject of actual veneration. This doubt becomes sustained looking at the finds connected to the Iseum Campense in Rome, where many statues of animal gods are encountered. These animal statues seem to have been used to evoke the atmosphere of Egypt rather than that those animals were truly worshipped. Both Lembke and Roullet argue that such imports were merely to create a proper Egyptian atmosphere and that users would not have known the exact religious significance of the statues. The deities that were important and were really actually worshipped were the Hellenistic deities of Isis and Serapis, as these had their own sanctuaries and cult statues. Their statues in a public context, next to portraying anthropomorphic statues, were also always made out of white marble, as to further ‘internalise’ them for the Roman worshipper, for which this was normal.

The animal statues from the Iseum however, did not only created an atmosphere, but also might have added individual sacredness, maybe

929 It is not rare for a Roman family or *pater familias* to worship an uncommon and ‘foreign’ deity. The Roman pantheon was large and theologically all existing gods could be integrated into the *praxis*.
930 Smelik and Hemelrijk 1984.
931 See note 871.
934 For a more thorough discussion on the use of marble in Roman public cult statues and the Isis cults, see Mol 2014, 110-19.
especially when they were actually imported from the land that hailed Isis. If Horus was an import, the statue could likewise have accumulated value on the basis of this geographical distance.\textsuperscript{935} For the owners it may have been of extra significance that the statue came from Egypt, both on a social level and in a cult-related way. A comparison with the sanctuary of Isis in Pompeii might present a number of final clues concerning the reception of the Horus statuette and its role in the shrine. These include, such as mentioned in part 4.5 (table 4.17), a number of imports as well, such as a squatting male deity, an ushabty, and a limestone stele containing hieroglyphs. The faience ushabty mentioned by Swetnam-Burland as displayed in the sacrarium, was actually found in a sacrificial pit in the court of the temple, and therefore most probably part of a ritual and not to endorse the atmosphere. However, the stele was displayed in front of the sanctuary. The imports in the sanctuary supposedly had a sacred value especially because they were imported from Egypt. Finding the ushabty in a sacrificial pit endorses this view. Authenticity as a concept therefore in some instances might have played a role. Although none of these objects indicate they were actually venerated, the argument that an object sometimes mattered as an \textit{import} can be sustained through the finds of the Iseum. The complete haphazardness of the objects in both subject, object, material, age and provenance, and the absence of a direct link to the Isis cult, suggests that they were important because they came from.\textsuperscript{936} The statuette of Horus, just as the ushabty and the stele, could have carried similar importance, meaning that it provenance was of more significance than what the statuette actually signified. While it is unlikely they were the focus of veneration, all these imports could well have been considered sacred objects, connected to the origin of Isis, and be used in rituals. Stating therefore, that such objects had a purely decorative function, in order to ‘evoke Egypt’ or to ‘add to an Egyptian atmosphere’ is oversimplifying the case.\textsuperscript{937} If an Egyptian atmosphere was required, it was of course not really necessary to acquire a genuine Egyptian import. The sphinx from the Iseum was locally produced, and could without any problems be placed in the sacrarium of the Isis temple.\textsuperscript{938}

\textsuperscript{935} On the deliberate acquisition of practices or objects as source of prestige and power, see Helms 1993.

\textsuperscript{936} As can be witnessed from, for example, the Iseum Campense and the sanctuary at Beneventum dedicated to Isis, See Lembke 1994 and Müller 1968.

\textsuperscript{937} As Lembke 1994 for the Iseum Campense.

\textsuperscript{938} The examples from Lembke in Rome should be seen as unique and incomparable to a site such as Pompeii. The Iseum Campense was a display case of the Flavian emperors. The
Combining all the evidence of the sanctuaries in Rome and Pompeii, the imports, and the statue itself, the most reasonable explanation within a cultic context is therefore that the Horus statuette was sacred because it was Egyptian; it was not completely decorative, but also not venerated in the way Isis was venerated.\textsuperscript{939} The Horus statuette therefore brought the owners an elevation of the domestic shrine in both a cultic and on a social level.

\textbf{5.2.9 Conclusion}

Looking at the house size, the inhabitants of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati did not own much space with which to impress their visitors. Because of the dense urban pattern in Region VI, people could not easily purchase space when one’s wealth increased. One could however, make up for this by means of decoration, consisting of expensive material as well as of objects considered exotic and luxurious, in order to create a marble pleasure garden. The inhabitants had also acquired prime pieces in a collection-like fashion, (e.g., the statue of Omphale, the 4\textsuperscript{th}-century BC Attic grave relief). The cubicula were experienced as individual private spaces, and although the peristyle was more public, the garden sculptures were only to be enjoyed by the inhabitants, but also to select group of invited guests. Physical boundaries and material hints were put up to structure the behaviour of these visitors and it could be noted that the careful compartmentalisation within the house had social, aesthetic, and religious reasons. However they were not eclectic. Petersen indicts scholars like Zanker to be erroneously searching for a unified decorative program in painting (based on iconography) and equaling the lack hereof to a case of ‘bad taste’, as Zanker does denote explicit eclecticism.\textsuperscript{940} However, as became clear from the pattern analysis, all the rooms in the peristyle were intended to function as single units and therefore deliberately do not display an overlapping theme. Their decoration serves to separate them as individual spaces. Within these individual spaces, a search for unification, for things that fitted together, continued.

\textsuperscript{939} The Egyptianness of Isis was undisputed and did probably not really vanish in the perception of Romans, although the cult over the years of course became more and more approached and used from local perspectives. It was Roman, but viewed as Egyptian of which aretalogies reminded the followers. As an Isis hymn from Kyme states: ‘\textit{Hail, Oh Egypt, that nourished me.}’ (c.100 AD), or the Maroneia aretology from the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC: ‘\textit{You are pleased with Egypt as your dwelling-place.}’

\textsuperscript{940} See Zanker 1998; Petersen 2012, 323-4.
Through the method of place-making, some significant new insights were noted about the position of the Egyptian shrine. It took up a rather segregated space in the peristyle. Furthermore, no traces of Egyptian influences were encountered anywhere else in the house. Presumably, this had to do with the way in which the owners dealt with the concept of Egypt, in their case linking only to the cult of Isis. They took the cult seriously; therefore no Egyptian statues were placed in the garden space or in the portico. *Otium* and exoticism could impossibly be connected to Egypt in this house, they used a Bacchic theme for this. There has been made a conscious decision to separate the two shrines and dress them accordingly. It seems that owners deliberately separated them, but the separation had to do with other reasons than just being a cultic decision. A social reason was behind the separation, as it provided an extra moment to display wealth, knowledge and personal values through the positioning of sculpture.\textsuperscript{941} The notion of Greenwood that: "The homeowner wanted to be perceived by outsiders a loyal Roman citizen (the Isis-lararium is not visible in the tablinum) but probably identified himself primarily as an Isis worshipper. While religious beliefs may not have been directly associated with either [Romanitas] or [luxuria], this further suggests that the paterfamilias had strong oriental, and hence luxuria-associated preferences."\textsuperscript{942} is therefore difficult for several reasons. First of all in terms of being a loyal Roman citizen by displaying ‘Roman’ gods can be considered a modern projection. The shrine, with the Capitoline gods displayed, is equally unique as the Isis shrine, and therefore does not display ‘true Roman manners.’ Further, although Isis origin was Egyptian, something strongly emphasised by the inhabitants, it does not equal ‘oriental’, for the relationship with the east was more differentiated and complex. In this respect the links to concepts such as the oriental and to *luxuria* should be nuanced. A marble statue of Omphale has been put up with a different purpose in mind than an Isis shrine and do not belong to the same category. The owners of the Amorini Dorati wanted to display a sense of luxury everywhere, also in the display of the Isis shrine; however, they did not accomplish that by putting up the Isis shrine.

\textsuperscript{941} See 4.3.4. Interestingly, the way the shrine was erected (this is the most lavish and exclusive example) including paintings of the Hellenistic Isis and companions and excluding the Isis-Fortuna type we mainly encounter in Pompeii, counts only three more examples here from large and rich houses, and are not socially emulated to houses of the lower classes. Within the psychology of aesthetics it thus denotes a preference of the elite.

\textsuperscript{942} See Greenwood 2010, 135.
5.3 Case Study II: the Casa di Octavius Quartio

5.3.1 Introduction

The Casa di Octavius Quartio, or Casa di Loreius Tiburtinus (II 2, 2), is the second case study to be included in chapter 5. It presents a different example of employment of Aegyptiaca and another image and use of Egypt than the Casa degli Amorini Dorati. It was excavated between 1916 and 1921 by Spinazzola as part of a larger project that aimed to uncover Insula II, where the house was located. Later excavations in parts of the house were carried out between 1933 and 1935. Although the Casa di Octavius Quartio has rarely been analysed in its entirety, it has been discussed by various scholars. A complete study of the house was presented in 2006. Whereas the Egypt-connected objects from the Casa degli Amorini Dorati presented a clear cultic context and a nucleated locus of objects all closely connected to Isis and carefully separated from the rest of the objects and styles of the rest of the house, the ‘Aegyptiaca’ of the Casa di Octavius Quartio were dispersed throughout the house (see table 5.6 below). As indicated in the table, it contained green-glazed statuettes of Bes and a pharaoh (section 4.4), a marble statue of an Egypt-styled sphinx (4.5), and a painting of an Isis priest holding a sistrum. In its diversity and outreach of the employment of Egyptian objects in domestic contexts it therefore presents an ideal counter example with regard to the previous case study.

In general the development of architectural construction and decoration of the house of Octavius Quartio (for a plan, see fig. 5.14), like the Casa degli Amorini Dorati, belongs to the final phase of the building activity in the town (62-79 AD), and reflects the change of focus from the atrium to the peristyle area in an extreme manner. Although there still is an atrium, its decoration was very modest and many rooms were still in a state of renovation during 79 AD. The tablinum, once an indispensable feature of the traditional atrium-house, was completely absent in favour of a large peristyle area with a garden occupying more than half the house.

---

943 The former name of the house, Loreius Tiburtinus, was invented by Della Corte 1932 on the basis of graffiti. However this could not have been the real owner of the house, as research into Pompeian family names revealed that while there may have been a family of Loreii as well as a Tiburtinus, there was no “Loreius Tiburtinus” in Pompeii. The currently employed name however, D. Octavius Quartio, at present the name giver of the house, was most probably also not its owner.
944 See Spinazzola 1953.
945 See Maiuri 1947.
947 Tronchin, 2006; see Tronchin 2011, 33–49.
Fig. 5.14) Plan of the Casa di Octavius Quartio. (After Clarke/de Vos 1991, 195 (fig. 108). Room numbers correspond to PPM.
Of interest in terms of interpretation of the house and its owners, especially in relation to the discussion in 5.1 on *luxuria*, is that most scholars agree that in this case the owners tried too hard to ornament their house. A clear consensus exists that the inhabitants of the Casa di Octavius Quartio decorated their house in a tasteless manner: too many sculptures, water features, plants, fountains, and architectural features adorned the place. It has been referred to by Zanker (later followed by Clarke) as: ‘*An idiosyncratic Walt Disney world*’. La Rocca declared the house and its contents as kitsch, while Hales describes it as: ‘the bizarre fantasy world that was his [pater familias] home’.948 A collection of remarkable subjective aesthetic judgements were made through these comments, based on the large number of fountains, waterworks, and architectural features, but mainly on the seemingly ‘eclectic’ sculptural finds that were spread through the house which did not display a clear theme or possessed any underlying thoughts in composition or iconography.

It is clear that judgements as quoted above are profoundly influenced by the historical accounts previously discussed (in part 5.1), which called the exceeding lavishness of the new elite into question and seem to directly accuse the owners of a house such as the Casa di Octavius Quartio of bad taste. The reflection between the written words and the physical remains is that strong, that the story of Trimalchio and this specific house became inextricably linked. Referring to the discussion in 5.1, the Casa di Octavius Quartio is considered to be the ultimate Trimalchio home.949 The waterworks and canals (also called ‘Euripi’) which the house flaunts so frankly, supposedly reflect exactly those which were once mocked by Cicero.950 Moreover, and of importance to this research, the Egyptian artefacts play a substantial role in the so-called Trimalchio-indictment, as examples of lavish exotic display. This latter statement makes this house a specifically

---

948 Clarke 1991, 197; Hales 2003, 161. Zanker states: “This is a ‘Walt Disney world’, in which an owner with little taste has tried to imitate the leisureed country world of his betters, consistently choosing quantity over quality.” Zanker 1998, 156; La Rocca notes the house: “...con l’architettura movimentata, irrequieta dei tanti piccoli ambienti, sovraccarichi di rifinimenti kitsch.” La Rocca 1976, 241.

949 It has been remarked that: “Like the rich former slave Trimalchio in Petronius’ *Satyricon*, these new bourgeoisie imitated the wealthy aristocratic upper class in their desire for the material trappings of wealth”, see Clarke 1991, 207.

950 Atticus mentions in conversation with Cicero—“Atticus: For my part, this is the first time I have been at the place, and I cannot have enough of it; I think scorn now of splendid villas and marble pavements and fretted roofs. When one looks at this, one can only smile at the artificial canals which our fashionable friends call their ‘Nile’ or their ‘Euripus’. Just now when you were discussing law and jurisprudence you ascribed everything to nature; and certainly in regard to these objects at any rate which we seek for the repose and refreshment of the mind, nature is the only true mistress.” Cicero *De Legibus* 2.2.
interesting case study, as it touches on an important debate on exoticism and Egypt. Therefore the case study to follow will be treated in the same way as 5.2, carefully analysing the house, its configuration, decorative patterns, and materials. How does the presumed ‘kitsch’ or ‘eclecticism’ express itself when discussed contextually? Can differences be discovered in the context of this discourse when the house is compared with the Casa degli Amorini Dorati?

Yet another question guiding this case study again concerns domestic religion. In addition to being a material example of cheap taste of the new elite, the Casa di Octavius Quartio has often been dealt with as the example of Isiac worship within domestic contexts. This opinion has its origin in writings of Della Corte, who interpreted the house as being owned by an Isis priest.951 He explained many finds in the context of Isiac worship; tying all finds and structures together as one large ritual space for Isiac worship.952 The two canals in the peristyle and the garden, for instance, Della Corte considered as representations of the Nile, the amphorae in the garden played a part in Nile water libations, whereas a room with a painting of a priest served as a ritual space for Isis, etc. Tran tam Tinh, de Vos, Wild, Hales and others followed this train of thought which subsequently was reflected in more recent and general studies as well.953 Clarke states that: ‘room f is of exceptional quality and contains several possible references to the cult of Isis’. Hales calls the room an “Isiac sacellum”, while Platt mentions that “The sacro-idyllic structures of the garden and portico (tempietti, aediculae and nymphaea) and the room decorated with Isiac paintings point to cult and ritual more than is usual in a domestic Roman house.”954 Whereupon did Della Corte base his statement that had such a profound impact? Principally, on a single painting encountered in Room f depicting an Isiac priest holding a sistrum. (fig. 16b). Although there is a connection to Isis, the explanation of the room as a cult room devoted to Isis seems rather doubtful on the basis of one small painted figure, let alone when drawing the entire house and its finds into this context and declaring the pater familias an Isis priest. Although Tronchin, after looking carefully into all paintings and artefacts of

951 Della Corte 1932; 1965, 374.
952 See Della Corte 1932, especially 196-200.
954 See Platt 2002, 88. Although it is mention here Isiac paintings are spread throughout the room, in fact it only contains one painting.
the house, presents a much more nuanced picture of the house and its
owners, she still holds that followers of the Isis cult must have lived here:
“While the Egyptian artifacts and the various references to Egypt in the Casa
di Octavius Quartio made these exotic and fashionable references, they
probably also indicated that the owner of the house was a devotee of Isis,
though not a priest of her cult.”\textsuperscript{955} The nuance here lies in the fact that the
house owner is not a priest but still an adept of the Isiac cult.

The two discussions on cult and exoticism in relation to Egyptian artefacts
conjoin pleasantly in this case study. The objective is therefore to try to
carefully re-place the Egyptian artefacts within the context of the house,
while analysing the objects more closely as well as the context,
configuration, iconography, and material of the finds. At the same time
Egyptian artefacts must not be dealt with as belonging to a similar category.
Moreover, any \textit{a priori} interpretations about their use and perception should
not occur. In the coming sections the material and rooms will be discussed,
where after the analysis of the house and its contents will take place in
accordance with the method of place-making.

\textbf{5.3.2 Description and discussion of the Egypt-connected finds from the
Casa di Octavius Quartio

\begin{table}[h!]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
Object & Subject & Material & Ref. no. & Find location \\
\hline
Figurine\textsuperscript{955} & Bes with the head of a baboon & Blue-green glaze & PMS 10613 B & Viridarium (behind the space south of the triclinium) \\
\hline
Figurine & Bes & Blue-green glaze & MNN 2897 & Northwest corner of the small peristyle garden \\
\hline
Figurine & Pharaoh & Blue-green glaze & MNN 2898 & Northwest corner of the small peristyle garden \\
\hline
Figurine & Sphinx & Marble (white) & PMS 2930 & Midpoint of the upper canal, north of the basin \\
\hline
Painting & Isiac priest & & & Room f, south wall, east side \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{All the objects connected to Egypt found in the Casa di Octavius Quartio.}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{955} See Tronchin 2006, 344.
\textsuperscript{956} The figurine belongs to this house, see Di Goia 2006. However, it is not mentioned in
Tronchin 2006. Because di Goia mentions that the statuette is found behind the space
south of the triclinium, she points to the space at the canal, this was however, not a
viridarium. It might mean that she meant west of the triclinium, in this case the statuette
would have been found at the same location as the other faience figurines.
Firstly, in order to construct a proper foundation for this analysis, the Egyptian objects found in the house will be discussed in the light of the previous research. The objects are presented in table 5.6., their location in the house is indicated in fig. 5.15. In brief they consist of five items (generally accepted as linked to Egypt) and two objects maintaining a weaker link to Egypt, one by means of iconography, the other by its context.957 The ‘ascertained Aegyptiaca’ consist of (a) a figure of an Isis priest (from the example above), (b) a marble statue of a sphinx in Egyptian style, and (c) statuettes of Bes and a Pharaoh consisting of blue-green glaze, together with five more blue/green-glazed fragments of bases (some with feet) that could not be iconologically identified. The two more ‘difficult’ objects consist of a marble statue of an ibis (found together with the blue/green-glazed objects in the small peristyle garden) and a bronze lamp depicting Jupiter-Ammon encountered in the kitchen of the house. Looking at the general overview of finds from the house presented in table 5.6, the first thing to be noted is the variation of both objects and contexts in with the objects were found compared to the previous house of the Amorini Dorati. They are found in three separated locations in the house, both indoors and outside, also, they display a variety of objects that is characterising for the overall finds connected to Egypt within Pompeii, which raises the question whether a single concept of Egypt was present within the employment of these objects. It is therefore interesting to see this variation present in a single unit.

The first object, mentioned above in the light of Della Corte’s interpretation of the house, is the painting of an Isis priest, located in room f (see plan in fig. 5.15 and fig. 5.16a-b), of which the function is somewhat obscure. The room is decorated in late Fourth Style rendered in a high quality, consisting of large white panels depicting small floating figures and medallions. The larger representations in the central panels, sadly, have been removed and their location therefore remains unknown. The Isis priest figure is portrayed on the south wall. His head is traditionally shaven, he wears a white garment holding a sistrum in the right hand and a situla in the other, as could also be observed with the paintings of priests in the sanctuary of Isis.958 It is not usual to depict Isis priests (albeit that we see sistra more often). Moreover, a graffito was found written beneath the painting (no longer

957 Both are not Egyptian artefacts. In spite of previous interpretations, it is unclear whether they were utilised or perceived as Egyptian.
958 Reference numbers 8922 and 8969, now displayed in the Museo Nazionale di Napoli.
visible today) and probably read ‘Amulius Faventinus Tiburs’. The graffito resulted in the statement of the owner being an Isiac priest. However, is it likely to presume that the name would refer to one of the inhabitants of the house?

If it was the owner, or a close relative, it would not have been necessary to write his name underneath the picture. The connection seems questionable. It is equally plausible, that by means of a joke, someone wrote the name of an Isis priest he or she knew beneath a decoration of an Isis priest that was

---

959 See CIL IV 7534; Vidman 1969, no. 490; Tran tam Tinh, 125-6, no. 5; Bricault 2005,504/0214. Clarke, however, states it could also have been ‘Amplus Alumnus Tiburs’, which means ‘the illustrious disciple Tiburs’, see Clarke 1991, 196.

960 See Della Corte 1932, 192.

961 As presumed in Spinazzola 1953, 427-29.
painted there with no particular reason else than decoration.\textsuperscript{962} As mentioned, only one out of ten panels in the room includes anything Isis related, but it nevertheless led Della Corte to believe that the entire space should be seen as a cult room.\textsuperscript{963} The error observed in his argument, and that of Tronchin, is not only by linking the function of the house and its inhabitants to one small painting, but also the fact it is still assumed that ‘things Egyptian’ automatically connect to Isis. In the light of the previous analyses within this dissertation, the house of Octavius Quartio actually does not follow any of the rules that could be observed regarding the veneration of Isis in a domestic context. We encounter no house shrine paintings, no statues of Isis or other Egyptian gods, no sistra, no lamps, no amulets. In fact, the painting of the Isiac priest is the only direct connection to Isis. On the other hand, the Octavius Quartio house presents a rather atypical domestic context in general while it does not follow standard housing patterns; no shrine has been attested at all. However even then it remains interesting, that such a profound conclusion on the house, its owners, and contents was reached on the basis of so little and unpersuasive evidence. If it comes down to cultic references in sculpture, these are far better represented by Dionysus than Isis, and when wall painting is considered, the deity which is mostly depicted is Diana, while there is no single painting of Isis.\textsuperscript{964} No scholar has related the house owner to Dionysian mysteries or to the cult of Diana. Again, Egypt seems to be discriminated again because many scholars still regard it as a deviant category. Therefore all Egyptian things were connected to the Isis cult, whereas the Dionysian sculpture could be interpreted as adornment. A directive for this specific section is therefore to contextualise and balance the \textit{a priori} cultic interpretation of the artefacts.

\textsuperscript{962} Was it not more probable that even in the case it was a name that should refer to the picture, it was a name of a known priest or follower of Isis not related to the house? Or that it was a joke?
\textsuperscript{963} See Della Corte 1931, 192.
\textsuperscript{964} Tronchin considers the possibility the owners were Egyptian: “Another possibility, though one that stretches the imagination, is that someone living in this area of the house was actually of Egyptian descent, and arranged for the statuettes and paintings to be placed here almost as a \textit{memento patriae}.” see Tronchin 2006, 51-2.
What was seen on the remaining walls of this room? There are figures on the west wall opposite the main entrance, among which the central panel of the room (probably containing the most important figures of the painting) are lost. The northern wall has two heavily damaged panels and depicts a personification of the summer season. On the southern wall we see the Isiac priest, and a personification of the autumn. The other discernible figures represent so-called Dionysian portrait medallions. On the east wall a maenad offers a drink to Silenus, while another maenad drinks from a cup on the west wall (see fig. 5.16a).\textsuperscript{965}

Because of this small painting of the priest not only the use, but also the gender of the user of the room was inferred. It was identified as a space used by the patroness of the house, guided mainly by the idea that Isis was predominantly popular amongst women.\textsuperscript{966} Tronchin, who follows Clarke’s interpretation, states: “The concentration of Egyptian iconography in room $f$ and the garden might suggest that the residents of this area of the house were devoted to the cult of Isis. The cult was especially popular among Roman women. Given the “feminine” iconography of room $f$—which includes female personifications of the seasons and Venus—it may be argued that this was a

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[\textsuperscript{965}] See \textit{PPM} III, 70-9.
\item[\textsuperscript{966}] See Clarke 1991, 196.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
space primarily used by the matriarch of the family who may have also been a member of the popular Isiac cult in Pompeii.\textsuperscript{967}

This interpretation is problematic for the following reasons: firstly, a single portrait of a priest does not denote ‘a concentration of Egyptian iconography’, it is only one small picture and it is Isiac, not Egyptian in iconography. Secondly, the cult of Isis is no longer defined as a cult mainly followed by women, it was popular among male and female followers from diverse social strata\textsuperscript{968} Lastly, the discussion on gendered spaces in Roman houses is equally perilous and making a connection between painting and gender, is an even more dangerous projection than the classification Egyptian. The fact that there are a number of women depicted on the walls does not say that the room was used by a woman.

---

\textsuperscript{967} See Tronchin 2006, 51-2.
\textsuperscript{968} See 4.4.

---

Fig. 5.17) Statuettes of Bes and a Pharaoh (from Tronchin 2006, after Della Corte 1932, fig. 38). These statues were destroyed after the Allied Forces bombed the Pompeian storage rooms during World War II. From Tronchin 2006 45, fig. 38.
The second group of objects consists of the green-glazed statuettes in the northwest corner of the small peristyle garden (g, see plan in fig. 5.15). It counts a figurine of a pharaoh and of Bes, as well as at least five other figurines of the same material. Only photographs and descriptions of these two statuettes remain (see fig. 5.17). The chance they were also imported from Memphis, as almost all of their chemically analysed equals were derived from 4.4, can be considered plausible. According to Tronchin, (who follows the central thesis of Swetnam-Burland seen in part 5.1.4), whether or not the statues were imports is of no real importance, the significance lies in the fact that they "were clearly intended to appear Egyptian...By nature of their material, style, subject matter, the statuettes of Bes and a pharaoh would have been Egyptian to the eyes of any visitor to this house." When one can assume it is imported from Egypt, the chance the owners were aware of this fact can indeed be argued. They were all placed together in the same location implying it can be fairly safe to say this was done on purpose and that the owners had a concept of Egypt in mind which was linked to this group. The Pharaoh as an individual sculpture is significant in this respect, as it is the only statuette of this kind giving voice to such iconography. Would people have recognised a portrait of a pharaoh? Only two other references are found, both within domestic contexts: paintings of pharaoh statues in the triclinium of Casa di Bracciale d'Oro (VI 17, 42) and in the Casa di Frutetto (I 9,5). No other statues are known. The statuette from the Casa di Octavius Quartio wears an Egyptian shendyt (a kilt-like garment made of cloth and worn around the waist) and a nemes (a striped head cloth), typically worn by pharaohs. Although it has been argued that the dress of Egyptian immigrants in Italy may have been known to the residents of Pompeii (as Tronchin 2006, 51 argues), this is highly doubtful. First of all it not likely that immigrants from Egypt would in general have continued to wear traditional Egyptian clothing in Pompeii. Furthermore, as the nemes was exclusively worn by pharaohs, symbolising his divine power, it would never have been worn by common Egyptians.

969 Five bases were found, all with traces of feet, and thus the largest assemblage of green-glazed statuettes attested in Pompeii. All were destroyed when the Pompeii Antiquario, where the statuettes were stored, was bombed in 1945, see Tronchin 2006, 45.
970 See section 4.4 (table 4.14) after the chemical analysis of Mangone et al. 2011.
971 See Tronchin 2006, 49.
972 See figs. 4.21, 4.22 and section 4.5.3 for a discussion on these paintings.
973 "The group of these two statuettes would have conjured up a foreign land populated by unusual figures (the appearance of dress of Egyptian immigrants in Italy might have been known to the residents of Pompeii)". See Tronchin 2006, 50.
The iconography may therefore be difficult to be the sole identifier of the statue to view as something Egyptian. In this case the material, as discussed in 4.4, does play an important role, as does the fact that it contains a larger number of statuettes. All the objects in the peristyle garden consisted of green glaze, which may have been more important than that which they represented. Two questions arise in terms of perception that should be a separated guide the interpretation. What was the effect of these statuettes on the viewer? What were its values to the owner? It is mentioned about the objects they once were: “Allusions to a mysterious and distant land, peculiar religious practices, magic, and even the aping of the Egyptomania of Early Imperial style are all elements conveyed by statuettes like these glazed terracotta ones.” It is the same statement as made by Swetnam-Burland about the threshold with hieroglyphs from Casa del Doppio Larario (discussed in part 5.1.4), that people would have immediately recognised that something was Egyptian, and that it was therefore considered magical and powerful.

The third object, a marble sphinx (discussed in part 4.5.5), was found together with many other white marble sculptures along the upper canal in the peristyle (Fig. 5.18), also called the ‘upper Euripus’. The sphinx consists of white marble and made in a characteristic Egyptian style. It is reclining, has the body of the lion, the head of a human being (pharaoh), wears a nemes and is male. A small bronze boss depicting the face of a gorgon is placed between its paws. Although it has been argued that the marble clarifies the Italian origin (imported Egyptian statues were normally made of coloured stone), this does not necessarily be true. Indeed the time of Ramses (i.e., during the New Kingdom) small white limestone statuettes such as this are known in Egypt.

---

974 See Tronchin 2006, 50.
975 Although Tronchin 2006 states that the material is unusual for Egyptian objects, white coloured sphinx statuettes are known to be from Egypt. For the context of Rome and Tivoli, see Roullet 1972; Lembke 1991.
Many questions can be raised concerning this statuette which are considered of interest in the discussion on the use and perception of things Egyptian. Would the location between other Graeco-Roman-themed sculpture for instance argue against Egypt as ‘something special’ and something that should be ‘set apart’ in Roman contexts? Does it call the recognisability of Egypt as stylistic feature into question or the importance of its style? What is the difference between this context and the green-glazed statuettes? The statuette was already dealt with (see 4.5) as an argument of the multifaceted associations surrounding artefacts and the way in which these associations influenced the integration of ‘exotica’ in the environment of Pompeii. The cognitive associations with this particular statue, as argued, were much more complex than merely ‘something Egyptian’. When the context and social significance of the statuette is analysed here this should be the starting point of interpretation.

This section contains two objects that are in some way also connected to Egypt, but not always included as Aegyptiaca. First of all the statue of a bird which the excavators described as “un ibis avente sul petto una serpe in atto di beccarlo”. It was found in the small peristyle garden together with the green-glazed statuettes (fig. 5.19a).\textsuperscript{976} This is a difficult case, because the

\textsuperscript{976} Giornale degli Scavi, Tronchin 2006, no 94
identification of the bird statue as an ibis may have been based mainly on the fact it was discovered together with the Egyptian statuettes and clearly differs from other ibis depictions as well as other statues of ibises encountered in Pompeii. For this reason Tronchin stated that the identification of the bird as an ibis was 'erroneous' and she opted instead for the statue to signify a heron. However, the context of the house shows clearly that too strictly applied iconographical interpretations might not be helpful. There can be a discrepancy, between what objects represent to us, and what people thought it represented in Pompeii (emic vs. etic). And even if although people that know a thing or two about different bird species might have known it was a heron and not an ibis, how do we know for sure that the owners knew, or cared? The concept of an ibis, although it was present in wall painting, was of course not that strong in Pompeii as ibises did not exist in Italy. Moreover, it seems that the concept of ibises and herons might be quite blurred, as both birds can be observed in Roman wall painting fighting snakes. The ibis appears frequently in Nilotic scenery (fourteen paintings, one mosaic), now and again accompanied by snakes. An identifiable statue consisting of rossò antico representing an ibis with a similar snake coiled around its beak resembling the statue of the Casa di Octavius Quartio was found in Rome. In terms of perception, therefore, the interpretation of an ibis cannot be excluded, despite the iconographical characteristics.

The final object, a lamp decorated with a portrait of Jupiter-Ammon, was found in the kitchen of the house (fig. 5.19b) and is one of the objects interpreted by Della Corte to be used during Isiac rites. Tronchin does not follow this interpretation but notes that: “The two bronze lamps indeed are

977 Statues encountered in Egypt depict the ibis in black and white, with a smooth head, wings, and a body from no feathers protrude as with this statue. They have long necks, long, thin, and curved beaks, and long legs. The Isis temple also includes such an ibis. This painting is to be found in an inaccessible part of the sanctuary and therefore not open to the public. However, the renowned painting of the Isiac ritual from Herculaneum, the ibis statues from the Casa di Marcus Lucretius, the Nilotic mosaic from the threshold of the exedra in the Casa del Fauno (VI 12,2) and the Nilotic painting from Room 9 of the Casa delle Nozze d'Argento (V 2, i) present ibises in exactly the same way.

978 See Tronchin 2006, 160. Herons also feature in the art of Pompeii, but only attested in wall painting. Room 11 of the Casa della Venere in Conchiglia (II 3,3) includes a heron, the lower north wall of the triclinium in the Complesso dei Riti magici (II 1,12) counts several. Although they do not resemble the statue of the Casa di Octavius Quartio, the herons of the Domus M. Assili (VI 7, 18) do and also attacks a snake. The heron from the Casa degli Epigrammi Greci (V 1,18) is represented with a cobra.

979 Now on display in the Villa Albani, see Bol 1994, no. 511, 384-6.

980 See Della Corte 1931, 182-216.
decorated with motifs that does point to some relationship with Egypt. One had a protome of Zeus-Ammon, the other a lotus flower and a phallus.”⁹⁸¹ They did not have a religious function per se but were: “probably just more examples of the depth of Egyptomania in Roman visual culture in the first century C.E.”⁹⁸²

Fig. 5.19a-b) The ibis statue, found together with the green-glazed figures in the small peristyle garden (from Spinazzola 1928, fig. 62) and b) the bronze lamp depicting Jupiter-Ammon found in the kitchen (from Tronchin 2006, 358, fig. 15).

This line of reasoning would again point to a conscious incorporation of all Egyptian objects, as the term Egyptomania implies a deliberate choice for things Egyptian, whereas it has already been argued one must be careful in this respect. According to the Egyptomania thesis, the object (i.e., all the objects deemed ‘Egyptian’ kept in the house) became part of a mania in which it was solely purchased because it was Egyptian. As became clear in part 4.2, it remains doubtful whether Jupiter-Ammon was really considered Egyptian and quite uncertain whether everything was intentionally purchased for this reason. Looking at the contexts in which examples of Jupiter-Ammon are attested, there is no clue at all he was consciously used or perceived as something Egyptian in Pompeii. There is no single connection between Jupiter-Ammon and Isis neither in the sanctuary nor in any of the

⁹⁸¹ See Tronchin 2006, 293. The bronze lamp with the lotus flower (2871) was found in or near the atrium.
⁹⁸² See Tronchin 2006, 293.
domestic contexts. Whenever Jupiter-Ammon appears in wall painting in Pompeii it is always as an individual and separate figure or object.\(^{983}\) In this specific case, when looking at the lamp in fig. 5.19b, the identifiable trait of Jupiter-Ammon, the two horns are not even present but broken off.

As argued above, regarding the previous interpretations of the finds, the largest problem is that Egypt is still taken as a single concept, while this house - even prior to the analysis - clearly displays a large diversity in employment and the diversity of concepts and objects involved which do not seem to be cognitively (emically) related to each other. However, all things recognised as Egyptian by archaeologists should automatically belong together. Tronchin’s note contains a revealing example of this ‘upheaping’ of Egypt: “It would appear that the owner of the house was attempting to create a sort of shrine of Isis or Egyptian theme park in this area. If so, why did he not place the sphinx statuette from the upper canal here in the small peristyle? If the river god is indeed meant to depict the Nile, why also is it not situated with the other Egyptian and Egyptianizing statuettes?”\(^{984}\) Because all objects indicate a link to Egypt (to the researcher), they must logically belong together and be able to be understood as if they provide a similar representation, a similar meaning, and a similar feature. As was mentioned, because of one small painting of a priest Della Corte not only interpreted the room with the painting to be a shrine dedicated to Isis (an opinion many scholars still follow), but also concluded that the presence of amphorae in the garden was a manifestation of Isisic water rituals connected to the Nile, a marble statue of a heron was an ibis, a marble statue of a river personified the Nile, and that the two water canals in the garden were representations of the Nile. All the appearances of Egypt in house, which Della Corte interprets as Isisic behaviour and Tronchin as exotic eclecticism, should according to previous research belong to the same concept of Egypt.

\(^{983}\) Another example is Zeus-Ammon is depicted on a terracotta triple lamp with a handle in the shape of a crescent. It is decorated with the head of Jupiter Ammon and an eagle from the Casa di Fabius Rufus (VI 16, 19). Another bronze lamp originates from the Casa di Paquius Proculus (I 7,1): a bronze candelabrum with Ammon lamp soldered to its upper part: SAP 3244 (Candelabrum) and 3244a (Lamp). In wall painting Zeus-Ammon appears as a small medallion on the walls of the atrium and the large triclinium of the Casa del Menandro (I 10,4).

\(^{984}\) Tronchin 2006, 51, 98 also states: “The sphinx statuette’s position along the upper canal is an unusual one. It would appear from the presence of the faience statuettes in the small peristyle garden that the owner of the house was attempting to create a sort of “Egyptian garden” or shrine in that area. It would have been more logical to have placed the sphinx in that area of the house in order to accentuate the exotic connotations of the garden.”
These are generalised interpretations of what in fact belongs to much more complex and different processes and phenomena. It is a traditional reading of Egyptian material culture in Roman contexts such as was deconstructed in the previous chapter. However, as was argued in part 5.1, after a more general deconstruction of object and concept the actual context should still be taken into account to allow for social interpretations and concepts that were present surrounding these objects. It cannot be ruled out beforehand that a concept relating to Egypt, or a concept such as exoticism, played a role within use. What one should attempt to retrieve by means of contextual analysis are the owner’s ideas and applications concerning these statues, how the impression on the viewer was made (or not made).

In a house that at first glance seemed to have dealt with Egypt very consciously, it could be observed after a closer look that this is not at all without problems. The spread, the use of material, and the use of iconography of objects are dispersed and supposedly connect too many concepts and forms of Egypt instead of just being an exotic allusion to a distant country. A firm contextual treatment of these objects in comparison with other objects found in the house is therefore required.

5.3.3 History and discussion of the rooms and remaining finds of the house
The Casa di Octavius Quartio is located within Region 2 in Pompeii. It was not a very densely populated area, as the amphitheatre and palaestra occupied a large quantity of space. Consequently, more space was devoted to agri- and viticulture. This can be seen for instance, by the large villa estate of Julia Felix that completely took up insula 4. The Casa di Octavius Quartio was named after the inscription on a signet ring found in shop adjacent to the house. As mentioned in the introduction, Spinazzola excavated the house between 1918 and 1921. His book on the Via dell’Abbondanza was published posthumously. It can be considered one of the larger houses in Pompeii, occupying almost an entire insula. Because of the number of sculptures attested, the architectural features, and the decoration of the house, its owner had probably acquired a considerable fortune. The first construction phase encountered dates from the 4th or 3rd century BC.

During this earliest phase the house still consisted of a double atrium house

---

985 Considered a more likely owner than Loreius Tibertinus, the house was renamed in this manner.
986 Spinazzola 1953.
987 PPM III, 42-3.
as can also still be seen today, for instance, at the Casa del Fauno. The second atrium (House II 2,4) was separated from the building after the reconstruction phase in 62 AD. The atrium plan shows a typical traditional 2nd century BC Italic layout, while the peristyle is clearly added to the house at a later date and displays a more playful and dynamic way of dealing with space. It is more difficult to divide the house into separate zones as could be done for the Casa degli Amorini Dorati in the previous case study. It is unclear for instance, where the service area was located in the Casa di Octavius Quartio (probably on the first floor). Both houses have in common that their most important space is the peristyle and not the atrium. This development, as mentioned, is common to the later phases of Pompeian upper middle class houses. However, the atrium of the Casa di Octavius Quartio is much more spacious, and better preserved and maintained. Its atrium also offered the so-called visual axis through the house. As with the Casa degli Amorini Dorati, the Casa di Octavius Quartio was renovated between the 62 AD earthquake and 79 AD and was still partly under construction at the time of the eruption. In this respect the two houses are furthermore comparable, in both cases the garden area is the most prominent space and most important for displaying objects of aesthetic value, with lavish finds of high quality (in all cases mostly made out of marble) and rooms that were aimed at entertaining guests. As with the Amorini Dorati, a visitor-inhabitant relationship is fundamental for the structuring of the house. Both plans are open and seem easily penetrated. However, looking closer at the finds, decoration, and configuration an entirely different spectrum of structuring of behaviour and negotiation of privacy and hierarchy is revealed. Another interesting difference between the two houses consists of the sculptural finds. The Casa di Octavius Quartio has no marble reliefs or oscillae at all, whereas the Casa degli Amorini Dorati counts a large number. The Casa di Octavius Quartio, on the other hand, houses more statues. Another point of interest is the emphasis the Casa di Octavius Quartio placed on water (features) in comparison to the Casa degli Amorini Dorati. A significant amount of space in the peristyle was taken up by canals and fountains in the Casa di Octavius Quartio. A canal in the garden runs from one end to the other whereas the Casa degli Amorini Dorati has only one modest fountain in the middle of the peristyle.

988 Tronchin 2006, following Maiuri 1947.
989 See Maiuri 1942, 153.
Atrium

After entering by means of a small stairway and a vestibule with two incorporated stone benches and moving towards to the large and spacious fauces (of which the paint is no longer visible) one reached an impressive atrium space. The wooden doors of the entrance are preserved by means of plaster casts. The classic Tuscan atrium, as stated above, includes the time-honoured Italic design of the 2nd century BC. Six rooms flank the atrium space. Two rooms at the front revealed commercial activities taking place around the house, one of which (II, 2, 1) PPM, has been identified as a wine shop (popina). No sculptures were found in the atrium of the house, which again reminds us of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati. The pavement consisted of a cocciopesto floor with regularly hexagonal shaped inserted pieces of white marble.

Rooms 3 and 4, the first two rooms, are defined as cubicula. Its painted decorations in the Fourth Style have now almost disappeared from the walls. However, the plaster stucco was in a state of restoration when Mount Vesuvius erupted. In Room 3 a small oven was found which may point to the production of small vases or, as has also been suggested, a temporary studio for the restoration and refurbishment of the walls in the atrium rooms. All the rooms surrounding the atrium are in a poor state of preservation. Several still include some First Style wall decoration in the form of architectural cornices (Room 3). Room c contains examples of Fourth Style decoration, in casu landscapes and birds against a yellow background framed by a red band. Remains of furniture were encountered in this room. Room a also housed Fourth Style wall paintings. Sadly, on the 19th of September 1943, a bomb destroyed nearly all examples of the Fourth Style decorations in the central cubiculum which were located on the north and west wall, and part of the south wall. The Rape of Europa by Zeus was only partially damaged and restored. The remaining walls include black panels against a red background depicting mythological scenes of a fishing Venus and Narcissus alternating with soldiers. Room b is the best preserved room in the atrium. It was coloured in red paint and portrays floating warrior figures in the centre. Room 5 (no painting has survived here) probably had a utilitarian function during the most recent phase of the house, as it provided a passageway to Room 7, the kitchen, and the latrine.

991 I.e., a piece of a chest and the remains of a chair.
992 See Tronchin 2006, 11-2, Garcia y Garcia 1998, 2.1136
This kitchen housed several interesting finds: the high quality bronze candelabrum with a bronze lamp decorated with a mask of Jupiter-Ammon (fig. 15) and a large bronze vase with a human finger on its handle. They were found among other vessels and a tripod. Perhaps the kitchen also served as a storage room. The atrium had an impluvium, including a first hint to the owner’s love for plants, water, and garden features. The impluvium is surrounded by a masonry wall that was utilised as a planting box. The four flanks of the walls and the centre of the impluvium contained fountains.

*The peristyle and portico space*

The most radical innovations after 62 AD took place behind the atrium space. Here the conventional alae and tablinum rooms were converted into a small peristyle and a portico garden, with canals, nymphaeum, and a biclinium. The house thus lacked a tablinum, which is unusual for this period. Did the main activities taking place in the house not require a tablinum? The owners were not short of money as a large reconstruction was still going on in 79 AD. A change in the social or economic situation prior to the reconstruction in 62 AD must have taken place in order to have such a profound modification carried out. After entering the space from the atrium one arrived in a small portico and peristyle garden (g). The small garden (in which the statuettes of Bes, the pharaoh, and the bird statuettes were located) was enclosed by means of a portico of columns on all sides with the exception the south side. The walls of the garden walkway were painted in black and red Fourth Style. In the centre of the garden are remains of two planting beds. Surrounding the peristyle and garden terrace were four rooms: d, e, f at the west side, and a larger room h that served as a dining room on the east side of the peristyle. According to Tronchin 2006 the peristyle was initially larger to be reduced after the 62 AD-construction (or rebuilding) of Rooms d, e and f. Rooms d, e, and f were all decorated in the Fourth Style. Room d had a white background including tondi and landscape pinakes. Room e was painted in yellow and contained hunting scenes with leopards. A mosaic formed the threshold which was later incised by means of a white marble threshold of which the door could be closed off. Room f (as discussed, the room in which the painting of an Isis priest was found) was the final room on the west side. Again the main colour was white.

---

993 See Tronchin 2006, 12.
994 See Jashemski 1993, 78.
(as with Room d). It contained small floating figures (one of which was the Isiac priest) as well as a two-faced medaillon on the east wall and a medaillon of a maenad with a raised glass on the west side. Although the entrance of Room f could be reached from the small portico in the peristyle, the exit ended in the portico garden and looked out at the eastern end of the upper canal. The room had two columns as an entrance. From the other side it almost resembled a temple. The exterior of the eastern wall included large portraits (presumably in order to be visible from the biclinium) of Diana (left) and Actaeon (right).

Room h copies Room f in the sense that the access was from the peristyle and that it ended in the portico-garden space. However, the opening of this room was on the lower, not on the upper canal. Clearly the most important room in the space, as it is the largest and the most central. It houses the most distinguished wall painting in which nothing Egyptian is represented. This Fourth Style wall painting contains clear elements of previous styles which are interwoven in order to create an innovation. The lower frieze depicts marble imitations (First Style), whereas the large frieze includes mythological scenes echoing the Third Style.

As mentioned above, after leaving Room h or f, or when walking through Room g behind the peristyle, along the rear of the house, one would enter a vine-covered portico on a raised terrace. This terrace ran on an east-west axis and was centred by means of a water canal measuring 1 m. wide, 1,4 m. deep and 20 m. long. The wall on the northern side parallel to the canal included large hunting scenes against a white background divided by means of a red frame. Along the eastern half of the canal, a large number of marble sculptures were placed (see table 5.10). In the middle of the canal a bridge (located at the axis of the opening of Room h and the lower canal) ended in an architectural structure denoted as the tempietto, a small temple-like structure containing a water feature. Alongside the small temple, there were two statues of muses: Polyhymnia and Mnemosyne (or Erato). Next to these statues, there are four marble bases (one on the west and three on the east side). It could be assumed they once carried statues. At the eastern end of the upper canal, a biclinium (k) was divided by means a niche with a water feature. It is also referred to as the Corinthian Aedicula because of the small columns with Corinthian capitals that adorn the niche. The biclinium niche is decorated with two figure paintings just above the couches Narcissus on

995 See note 955 for a description of the paintings.
996 Von Stackelberg 2009.
the left and Pyramus and Thisbe on the right. The paintings consist of large panels against a red background. Below the panels we see painted shrubs with small leaves. Behind the outdoor biclinium lay an area described and interpreted by the excavators as a 'stalla’ i.e., a room in which to stall horses or other animals.

Garden
The large garden which takes up most of the space of the house could be reached by means of a stairway on the eastern side of the portico, next to the so-called tempietto. It has presumably always been a part of house in this form. At any rate it was constructed on virgin soil and does not include any earlier structures. It has been suggested that the garden produced flowers on a commercial level and that the water served as a fish pond for similar motifs (see fig. 5.20). However, canals were too small and shallow in order to breed fish at this level. Moreover, due to the lack of the so-called ‘strawberry

pots’, the idea of the garden being a flower plantation was refuted. However, the absence of these pots does not exclude any growing of plants. Tronchin 2006 argues that plants and flowers would have grown in the garden in order to allude to the exotic and lavish atmosphere of the premises. The 50 m. long canal running from one end to the other in the garden emphasises the visual north-south axis of the house. On both sides of the canal, parallel rows of holes indicate the presence of long narrow walkways either covered with vines or flanked by trees. On the north end of the canal, an elaborate nymphaeum (just below the tempietto) is flanked on both sides by means a painting of Diana (left) and Actaeon (right), as with the exterior of Room f. Water flowed from a fountain statue of a cupid holding a theatre mask, down marble steps into the canal.

The lower canal was divided by means of three architectural structures, the first (at c.2/3 of the canal) consists of a pool covered by means of a pergola. The centre of the pool contains a fountain with four sets of marble steps placed on a central platform. The twelve (empty) bases surrounding the edge may have served as the bases for statues or fountains. On the eastern side of the pool a rectangular platform could be found. A masonry triclinium with the remains of a marble table (its two supports were found in situ but are now lost) served as the summer dining room before the biclinium was constructed. The second dividing structure consists of a small pavilion decorated in red paint with floral motifs. The excavators found a statue of a sleeping hermaphrodite (table 5.10, no. 16), located near the wall at the south end of the garden. Next, a final pergola followed.

The main part of the garden was taken up by vegetation. It is reported that the cavities nearest the side walls were caused by means of larger trees, behind which came rows of smaller trees or shrubs (see fig. 5.20). Paintings were also present, next to the channel on each side. Near the large trees on the eastern edge of the garden a row of fourty-four unbroken amphorae were attested, embedded in the soil. According to Tronchin, following Spinazzola, these were used to house delicate flowers and plants, although

---

998 Della Corte 1932, 190. Strawberry pots, as defined by Jashemski, were open mouthed vessels with holes in the body allowing plants to grow.
999 The canal in a garden is in part too a sign of romanitas. For the Roman proprietor, an aspect of pleasure as to his country estate was the way productive farming may be integrated into its decorative scheme: a meeting of agriculture and elegance.
1000 See Von Stackelberg 2009, 106.
1001 Von Stackelberg 2009, 106.
Jashemski disputes this point because of the narrow necks of the amphorae and the absence of holes common for flower pots.\footnote{See Jashemski 1979, 47. It is, however, believed that the amphorae once contained Nile water and that they were a special locus of Isiac worship in the house, see Della Corte 1932, 197-8.}

5.3.4 Place-making in the house: configuration, visibility, and movement

Concerning access analysis, although the house was not a part of Grahame’s aforementioned space syntax study, space syntax was used within studies on Roman gardens.\footnote{The house was therefore a prime example of access and control, see Von Stackelberg 2009, 101-7.} This was however, not combined with visibility and movement analyses. As to the configuration of the house, its spaces were subdivided into convex spaces and renumbered (see fig. 21a-d).\footnote{Space syntax theory dictates a division of the house into convex spaces. Here no lines between any two of its points cross the perimeter. It can therefore be considered to be experienced as an individual space. A room can have more convex spaces according to its shape. It is relevant to look at the way in which space is experienced more than regarding the actual measurements of the room. Consider the so-called topological features not the topographical ones.} The most important thing to note when considering the configuration of the house, is the divergence between the access of spaces in the Casa di Octavius Quartio and its visibility, especially when compared to the previous case study.\footnote{See Von Stackelberg 2009, 115.}

Whereas the Casa degli Amorini Dorati has a rather straightforward pattern when comparing visibility analyses with access graphs, the Casa di Octavius Quartio presents a genuinely more complex picture. The house of Octavius Quartio is visually open space, in the sense one can immediately see the rear of the house from the entrance, whereas the accessibility is very low (compare the access graph in fig. 5.21a with the visibility analysis in figs. 5.22a-c). The garden (no. 24 of the access graph) can be seen immediately upon entering the house, and remains its main visual focus. One is ‘drawn into it’ visually. However, at the same time configurationally, the garden is the most segregated and most inaccessible space of the premises. For a visitor to the house, many moments of permission were necessary before one could enter this space.

Two routes lead from the peristyle entrance (no. 13) to the garden (no. 24) as can be observed in the configuration of fig. 5.21c (indicated in red). However, the portico garden can also be reached from cubiculum $b$ and (from no. 10 to 15). Now space no. 13 can be circumvented. The garden is only to be reached either after passing through the eastern portico-space (no. 16) or Triclinium.
h (no. 18) and the upper part of the terrace, or through Room f (no. 21) and the lower terrace (no. 23). This implies that space no. 13, the entrance to the peristyle, is of relevance as it is a point where one chooses in which direction to go (the famed pause moment described in 5.1) or guided to. Although its control value is not as high as the atrium space, it can be considered the most important access provider from a social point of view. The high control value means that whenever it comes to social encounters and interaction, the atrium space is the most likely location for this to occur, as it provides access to most other spaces. However, although the entrance to the peristyle (no. 13) does not give way to most spaces, it does control the access to the social significant spaces. In terms of material culture, it is significant that this space contains the Egyptian statuettes. In fact, the first items to attract attention when entering this space are the green-glazed statuettes placed in the small garden because the peristyle garden immediately blocks the route.

Then there is a choice to go either to the left or to the right when not entering through cubiculum b. What does the differentiation in such routes inform us about the use of space? They most likely point to a social or functional distinction in the use of space. If it is assumed that the garden in potential is the least accessible space, and therefore also socially the most desirably space to go (the endpoint of intimacy is reached when a visitor is allowed to enter the least integrated space of the house). The first route (through spaces nos. 16, 18, 20, 22, and 23) is connected to a series of rooms associated with dining. Depending on the season the Triclinium h (no. 18) or the Biclinium (no. 22) is used. Because these two spaces are situated along the same route leading to an important end point (a desirable place) they do not really differentiate hierarchically (although syntactically the biclinium lays one step deeper than the triclinium

---

1007 This is another case in which the Roman house acts aberrantly in terms of social logic. The atrium loses its function as most important social hub, but changes into a semi-public commercial space while the attention shifts towards the peristyle spaces.
Table Access Graph of the Casa di Octavius Quartio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Real Asymmetry value</th>
<th>Relative Asymmetry value</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Control value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graph</td>
<td>MIN 0.53 MEAN 1.04 MAX 1.69 TOTAL 7</td>
<td>MIN 0.13 MAX 6.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrium (3)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peristyle (13)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triclinium h (18)</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room f (21)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden (24)</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The minimum control values belong to the Cubicula 3, 4, a, b, and c (corresponding to configuration nos. 7, 6, 9, 10, and 8) in the atrium.

Fig. 5.21a-d) Configuration of the Casa di Octavius Quartio (II 2,2). (a) the plan with the corresponding numbers (after Clarke 1991), (b) the access graph, (c) the two routes leading from the entrance of the peristyle to the garden and the two rings around Room f (21) and Room h (18), and (d) the accompanying table with spatial calculations.

Because they connect to the same important convex spaces (i.e., the garden portico), they both connect to a visual axis with a view on a temple-like structure (Room h looks out on the tempietto and Room k on the columns and paintings of Room f).

Their immediate outside view was on the upper canal with the marble sculpture. Moreover, whenever one was invited into a dining area the route to the garden becomes accessible in an equal amount of syntactical steps. It can be therefore be presumed that this part of the

---

1008 One may presume that the decoration on the exterior of Room f belongs more to those people on the other side of the room (such as the people in space k or in the large portico) than that it added up to the importance of Room f. It was important that both dining areas had a similar (hierarchically) view.
canal (convex space no. 20) is connected to the activity of dining and entertaining visitors. Access to the garden is also allowed on this side of the house, by means of no. 23, taking the stairs, probably especially for this reason positioned on the eastern side of the terrace left of the tempietto. It can thus be considered that the eastern part of the garden (divided in two by the lower canal) was also connected to the dining ritual. This inclusion in terms of activity probably consisted of walking or standing alongside the canal in between and after meals. It may also have included some form of entertainment. Important to note is that, only from this part the access to the garden became visible, and that from that point visitors could see the physical access to the garden which was carefully hidden before.\textsuperscript{1009} Access was therefore granted. Now the relationship between visitor and inhabitant was considered on an equal level or on a level in which the former was of a higher status than the latter.

As the summer and winter dining spaces were situated along this route, the path leading along Rooms $d$, $e$, and $f$ on the western side probably had a more private character. They also must have had a different function, or were only used by inhabitants of the house. The passageway from cubiculum $b$ underlines this thought, as the public spaces such as the triclinium and the portico garden can be completely circumvented by means of this route. This argument is also significantly reinforced when one regards the sculpture found alongside the upper canal. This completely centres on the eastern part of the water. This part belongs to the dining area and is practically empty around the western part. According to the reconstruction in Tronchin’s thesis the statue of a muse standing right to the fountain tempietto was the only sculpture positioned at the west side of the terrace (in contrast to at least eleven marble statues attested on the east side), which is the part connected to this route and Rooms $d$, $e$, and $f$.\textsuperscript{1010} Finally, although this side has a set of stairs as well, they are small, located at the very back of the western wall, and clearly not meant for visitors. Seemingly this house counted two quarters in which private and public matters were separated.

\textsuperscript{1009} This was comparable with the Casa degli Amorini Dorati, where the entrance to the garden could be witnessed when was allowed access to the western part of the portico.

\textsuperscript{1010} The statue of the muse belonged to the tempietto. On the east side it was flanked by the female statue of Polyhymnia and on the west side by the statue of the muse. The best vista on this statue was from Room $h$, the triclinium, which again points to a placement much guided by personal display, see Clarke 1991, fig. 115.
From the atrium, an entirely different route could be followed to the garden space (fig. 5.21c).

Looking at the public route of the premises, it is interesting from a social viewpoint that the garden is the most segregated and least accessible space. Within space syntax theory it is argued that the most desirable spaces to enter as visitors are those most segregated, because being granted access to those spaces implies the inhabitants rank the visitors highly (called the axis of honour). In most domestic contexts, these more segregated spaces are formed by private areas used by the owners; they often consist of the principal chambers, bedrooms, and bathrooms, which the visiting public is not supposed to enter. Supposedly, in the case of Roman atrium houses there is a similar succession of rooms of which the access is socially dependent. In that case it is interesting to note that in this house the garden forms the most segregated space, and that intentional actions were undertaken to carefully restrain access to it. However, it seems from the access graph (the main entrance to the garden is only on this side) that this space should be entered from the public side of the house (the dining zone), and not the more private one. This makes again clear how much this house (the Roman house in general) is aimed at visitors.

The existence of two different social zones within the peristyle area provides a first argument against grouping the Egyptian objects together conceptually. The painting of the priest was part of another, more private area of the house than the marble statue of the Egyptian sphinx and the faience statuettes of the peristyle garden. The latter group belonged to a first point of access into the peristyle, while the sphinx was physically connected to the dining ritual and (together with the other statues standing around the pool) served to make an impact on highly esteemed visitors to one of the two dining rooms.

**Visibility**

The Casa di Octavius Quartio has a visual axis running from the entrance to the rear of the house, implying that its complete scope can be seen at first glance. The general visibility analysis indicates, as discussed above, the visual openness in conjunction with the relatively difficult access to the

---

1011 As to medieval castles, for instance, it was discovered that a certain ‘axis of honour’ exists regarding accessibility. A ceremonial route to the principal chambers revealed itself in a tree-like path through a succession of rooms intended to filter out all but those of the highest rank, see Mol 2012, 55-6; Fairclough 1992, 355; Richardson 2003, 379.
garden. As can be observed in figs. 5.22a-c, all the visual focus is placed on the garden, especially on the eastern side. Witnessing such a large difference between visual access and physical access does not imply that one of the analyses is obscured, but that although movement is visually directed to the garden, physical boundaries obstruct this movement. It is an interesting interplay of access and display in which the status and wealth but most of all the owner’s power to control the space is showed, defining his relationship with the visitor when denying or granting access to certain parts of the house. Only when one removes the entire garden from the analysis and only includes the walkway around the lower canal does the atrium space present us with a more visually integrated picture. The visual focus in this case shifts towards the end of the pathways from the garden on the terrace (fig. 5.22a).

Fig. 5.22a-c) Three Visibility Graph Analyses of the Casa di Octavius Quartio. (a) the visibility when movement patterns through the garden are reconstructed, (b) here no reconstructed patterns only movement obstacles (e.g., impluvium, canopi) are left in its place implying that the visibility is directed towards movement, and (c) an illustration of visibility in the purest sense, whereby only visual obstacles (e.g., columns, walls above eyesight) are left in place.
One can further infer from the general visibility graphs that the most visually integrated space is the eastern side of the garden, no matter which physical obstructions are included (fig. 5.22b) or excluded (fig. 5.22c) in the analysis. The visual emphasis of the garden and the house was placed on the side the dining area was situated, indeed is a significant observation. Interaction (whether permitted or not) was directed towards this area, corresponding well to the more public character of this part of the house. Naturally, this means that the garden on the western side of the house had a more private character than the eastern side. It was also connected visually to the more private western part of the peristyle area (connected to rooms d, e, and f).

The part of the upper canal, where the marble statues were placed, was visually better integrated than the small peristyle with the green-glazed figurines (fig. 5.22c). Therefore they could be seen from more points in the house than the latter. However, the small peristyle would have been viewed more because it is situated in the centre of the two routes.

From which rooms and which points could the ‘Egyptian’ painting and sculptures best be observed? When the individual contexts of Egyptian material are regarded within visibility analysis, several points of interest can be noticed. Firstly, the painting of the Isis-priest in Room f can only be seen when one is physically in Room f, or in the door opening. It is not made to be seen by a larger audience than those present in the room. This does not count for the other contexts, which were consciously and explicitly presented in selected areas of the house. Although the marble sphinx was visible from more than one point within the house, the green-glazed statuettes were the first statues that could be seen when entering the peristyle area and must have made quite an impression.
Fig. 5.23a-e) Five Isovist analyses of the Casa di Octavius Quartio. Isovist (a) was made from the main entrance, presenting the vista extending to the rear of the house, (b) depicts the view from the entrance to the peristyle (convex space 13, see fig. 5.21a), (c) was made from Triclinium h, (d) from the biclinium, and (e) presents the vista from Room f, that houses the painting of the Isiac priest.

From the Triclinium h one could cast a glance upon the statuary around the upper canal. Interestingly this could occur only after entering the room, because the walls of the triclinium would block the view prior hereto. The sphinx statue could not be witnessed from this room, but from a certain angle one could have looked at the statues in the small peristyle.1012 However, the most prominent view from this room would have been the tempietto and its two accompanying statues of the muses, as argued in a reconstruction created by Clarke of the guest of honour’s view from Oecus h.1013 This stands in contrast to the biclinium, which had the sculpture and canal as its most important visual focus. It seems that both locations deliberately presented a different but aesthetically (made) important scene to look at while dining.

**Movement**

In the atrium space, as in more Roman houses in the imperial period a room which lost its importance to the peristyle area, people were assembled no matter their status. We can see this reflected in figure 5.24, which shows the Depthmap agent analysis for the house.

1012 The best places would of course have presented a view on the garden and the tempietto.
1013 See Clarke 2003, 227 fig. 131.
It remains unclear which specific activities normally took place in the atrium space, because at the time of the eruption, this part of the house was being renovated. As previously discussed, the movement patterns through this house are particularly intricate. As soon as the atrium is traversed it almost seems a maze with a constant vision of the disproportionately large garden but no sight on where to enter. Visitors invited for cena took the eastern route along the small peristyle garden and the green-glazed statues. No noticeable painting attracted any further attention until the Triclinium h was reached. The statuettes and the small garden were the ultimate eye catchers. Shortly afterwards one was lead into the Triclinium h.

The so-called ‘axis of honour’, already mentioned being a hierarchical route existing within buildings, would supposedly have lead from the entrance to the garden. In between boundaries were put up for those who could not gain further access to rooms situated deeper into the house. The atrium was the first moment where this occurred. People with a commercial interest who were not invited to cena or an important or intimate meeting would stop here. It remains unclear whether business was done in the form of salutatio
in this phase of the existence of the house. Matters concerning lower class business could have taken place in one of the cubicula in the atrium. If guests were granted further access they could proceed towards the peristyle space, where they were ushered to go either to the left, the east part of the house, or to the right to Rooms d, e, and f. Private matters (it is impossible to specify these, as no finds are able to interpret the function of these rooms) may have been dealt with in the more quiet western part of the peristyle. Any audience other than those invited to cena were presumably taken here. Relatives perhaps or appointments with a more intimate character in the case the guest was held in high regard. As to the specified graphs of the peristyle area (fig. 5.25a), it can be observed that the most visually integrated part of this area, when it comes to actual movement, is situated in the axis between the Triclinium h and the tempietto. The biclinium was a more secluded space and less easily accessed. It was of course a seasonal room only utilised during the summer.

Fig. 5.25a-c) Left: (a) a Visibility Graph Analysis directed towards movement in the peristyle area. Upper right (b): an Agent Analysis of the same area, with agents released randomly. Lower right (c): agents released from a selected location, the entrance to the peristyle area.

As to the agent analysis (see figs. 5.25b-c) the importance of the Triclinium h is again confirmed. The largest part of the direction is drawn to this room, rendering it and its visual axis the most significant focus of the whole area. The more interesting the case becomes when fig. 5.25c is regarded. In it one can observe that when the agents were released from the entrance, the
eastern side is easier traversed than the western side, being also the side to which visitors invited for dinner should end up. The higher values shown here have to do with the length of the sight lines and angle of approaching this space. Both are wider and longer on the eastern side. As people are internally programmed to follow the longest sight lines ahead and the most available space available, this route was probably more naturally followed than the western one, while the opposite was supposed to happen.\textsuperscript{1014} The placement of the green-glazed statuettes representing for example Bes and a pharaoh is of interest here. They were carefully placed at the north west part of the small garden (see the green square in fig. 5.26). First of all it strikes that the opening from the atrium to the peristyle reveals only a half of this garden, but that the width of the doorway makes it seem to be square instead of rectangular. This also the case when one looks at the garden from the Triclinium $h$.

![Fig. 5.26](image)

Fig. 5.26) The statuettes (visualised by means of the green square) cause one’s glance to be directed towards the Triclinium $h$ and the west part of the peristyle.

The fact that the statuettes are placed in this corner makes clear they belong to the east route leading from the atrium towards the garden, the eastern part of the peristyle area and the dining area, as was discussed above. However, it can be argued that this group of statuettes played an active role as well. They cause the visitor to glance towards the east part of the area and the triclinium (as indicated in fig. 5.26).\textsuperscript{1015} It thereby stops people from

\textsuperscript{1014} See Turner and Penn 2002.

\textsuperscript{1015} This implies that the statuettes were not considered the prime pieces of sculpture, as they were not placed in the dining area. However, they were important with regard to that materialized pause discussed in 5.1. The marble statues at the upper canal did not belong to a transitional space and formed a reward to someone who was considered important enough to be invited to dinner.
moving towards the east part, but towards the place they are meant to arrive: the dining area. An eye catcher was necessary in order to attract the attention towards the east side and move people away from the west side. Were these green-glazed statuettes more suitable for this task than other material, or other iconography? They definitely caught one’s eye and made a strong first impression by means of their appearance and number (a total of seven green-glazed statuettes were counted) as will be discussed in the following section on object analysis. In any case, in terms of movement and of Markers, this example is a telling one, and shows the way in which material and space work together in order to structure behaviour.

Once people were allowed to enter the garden, a surprise awaited in the shape of the nymphaeum just below the fountain tempietto. This architectural piece is hidden for the eye until one descended the stairs into the garden. Was this the culmination of access into the house or was it the hermaphrodite also located on the eastern side of the garden? Although one could move to the back of the house, nothing but a path around the canal could be physically accessed. There were no further discontinuing spaces to enforce any social interaction in the garden, as the summer triclinium was moved. It would probably be designed to just move along. The western side of the garden did also give access to the peristyle; however, it had a completely different character, both the stairs up to the peristyle, as well as that particular part of the garden (notably smaller). It would be most likely that the garden was divided into two parts, of which the eastern part was used by guests.

5.3.5 Place-making in the house: pattern language
Although the Casa di Octavius Quartio does not contain such well preserved and lavishly decorated thresholds and pavements as the Casa degli Amorini Dorati, the observations made by means of the configuration and visibility analyses could largely be sustained by means of the pattern language analysis. Whereas the former house placed much effort in distinguishing between rooms by different pavements, and elaborate boundaries, the Casa di Octavius Quarto invested more in wall paintings and scenery.
Just as could be observed in the previous case study, the colours and treatment of the different rooms in the peristyle area are all individualised, however, not to the extent as the Casa degli Amorini Dorati displays it (see table 5.7 for the different paintings). The western side has three rooms, painted white yellow and white. This would make Room f in terms of colouring, not the main distinguishing room (because d was also white) but the yellow room, however, the quality of the painting and the location near the canal makes it the prime space of the western part. More interesting in terms of colour patterning is the eastern side of the peristyle. A differentiation made in colour can be witnessed between the portico peristyle g and the peristyle i, which turns from black to red. Within turning around this corner the space was markedly different, also sustained by the colour.
One did now step from the transitional zone which was space \( g \), to the Dining area \( I \) and Biclinium \( i \). The Biclinium therefore, was not coloured differently but was also painted red, to draw it into the same atmosphere. Also the outside of Room \( f \) and the columns of the portico were painted red for this reason, to make the space to be experienced as one large open air dining hall, separated from the peristyle and from the garden. It can therefore be assumed, that the two sets of paintings of Diana and Actaeon on the outside of Room \( f \) and of Narcissus and Thysbe and Pyramus in the bicolinium were enforcing the same effect of pulling the spaces together and should be considered closely linked. The Triclinium \( h \) was not red, but white because it housed lavish Third Style mythological scenes.

**Iconography of the paintings**

The fact that the Casa di Octavius Quartio makes intricate use of the subject of paintings should also be included in the analysis of the house. The Triclinium \( h \), with such elaborate iconographical elements, was more than just the experience of colour. The Fourth Style paintings consists of two friezes. The smaller, lower of which depict two temporally distinct sagas of Troy, whereas the large frieze represents episodes from the life and works of Hercules.\(^{1016}\) According to Clarke, with the triclinium couches in place, the paintings are looked upon in a counter clockwise and then to clockwise reading.\(^{1017}\) Doing so from right to left the viewer was able to follow the narrative to the point where it touches the most recent event of the story depicted, easily recognisable because of its proximity to the end of the tale. The remaining part could be read from the couch. It could therefore be read

---

\(^{1016}\) The mythological friezes are a Fourth Style rendition of a tradition which ceased since the Second Style, when painted panels replaced friezes. The triclinium paintings are thus a unique exception to the development of wall painting. The lower sections of the walls exemplify imitation of marble above which a 30 cm. long frieze depicts scenes (counting fifteen) from the Iliad (e.g., Patroclus’ funeral games, the battle between Ajax and Hector. On the north wall we see a group of heroes. On the west wall proceeding with Patroclus fighting with the arms of Achilles, Thetis provides Achilles with weapons, Automedon prepare the chariot. Represented on the east wall a chariot drags Hector’s body. The East upper wall depicts Hercules’ battle with Laomedon, King of Troy. The narrower, lower section present stories from the Trojan War featuring Achilles (e.g., the funeral of Patroclus, the games held in his honour, the ransom of the Hector’s body). The names of those involved are written in Latin (although translated from Greek - as several misspellings indicate). The south side depicts Apollo firing arrows which causes a plague on the Greek army. The west wall shows combat scenes. The frieze above shows scenes from the life and works of Hercules. This is also quite unique as the only other representation of the Twelve Labours is to be found in the Casa del Menandro in Pompeii, on a skyphos, see Spinazzola 1953, I.389; Clarke 1991, 205; Ling 1995, 111-2. For a discussion on Hercules in the houses of Pompeii, see Coralini 2001.

\(^{1017}\) See Clarke 1991, 206.
almost like a present-day comic book.\footnote{See Clarke 1991, 206.} One may presume these scenes were meant to look at, contemplate, interpret, and discuss actively. It was created in order to accompany the cena. At dusk, the garden was no longer visible. The room turned inwards and the focus placed on the elaborate paintings on the walls. As time was spent here in social interaction, the paintings offered an appealing distraction and food for conversation.

The contrast between the paintings outside the triclinium and the cubicula in the portico space and those inside is remarkable. Whereas the interiors of these spaces include small figures and detailed decoration (either Fourth Style small figures or Third Style elaborate mythological scenes), the exterior spaces contain quite large, modest and rather straightforward scenes. For instance, the hunting scenes on north wall of portico \(i\) were too large to see when one moved from the portico to the bica
dium on the north side of the canal. They were only visible on the other side of the canal and could be observed from either the bica
dium or at the other side of the canal whilst walking. All the large paintings in the red painted portico area are supposedly meant to be seen from a distance, in contrast to the triclinium, which had to be viewed from up close in order to understand the complexities of the almost comic-like stories.

As mentioned above, the paintings from the exterior of Room \(f\) and bica
dium \(k\) are of equal size, and both depict large figures against a red background. Due to the portico columns, however, the four paintings cannot be seen all together. Outside Room \(f\) one can only see the painting of Pyramus and Thisbe and vice versa. Only Diana can be seen from the bica
dium \(k\). This also counts for Narcissus and Actaeon. One can only engage with the paintings all together when in movement, however. Unlike most Fourth Style paintings they are large, individual figures and do not contain any typical Fourth Style embellishments or attributes, therefore, the paintings can be recognised from the other side of the space. According to Platt, they illustrate the power of the glance, a confrontation with Self and Other, and the intimate and potentially dangerous relationship between the glance, reflection and desire.\footnote{"The emphasis on reflection, reciprocity and ambiguity we find in the literary accounts is here communicated by the image’s complex relationship to its context, through which Narcissus presents a twofold danger to the viewer. The painting’s position next to the euripus is a reminder that the viewer might catch sight of himself in the water and lose himself in solipsistic desire. Indeed, the background of the painting, with its combination of architectural detail, pool and leafy locus amoenus, is remarkably similar to the portico’s setting between}
canal served as a reminder that the viewer might catch sight of himself in the water and lose himself in solipsistic desire. This warning is reflected in the painting and the pool. Was there really such a deep and conscious interpretation of these paintings when someone looked at Narcissus? The suggestion that the painting of Narcissus was chosen because of the water-related theme could equally well be forwarded. Indeed many paintings are thematically linked to water, whereas they are physically connected by means of the upper canal. Diana is bathing, Narcissus is gazing into a pool. The meeting place of Pyramus and Thisbe is at a spring. Furthermore, the paintings connect to the canal, to each other, and to the subject of water by means of their lower sections, of which all four included a painted fountain with sparkling water. As with the entire house, the peristyle space plays with the dichotomy between visibility and accessibility on a micro-level. It is interesting to note, that while the biclinium and Room \( f \) are not accessible simultaneously when approached from the peristyle \( g \), they are visually connected. They remain physically separated, but are connected by means of their paintings, which are very large in order to be seen from a distance, and through the canal as a connecting element, so they become visually connected. The details for the viewer in the dining space may not have been provided by means of the paintings in the portico. It served mainly to not only connect the space to each other and to the water features, but also to the sculpture placed around the portico. The lower canal lastly, has a hidden nymphaeum beneath the tempietto which could only be seen after descending the stairs into the garden: one more aesthetic surprise having been granted access. Here too paintings in red colours were encountered. The fact that Diana (west side) and Actaeon (east side) were depicted again on a painting, suggests that the space was a separated space from the dining area.

**Pavement types**

Unfortunately, as mentioned above, not much pavement was preserved in the house. It is not known whether this was a development that took place pre- or post-eruption. However, when considering these floors it is obvious that the owners of this house did not put as much effort into their floors

---

1020 Narcissus was well-loved. Pompeilian houses count fifty-two portraits of him, see Hodske 2007, table 6.
1021 See Platt 2002, 90.
when compared with the inhabitants of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati. No complete mosaic floors are encountered, only those with a *cocciopesto* floor decorated with tesserae in a simple design. The first was the atrium, with large marble hexagonal shaped cubiculum *e* which preserved such a pavement, which may argue that Rooms *d* and *f* also had such floors. However, this cannot be confirmed by means of the archaeological remains. The other room, Triclinium *h*, was the most important room of the public dining area. The biclinium formed an important part of the portico space, as its pavement (and benches) consisted of red *cocciopesto* in the same colours as the walls, which tied the spaces together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Type (Watts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fauces 1</td>
<td>Cocciopesto with white tesserae, diamond shaped pattern</td>
<td>Directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrium 2</td>
<td>Cocciopesto with large white hexagonal shaped marble pieces</td>
<td>Directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubiculum 3</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubiculum <em>d</em></td>
<td>Cocciopesto</td>
<td>Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubiculum <em>e</em></td>
<td>Cocciopesto with white tesserae</td>
<td>Centralised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubiculum <em>f</em></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peristyle <em>g</em></td>
<td>Cocciopesto?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triclinium <em>h</em></td>
<td>Cocciopesto with tesserae, flower motif with a band of swastikas around the sides</td>
<td>Centralised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portico-garden <em>i</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biclinium <em>k</em></td>
<td>A red coloured cocciopesto</td>
<td>Background</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.8 Pavements of the Casa di Octavius Quartio.

**Boundaries (thresholds, frames, and openings)**

The thresholds, as with the pavement, do not yield sufficient information to discover any patterning to the extent observed at the Casa degli Amorini Dorati. Again, it does not seem to be of the same importance as the former case study. Only one mosaic threshold (Room *e*) emphasises a boundary situation. The majority of the thresholds have disappeared. Those still present differentiate in function. The threshold in the kitchen and in Cubiculum 3 consist of lava, whereas the Cubicula *e* and *f*, and the Triclinium *h* have marble thresholds (see table 5.9). The rooms on the west side (*d, e*) were as the cubicula in the Casa degli Amorini Dorati were meant to be experienced as a space on its own. Room *e* could also be closed off. Room *f*, even though it was completely cut off from the dining area and the garden, did make a visual reference by means of the enlarged opening and the alignment with the east-west axis and upper canal. However, it did not
seem to have been necessary to emphasise the individuality of the rooms to such an extent as with the Casa degli Amorini Dorati. This may have to do with the difference in layout of the two houses. Whereas the cubicula of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati were all situated around an open courtyard, the Casa di Octavius Quartio has differentiated spaces with less accessibility to rooms, as was analysed above. It may not have been necessary to physically erect boundaries. When someone was invited to a specific space these boundaries had already been lifted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Decoration</th>
<th>Closing</th>
<th>Dimensions (in cm.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fauces</td>
<td>Atrium</td>
<td>Travertine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Atrium</td>
<td>Cubiculum 3</td>
<td>Lava</td>
<td>Only tiles left</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>but might have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>been travertine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>similar to c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Atrium</td>
<td>Cubiculum 4</td>
<td>Lava</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Atrium</td>
<td>Cubiculum a</td>
<td>Not visible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Atrium</td>
<td>Cubiculum b</td>
<td>Not visible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Cubiculum b</td>
<td>Peristyle g</td>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Atrium</td>
<td>Cubiculum c</td>
<td>Travertine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Atrium</td>
<td>Cubiculum 5</td>
<td>Not visible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>274? narrowed down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Atrium</td>
<td>Peristyle g</td>
<td>Not visible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cubiculum 5</td>
<td>Kitchen 7</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cubiculum 5</td>
<td>Latrine</td>
<td>Lava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Peristyle g</td>
<td>Cubiculum d</td>
<td>Not visible but</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not similar to e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Peristyle g</td>
<td>Cubiculum e</td>
<td>Marble and</td>
<td>black and white</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mosaic</td>
<td>floral motif</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Peristyle g</td>
<td>Cubiculum f</td>
<td>Not visible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Peristyle g</td>
<td>Portico-garden</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Peristyle g</td>
<td>Triclinium h</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Cubiculum f</td>
<td>Portico-garden</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>Probably</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Triclinium h</td>
<td>Portico-garden</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Portico-garden</td>
<td>Thresholder</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Portico-garden</td>
<td>Stalla</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Portico-garden</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>Travertine and</td>
<td>Lower two original? Lava</td>
<td>West side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lava stairs</td>
<td>threshold from a shop-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>doorway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.9 A threshold analysis of the Casa di Octavius Quartio.

**Light and level change**

The Casa di Octavius Quartio also works with light and level changes. Again, important rooms have a window e.g., Room f. The terrace was a darker place, as it consisted of a portico once completely covered in vines according to the
excavators. This caused the Portico space \( g \) and the Portico space \( i \) to be connected spaces, and also rendered it cognitively easier to view the spaces as a route. The vine leaves provided a cool and shady place to linger during summer afternoons. A consequence hereof was that the lower garden became particularly appealing.

As with the Casa degli Amorini Dorati, the *fauces* of the Casa di Octavius Quartio also slid upwards to the atrium space, which had as a consequence that it made the entrance experience more impressive. There is no noticeable further level change in the house except for the garden. It is, presumably because of the fact it is on virgin soil, situated on lower ground when compared with the rest of the house. However, the difference in level is significant for the way in which one experiences the garden, inhabitants and visitors alike. First of all it creates the effect that features of the garden, such as the fountains, the canal and the statues were not well visible from the house, making the garden a more private space, but also enlarged the surprise for those who finally got to visit the garden. Even more important however, because one had to descend to the garden by a flight of stairs, people really got the feeling they entered a different space. Because of this level change the garden separates itself from the house creating a different world with different rules, as is generally argued with regard to garden spaces in Roman houses. This is sustained by means of the statue of the hermaphrodite. It was not appropriate to place it inside the house, in the garden where it would be clearly visible or in an open part of the house, but could adorn the garden.

*Synthesis of the pattern analysis*

Numerous dissimilarities regarding the pattern analyses can be observed when comparing the Casa di Octavius Quartio with the Casa degli Amorini Dorati. Although one may assume that material boundaries were so profoundly present in the latter are not as intense as in the former. The reason for this is that the structure in the house (perhaps partly due to recent renovations) allows more differentiation and segregation of space. The cubicula were situated in the atrium, and therefore segregated from the important social spaces meant for a different audience situated around the peristyle. It may be, however, that in the case of the House of Octavius Quartio the sculpture played a more significant role in the structure of space

---

1022 See Spinazzola 1953.
1023 See Von Stackelberg 2009.
and the framing of behaviour than pavements or other types of boundary markers. This will be discussed in the following section.

5.3.6 Place-making in the house: object analysis
Regarding the decoration, but in this case especially regarding the configuration, the Casa di Octavius Quartio shows, just like the Casa degli Amorini Dorati a distinct functional compartmentalisation in the different spaces of the house. The atrium space, the peristyle’s western and eastern side, and the garden were independently experienced units, for specific audiences and with specific functions. This observation has significant consequences for the way in which the objects found in the house should be interpreted. Because the spaces were separate units, the objects which were displayed through the house should be regarded within their own use-space, and not as one large group. Looking at the sculpture already suggests this; the statuettes around the upper canal and portico-area are all made of marble for instance, while the statuettes in the peristyle garden are made out of a green glaze. The marble sculpture was to be found on the side of the canal considered the public dining area, and absent from the more private western side of the peristyle. As was also observed with the Casa degli Amorini Dorati there is an interesting grouping of material culture on the basis of the material and external appearance, which seems to have been more important than the subject of the statuary. Just as with the peristyle of the Casa degli Amorini Dorati, the sculptural display might have been less eclectic in experience than often imagined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Objects</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Specifics of location</th>
<th>Iconography</th>
<th>Inv. No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Statuette</td>
<td>Terracotta with blue-green glaze</td>
<td>(g) Peristyle</td>
<td>Northwest corner of the small peristyle garden, c. 0.5 m from the northwest column</td>
<td>Bes</td>
<td>2897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Statuette</td>
<td>Terracotta with blue-green glaze</td>
<td>(g) Peristyle</td>
<td>Northwest corner of the small peristyle garden, c.0.5 m. from the northwest column</td>
<td>Pharaoh</td>
<td>2898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bust</td>
<td>Fine-grained white marble</td>
<td>(i) Portico garden</td>
<td>North edge of the upper canal near the central tempietto</td>
<td>Bearded Dionysus</td>
<td>2914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Fine-grained grayish-white marble</td>
<td>(i) Portico garden</td>
<td>South edge of the upper canal near the central tempietto</td>
<td>Youthful Dionysus</td>
<td>2038 2/29 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Statuette</td>
<td>Fine-grained</td>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>North edge of the upper</td>
<td>Lion and Antelope</td>
<td>2929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Material Description</td>
<td>Location Details</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Object No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Statuette</td>
<td>Large grained white marble (i) Portico garden</td>
<td>South edge of the upper canal, several m. east of the central tempietto</td>
<td>Lion and Ram</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Statuette</td>
<td>Fine-grained light grey marble (trace of pigment) (i) Portico garden</td>
<td>Southeast corner of the upper canal</td>
<td>Hunting greyhound attacking a hare</td>
<td>2934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Statuette</td>
<td>Larger-grained greyish-white marble (i) Portico garden</td>
<td>South edge of the upper canal near the midpoint of the canal, in front of the third pillar</td>
<td>Boxed theatre mask depicting a female</td>
<td>2928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Statuette</td>
<td>Fine-grained white marble with a bronze attachment, (i) Portico garden</td>
<td>Midpoint of the upper canal, to the north of the basin</td>
<td>Reclining Egyptian sphinx &lt;sup&gt;1024&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Statuette</td>
<td>Large-grained white marble (i) Portico garden</td>
<td>East end of the upper canal, on the north side</td>
<td>Infant Hercules seated on a flat, more or less triangular base, the edges of which were apparently carved to imitate a rocky ledge.</td>
<td>2932 / 2840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Statuette</td>
<td>Large-grained greyish-white marble (i) Portico garden</td>
<td>Short east end of the upper canal in front of the biclinium</td>
<td>Bearded river god reclining to his left and propped up by means of an object under his left arm &lt;sup&gt;1025&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Statuette</td>
<td>Fine-grained white marble (g) Peristyle garden</td>
<td>Entrance to the small peristyle garden, just south of the atrium door-way (not in situ)</td>
<td>Naked young satyr in the form of a telamon</td>
<td>2891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Statue</td>
<td>Fine-grained white marble (i) Portico garden</td>
<td>Upper terrace, south of the canal, to the east of the tetrastyle tempietto</td>
<td>Muse I, Polyhymnia, the muse of sacred poetry</td>
<td>2917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Statue</td>
<td>Larger-grained white marble (i) Portico garden</td>
<td>Upper terrace, south of the canal, to the west of the tetrastyle tempietto</td>
<td>Muse II, Erato, the muse of lyric poetry</td>
<td>2909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Statuette</td>
<td>Fine-grained white marble (l) Garden</td>
<td>Below the garden tempietto, on the water stairs of the nymphaeum</td>
<td>Eros holding a theatre mask</td>
<td>20513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Statuette</td>
<td>Grainy grey-white marble (l) Garden</td>
<td>Southwest corner of the garden c.3.3 m. from the west wall</td>
<td>Hermaphrodite</td>
<td>3021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1024</sup> According to Tronchin 2006 it portrays a female sphinx (93). In fact it represents a male sphinx styled in the Egyptian tradition. With no female features, the sphinx wears a nemes headdress reserved for males only.

<sup>1025</sup> According to Spinazzola (1906) the canal personifies the Sarno, according to Della Corte (1932, 194) it personifies the Nile, see Tronchin 2006, 107-8.
Table 5.10 introduces all sculptures displayed throughout the house. As expected, the atrium did not contain any sculpture. The majority of sculptures are from the peristyle area and the portico. The lower part of the garden, in contrast to the upper part, did not yield many objects. Although sculpture might be missing, it seems that the garden, the nymphaeum, and its fountains were the prime visual impressions and that more sculpture to adorn it was not necessary (with the exception of a statue of a hermaphrodite, a surprise on the rear end of the garden). Important to consider and separate are perceptions dealing with the intentions of the

---

1026 According to Tronchin 2006 who studied the official excavation notes, the exact location of this room is not completely clear. We read: “vano M a circa 4 m dal pavimento.” Unfortunately, “vano M” does not unambiguously correspond to any room in the house. Based on the date the mask was discovered, at an early stage of the excavation of the house, and on the locations of other objects found within the same time frame, the sculpture was presumably found in one of the cubicula on the west side of the atrium.

1027 The mask was affixed to the back wall of the small fountain and rested on a shallow marble shelf. It apparently served as a spout for the water which fed the north-south canal, having trickled from the tetra-style fountain above towards the nymphaeum, see Tronchin 2006, 152.

1028 Tronchin 2006 used the example of sculpted statues representing ibises from the temple dedicated to Isis (after Ward-Perkins and Claridge, 1978, II.181, fig. 185). These, however, are not from the Isis temple. Two paintings of ibises from this temple are published, amongst others, in DeCaro 1992, 89; 117. For one from the Casa di Marcus Lucretius, see Dwyer 1982, 45, figs. 44, 45. For another ibis sculpture, see Bol 1994, 384-6. According to Tronchin 2006 this bird is a heron not an ibis.

1029 According to the Giornale degli Scavi (find date 27-11-1919) it was found in: “giardino a .75 m dal piano di campagna”), see Tronchin 2006, 502.
owners, their ideas about decoration and the concepts they had in mind with putting up sculpture compared to the conscious and unconscious effects it had to the viewers of these objects. Different layers of perception are at work whenever an impression is created and human intentions and the subsequent effect of material culture within a specific setting differ.

To start with the figurines in the garden of peristyle g: their positioning at the most important access-giving space in the house, renders these green-glazed figurines of crucial importance in terms of perception. They materially constituted the transitional space leading from the atrium to the garden, and subsequently from the garden to the more public dining area or the more private area of the peristyle to the west. The sculpture group is the first introduction to the luxurious leisure space of the house owners. In addition it creates a first impression on guests, whether they were invited for dinner or to a more private occasion on the west side. What did this impression target at? Did it consciously evoke an image of Egypt?

First of all, the statues were set apart, and bounded by the wall of the small peristyle it created an isolated other world. Would this have been possible as an integrated feature in the structure of the house? Considering a potential exotic atmosphere, it must be noted that if this was intended, the effect was mainly created by means of the green glazed material (possibly enhanced by its large quantity). This is important, while the green-glaze statuettes might of course have conjured up Egypt, the experience of the exotic was arrived at by means of green-glaze, not through its Egyptian style or subject. This leads the argument towards the owner’s intentions. The marble bird positioned next to the statuettes is in this case of significance. It seems likely it was placed alongside the green glaze because the owners thought it was an ibis (or that it could pass for an ibis in the context of the statuettes). These observations might again lead to the assumption also made in part 4.4, that as a group, it was meant to display a three-dimensional Nilotic scene.\textsuperscript{1030} It was suggested in 4.4, that these statues might be representing Nilotic creatures in some cases, as the majority of green-glazed statuettes can be connected with this particular imagery (pygmy-like figures such as Bes and Ptah-Pataikos and animals such as frogs and crocodiles). This could also be

\textsuperscript{1030} The absence of water features weakens the argument for a Nilotic scene being a as consciously adopted concept. However, as was argued, the location of these statues in the garden as an isolated exotic display may have been preferred over any fountain space.
the case with regard to this context. An issue with this interpretation is that the iconography of the statuettes is not particularly associated with Nilotic imagery.

Did the owners have a choice exactly which green-glazed statuettes they acquired? Would they have chosen a statue of a pharaoh on purpose? As discussed above, its unusual iconography was not well known in Pompeii. They might think it was special, while its strangeness added to the exotic atmosphere. If Egypt was a concept employed by the owners concerning the statuettes (which seems likely in this case because of the iconography of the statuettes and of the specific material, because of the way they have been placed together, and because of the unusual large quantity), the figurines might just have been associated with the oldest and most omnipresent images of Egypt in Pompeii, Nilotic scenes. The collection of green-glazed figurines and the addition of the ibis should be explained in a more nuanced way, for it is more likely that the Nilotic scene as a concept of Egypt just influenced the way the statues were put up rather than that a conscious attempt was made to create something Nilotic.

In addition to that what the owners intended when they arranged the ensemble, the statuettes made an impression on the viewer independent from their intentions. Would an average visitor realise that the statues were Egyptian, did they remind of Nilotic imagery too? Or did they merely establish the exotic image of a secluded garden? Needless to say, the interpretation could have been communicated. With this particular group that does not seem likely for a number of reasons. For the viewer, it stood out because of the large number of green-glazed figurines (with seven objects the largest quantity found together in all Pompeii). This is the perception layer consciously experienced by someone confronted with the sculpture. However, more layers have influenced perception on a more subconscious level which is equally important to consider. For instance, another notable feature of the manner in which the statuettes were disclosed to the viewer is their seclusion from the open space of the house. Not only was this seclusion created by means of separating them from the other marble sculpture along

---

1031 It is difficult to say anything decisive without knowing the meaning of the remaining five statuettes. An issue interpreting the Nilotic scene causes is: the iconography of the statuettes, which is not particularly associated with Nilotic imagery. It also does not feature within a water context. The ibis, however, does.

1032 Only in two other wall paintings are pharaohs portrayed.
the canal (a material-based separation), the statuettes were framed inside the walled peristyle garden. They could therefore not be touched, only be glanced upon in passing. This is of significance, as it renders a completely different experience than for instance with the marble group in portico i surrounding the canal. Furthermore, the black and red painting in the portico, together with the red paint on the columns surrounding the peristyle garden, did not pull the garden into the portico (as could be observed with the Casa degli Amorini Dorati). Instead, it secluded the portico space from the garden space which by means of its light and predominantly green colour turned into a wholly different space. This informs us not only of the way in which it was experienced, but also reveals something about what the owners thought of the statuettes. As it was secluded from the rest of the space one could argue that a more ‘estranging’ or ‘exotic’ image was particularly suitable for this location. The outstanding number of statuettes consisting of a similar material, but specifically the fact that they were isolated behind the garden walls and that they were positioned in a so-called ‘through-route’ of the portico further suggest that this was not a pause moment in which the visitor was allowed much time in order to contemplate the figurines individually.

The group of statues was the first aesthetic experience upon entering the peristyle area, the most important area in terms of access providing and control. Why would they be placed here and not along one of the canals? One may presume, as argued above, because it provided a pleasant secluded space in which exotic display fitted as it was set apart from the rest of the house. Furthermore, such a display was immediately eye-catching being dissimilar to material found in more frequently displayed sculpture. The fact that the green-glazed statuettes were placed in the northwest corner of the peristyle, the route belonging to the dining area, and the corner closest to Triclinium h, further suggests that they belonged to the public dining area rather than to the rooms at the east. As shown in fig. 5.26, the group served as an eye-catcher to guide the gaze in the direction of the dining area. The sculpture was a means to move guests in the right direction, as the peristyle portico itself was a divider of space more than a place for social interaction. Viewing the group of green-glazed statuettes was thus not so much a pause, but rather a structuring and directional moment in which the objects played an important role. As the amount of time spent around these statues was meant to be short, the idea is enforced that they had to be experienced as
group. They were not to be regarded as individual sculpture. This also strengthens the argument of the importance of the material above that of iconography, as it was the green glaze that could be perceived within this setting and time frame, not the subject of the statues.

Moving to the second sculpture groups located along the canal and within the portico, it can be noted that an attempt was made here to evoke an entirely different atmosphere in comparison with the above, not only by the use of different material (marble), but also by means of the way in which the sculpture was displayed. As discussed in 4.5, the statuette of the sphinx is presented along with other marble statuary positioned along the first water canal in the peristyle. These statues represent a herm of Dionysus, a lion devouring an antelope, two statues of Heracles as a child, a river god (placed at the head of the canal closest to the nymphaeum), a dog with a faun, a woman’s mask, a lion with a ram’s head beneath its paw, another herm of a young Dionysus, and the muse Polyhymnia (see table 5.10). As the previous case study illustrates that not only are they all white marble statues but also that their iconographic ‘eclecticism’ does not point as much to cultural associations with Greece, Egypt, or the Hellenistic East, as it exemplifies a richness of marble statues in general. A unity was experienced in both contexts i.e., in form of material, not in iconography or cultural references. The water of the upper canal reflected the white statues even better. Indeed positioning them near the upper canal (instead of the green-glazed statues which may even have suited the water context better thematically) was an aesthetic choice of the owners. The other statuettes, although they did not allude to a clear theme, all added to appropriate garden scenery as could also be observed at the Casa degli Amorini Dorati. Two lions representing wildlife were placed opposite each other alongside the canal, as were the herms of Dionysus. The river god at the eastern end of the canal protected the water while personifying it. Was the sphinx alien to this context? As argued in 4.5, the sphinx, although of Egyptian style, might have been considered a Mischwesen linked to marble garden statues. The latter which were abundantly present in Pompeian wall decoration, predominantly occurs in painting (see 4.5.4), and occasionally in sculpture and furniture. The statuette suited this water context well because tradition of garden paintings depicting sphinxes were also always connected to water, and often even featured as fountains. Therefore, the marble sphinx should not be considered an anomaly among the other statues at the canal.
However, there is more to mention on the statuettes at the canal. In which way did the sphinx ‘fit’ in with this ensemble that seems eclectic in both style and theme? There seems to be a difference between this sculpture group and the previously discussed garden in peristyle $g$. In addition to their consisting of marble, it is important to look at the manner in which the statues were displayed at the canal. Here the marble statues stand freely along the eastern side of the upper canal, while the Egyptian green-glazed statuettes were framed by means of a wall, implying that the latter group was conceived as more passive. The marble sculptures, which belonged to the dining area, could be touched and walked around. Therefore they were intended to be engaged with and consequently experienced in a more active fashion. Convex space 13, albeit an important controlling space within the house, was not meant for social encounter but to move through. On the other hand the space in front of the tri- and bicolinium was primarily meant for social interaction. It was used to interact; converse, walk, stand, and engage; not only which each other, but also with the sculpture. The showed green-glazed statuettes, on the contrary, were merely meant to briefly glance at another world, enframed by walls. After this initial strong impression one moved further along the dining space and it was not the intention to engage in contemplation at great length. This also explains the seemingly ‘eclecticism’ in content on the side of the upper Euripus sculptures. As this space served social interaction, each statue should be appreciated independently, not as a thematic group. They could be experienced as a group, as they were all consisted of marble and were all situated in the dining space, pulled together by means of space, colouring and paintings. Thematically, however, they could also be experienced individually. In this way, the freestanding exhibition of the sculpture and their varied themes contributed to the centralisation of the space, to the enhancement of social interaction and cohesion in the same manner the paintings in the Triclinium $h$ did. Whereas the first open space and sculpture enforced movement, this sculptural setting achieves the opposite i.e., to slow one down instead of moving one forward. Therefore, it is of crucial importance here not to search too profoundly for a thematic guideline underlying the organisation and iconography of the sculpture. They were intended to be perceived individually.
5.3.7 The use of Egypt in the Casa di Octavius Quartio: Egypt as exotic decorum?

“Lucius Istacidius! I think anyone who doesn’t invite me to dinner is a bore”

The concluding section will provide a socially embedded explanation for the Egyptian artefacts found in the Casa di Octavius Quartio as part of a domestic assemblage. The analyses of the house have proven successful in illustrating the way in which various spaces were utilised and perceived and in how the objects played a distinctive role within those spaces. The house and its contents did not only display the owner’s aesthetic values and preferences or reflect Roman art within domestic contexts. The analysis has also indicated the way in which the house as a unit is able to control behaviour, in the use of space. This is aided by means of lightning and level change, change of flooring and colouring, and the introduction of sculpture. After knowledge has been acquired on the spatial use of the house, the materials, and the decoration, it is time to return to the objects. They are not only Egyptian but also part of the intricate movements and encounters in a Roman house.

In contrast to the Casa degli Amorini Dorati, the ‘Aegyptiaca’ of which were applied with a single concept of Egypt in mind (in casu the cult of Isis and her Egyptian origin), the Casa di Octavius Quartio presents another side of the diverse concepts of Egypt and their workings. Although such a concept occurs when decorating houses, the Isis cult was not the main directive. The presence of Egyptian artefacts does not disclose much with regard to the religious preferences or ethnicity of the owners, but tellingly reveal the degree of complexity of the concepts of Egypt during the 1st century AD, and their entanglement within a diversity of social practices. A large number actively aimed at the ritual of the cena. The artefacts served as adornments and played an important role in the flaunting of the family’s acquired wealth, knowledge and status to other guests. This house as a whole to a great extent designed to play with movement, visual access and configurational restriction. Configurationally, the emphasis on the visitor-inhabitant relationship is much stronger than in the above case study, which established the differentiation by means of applying an elaborate boundary and pavements. As previously discussed, the commercial activities of the salutatio were most probably less important or even absent in the Casa di Octavius Quartio. One may argue with reasonable certainty that the cena

---

1033 CIL IV 1880, graffito found in the Basilica of Pompeii.
increased in importance in later phases, as it is obvious that the owners deposited all their material revenues in redecorating and adorning the peristyle area. Dinner was hugely relevant as a social ritual at this time (see also note 718). A dinner invitation was not only a sign of social acceptance for the upwardly mobile but also a means for the affluent elite to flaunt their wealth and generosity to friends, rivals, and favoured clients. The marble statues along the canal were important as a visual aesthetic. The most significant spaces were: the peristyle garden with the sculpture, the elaborate mythological paintings of the triclinium and biclinium, and the canal with its marble sculptures. Everything was directed at the dining area; even the outside view of Room $f$ towards the private western side was created in order to change the dining area into a world of myth, sculpture, and architectural wonders. When inside the triclinium, it was entered from the peristyle. It was thus impossible to already see all the marble on display. This rendered the impression even more lavish. How much more could there be?

Egypt can indeed serve as an exotic display, but not because the exotic is automatically linked to Egypt. The sculpture in the Garden-peristyle $g$ is discussed by von Stackelberg as follows: “It was the function of the hortus to act as a transitional space where self met the other, and what was more alien to the Roman imagination than Egypt?”\textsuperscript{1034} Although the exotic may have played a role in providing a suitable introduction, and it was especially fitting in this secluded and different space, von Stackelberg is too sweeping when equating ‘Egyptian’ with alien. Firstly, there was not one concept of Egypt, but a multitude. This house is the telling example of the fact that matters are more complex than just being either ‘Isiac’, ‘alien’, or ‘the Other’. Although the presumption that the owners had a concept of Egypt in mind when they constructed this ensemble is plausible, it is yet another case for the viewer. As to the statuettes in Garden $g$ it is not Egypt \textit{per se} that is considered exotic. The component of green glaze in combination with Egyptian iconography provides the exotic atmosphere. If it was merely Egypt, then all the artefacts could have been put together in this location. However, the marble was not exotic. To a degree the material is inherently considered to be more intrinsic than others. White marble, which was omnipresent in Pompeii in the imperial period and was also used in public buildings (such as the forum, temples, and baths), is more likely to be perceived as ‘normal’.

\textsuperscript{1034} See Von Stackelberg 2009, 122.
However, although less commonly employed than marble, the exoticism of green-glaze should not be exaggerated. It was not unusual to ostentatiously display these green-glazed statuettes within garden contexts, as observed in other instances too. Green-glazed statues did not occur as lavishly as marble sculpture, which may have added to their eccentricity. Nevertheless, they were by no means uncommon. It was in no way as unique as, for example, the alabaster statuette of Horus found in the Casa degli Amorini Dorati. Furthermore, these figurines were clearly affordable and formed integrated parts of the social emulation process, as indicated by the fact they can be found within all kinds of social contexts (4.4). Apparently, the green-glazed statuette was seen as an aesthetic and costly item. Its eye-catching presence would certainly have helped in increasing its value. However, incorporating the objects into the discussion on social emulation (see 5.1), whenever something is appreciated it is copied by other social groups. Next its value decreases because lower classes utilise them in order to increase their own status. In this sense, the prominently displayed blue-glazed statuette of Ptah-Pataikos in a Caupona (VI.1.2) which was visible to every citizen and visitor entering the town through the busy Ercolano Gate, might have caused the statuettes in the gardens of the Casa del Nozze d'Argento and the Casa di Octavius Quartio to decrease in value along with the link to Egypt. Could it be that the owner of the Casa di Octavius Quartio solved this by means of the quantity he had exhibited in the Casa di Octavius Quartio? Not one, but no less than seven green-glazed statuettes were displayed in the small peristyle garden. Unfortunately, only two could be identified as the rest was too damaged to be refitted.

When Egypt is used as a decorative device (which does not imply it is devoid of any religious connotations) it can be observed that different rules are in order. Exoticism itself is a difficult term because it can be interpreted from the position of a researcher (etic) and of the person who viewed and used it (emic). The green-glazed objects of course were exotic, as they were presumably imported from Memphis (Egypt) and arrived in Pompeii via Puteoli. It is remarkable to observe the way in which exotica such as these were integrated into a town such as Pompeii. However, it is important to realise that it was not Egypt that was exotic in the Casa di Octavius Quartio, it were the green-glazed statuettes that were exotic. This not only nuances the position of the concept of Egypt but also forwards another plea in order to allowing more complexity between cultural labels and object types. Egypt
had been reflected in Nilotic imagery for a long time and quite frequently in houses, public baths, and in the temples dedicated to Apollo and Isis. Is it in this respect still justified to consider everything Egyptian as a part of Egyptomania, when Egypt became a Roman province more than a century ago and when we ascertain the high level of integration? The profundity of Aegyptiaca with regards to Roman visual culture during the 1st century is characterised not by an ongoing mania, but rather due to the loss of a mania and a more complex dealing with the Self and the Other, something which Egypt both represented. It could be set apart and be accepted as something normal and intrinsic. For instance, it is obvious that the green-glazed items in the peristyle garden had another function than the marble sculptures, they formed an atmosphere and material sign indicating the direction of the dining area. It was not a sculpture group to be discussed at length but important as a first impression, not a final one was (as yet) reserved for marble statuary. However, this statuery could subsequentl easily show an Egyptian sphinx in marble, without it being exotic.

5.3.8 Conclusion
The Casa di Octavius Quartio presents us with an example of the adoption of Egypt which differs from the Casa degli Amorini Dorati. However, the case study has also shown that even with regards to a large quantity of material that seems to be linked to Egypt which was consciously applied as such, it is still difficult to get a grip on the way in which they were experienced. Indeed many concepts other than those of ‘Egypt’ play a role within the understanding of these objects. Even if one would consider the possibility that the owner had purchased these objects out of admiration for Egypt, one would not consider the marble statuette to belong to the same concept of Egypt as the green-glazed statuettes. Interestingly, although exoticism probably plays a role in this garden, this exoticism was not achieved because the objects were connected to the concept of Egypt, but because they consisted of green glaze and because of the large quantity of objects. Was it Egypt that was alien to the Roman imagination? Yes and no. It could be consciously set apart as alien, as with the green-glazed figurines in the peristyle garden. On the other hand, it was just as much a part of all things familiar. In the case of the marble sphinx which, although Egyptian, was also marble and associated with water and fountains just as any other kind of marble sphinx.
Lastly, although the Casa di Octavius Quartio included unique features as to decoration and outward display, to call it an example of *nouveau riche* gone wrong, or a ‘Trimalchio-case’, is problematic. We do not know the way in which the inhabitants of Pompeii looked at a house, its contents, and owners. Pompeii is no Rome, and it could be argued in the same way that the house alluded to new trends in housing, or created such trends. Was this house really considered a vulgar misconception of elite behaviour? Are archaeologists and historians capable of delivering aesthetic judgements based on a literary tradition? How can they know this was considered a case of bad taste? The assumption should be contextualised and one needs to consider the differences between the source materials. Pompeii is a different environment with its own unique social dynamism, as countless examples of houses and material culture show it is not similar to neither Rome, nor closer and smaller settlements like Herculaneum. Furthermore, the previous case study has shown that display, which was important in Roman houses, was based on much more factors than just iconography, and that because archaeologists cannot always discern the underlying thoughts does not mean it was not there. However, despite these caveats on the side of interpretation and judgement, the entry on Egypt as exotic display in domestic contexts is considered relevant. Following the lines of social emulation and aesthetic preferences, to add to status they should have conformed to local taste, and by setting a new example might just as well prove social confidence to innovate.

5.4 Conclusion to Chapter 5: the social significance of Egypt as object and idea in Pompeian houses

5.4.1 Introduction

While chapter 4 showed that the networks of conceptualisation in which the so-called Aegyptiaca functioned were much more complex than scholars had assumed thus far, their place as to their use-context was not entirely clear yet. Therefore it was considered fruitful to take a closer look on a contextual level at the household (as a social and material phenomenon) in order to analyse the Egypt-related artefacts in their use-contexts and perception in chapter 5. Two houses (and the example from the Casa del Doppio Larario in 5.1), the Casa degli Amorini Dorati and the Casa di Octavius Quartio, were selected in order to exemplify how Egypt could be used and perceived within a domestic context. In this way a ‘re-placing of Egyptian artefacts’ was attempted. The reason to apply a holistic approach is the assumption that
the use of Egyptian artefacts cannot become clear when only Egypt is considered a cultural or stylistic device. The objects should be studied in relationship to those objects which we would regard Greek or Italic, or Gallic. Furthermore, as a next step these cultural labels should be removed as a defining characteristic for the users and the retrieval of their social significance should become the first objective instead. Were any differences observed in the use and display of such artefacts? Or are these also modern cultural constructions invented to classify domestic assemblages? When it comes to studying something such as Egyptian-related artefacts, they seldom have the benefit of such a clear and well preserved context as in the case of Pompeii, therefore it provided a unique chance to study the importance of the artefacts for the owners, their intentions, the relative values regarding choice, and the concepts that were employed within use.

A matter of concern was concluded from chapter 4 showing that Egypt as a perception could be concealed, and be lost in the network. Things did not necessarily have to be viewed as something Egypt although scholars could recognise it as such. When an artefact, a group of artefacts, or a style or motif from outside the society integrates within a certain society, it takes on more complex understandings. Becoming part of the social dynamics within a community, it obtains social values and is no longer merely a cultural ‘anomaly’\textsuperscript{1035} The connotation of eastern, or exotic, might occasionally be present, but is no longer experienced as such per se. Although differences may be witnessed as to Greek-looking artefacts in Pompeian contexts, this process also occurred with Egyptian objects in a Roman context. Nonetheless, the case studies that were selected both seemed to illustrate a conscious employment of something Egyptian, not something in which the cultural concept of Egyptianness of the artefacts was lost, but cases were it was employed to convey a message. However, the fact that the owner understood it as such might be evident (as he placed it there). How a viewer experienced it, as a guest or client to the house, is yet another question. The two case studies demonstrated even though there seemed to have been conscious references to Egypt in certain cases; it presented more complexities concerning the social dynamics of the house. Furthermore it could be observed that studying the use of artefacts in a domestic context

\textsuperscript{1035} In modern society an image of the Buddha is no longer ‘eastern’ or ‘exotic’ as it was several decades ago when introduced to western societies. Nowadays it is associated with vegetarianism, spirituality, Buddhism, yoga, health, meditation, a pure lifestyle, etc.
was indeed able to illustrate the process of social integration of a cultural (deviant) artefact.

5.4.2 Houses and households in Pompeii

As discussed in 5.1, Pompeian housing and the way it deals with concepts of public and private space, social dynamics, and display of objects and values has been written about extensively. A difference was observed as to the two houses in terms of configuration and decoration. Both case studies witnessed a redecoration in the final phases of Pompeii’s existence. Both show a change in emphasis from the atrium space to the peristyle space with regard to the most important part of the house. However, the houses dealt with it in different ways, illustrating the differences in personal tastes and values. The houses involved with the case studies i.e., the Casa degli Amorini Dorati and the Casa di Octavius Quartio have often been studied. Could something be added to this discussion from a place-making perspective? Place-making may supplement research as it was as yet not applied to Roman houses on this scale. It was useful to regard the house as a diagnostic totality within an analysis and study the material, space, and decoration as social agents and as a creative force within human behaviour. The case studies could not provide such a detailed treatment as applied in the Häuser in Pompeji-series. However, they did attempt to be as detailed as possible with regards to the objects, use of space, and decoration. Additionally, those features were treated on a hermeneutic level instead of being merely of a descriptive nature. The difference in approach in relation to previous studies furthermore consisted of a focus on perception and materiality; the decoration, spatial configuration, and material was analysed on a sub-conscious level in order to ascertain how it influenced behaviour and structured relationships as well as how it shaped interaction between the diverse social groups in the house. The ‘stuff’ and the decoration of which the house consisted was not always consciously dealt with on a daily basis, more often it was just used unreflectively. For example, the iconography included in the paintings of the Casa di Octavius Quartio can be read and are read by scholars on a variety of levels. A religious explanation has been presented: it has been explained as kitsch, eclectic, exoticism; there is a Dionysian theme, or an Isiac reading. Platt forwards a psychological interpretation stating that the paintings in the portico garden are connected by means of voyeuristic themes concerning confrontational gazes between the Self and the Other (because of the references to
Narcissus, Pyramus and Thisbe, and Diana). In all these cases attention is paid only to the interpretative side of material culture and not to its unreflexive parts. Members of the household living in the Casa di Octavius Quartio were probably not actively and consciously ‘confronted with the gaze’ every minute of the day. The paintings were merely present and the family lived among them. They walked past the statues in the peristyle portico from time to time, children played around them, a slave walked past on his or her way to the garden. Not interpreted iconographically, religiously, or thematically, they were present as a backdrop of all the activities taking place in the house. This is how material culture in a domestic environment is normally used, unconsciously. However, its unnoticed presence did not render the objects devoid of any power. They affected the way one moved around the house, and how the world outside the house was recognised and understood; it was not thought about reflectively, but that was in fact its power as an agent. The views obtained by studying the material culture, the spatial configuration and the decoration showed that the non-human environment formed a mental substrate which was capable of creating social values, affecting life, and structuring movement and behaviour.

Place-making as a toolbox analyses exactly that level of agency. In this way it indeed adds to the study of households in showing that because material culture did not matter on an interpretative level, it did matter. This demonstrated that the house, despite its apparent openness by means of the visual axis and the highly integrated ground plans, put up visible as well as physical restrictions for visitors. The Casa di Octavius Quartio illustrates this by means of a complicated configuration. However, material clues much aided this configuration, as can be observed with the green-glazed statuettes which directed one’s gaze and movement towards the dining area. It could be observed in the number of material nuances the Casa degli Amorini Dorati had applied when it came to limiting access to locations adjoining the peristyle. The pavement, the walls, the thresholds, all clearly showed how each room was meant to be experienced individually.

Although the two case studies have been amply dealt with in previous scholarship, they were revisited in the present chapter in order to specifically
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1036 See Platt 2002, 90.
focus on how Egyptian artefacts were used.\textsuperscript{1037} The existence of a rather rigorous difference in the use of Egyptian objects was observed. Within these dynamics, rules were certainly discovered regarding this aspect of Egyptian artefacts. They seemingly centre on applying Egypt in a cultic context, or in a decoratively-\textit{cum}-leisurely context. Moreover, the houses illustrate that either the one or the other seems to have been appropriate. Both ways of adopting Egypt includes religious aspects and aesthetic aspects, but a differentiation between them could nonetheless be witnessed. The Casa degli Amorini Dorati did not use Egypt to adorn the garden, to make that confrontation with the other from a leisure context. Egypt was used to emphasise the importance of the cult for the owners, and their means to acquire objects from afar. They employed Bacchus as a theme to make the reference to \textit{otium}, the cultured, and fantastic leisure space of the garden. The Casa di Octavius Quartio did not house a shrine dedicated to Isis, or statuettes, or anything else related to Isis (except for the painting of a priest), but did have green-glazed statuettes in a garden, and an Egyptian sphinx next to an aquatic context. They represented two quite strictly separated ways of using and interpreting Egypt. The Casa delle Nozze d'Argento and the Casa di Acceptus and Euhodis did have green-glazed statuettes but no Isis-related objects; the Casa delle Amazzoni and the Praedia di Giulia Felice housed shrines displaying Isis and her consorts, but did not have any green-glazed statuettes in the peristyle.

5.4.3 The experience of Egyptian objects in context; perception of cult and exoticism revisited

In the historiographical analysis of chapter 2 of the present research it was stated that, although previous interpretations of Aegyptiaca as cult items or exotic objects were not automatically untrue or inadequate, they were \textit{a priori} made without considering the use contexts of the artefacts and without allowing any other possible option for an interpretation. While objects that looked Greek or Roman to the scholarly observer were explained as intrinsic parts of the material and social complexities of the Roman world (receiving interpretations beyond their ‘cultural’ origin), Egyptian objects were placed

\textsuperscript{1037} Only these two case studies served as examples of place-making due to the required extensive discussion. The additional houses included were adopted in order to strengthen the argument concerning certain use and to view the houses of Pompeii in a wider framework. These houses are the Casa di Ceii, the Casa di Caccia Antica, the Casa del Fauno, the Praedia di Giulia Felice, the Casa del Frutteto, the Casa del Menandro, the Casa del Nozze d'Argento, the Casa del Bracciale d'Oro, the Casa dell'Efebo, the Casa dell'Ara Massima, the Villa dei Misteri, and the Villa San Marco at Stabiae.
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outside this discussion and always only classified as Egyptian. The analysis and re-interpretation of Egypt related material from Chapter 5 aimed at not altogether dismissing the possibility of a exotic and religious explanations, but rather to contextualise the concepts treating objects as (a) belonging to a totality of a household assemblage and (b) within an intricate network of social values and complex system of interactions within the Roman household. A first notion concerning the Egypt-related objects in this context was directed towards their diverse applications, as their varied integration within the house not only augmented the argument that was developed in the previous chapter (on the intrinsic diversity of the objects themselves), it also indicated how profoundly Egyptian artefacts within their diversity were entangled with the social and personal values of the owners of Pompeian houses. Although the objects can sometimes be clearly considered exotic from an provenance viewpoint (in the case they originate from Egypt), even if they served to add to an exotic atmosphere (a frequent theme in garden decoration), they revealed a high degree of social integration. The artefacts in all instances could be fitted into the habitus of Pompeians, and into concepts connected to the social life of the house.

Cult
How could ‘Egypt’ behave as a cult item? In this context, too, although notably different from the use of Egyptian artefacts within a garden setting, it is important to realise that such objects were part of similar complex social structures. In terms of objects there are perhaps references to the physical context of the Iseum, e.g., the threshold from the Casa del Doppio Larario, or the imported Horus statuette from the Casa degli Amorini Dorati. Egypt evidently mattered to those venerating Isis and owning a ‘true’ Egyptian statue such as Horus might have even added to concepts such as ‘sacredness’. Authenticity and age may therefore have played a more important role here than in other Egypt-related contexts. It is perhaps be probable that the statue created a link to the country Egypt, but as an unintentional outcome of social values (wanting an expensive looking and sacred statue) and not to intentionally ‘Egyptianise’ the cult of Isis. This was emphasised by means of all the other objects found in the shrine, which could be connected to the cult (e.g., the marble statuette of Fortuna) but not necessarily to Egypt. According to Alvar Isis was unquestionably Hellenised and Romanised, but adherents seemed to have stressed her alterity and that of her cult, even if it is a ‘pseudo-alterity’, through deliberately Egyptianising
the cult. Such deliberateness on the side of the initiates should be nuanced, as it seems to be the outcome of unintentional processes and associations. Personal value should not be mistaken for a deliberate stress on alterity. However, it must be noted in the context of materiality and object agency, that because of the strong social role the Isis shrine played in the value-making process (being able to display the owner’s financial, social, and intellectual wealth as well as the ability to procure something unique) this unintentional Egyptianisation would have emphasised the deity’s Egyptian aspects. The shrine does indeed mark off Isis, *remaking* her a foreign deity based on aesthetic decisions. The statuette of Horus in this respect possessed a double function; it was selected because it was special and because carried a deep cultic significance. It was probably not selected because of its iconography, but because it looked unique, was made of alabaster and had an eye-catching appearance. This personal preference of the owners in a cultic sense was therefore capable of impressing visitors unknown to Egyptian theology too. The recognisability of the ‘specialness’ elevated all objects in the shrine to this atmosphere as well, at least in social status. This was a remarkable house, with remarkable inhabitants.

**Exoticism**

Furthermore, with regards to exoticism, as touched upon in 5.1, several remarks could be made concerning previous analyses of the houses. Firstly, it can be argued that exoticism is part of a selective and socialised process, and not something which is an intrinsic quality of the object. In the context of Pompeii certain objects were considered exotic and others were not. However, this had little to do with the alleged intrinsic ‘alien’ concept of Egypt, but rather with the personal appreciation of specific materials, styles, or decorations. Something Egyptian could be experienced as non-exotic when it was made out of white marble, a material very common in Roman Pompeii in the first century AD. Also of importance in this case is to mention than objects cannot be studies disconnected from everything taking place in the house – socially, spatially, visually as well as physically - but that it should be seen as part as a whole; as a domestic unit. In that respect the Isis shrine attested in the Casa degli Amorini Dorati cannot be considered exotic on the basis of ‘Egyptianness’, but as a part of careful social, cultic, and aesthetic decisions and of reflections of personal value that only made sense in the context of that particular but nonetheless entire house.
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1038 See Alvar 2008, 2.
Contextualising a term like exoticism has therefore illustrated it sometimes formed an important concept, but within the network of social values. Daily confrontation with an artefact in a domestic context, makes the strange and exotic object as ordinary or as special as all other things of the household. Through there use in context objects became, so to say, domesticated. Even when it was considered special and of extra value, it was nonetheless a part of the Self.

Exoticism should therefore be viewed within a social context of perception and aesthetic judgement. The subconscious social influences and situational signals of which people are unaware in their aesthetic judgment play an indispensable role. How were such objects chosen and regarded when they are reviewed in this respect? Choices are neither reducible to political and social factors, nor is it solely the agency of subjectivity of the inhabitant of a house. Social factors are of importance within the concept of what is considered aesthetically pleasing, just as that the agency of an individual object can hugely influence its development. Moreover, looking at the hidden and concealed layers behind the choice for an object is significant to observe. Neuro-psychological research has revealed that because many actions are performed habitually and therefore unconscious, all kinds of subconscious factors (e.g., status cues, subliminal familiarity, social signals) influence appreciation and judgment. People are therefore much more influenced by subconsciously processed environmental features as they are by social considerations when forming aesthetic judgments than is often realised.

For example, an object becomes aesthetically valuable when it gives rise to pleasure in our appreciation of it. This appreciation, however, not only depends on the viewer's perceptive qualities, but also on relational qualities. An example of such a quality is the perception of familiarity, which can make objects become socially significant. Within perception, people generally turn familiarity (in the sense of subconscious recognition) into aesthetic value. Regarding an object special depends on a relation between habitus, the environment, and the properties of an object. And it is
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1039 Hence the importance of decorative aspects when studying Roman houses. The reason for this is that they are capable of illustrating the underlying principles in appropriation.
1040 See Kieran 2012, 32; this links to the theory of Bourdieu as noted chapter 5. The relationship between agency and structure is a dialectical one: society is constructed, historically, by people and groups of people. Those people themselves have been constructed in and by society. See Berger and Luckmann 1967; Wolf 1981, 19.
1041 See Kieran 2012, 37.
1042 We read: "Aesthetic appreciation draws on the cultivation of a wide range of perceptual capacities, cognitive-affective responses and relational knowledge. Hence, appreciation is in principle always open to discrimination.", see Kieran 2012.
a dynamic dialogue in the sense that the relations shift easily. When something becomes too familiar for instance, it loses value, as might be reflected in the intensive social emulation process of Pompeii (when the lower class has easy access to certain objects, it loses its value for the upper class, and ceases to be of value for both groups). Therefore aesthetic judgment is susceptible to many social factors, for instance the cultivation and maintaining of status, the drive towards conformity when one wants to belong to a certain class, and the drive towards non-conformity when one wants to distinguish oneself from another class. Certain social groups will appreciate specific objects or values; in order to identify oneself with such a class and in order to establish membership of that group the judgment of what is considered valuable or exotic is contextual.\footnote{On social influence as a direct and indirect processes, see Latane and Bourgeois 2001.}

The Casa di Amorini Dorati is an excellent example of how exotic and antique objects became a means of distinguishing oneself. By means of imported ancient Greek and Egyptian objects and by procuring exotic and valuable pieces of marble, obsidian, and gold they certainly had a drive towards non-conformatity as a means of social disistinction. In this way the foreign becomes a characteristic of the Self, however, by means to show oneself. The house was therefore also a constant confrontation with the Other in which the Self became re-established. The visitor played an extremely important part in the social dynamics within the Pompeian household. He or she was confronted with all these artefacts too. This dialogue makes object perception socially dependent. The visitor, when confronted with an object, revealed Heidegger’s thingness of an artefact for both parties, thereby changing its values. The artefact moved from a domasticated item that was just present in his everyday life to something that became consciously reflected upon. And it also became a reflection of his status; his wealth, knowledge, and taste.

\textbf{5.4.4 The agencies of Egypt from a domestic perspective}

In terms of Egypt’s (pre-interpretative) agencies, these are formative considering the creation of cultural value through the social role they took up within the system of aesthetic judgement discussed above. This is because aesthetic processes are actually indices of cultural value and vice
versa. Egypt-related objects are prominently included in this system of value-making, which is of importance to their integration in Pompeii (and presumably beyond). They feature in the most relevant spaces of self-representation and therefore were of an intensive aesthetic value as they were clearly worthy of attention. Porter argues that if paying attention to objects creates value, then cultural attention to objects creates cultural value. Cultural objects act to pool attention and thus to create, consolidate, or shift and remake value. The cultural values created through aesthetic experience in part consist of Egypt-related objects. Thus by means of their agency, they start to become an intrinsic part of the society of Pompeii and their culture. Not because the objects were culturally, materially, or stylistically integrated per se, but because they were firmly socially embedded.

Both houses represent examples from the final phases of the town and therefore present us with a good sense of the horizontal development of the agency and of the integration of Egyptian artefacts. An Egyptian sphinx was also a marble Mischwesen, decorating a water feature in a similar way a marble statuette of a dog would do. In the case of the marble sphinx, it did not actively seek to allude to Egypt in a cultural sense, which is not that surprising. Even if an Egyptomania occurred after the annexation of Egypt, at the time the two case studies adorned their houses almost 100 years had passed since the annexation of Egypt. If one century of Egyptian things, passing from family to family, or being available at shops and markets, can such items still be unfamiliar to a community? Can a mania last that long or should Egyptian artefacts and their acquisition be considered an integrated part of a sort of elite-buying fetish as discussed in 5.1? The answer to these questions is both a yes and a no. Although Egyptomania is a too simplistic interpretation, foreign-looking artefacts did sometimes bring something special to the social dynamics of domestic decoration. The procurement of artefacts as a means of defining one’s social status, and the dynamics of social emulation as a social process, was indeed a mania (as habitus) that continued up to Pompeii’s final days. In it Egyptian artefacts played had agency. A case of social emulation, for instance, can be observed with the green-glazed statuettes. These objects were around, commonly available and

---

1044 In their primary function of aistésis (in their immediate connection to the senses of pleasure and pain). See Porter 2012, 338.
affordable, and already ‘loosing’ their special status as symbols for elite power. The house of the Octavius Quartio had to solve this by the quantity of objects. This is not because the owners did not have taste and the interior was kitsch, it is because in a globalised society when the social value of goods shift very quickly one has to be quicker to still impress. And in the society of Pompeii this was important, for the construction of self-identity occurred for a large part within and through the home and its contents.

*Agency, materials, and eclecticism*

Furthermore noted in this chapter with respect to the concept of the agency of objects, was the relevance of the material itself. Within the creation of value, the intrinsic values are important. And in certain cases perhaps of more significance than the iconography of the artefacts. Archaeologists seemingly interpret the meaning of sculptures mainly on the basis of iconography of which it is logically assumed this was also the primary selection criteria of the object’s user. Statues are interpreted as ‘a statue of Omphale’ and never as ‘a statue made out of parian marble’. Such practices, however, do run the risk of becoming applied as an ‘emic’ interpretation; in this guise becoming another form of projection. It exaggerates the importance of iconography for a Roman audience and obscures other possibilities of value connected to the users of these objects. Because how can it be known for sure that the material, the quality, or other factors were not equally or even more important within the selection of objects and within the experience of objects? It seems to be the case for both houses that careful decisions were made to place things together to create a certain atmosphere or convey specific messages, and that material played a large role in this process. As was mentioned before, while Seiler noted a prevailing Bacchic theme in statues and herms found on the garden, the sculptural collection has often been described as eclectic (Petersen), or haphazard (Allison). As a group of white marble sculpture however, the sculpture is not haphazard at all.

Marble was also assembled on the canal of the Casa di Octavius Quartio, while the alabaster seems to have been consciously chosen for its unique material in the corner of the Isis shrine at the Casa degli Amorini Dorati. The

---

1046 One cannot be considered a professional when the latter ends up in the books, which would denote a clear sign of ignorance.
Roman shrine consisted solely of bronze objects. As to both cases discussed in this chapter, indeed a significant observation, the final decision to place objects together was carried on the basis of the material, and not according to what was represented. Material used when decorating Roman houses preceded therefore what it represented iconographically. The concept of value, as applied to material goods, is a social fact that can emerge only from a system of interpersonal relationships. Within this social network, the intrinsic value and the material were considered relevant. In this observed process Egypt played a role in both houses, not with regard to deviant iconography, but concerning the ‘specialness’ of the material. In the Casa degli Amorini Dorati this was alabaster. In the Casa di Octavius Quartio, these were the green-glazed statuettes. In the latter case the importance of material quite literally seems to have moved people, as their position and the way they were displayed guided the gaze to the public area of entertainment, the destination of guests of the house. The green glaze served as a visual attractor. It was, however, framed, situated in a dynamic space of the house, and did not serve to be more than glanced upon. ‘Egypt’ in this case triggered the audience by means of its material, which was experienced in a completely different way than the marble displayed in the house.

5.4.5 On place-making
Much can be learned about the structure of a society by analysing specific house structures, artefact assemblages, production and consumption, and by studying the interaction of various members of a household. There is an important creative power of the household as a collective, because through its physical boundaries it creates a strong, shared sense of belonging to each other and to a place, which is mutually reinforced. While the feeling of belonging not completely depends on physical space, a physical reference is much stronger than just being an imagined community.\textsuperscript{1048} This means that the house does not reflect a social or cultural identity, but in fact creates one. Moreover, the household can be considered a unit of analysis which is not artificially confined but a phenomenological entity where material and the social fuse. However, while ‘traditional’ household approaches predominantly focused on micro-assemblages, on household production, or on social relations such as gender, a new strategy had to be designed to

\textsuperscript{1048} Consider the so-called ‘imagined communities’ advocated by Benedict Anderson 1991. Members of such a community albeit unaquainted can still have a very profound sense of belonging (e.g., with nation-states, religions).
analyse perception and agency. It was not only to aim at studying the artefacts within a holistic unity, but also focus on decorative patterns, material agency and the relationship Egyptian artefacts had within the social dynamics of the house. For this place-making was applied while shaped to the needs of this research. As stated above, place-making was meant to study the objects in their use-contexts, both on a spatial, a material, and a social level. Egyptian related artefacts should be studied along with all other objects in the context of dwelling, where people meet and live, where the objects acquire its value and meaning and act out their agency. As shown in the above two case studies place-making served to provide a more balanced picture for the perception and uses of Egyptian objects within a house. As an approach it was designed and adopted to fit in with the created theoretical framework and propositions and to provide a platform where object and concept could meet. The realities of the space, the walls, the light, the colours, and the objects were able to provide valuable information on the social conventions, cognitive schemata, concepts, and aesthetic preferences. Place does, of course, not only apply to houses, but also to any locus of the built- and non-built environment through which individual or group actions, experiences, intentions, and meanings are drawn together. Place-making is multivalent and dynamic. It is an organised complexity, and sophisticated synergy of intricately intertwined elements, processes, and relationships. In this way it acknowledges the complexities involved with dwelling as discussed in part 3.7, and its cognitive and physical interplays. Not only do people interact with and change their environment, this influence is of a dialectical nature. Place-making has furthmore shown the way the environment affects the way people think. The complex totality of environments, the partitioning of space into discrete categories, and the density of space has implications for cognition. Together they make the experience of objects for a viewer and user. Together they are able to show how different properties of objects (apart and together) influenced that viewer. The tools of the method are therefore considered appropriate to use in the contest of this thesis, for being able to recognise the object in all its intricate complexities and infer from it its pre-interpretative agencies. Place-making can be considered a valuable way of approaching domestic contexts. It allows room for a physical reality which is able to influence human behaviour while respecting the social realities, subjective experiences, and subconscious dealings involved in using a space. As argued it is important
to bring together environmental and cognitive studies, in order to clearly reflect and advocate place-making as a methodology.

The individual tools applied in the present chapter; configuration analysis, visibility analysis, agent analysis, pattern analysis, and object analysis, were all selected because they could contribute directly to the focus of dwelling on a more metaphysical level and on a pragmatic level applicable to the context of the house. Together, these tools not only have contributed to housing studies as discussed above but also to the contextualisation and interpretation of Egyptian artefacts. Firstly, the individual tools in this respect had proved to be especially useful as complementary methods. The two case studies displayed different ways of structuring space, the Casa degli Amorini Dorati (primarily by means of differentiation in decorative schemes and pavement types) and the Casa di Octavius Quartio (by means of configuration). Both have placed much emphasis on controlling spaces.

It could be observed that using space syntax' access analysis was not sufficient on its own to expose all the details in the complex social conventions within the Roman house. Nevertheless the addition of object analysis and pattern analysis formed a successful complement to the methodology to understand the complex workings of domestic contexts. The spatial layout of Roman houses appeared to be shallow, open and integrated. The need was great to differentiate privacy, and social rules in terms of decoration and not in the configuration of space.\textsuperscript{1049} It is therefore suitable to study space-human related issues (e.g., interaction potential, interaction with the exterior, interaction with strangers, issues of public and privacy) However, in order to learn about how houses were experienced and how they structured relationships and behaviour it is necessary to include all material culture available. The results of space syntax’ analyses were only in part a reflection of the Roman house and its social experience. Apparently, when compared to other structures, Roman houses reveal an incredible emphasis on the relation between those living in the house, and those visiting. However, in contrast to numerous examples subjected to access analysis, Roman houses are, on the one hand, much more open configurationally and, on the other hand, display a huge complexity by means of decoration,

\textsuperscript{1049} However, it is incorrect to assume that access analysis has the limitation of working from modern terms of visitor and inhabitant as stated by Von Stackelberg 2009, 59. As the method does not have those concepts embedded in its methodology it is suitable for application in issues such as privacy, and the method clearly indicates that in Pompeii privacy was experienced very differently.
objects, and the differences in light and heights. Moreover, as noted in the introduction, the notion of privacy is a problematic concept for Pompeii. This was a prime example to illustrate that such things are less universally experienced than sometimes assumed.

Grahame and Watts did not discover many solid patterns by means of their applied access and pattern analysis to dictate a clear universal structure in use. This does not point to a paradox so much as it does to the core social values in Roman housing, which differ from modern domestic contexts. Pompeii was a culturally open society with ample room for differentiation and freedom when decorating one’s interior (to be observed, for instance, in how Egypt was used in both houses), and houses were indeed quite individualised units. However, at the same time there was a high degree of control necessary and a rigid set of social rules in order to keep open societies effective. Different houses received people in different ways; however, the need to control and regulate these visitors was equally present in all houses. A society which is very open, with a semi-public space such as an atrium needs a high degree of social controllability. Privacy however, was sought for, and became more visible not from visibility and accessibility, but as a combination of these accompanied by intricate material signs. The tools included in the place-making perspective had the great additional value of highlighting the diversity in expressing the similar social values of Roman domestic contexts. Pattern-analysis in combination with the agency of material culture illustrated both how rules were present in the material and how the mundane background could be the creating factor of social values and cultural values, as it also shaped how other interiors were experienced and thus how Egyptian artefacts were experienced.

5.4.6 Conclusion

In conclusion to chapter 5 it can be stated that including an analytical chapter on a holistic material-social entity such as the Roman house has proved fruitful with regards to the investigation of Egyptian related artefacts, mainly because it was possible to add a social component to the discussion of the meaning, use, and perception of the artefacts under investigation. This discussion ties in with the discussion of the agency the Egyptian object has as such and its consequences for Roman viewers. An important methodological proposition in the present thesis was to separate the thingness and the thing from what is thought of it. Not to strip it off its meanings or intentions, but to carefully study the various layers of
perceptions involved. The pre-interpretative perceptions of the statues, in use and passing, mattered and were able to affect viewers. The statuette of Horus was deliberately placed in a corner of the shrine dedicated to Isis. However, as a thing it did something. Although not consciously experienced by viewers, the shininess of the polished stone, its colour and the material itself, gave the first impression even before people knew, recognised, or were informed it was Egyptian. Material has come forward in this chapter as an important perception layer, together with aesthetic perception and value-making. Moreover it showed that even in the cases that Egypt could be used as something other or exotic, it was socially embedded.