

Appendix 1

A CATALOG OF POSSIBLE
BROTHELS AT POMPEII

The evidence for cribs, taverns, hotels, and baths in the immediate vicinity of the Purpose-Built Brothel, which I surveyed at the close of chapter 8, suggests that insofar as our interest extends beyond purpose-built brothels to include any venue where sex was sold, a review of the sites postulated for other brothels might be useful. Two questions arise in light of the expansive definition of brothel offered above. What other structures were used as brothels? In particular, are we able to locate other businesses where sex was sold as an important sideline, such as taverns?

It seems best to pursue the answers to these questions by listing the potential brothels in Pompeii, together with the evidence that supports such identifications, as well as references to modern discussions.¹ I include even a couple of doubtful cases, though not implausible ones. The latter category includes the House of the Vettii brothers.² Another omission is 6.14.4, identified as a brothel connected with a private house by La Torre.³ This site is mentioned by no other author cited here and appears as a shop on the plan for *Regio* 6. I believe “6.14.4” may be a mistake for 6.14.43 (the “gran lupanare” or “lupanare grande”), which Andrew Wallace-Hadrill convinces

1. A number of these references are found in a convenient tabular form in Guzzo and Scarano Ussani, *Veneris figurae* (2000) 66–67.

2. See chap. 7. n. 98; see also chap. 5, for the argument that the House of the Vettii contained not a brothel but a “sex club.”

3. La Torre, “Impianti” (1988) 93 n. 29; cf. *Pompei* (1988) 138.

me is unlikely to be a brothel, despite the presence of erotic graffiti (here evidently idle boasting/ribaldry) and (mythological) art: it is more likely to be a private house.⁴

The site 7.2.42, identified by Eschebach and Müller-Trollius as a brothel, also appears to be an error, judging from the fact that they fail to include it in their catalog.⁵ I believe 7.6.14–15 are better classified as two adjacent cribs than as a brothel.⁶ Three shops (?) (6.6.14–16), tentatively identified by Mazois in the early nineteenth century as a brothel on the basis of a nearby representation of a phallus, are rightly rejected as such by Pirson.⁷

Finally, recent excavations at Moregine (also known as Murecine), an area just to the south of the ancient city of Pompeii and well within any reasonable conception of its immediate hinterland or microregion, have turned up material of great interest.⁸ In November 2000 the skeletal remains of two adult women and three children were found in the context of an ancient *caupona*. One of the two women, aged about thirty, was discovered wearing several items of jewelry, including a gold and silver bracelet shaped into the form of a serpent with the remarkable inscription “dom<i>anus ancillae suae” (“the master to his slave”). Pier Giovanni Guzzo and Vincenzo Scarano Ussani offer a series of possible explanations for this evidence, namely that the jewelry (which also includes a gold chain the authors show probably served to adorn the woman’s nude torso) suggests that the slave woman played the role of sexual partner for her master, which seems very likely, or that of a sexual toy to be shared with his friends, which seems possible, or that of the tavern’s mistress, who acted also as a procuress and perhaps a prostitute as well. If this last hypothesis were true, the *caupona* might be listed as a brothel. But there is no real evidence of prostitution here. The first, most likely hypothesis renders the other two, especially the last, less likely. We cannot moreover exclude the possibility that the woman and her companions found themselves in this locale in the midst of an attempt to flee the eruption of Vesuvius and so neither lived nor worked there.

This last example, however, offers a salutary reminder of the fact that our

4. Wallace-Hadrill, p.c. See also Savunen, *Women* (1997) 112. This site has been studied in recent years by teams from the University of Nijmegen: see Mols and De Waele, “Rapporto” (1998); Peterse, “Secondo rapporto” (2000).

5. Eschebach and Müller-Trollius, *Gebäudeverzeichnis* (1993) 491; cf. 258, 262.

6. See chap. 7.

7. Mazois, *Ruines* 2 (1824/38) 84; Pirson, *Mietwohnungen* (1999) 33 with n. 127.

8. Guzzo and Scarano Ussani, “Schiava” (2001) is my source for the information in this paragraph. Moregine is about 600 meters to the south of the *Porta Stabiana*. For the archaeological context, see Mastroroberto, “Quartiere” (2001); on the jewelry, see D’Ambrosio, “Monili” (2001). See also the essays in De Simone and Nappo, *Mitis Sarni Opes* (2000).

knowledge of Roman brothels is susceptible to change. Investigation of the physical remains of brothels, which for Pompeii is in its infancy,⁹ may well result in a shorter or longer list of brothels. Again, the list includes only brothels that have already been identified. As with the *cellae meretriciae*, it is possible that (re)excavation, or at minimum adequate surveying, will yield some useful information about brothels. A project of this kind would be a valuable step toward the difficult goal of developing a more satisfactory typology of these establishments. Without close attention to the physical remains, the enterprise of brothel-identification at Pompeii cannot proceed very far. Even so, wild optimism about discovering unknown brothels or even confirming suspected ones, is not justified.¹⁰ Though I remain steadfast in my purpose, set forth at the beginning of this book, not to catalog “new” brothels, that is, brothels not previously identified in the scholarship, simply in order to suggest to the reader that such establishments can indeed be tracked down and identified, I offer an example of a possible brothel at 1.8.1, a *caupona* that sports an upstairs as well as graffiti referring to a woman offering fellatio and to another charging two *asses* for sex.¹¹

I refer to the works of the brothel-writers by their last names or, in a few cases, by the title of their publications, in the text of this catalog.¹² Here is an alphabetical list of abbreviated forms: Cantarella, *Pompei* (1998); *Corpus Topographicum Pompeianum* (CTP) 2 (1983), 3a (1986),¹³; Della Corte, *Case*³ (1965)¹⁴; DeFelice, *Roman Hospitality* (2001); Dierichs, *Erotik* (1997); Eschebach, *Entwicklung* (1970); Eschebach and Müller-Trollius, *Gebäudeverzeichnis* (1993); La Torre, “Impianti” (1988)¹⁵; *Pompei* (1988)¹⁶; *Pompei*:

9. The treatment of the Purpose-Built Brothel by Clarke, *Looking at Lovemaking* (1998) 196–206, virtually stands alone as an intelligent discussion of an ancient brothel. To be sure, Clarke’s focus is on the erotic art downstairs and one could wish for more description, especially of the upstairs.

10. See below in the text and chap. 10.

11. *CIL* 4.8185. Della Corte, *Case*³ (1965) 323–24, identifies this establishment as a tavern that sold fruit; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius, *Gebäudeverzeichnis* (1993) 42–43, as a “*thermopolium*” (on this word, see n. 24). Other places to look for “new” brothels are 6.1.1, 6.1.2–4, 6.2.3–5, 30–31, and 6.14.28.

12. Other works are given in abbreviated form in the notes.

13. The *CTP*, esp. volume 2, restates earlier identifications, whether as brothels or not. Nevertheless, it is a resource of great value and so I have included reference to it here.

14. In what follows, I attempt to render Della Corte’s vague and, I fear, inconsistent descriptive terminology in the following way: “*ammezzato*” = small room; “*annessi*” = side or back rooms; “*cenacoli*” = suites.

15. La Torre describes some brothels with the vague “*connessi ad edifici di ristoro*,” which I render as “associated with food/drink service.”

16. I refer to the “*Indirizzario*” (“Address-Book”) in this work.

*Pittura e Mosaici (PPM)*¹⁷; Savunen, *Women* (1997); Wallace-Hadrill, “Public Honour and Private Shame” (1995). Full citations of all of these works are either in the bibliography or the list of abbreviations.

1. 1.2.17–19.¹⁸ YFE: 1869.¹⁹ “Proprietors”: Demetrius and Helpis Afra.²⁰ Tavern. Layout includes small rooms upstairs; a sculpture [?] of an erect phallus found on an exterior wall. Della Corte 272 (“*caupona-lupanar*”: 1.2.18–19); Eschebach, 117, 174 (same address as Della Corte)²¹; CTP 2.225 (same address as Della Corte); CTP 3a.4 (= 1.2.18); La Torre, 93 n. 29 (= 1.2.19, associated with food/drink service); *Pompei* 105; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 17–18 (statue of Venus); Wallace-Hadrill, 61 n. 71 (= 1.2.18), plausible, on the basis of a cluster of “hic futui” graffiti: see *CIL* 4.3926–43, esp. 3935 and 3942 (“hic futui” type); Dierichs 77–78; DeFelice 106 (“no evidence”), 184–85 (= 1.2.18–19). PPM 1.37–46 (= 1.2.17, 18–19). Two gardens: a small one in back entered from the *tablinum* and a peristyle garden to the E of the atrium contained statuary, including a marble statuette of Venus found in a “shrine-like structure.”²² This establishment appears to fit the subtype of the *caupona* with a brothel upstairs and/or in back: see below.

Context.²³ Next door: 1.2.16 (private house); 1.2.20 (possible brothel [cat. no. 2]). Across: 1.3.29 (private house).

17. PPM is the great multivolume encyclopedia of Pompeian physical remains: Pugliese Carratelli, *Pompei: Pitture e Mosaici* (1990–1999).

18. In this place I give the address supplied by Eschebach and Müller-Trollius, *Gebäudeverzeichnis* (1993) noting differences registered by others after citing their respective works. They usually do not provide justifications for such changes, so that in some cases at least simple error cannot be ruled out. Exceptions to this practice occur with the possible doublet brothels: see nos. 20, 23, 27. On the general problem with addresses in Pompeii, see now Franklin, *Pompeis Difficile Est* (2001) 4–6.

19. The “YFE” is the year of first excavation, as given by Eschebach and Müller-Trollius in *Gebäudeverzeichnis*. In some cases, of course, this is the only year of excavation. For a small number of cases where no date is given, I use the date from a building next door, which is perhaps not always reliable.

20. Proprietors are often identified as such on the basis of electoral inscriptions, that is, inscriptions that communicate recommendations for candidates for public office. Unfortunately, they are of little use in identifying the occupants of any given location: Mouritsen, *Elections* (1988) 18–19, 21; Mouritsen, “Campaigning” (1999) esp. 518.

21. Eschebach’s brothel-identification is cautiously accepted by Gulino, *Implications* (1987) 32–34.

22. Jashemski, *Gardens* 2 (1993) 23–24 (= 1.2.17).

23. This information derives from the entries in Eschebach and Müller-Trollius, *Gebäudeverzeichnis* (1993). I give the entries for next-door neighbors as well as for those that are located more or less directly across the street.

2. 1.2.20–21. YFE: 1869. “Proprietors”: Innulus and Papilio (or Pollius or Minius). Tavern. Layout includes masonry benches for visitors, small rooms upstairs, *biclinium* in garden; “*thermopolium*” at 1.2.21.²⁴ Wall paintings of Bacchus and Fortuna; erotic graffiti. Della Corte 273–74; Eschebach 117, 175 (= 1.2.20)²⁵; CTP 2.225 (“*caupona-lupanar*”); La Torre 93 n. 29 (= 1.2.20, associated with food/drink service); Pompei 105; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 18, 491; Wallace-Hadrill 61 n. 71 (= 1.2.20), plausible, on the basis of a cluster of “*hic futui*” inscriptions: see CIL 4.3926–43, esp. 3935 and 3942 (“*hic futui*” type); Dierichs 77; DeFelice 106–7: hotel occasionally used for venal sex, but not a brothel, 185–86. Note that the same epigraphs are used to identify the possible brothel next door, cat. no. 1. PPM 1.47–48. Garden at the rear with a masonry *biclinium*.²⁶

Context. Next door: 1.2.19 (possible brothel [cat. no. 1]); 1.2.22 (shop). Across: (unexcavated).

3. 1.7.13–14. YFE: 1927. “Proprietor”: Masculus. Tavern. Side/back rooms upstairs and downstairs. Painting of Priapus. Della Corte identifies as *caupona*, not brothel. Della Corte 319–20; Eschebach 119, 175²⁷; CTP 2.229 (*caupona*); CTP 3a.12; La Torre (= 1.7.14; connected with food/drink service); Pompei 109; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 41; Wallace-Hadrill 53, with 61 n. 72: no grounds for identification as a brothel; Dierichs 77; DeFelice 108–11: no evidence for a brothel, 195. PPM 1.728–29 (= 1.7.13).

Context. Next door: 1.7.12 (private house); 1.7.15 (shop [sign painters’ shop]). Across: 1.8.15–16 (*caupona* and private house).

4. 1.9.11–12. YFE: 1953. “Proprietor”: Sex. Pompeius Amarantus and/or Q. Mestrius Maximus.²⁸ CTP 2.231 distinguishes brothel at 1.9.12 from *caupona* next door, as does CTP 3a.16 (but see note on 11). Not in La Torre. Pompei 110; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 50: *caupona* at 1.9.11; DeFelice

24. “*Thermopolium*”: The reader will note that this usage was discredited by Kleberg, *Hôtels* (1957) 24–25, though it remains popular. See also the more recent criticism of the term by Wallace-Hadrill, “Public Honour and Private Shame” (1995) 45–46.

25. Gulino, *Implications* (1987) 34–36, accepts Eschebach’s identification, thinking this is “likely” to be a brothel.

26. Jashemski, *Gardens* 2 (1993) 24 (= 1.2.20).

27. Gulino, *Implications* (1987) 49–51, accepts this identification by Eschebach.

28. Because address labels on *amphorae* found on-site, and not just epigraphic evidence from walls, contain the name Sex. Pompeius Amarantus, it is actually rather likely that he was the operator of the *caupona* in its final years: Fulford and Wallace-Hadrill, “House of Amarantus” (1995–96) 101.

199–200. The brothel and *caupona* were operated together at least in the final years of the city, and there is reason to think that both “houses” were connected from a very early stage. Recent reexamination of the remains, which has been careful and extensive, has shown the construction of a series of upper-level rooms over the peristyle of 11 in a late phase of the development of this complex, the use of room 12.4 as a stable, and employment of the *atrium* that this room opens upon (12.2) as a storage facility mostly for *amphorae* that were full. Empties were stashed in the garden next door at 11.5, which also contained benches that were evidently used in connection with some form of entertainment, possibly cockfights. The wine in question was served at the bar facing the street in 11. Archaeologists have discovered on-site the remains of thrushes (considered delicacies by the Romans), blackbirds, sheep, and domestic fowl, as well as some shellfish, complemented by a series of charred food waste that includes various fruits, nuts, and grains.²⁹

The excavators believe that in the final stages of the complex the southern part of 12 functioned as a service annex to the commercial usage of the southern part of 11, while parts of both “houses” had gone to seed. The evidence for occupation at the time of the eruption in 79 is mixed to the point of contradictory, a situation which may be explained by continuing seismic activity between 62 and 79. The authors do not directly raise the question of whether some of the space in the northern parts of both houses was used for the purpose of lodging in connection with the tavern itself (which appears to have been nonfunctional in 79), let alone examine the issue of brothel-identification, but these are preliminary reports.³⁰ PPM 2.150–71 (= 1.9.12). Each part had a garden; the one for 11 was used for storage of empty *amphorae* and so forth (see above), while 12 had a peristyle garden in the rear.³¹

Context. Next door: 1.9.10: private house; 1.9.13: private house. Across: 1.17.2–3: hotel (?).

5. 1.10.5. YFE: 1932. No proprietor. Upstairs suites; erotic graffiti: *CIL* 4.8357–61, esp. 8357b (a price of 10 *asses*) and 8361 (a reference to *fellatio*).³²

29. For these details, see the preliminary summary of excavation finds by Fulford and Wallace-Hadrill, “House of *Amarantus*” (1995–96); also the important follow-up in Fulford and Wallace-Hadrill, “Unpeeling Pompeii” (1998). Also of great value, especially for some of the details that follow, is Berry, “Domestic Life” (1997). For an examination of the pre-Roman levels on the site, see the excellent treatment in Fulford and Wallace-Hadrill, “Pre-Roman Pompeii” (1999).

30. See also Gulino, *Implications* (1987) 56–58; Berry, “Unpeeling Pompeii” (1998) 62–68.

31. Jashemski, *Gardens* 2 (1993) 45 (separate listings for each part).

32. In his forthcoming publication of the inscriptions from the *Insula del Menandro* (1.10), Dr. Antonio Varone offers new readings for *CIL* 4.8359 and 8361. The new version of the former

Della Corte 299 (= 1.10.5–6); *Pompeii* 110; Eschebach 120, 175; La Torre 93 n. 29 (connected with private house); Eschebach and Müller-Trollius, 54; not in Wallace-Hadrill; part of the *Insula of the Menander*.³³ No entry in *PPM*.

Context. Next door: 1.10.4 (private house); 1.10.6 (workshop [marble workers' ?]). Across: 1.6.15 (private house).

6. 1.10.10–11. YFE: 1933. “Proprietor”: Ti. Claudius Eulogos. *CTP* 2.232, 3a.18 (= 1.10.11): private residence. Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 56. Erotic graffiti: *CIL* 4.8393 (a price of 5 asses?), 8394 (Naereia or Nereia: 2 asses), 8400, 8404, 8408a–c; part of the *Insula of the Menander*.³⁴ The erotic graffiti appear to refer to client(s), plus one or two prices. *PPM* 2.433–99. Four-sided peristyle garden behind the *atrium*.³⁵ The house is then of the familiar *atrium/peristyle* type, with a number of small *cellae* lining both rooms.³⁶ If it was indeed converted to a brothel,³⁷ this establishment would be the largest known at Pompeii, larger even than the Purpose-Built Brothel, especially given the presence of a second floor, now reconstructed around the peristyle.

Context. Next door: 1.10.9 (workshop); 1.10.12 (workshop or public latrine [?]). Across: 1.3.28 (“*thermopolium*”); 1.3.29 (private house).

7. 1.11.10–12. YFE: 1953. “Proprietors”: Euxinus and Iustus, or Euxinus and Phoenix. Tavern. Jashemski identified this as a brothel.³⁸ *CTP* 2.232, 3a.20 (= 1.11.10–11): *caupona*. Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 59–60

does not affect the argument here; in the latter case, his suggestion that the numerical indicators, which had been ignored by Della Corte, amount to a scorecard for acts of fellatio might actually support the case for a brothel. My thanks to Dr. Varone for sharing this information with me.

33. A brothel also according to A. De Vos and M. De Vos, *Pompeii* (1982) 89, who throw in the *caupona* at 1.10.2–3 for good measure, as do La Rocca and De Vos, *Pompeii*² (1994) 180. See also Ling, *Insula of the Menander* 1 (1997) 41–42, who is cautious about the status of 1.10.5 as a brothel (148). Kunst, “Dach” (2000) 301 n. 95, accepts this as a brothel. Pirson, *Mietwohnungen* (1999) 55 (see also 212) identifies this as a *cenaculum*; he rejects its characterization as a brothel because it fails to meet all three of Wallace-Hadrill’s criteria. On the *Insula of the Menander*, see also Berry, *Unpeeling Pompeii* (1998) 22–25.

34. The alternative names Naereia and Nereia are proposed by Dr. Antonio Varone in his forthcoming edition of the inscriptions from the *Insula del Menandro*. The older reading was Nebris; for Nebris, see *CIL* 4.5118, 5145, 5146. On the *insula*, see also Berry, *Unpeeling Pompeii* (1998) 22–25.

35. Jashemski, *Gardens* 2 (1993) 50.

36. Many inns and restaurants at Pompeii have features usually associated with high-end *domus*; the same may have been true of Ostia as well. See chaps. 8 and 10.

37. In his exemplary publication of the building, Ling, *Insula of the Menander* 1 (1997) 197–211, does not canvass this possibility.

38. Jashemski, *Gardens* 1 (1979) 175. The idea is cautiously accepted by Gulino, *Implications* (1987) 63–65.

(*caupona*); DeFelice 124, 203–4 (painting of Priapus; two erotic graffiti: *CIL* 4.9847–48). *PPM* 2.570–92 (= 1.11.10–11 [*caupona*], 1.11.12 [house of the *caupo*]). Large garden, directly accessible from street, that contained “a colorfully painted little room,” stairs leading evidently to upstairs accommodations, altars and apparatus for sacrifice, trees, vines, and a couple of semi-embedded *dolia* used to ferment the must, while behind 12 there was a large open area informally planted as a vineyard, containing statuary, including a marble statuette of Venus.³⁹

Context. Next door: 1.11.9 (back door to private house); 1.11.13 (private house). Across: 1.16.4 (private house); 1.16.5 (private house).

8. 1.12.5. YFE: 1914. “Proprietor”: Lutatius. Tavern. *CTP* 2.233; 3a.22 (*caupona*). Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 63–64 (*caupona*); DeFelice, 124–25, 206–7 (*caupona* with prostitutes working in it; graffiti with a price: *CIL* 4.8454—Firma, 2 asses; at *CIL* 4.4259, a woman of that name is listed for 3 asses: see cat. no. 11 below); cf. *CIL* 4.8449: fellatio. *PPM* 2.735–46. Small open area at the rear of the lodgings.⁴⁰

Context. Next door: 1.12.4 (shop/workshop); 1.12.6 (private house). Across: 3.2.2 (shop); 3.2.3 (workshop/dwelling) (neither are completely excavated).

9. 2.1.1, 13. YFE: 1915. “Proprietor”: Hermes. Tavern. Della Corte 366 (*caupona*). *CTP* 2.234; 3a.40 (*caupona*). Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 85 (“*thermopolium*”-*caupona*); DeFelice 125, 213–14: possible brothel because of design (multiple rooms), presence of graffiti (*CIL* 4.8473, 8475). *PPM* 3.1–4. Small garden at the rear of the lodgings area behind the tavern.⁴¹

Context. Next door: 2.1.2 (private house); 2.1.12 (cult complex). Across: 3.4.1a (tavern); 1.13.4–6 (dwelling/workshop).

10. 5.1.13. YFE: 1875. “Proprietor”: Salvius. Tavern. *CTP* 3a.70 (“*thermopolium*”); Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 124 (*popina*); DeFelice 126, 227–28 (*taberna/popina* with prostitutes working in it, multiple rooms, graffiti with prices). *CIL* 4.4023: Felic(u)la, 2 asses, 4024: Menander, 2 asses (“bellis

39. Jashemski, *Gardens* 2 (1993) 51–52, with separate entries for 1.11.10–11 and 12.

40. Jashemski, *Gardens* 2 (1993) 54. See also the description in Gulino, *Implications* (1987) 69–70.

41. Jashemski, *Gardens* 2 (1993) 75.

moribus”), 4025: Successa (“bellis moribus”). A woman named Felic(u)la is implied to be a prostitute at *CIL* 4.2199, 2200, 8917. No entry in *PPM*.

Context. Next door: 5.1.12 (back door to private house); 5.1.14 (private house and bakery). Across: 6.14.28–32 (private house, *popina*, and bakery).

11. 5.2.B–C, D. YFE: 1880?/1882? “Proprietors”: N. Fufidius Successus and/or N. Herennius Castus. Tavern. *CTP* 2.243 appears to regard as three separate private dwellings; cf. *CTP* 3a.72 (= 5.2.C–D), whose plan suggests the address(es) should be given as B, C–D. Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 134–35 (B–C, “*thermopolium*” with lodgings; D, row house); DeFelice 126, 229 (= 5.2.C–D): *taberna/popina* with erotic graffiti, multiple rooms; possibly functioned as a brothel. One of the graffiti shows prices: *CIL* 4.4259: Acria, 4 asses, Firma, 3 asses, Epafra, 10 asses (cf. 4.4264: cunnilingus with Rustica); one is of the “hic futui” type: *CIL* 4.4260. *PPM* 3.628–35 (= 5.2.D, i.e., no entry for B–C).

Context. Next door: 5.2.A (private house); 5.2.E (*caupona*). Across: 5.1.9 (back door to private house); 5.1.10 (back door to private house).

12. 6.10.1, 19. YFE: 1827. See figures 1–2. No proprietor. Tavern. Layout has a bar on street and small rooms in back. Erotic art.⁴² Della Corte identifies as a *caupona-lupanar*. Della Corte 55–56 (= 6.10.1); Eschebach 132, 175; *CTP* 2.258; La Torre 93 n. 29 (= 6.10.19; connected with food/drink service); *Pompeii* 133–34; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 192; Wallace-Hadrill 53, with 61 n. 72: no grounds; DeFelice 111–14: not a brothel.⁴³ *PPM* 4.1005–28 (= 6.10.1).

Context. Next door: 6.10.2 (possible brothel [cat. no. 13]); 6.10.18 (“*thermopolium*” with dwelling). Across: 6.8.23–24 (private house); 6.9.6–9 (private house).

13. 6.10.2. YFE: 1827. “Proprietor”: Obellius (?) or Avellius (?) Firmus. Not in Della Corte (cf. 56: a *caupona* at 6.10.3–4); Eschebach 132, 175; *CTP*

42. On this see Clarke, *Looking at Lovemaking* (1998) 206–12; Clarke, *Art in the Lives of Ordinary Romans* (forthcoming), chap. 6.

43. See also Packer, “Inns at Pompeii” (1978) 46, 49; Clarke, *Looking at Lovemaking* (1998) 211–12; Guzzo and Scarano Ussani, *Veneris figurae* (2000) 14. Clarke sees prostitution occurring only in one room (d). If he is right, 6.10.1, 19 would be a crib, according to my definition, and not a brothel.

2.258; La Torre 93 n. 29 (connected with private house); *Pompei* 133–34; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 192–93; Wallace-Hadrill, 61 n. 73: dubious. *PPM* 4.1029–43. Small garden with a partial portico and a dining room in back.⁴⁴ Ranks as one of the weakest identifications: see cat. no. 21 as well.

Context. Next door: 6.10.1, 19 (possible brothel [cat. no. 12]); 6.10.3 (“*thermopolium*” with dwelling). Across: 6.8.23–24 (private house).

14. 6.11.5, 15–16. YFE: 1842. “Proprietor”: Restituta. Tavern? Layout has suites upstairs; downstairs is a central room with four “cubicoli,” as well as a few side/back rooms; Della Corte compares to the Purpose-Built Brothel. Erotic graffiti, some of which list prices: *CIL* 4.1375–91, 4434–44 (see 4439: Pitane, 3 asses; 4441: Isidorus, 2 asses. Della Corte, 60–61 (= 6.11.16, the more usual listing); Eschebach 132 (= 6.11.4, 15–17), 175 (= 6.11.16); *CTP* 2.260 (= 6.11.16)⁴⁵; La Torre 93 n. 29 (associated with food/drink service); *Pompei* 135; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 198; Wallace-Hadrill 61 n. 73 (dubious: “the graffiti . . . are inconclusive”); Cantarella 91; Dierichs 135 n. 42; DeFelice 114–15, 249–50: not a brothel. No entry in *PPM*. Large cultivated area in *W* part with remains of a masonry *triclinium* from an earlier period.⁴⁶

Context. Next door: 6.11.4 (workshop/dwelling); 6.11.6 (workshop/dwelling); 6.11.14 (small private house with workshop [?]); 6.11.17 (workshop/dwelling). Across: 6.9.2, 13 (private house); 6.15.23 (hotel [?]).

15. 6.16.32–33. YFE: 1904. “Proprietor”: L. Aurunculeius Secundio. Tavern. Della Corte 94–95 (*domus* and *caupona*); *CTP* 2.266; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 231: *popina* with “*thermopolium*,” brothel, and home of Secundio (erotic art, representation of phallus, and table with Bacchant herm); Dierichs 77; DeFelice 257. *PPM* 5.960–73.

Context. Next door: 6.16.31 (private house/workshop [?]); 6.16.34 (shop). Across: 6.15.4 (stair to upstairs evidently part of private house at 6.15.5, 24–25).

44. Jashemski, *Gardens* 2 (1993):141.

45. *CTP* 2.260 n. 4, alerts us to an error made by Pietro Soprano in compiling the indices to the third edition of Della Corte in which this brothel is identified as that of Africanus and Victor: Della Corte, *Case*³ (1965) 507.

46. Jashemski, *Gardens* 2 (1993) 143 (= 6.11.5).

16. 7.1.20. YFE: 1853. No proprietor. Tavern? Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 246: shop (wine shop?) with back room; brothel upstairs? No entry in PPM.

Context. Next door: 7.1.19 (shop); 7.1.21 (private house). Across: 9.2.11, 12 (shops).

17. 7.2.12. YFE: 1843. No proprietor. Tavern. Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 256: *caupona* with brothel; erotic art. PPM 6.496–509 (= 7.2.11–12 [“Tinctoria”]; see 509).

Context. Next door: 7.2.11 (clothes dyers/cleaners); 7.2.13 (shop/dwelling). Across: 9.3.1–2 (clothes dyers/cleaners); 9.4.9 (shop).

18. 7.2.32–33. YFE: 1822. “Proprietor”: Philippus (or Aprasius Felix). Tavern. Della Corte 177–78 (*caupona*); CTP 2.275; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 261: wine shop and *caupona* (relief of phallus sculpted in tufa); Dierichs 76–77 (= 7.2.28–29, 32–33, taking the crib at 28—a suggestion of Eschebach and Müller-Trollius—and “*officina*” at 29 as part of the brothel), DeFelice 264. Brothel upstairs? PPM 6.720–21 (*caupona*).

Context. Next door: 7.2.31 (private house with shops); 7.2.34 (shop). Across: 7.9.29–34 (possible brothel [cat. no. 25]); 7.4.31–33, 50–51 (private house); 7.12.1–2, 36 (bakery).

19. 7.3.26–28. YFE: 1868. “Proprietors”: Euplia and Phoebus. Tavern. Upstairs suites and erotic graffiti (CIL 4.2310b, 3103). Della Corte 149–50; Eschebach 138, 174–75; CTP 2.277; La Torre 93 n. 29 (= 7.3.27 [cf. cat. no. 20, which La Torre identifies as a separate brothel]; associated with food/drink service); Pompei 147; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 270 (*caupona*–“*thermopolium*”–*lupanar*); Wallace-Hadrill 53 with 61 n. 71 (= 7.3.28): plausible, though only one erotic graffito [cf. cat. no. 37], discounting or ignoring CIL 4.3103).⁴⁷ Dierichs 135 n. 41; DeFelice 115–16, 267–68: doubtful. No entry in PPM.

Context. Next door: 7.3.25 (private house); 7.3.29 (private house). Across: 7.2.17 (shop); 7.2.18–19, 42 (private house).

47. Pirson, *Mietwohnungen* (1999) 55 (see also 226) (= 7.3.27) identifies this as a *cenaculum*; he rejects identifying this as a brothel because it fails to meet all three of Wallace-Hadrill’s criteria.

20. 7.3.28. YFE: 1868. “Proprietors”: Euplia and Phoebus (?). Tavern. For Della Corte Eschebach, and Eschebach and Müller-Trollius, see cat. no. 19. La Torre, 93 n. 29, regards as separate brothel (associated with food/drink service); *Pompei* 147 and Wallace-Hadrill also appear to regard as separate, but are unclear: see cat. no. 19. No entry in PPM.

Context. See cat. no. 19.

21. 7.4.44. YFE: 1833. No proprietor. Della Corte identifies as a private house, not a brothel. Della Corte 124–26 (= 7.4.44, 48); Eschebach 139, 175 (= 7.4.43, 48); La Torre 93 n. 29 (connected with private house); *Pompei* 148; Wallace-Hadrill 61 n. 73 (= 7.4.44): dubious; “was not suspected even by Della Corte . . . and is presumably confused with the *cella* [i.e., crib] at VII.4.42.” One of the weakest identifications: see cat. no. 13 also.⁴⁸ PPM 7.4–5 (= 7.4.44–47).

Context. Next door: 7.4.43 (back door to private house); 7.4.45 (business/commercial establishment). Across: 7.3.38–40 (private house with *caupona*, etc.).

22. 7.6.34–36. YFE: 1822. “Proprietor”: Venus. Two taverns with upstairs *cellae* or booths. Graffiti mentioning clients. *Caupona* across the street. Della Corte 169–72 (= 7.6.34–35); Eschebach 140, 175 (same address as Della Corte); CTP 2.283; La Torre 93 n. 29 (= 7.6.34 [cf. cat. no. 23, which he gives as a separate brothel]; “independent”); *Pompei* 152; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 297–98; Wallace-Hadrill 53 with 61 n. 71 (= 9.6.34): plausible, with various graffiti (CIL 4.1626–49b), though “none pointing conclusively to sexual activity”; Savunen, 111–12 (allows Della Corte might be right in brothel-identification); Cantarella 90 (whether or not a brothel, prostitutes worked here). See CIL 4.1631 (fellatio), 1645b (“hic futui” type). PPM 7.207–9 (= 7.6.34–35).

Context. Next door: 7.6.33 (shop); 7.6.37 (back door to private house). Across: 7.7.18 (possible brothel [cat. no. 24]); 7.15.11–11a (private house); 7.16.19 (workshop).

23. 7.6.35. YFE: 1822. “Proprietor”: Venus (?). For Della Corte, Eschebach, Eschebach and Müller-Trollius, see cat. no. 22. La Torre 93 n. 29,

⁴⁸. Rejected as a brothel also by Pirson, *Mietwohnungen* (1999) 55 (see also 227) (= *cenaculum*).

regards as separate brothel (“independent”), as does Wallace-Hadrill (= 7.6.35–36). *PPM*: see cat. no. 22.

Context. See cat. no. 22.

24. 7.7.18. YFE: 1859. “Proprietor”: L. Numisius. Tavern. Not in Della Corte. Eschebach 165 regards as a *caupona*, not a brothel, as does *CTP* 2.283; but see the assertion at Eschebach 140 that this is a branch of the brothel lying across the street (cat. nos. 22/23). La Torre 93 n. 29 (connected with food/drink service); *Pompei* 152; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 302 (*caupona* with brothel; obscene relief); Wallace-Hadrill 53 with 61 n. 72: no grounds; Dierichs 76: *caupona*; DeFelice 275: erotic graffiti (*CIL* 4.549 a–b). As many as three back rooms, erotic art.⁴⁹ *PPM* 7.277–81.

Context. Next door: 7.7.17 (back door to private house); 7.7.19 (private house). Across: 7.6.33 (shop); 7.6.34–36 (possible brothel [cat. nos. 22/23]).

25. 7.9.29–34. YFE: 1822. “Proprietors”: Donatus and Verpus. Tavern. Not in Della Corte. Eschebach 141, 175 (= 7.9.32, the more usual listing); *CTP* 2.289 (= 7.9.33); La Torre 93 n. 29 (associated with food/drink service); *Pompei* 154; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius, 314–15 (listed with 7.9.29–34, as the “*thermopolium*”-*caupona* of Donatus and Verpus); Wallace-Hadrill 53 with 61 n. 73: dubious; DeFelice 116–17 focuses on the two *popinae* at 7.9.30–31 and 33: the latter has three rooms (one with erotic painting) and an upstairs.⁵⁰ A *caupona/popina* type of brothel with more than one backroom and/or an upstairs seems very possible here.⁵¹ No entry in *PPM* aside from 7.9.33 (= *Casa del Re di Prussia*): 7.353–57. At the rear of 33 was a *lararium* painting of Mars and Venus on the wall above a fountain set in what was evidently a small garden.⁵²

Context. Next door: 7.9.28 (shop); 7.9.35 (business/commercial establishment). Across: 7.2.32–33 (possible brothel [cat. no. 18]); 7.4.31–33, 50–51 (private house); 7.12.1–2, 36 (bakery).

49. On this, see Guzzo and Scarano Ussani, *Veneris figurae* (2000) 14–17.

50. See Clarke, *Looking at Lovemaking* (1998) 259–60; Guzzo and Scarano Ussani, *Veneris figurae* (2000) 14, 17. There is also an erotic inscription, “*lente impelle*” (*CIL* 4.794), on the significance of which see De Martino, “*Storia*” (1996) 326.

51. Rejected as a brothel by Pirson, *Mietwohnungen* (2000) 55 (see also 229) (= *cenaculum*), because all three of Wallace-Hadrill’s criteria are not met.

52. Jashemski, *Gardens* 2 (1993) 189 (= 7.9.33).

26. 7.12.18–20. YFE: 1862. The Purpose-Built Brothel. See figures 4–11. “Proprietors”: Africanus, or Africanus and Victor.⁵³ Its ground floor has a hallway connecting five small rooms (each with a masonry bed) and featuring erotic paintings on the upper walls above the doorways. There is a painting of Priapus in the hall and a latrine under the stairs. A stair off a separate street entrance leads to a balcony connecting five small rooms upstairs: see cat. no. 27. One hundred and twenty-three graffiti according to Della Corte, many of them erotic: see *CIL* 4.817–18, 2173–2301. Della Corte 203; Eschebach 142, 174–75; *CTP* 2.291; La Torre 93 n. 29 (= 7.12.18–19, because he regards the upstairs as a separate brothel; identifies it as “independent”); *Pompei* 157–58; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 330; Wallace-Hadrill 51–53 (the only certain *lupanar*); Dierichs 76; Savunen 111; Cantarella 87; DeFelice 102–3. Extensive description in chap. 8.⁵⁴ *PPM* 7.520–39.

Context. Next door: 7.12.17 (wool works); 7.12.21 (private house). Across: 7.1.40–43 (private house with workshop); 7.1.44–45a (hotel with *caupona*); 7.11.11–12, 14 (hotel with *caupona* and crib).

27. 7.12.20. YFE: 1862. Upstairs of Purpose-Built Brothel (cat. no. 26). “Proprietors”: Africanus, or Africanus and Victor (?). See references under cat. no. 26. La Torre 93 n. 29, regards as separate brothel. Wallace-Hadrill, p.c., suggests these are the sleeping quarters of the women who worked downstairs. A better description of this site is urgently needed. *PPM*: see cat. no. 26.

Context: see cat. no. 26.

28. 7.13.13. YFE: 1847 (?). No proprietor. Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 335: upstairs brothel? Price graffito: *CIL* 4.2028 (with p. 704). No entry in *PPM*.

Context. Next door: 7.13.12 (business/commercial establishment); 7.13.14 (back door to private house). Across: 7.14.5, 17–19 (private house).

29. 7.13.18. YFE: 1839 (?). No proprietor. Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 336 (“*Casa di Ganimede*”): upstairs brothel? This upstairs complex was located

53. In this case, Africanus also appears in nonelectoral graffiti in and around the brothel. Franklin, “Games and a *Lupanar*” (1985/6) 323, identifies Victor as a *scriptor* who assisted Africanus in lettering electoral graffiti and also as a client of the brothel. On the unreliability of identifications of proprietors, see n. 20 above.

54. See also La Rocca and De Vos, *Pompei*² (1994) 313–16.

over the service sector of the *Casa di Ganimede* and so was the property of the owner of that house. There are two cribs at 7.13.15 and 16. These appear, however, to have been constructed after the earthquake, that is, in post-62 Pompeii, at a time when the access to the upstairs at 18 seems to have been cut off, presumably as a consequence of earthquake damage, while the upstairs itself dates to the years immediately preceding 62.⁵⁵ PPM 7.616–35 (= 7.13.4, 17–18). It seems clear that the owner or owners of the *Casa di Ganimede* had an appreciable interest in exploiting their property for the sale of sex, at least from the middle of the first century onwards. See cat. no. 30 as well. It is not necessary to suppose that the entire house was given over to prostitution at any time to make this point.⁵⁶

Context. Next door: 7.13.17 (private house); 7.13.19 (possible brothel [cat. no. 30]). Across: 7.10.1–2, 15 (business/commercial establishment).

30. 7.13.19–21. YFE: 1820. No proprietor. Tavern. Eschebach and Müller-Trollius, 336: *popina* and brothel (19 is a *cella meretricia*)⁵⁷; Dierichs 135 n. 41 (= 7.13.19); DeFelice 282 (= 7.13.20–21). PPM 7.655–57 (= 7.13.20–22). This establishment was evidently a property of the owner of the *Casa di Ganimede* in the final years of the city's existence.

Context. Next door: 7.13.18 (possible brothel [cat. no. 29]); 7.13.22 (shop). Across: 7.9.1, 43, 66–68 (Eumachia building [rear]); 7.10.1–2, 15 (business/commercial establishment).

31. 7.15.4–5. YFE: 1872. No proprietor. Tavern. Della Corte 199–200 (= 7.15.4–6): a *taberna lusoria*, not a brothel, similarly Eschebach 143, CTP 2.294 (same address as Della Corte); Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 343 (business with “*thermopolium*”-*caupona*); DeFelice 126–27, 283–84: possible brothel. Erotic graffiti of the “*hic futui*” type: CIL 4.4815–16, 4818. PPM 7.781–90. A small garden in the back of 5 is visible through a large window installed in a diningroom.⁵⁸

55. Eschebach, “*Casa di Ganimede*” (1982) 240–41, 274–75, 311–12.

56. Eschebach, “*Casa di Ganimede*” (1982) 277, suggests, if I understand him correctly, that the entire *Casa di Ganimede* may at some point have functioned as a brothel, partly on the basis of two representations of the phallus at different points of the facade.

57. Eschebach, *Entwicklung* (1970) 143, 175, also identifies 7.13.19 as a crib. Eschebach, “*Casa di Ganimede*” (1982) 248–49, 312, proposes that this tavern, which shows the remains of a staircase to an upper floor, offered prostitution there. The crib at 7.13.19, though it faces the street (see Eschebach, 245), very likely operated in conjunction with the tavern as well.

58. Jashemski, *Gardens* 2 (1993) 199.

Context. Next door: 7.15.3 (private house); 7.15.6 (business/commercial establishment). Across: 7.7.2, 5, 14–15 (private house).

32. 7.16.B. YFE: 1955. See figures 23–27. “Proprietor”: Faustius. The Suburban Bath complex. Della Corte knew only some erotic graffiti, only one of which is really secure: CIL 4.1751 features the relatively expensive—for Pompeian graffiti—price of 16 asses) and a masonry bench. See also CIL 4.1740–41, 1746, 1748, and 1750 (as restored by Della Corte, NB), 9146a–b, 9147b–d (names of clients?), 9146f (a reference to a client/prostitutes?), 9146h (a greeting to a *caupo*?). Della Corte 440–43 (= 7 Occ. [in front of the *Porta Marina* N.]); Eschebach 144, 174 (same address as Della Corte); not in La Torre nor in Wallace-Hadrill. Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 240, 491.⁵⁹ Explicit erotic art is found in the changing room (*apodyterium*) of the Baths themselves. The post-Della Corte excavations of the Suburban Baths show a group of three apartments on the top floor. Though connected with the *apodyterium* of the Baths by a service ramp/stairs, this level also has an entrance independent of the Baths.⁶⁰ One or more of these apartments might well have been used as a brothel at some point.⁶¹ No entry in PPM.

Context. The entrance to the *Porta Marina* and the city wall.

33. 8.4.12. YFE: 1861. No proprietor. Tavern. Layout has a vestibule leading to peristyle and upstairs rooms. Seven *dolia* were found embedded in the soil in back, as well as a metal chest. Della Corte has a barbershop in the entranceway: see CIL 4.743. Della Corte and Eschebach identify as a *ganeum-lupanar*; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius as a *ganeum-lupanar* behind a *caupona* and barbershop. Della Corte 237–38; Eschebach 145, 175 (= 8.4.12–13); La Torre 93 n. 29 (associated with food/drink service); *Pompei* 164; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 372; Wallace-Hadrill 53 with 61 n. 72 (= 8.4.12–13): no

59. The address is taken from the catalog at Eschebach and Müller-Trollius, *Gebäudeverzeichnis* (1993) 491. The brief discussion of the Suburban Baths at 240, viewed in the context of the city map, suggests an address of 7.A.1.

60. Conticello, “Lavori” (1988) 62, accepts the presence of a brothel on this level on the basis of the now-famous erotic paintings in the Baths themselves. The logic is suspect (see chaps. 4 and 7), and yet in this case a faulty premise does not necessarily preclude a correct conclusion; see also La Rocca and De Vos, *Pompei*² (1994) 96; Guzzo and Scarano Ussani, *Veneris figurae* (2000) 21–24 Scarano Ussani, “Alle terme” (2001/2002).

61. Jacobelli, *Terme Suburbane* (1995) 65, 97; Clarke, “Laughing” (2002) 151–55 are skeptical. For other examples of apartments built into baths, see Soricelli, “Piano Superiore” (1995) 112; for comparison with other rental property in Pompeii, see Soricelli, 116–17. Not all of the decoration, to be sure, seems consistent with a brothel.

grounds for identification as a brothel; Dierichs 77; DeFelice 118, 288 (= 8.4.12–13): not a brothel. No entry in PPM. The garden in back, in addition to the *dolia* mentioned above, had a four-sided portico and a masonry pool with a fountain.⁶²

Context. Next door: 8.4.11 (workshop); 8.4.13 (barbershop). Across: 7.1.8, 14–17, 48, 50–51 (Stabian Baths); 7.1.9 (shop).

34. 9.2.7–8. YFE: 1851. “Proprietor”: Hilario. Layout includes access to living quarters on ground floor and suites upstairs. Della Corte identifies as a tavern, not a brothel. Della Corte 208–9 (= 9.2.6 or 7); CTP 2.315 (lists 9.2.6 or 7 separately from 9.2.7–8); Eschebach 148, 175 (“*Casa della Fontana d’Amore*”); La Torre 93 n. 29 (= 9.2.8); Pompei 171; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 406 (relief in tufa of a phallus); Wallace-Hadrill 61 n. 73 (= 9.2.8): dubious, Dierichs 77. PPM 8.1068–87 (= 9.2.6–7). The garden at the rear of 7, surrounded on three sides by garden paintings, flanked a pool with a fountain, a marble statuette of an *amorino*, and a wall painting of a nymph.⁶³

Context. Next door: 9.2.6 (shop/dwelling); 9.2.9 (shop). Across: 7.1.23 (public latrine); 7.1.24 (shop); 7.1.25, 46–47 (private house).

35. 9.5.14–16. YFE: 1878. No proprietor. Tavern. Not in Della Corte.⁶⁴ CTP 2.320 (= 9.5.16); Eschebach 149, 175; La Torre 93 n. 29 (= 9.5.14; connected with private house); Pompei 174; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 425 (*popina* in 16); Wallace-Hadrill 53 with 61 n. 73 (= 9.5.14): dubious. The layout is irregular; some erotic art found. DeFelice 118–19, 295 (= 9.5.16): not a brothel.⁶⁵ PPM 9.600–69 (also skeptical of its identification as a brothel). A garden with portico lay at the back of 14, while the *atrium* of 16 had an *impluvium* enclosed by a low wall with a planting bed in the top.⁶⁶

62. Jashemski, *Gardens* 2 (1993) 213 (= 8.4.12–13).

63. Jashemski, *Gardens* 2 (1993) 228 (= 9.2.7).

64. Evidently first identified as a combination *caupona*-brothel by Mau, “Scavi” (1879) 209–10.

65. See Clarke, *Looking at Lovemaking* (1998) 178–87, who appears concerned to split the difference on the brothel-identification (at 186–87): “. . . [this is] simply a house-to-tavern makeover, with one of the attractions being a room [f] that could be used—among other things—for the occasional tryst by willing (and sometimes paid) partners.” The effort to limit the experience of prostitution both spatially and temporally is characteristic of much 1990s writing on Pompeian brothels.

66. Jashemski, *Gardens* 2 (1993) 237.

Context. Next door: 9.5.13 (private house); 9.5.17 (back door to private house). Across: 9.8.A (private house); 9.8.B (hotel); 9.6.8 (possible brothel [cat. no. 37]).

36. 9.5.18–21 (at 19). YFE: 1878. “Proprietor”: Somene. Upstairs room(s). Erotic graffiti (*CIL* 4.5099–5157, esp. 5105, 5123, 5127), mentioning clients, prostitutes, prices. Della Corte 162–63 (= 9.5.19, the more usual listing); Eschebach, 149–50, 175; *CTP* 2.320 (= 9.5.19); La Torre 93 n. 29 (connected with private house); *Pompei* 174; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 425; Wallace-Hadrill 53 with 61 n. 73, identifies as a private house, not a brothel, Savunen 112, agrees; Cantarella 91.⁶⁷ *PPM* 9.670–719 (= 9.5.18, “*Casa di Giasone*”): the entry at 19, with its staircase leading to the brothel, is a post-earthquake arrangement.⁶⁸ An *atrium* enclosed by a four-sided portico served as a garden with a pool and fountain in the middle and surrounded on three sides by a *viridarium*.⁶⁹

Context. Next door: 9.5.17 (back door to private house); 9.5.22 (private house). Across: 9.4.13–14 (Central Baths); 9.6.4–7 (private house).

37. 9.6.8. YFE: 1880. “Proprietor”: Amandus. Its design has eight rooms around a small *atrium*. Erotic graffiti of a kind: *CIL* 4.5187. Della Corte 163; Eschebach 150, 174; *CTP* 2.321; La Torre, 93 n. 29 (for whom this brothel is connected with a private house); *Pompei* 175; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 427–28; Wallace-Hadrill 53 with 61 n. 73 thinks dubious, because only one erotic graffiti; Savunen 112 agrees; Cantarella 91. *PPM* 9.765–67. A small garden lies behind the *atrium* in the SW portion of the “house.”⁷⁰

Context. Next door: 9.6.7 (private house), (unexcavated). Across: 9.5.14–16 (possible brothel [cat. no. 35]); 9.8.B (hotel); 9.8.C (private house [partially excavated]).

38. 9.7.14. YFE: 1880 (?). No proprietor. Not in Della Corte. Eschebach 150, 175; La Torre 93 n. 29 (“independent”); *Pompei* 175; Eschebach and

67. Rejected as a brothel by Pirson, *Mietwohnungen* (1999) 55 (see also 225–26) (= *cenaculum*) because not all of Wallace-Hadrill’s criteria are met.

68. The presence of a brothel here would make a nice counterpoint to the moralizing program of wall paintings in this house, above all those found in *cubiculum* e: Pugliese Carratelli, *Pompei* 9 (1999) 671.

69. Jashemski, *Gardens* 2 (1993) 237.

70. Jashemski, *Gardens* 2 (1993) 238–39.

Müller-Trollius 433: *posticum*? Not in Wallace-Hadrill. Appears to be a double crib. Cribs are also at 9.7.15 and 17. Associated with the tavern at 9.7.13? No entry in PPM.

Context. Next door: 9.7.13 (“*thermopolium*”); 9.7.15 (crib). Across: 9.1.22, 29 (private house); 9.1.28 (*stabulum* [lodgings for persons and draft animals]).

39. 9.7.26. YFE: 1880. “Proprietors”: Fabius Memor and Fabius Celer. Tavern. Della Corte, 197: tavern with side rooms, similarly Eschebach, 150; CTP 2.322 (= 9.25–26); Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 436: *caupona*-brothel. Evidently associated with the “*thermopolium*”-*popina-hospitium* attributed to Fabius Memor and Celer at 9.7.24–25; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 435–36; DeFelice 301. No entry in PPM. A small garden in the rear of 25 has a mosaic fountain with depictions of Venus and *amorini*, while at the rear of 26 there is a small open courtyard paved with *opus signinum*.⁷¹

Context. 9.7.25 (“*thermopolium*”-*popina*-hotel); (unexcavated). Across: 9.6.F (shop); 9.6.G (private house).

40. 9.11.2–3. YFE: 1911. “Proprietor”: Asellina. Tavern. Della Corte identifies this as a “*thermopolium*,” not a brothel. Ithyphallic-lamp found, plus graffiti argued to show that prostitutes were interested in local elections. Della Corte 307–9 (= 9.11.2); Eschebach 151, 174 (= 9.11.2–4, rooms upstairs); CTP 2.324 (= 9.11.2); La Torre 93 n. 29 (= 9.11.3; “independent”); Pompeii 177; Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 445–46 (depiction of Mercury with phallus and two women: “*thermopolium*”-*caupona* with brothel); Wallace-Hadrill 53, with 61 n. 71 (= 9.11.3), deems plausible on the basis of “suggestive graffiti,” but points out, however, that the site has not been excavated; Dierichs 77 (= 9.11.3); Cantarella 75 (= 9.11.2: doubtful); DeFelice 35, 119–20, 304–5 (= 9.11.2–4): CIL 4.7221, 7862–76, 9096–99, 9351.⁷² No entry in PPM.

Context. Next door: 9.11.1 (private house [unexcavated]); 9.11.4 (shop). Across: 1.7.1, 20 (private house); 1.7.2–3 (private house with workshop).

71. Jashemski, *Gardens* 2 (1993) 242, with separate entries for each.

72. There is a regrettable scholarly tradition of coyness in evaluating the nature of this site. For more or less indirect identification as a brothel, see Della Corte, *Pompeii: The New Excavations* (1927) 25 (“... the establishment in which, according to custom, not only foods and drinks were sold”); Maiuri, “Scavi” (1950) 25; La Rocca and De Vos, *Pompeii*² (1994) 213–14.

41. 9.12.6–8. YFE: 1912. “Proprietor”: Crescens or C. Iulius Polybius or Porphyrio/Purpurio. Tavern? Layout suggests the existence of an upstairs level; side/back rooms still unexcavated per Della Corte, who identifies this as a tavern, not a brothel. Della Corte 322 (= 9.12.6); Eschebach 151, 175 (same address as Della Corte); CTP 2.325 (same address as Della Corte, but has a separate listing for 9.12.7); La Torre 93 n. 29 (“independent”); *Pompei* 177 (= 9.12.6–7?); Eschebach and Müller-Trollius 448 (ithyphallic Mercury with purse). Not in Wallace-Hadrill. Dierichs 77 (= 9.12.6); Savunen 110: recent excavations show a bakery on the ground floor, which in her view excludes identification as a brothel.⁷³ DeFelice 305 (= 9.12.7). No entry in PPM.

Context. Next door: 9.12.5 (shop); (unexcavated). Across: 1.8.7 (shop); 1.8.8–9 (“*thermopolium*”); 9.13.1 (private house).

The gaps and inconsistencies in this list merit no great comment. For the reasons given in chapter 7, none of the three criteria of layout, art, and graffiti are really probative in themselves. A skeptic might object that even in the case of the Purpose-Built Brothel the evidence is not inherently better, just more abundant, than elsewhere. Just how easy it is to slide from reasonable doubt to hyperskepticism is well illustrated by the case of the Suburban Baths, which is no. 32 in the catalog. This complex also serves as an excellent example of the challenge in showing that a brothel operated in connection with a bath, a point discussed in chapter 7.

The descriptions of brothels in the literary evidence are of little help in identifying the material remains of such establishments,⁷⁴ since the salient details they provide do not survive in the archaeological record, with the possible exception in some cases of the *titulus*.⁷⁵ Beyond that they are impossibly

73. See Varone, “Terremoti” (1995) 29–35, with literature, above all his own work, with more extensive description of the finds. Besides the bakery, there is a dining facility, a retail outlet, and bedrooms both upstairs and downstairs, as well as erotic art. Definite exclusion as a brothel hardly seems justified.

74. The most important ones are in Sen. *Contr.* 1.2; [Verg.] *Copa* (at least using our definition); Petron. 7–8; Iuv. 6.115–32; Apul. *Apol.* 75; *Hist. Ap. Tyr.* 33–36.

75. The *titulus* was an inscription giving the price charged by a prostitute, which was found near the door to her room in a brothel, to judge from *Hist. Ap. Tyr.* 33–34. From among the over two dozen graffiti that give the prices of prostitutes at Pompeii, there is not a single unambiguous example of such a *titulus*, though some of those found in doorways might be thought to qualify: see, for example, *CIL* 4.4439, 4441. Of course the sources mention *cellae*, for example, but do not describe them in any detail.

vague—they are not really intended as full or accurate descriptions of brothels—and laden with clichés. They betray an upper-class sensibility about how dirty, smoky, and smelly brothels were, in other words, how low-class, rather than impart much information that is useful to us.⁷⁶ This does not mean, of course, that Roman brothels were clean, well-lit places, only that the literary evidence is inadequate to prove that they were not.

One index of the poverty of this literary evidence is that it does not allow us to conclude with absolute certainty that the concept of *lupanar* could embrace either *caupona* or *popina*, though it hardly excludes the possibility either.⁷⁷ The best evidence comes from the least likely source, Apuleius's accusation that his enemy Herennius Rufinus turned his house into a brothel in order to prostitute his wife and daughter.⁷⁸ In this case we have an upper-class *domus* that is made to seem like a *lupanar*, but is not the real thing. In any case, we might take the alleged occupation of the *triclinium* by partyers (*comissatores*) to suggest that the on-site vending of drink might facilitate the holding of a *comissatio* in a brothel, though it hardly proves it.⁷⁹

One instance where the literary and archaeological evidence actually aligns will give a fair idea of the absurd difficulties involved in identifying the remains of Roman brothels. In the *Story of Apollonius of Tyre*, the innocent Tarsia, immediately after her acquisition at auction by the pimp, is brought to a brothel, where she spies a golden statue of Priapus, adorned with jewels and gold trim.⁸⁰ When instructed by the pimp to pay homage to his patron deity, she asks him whether he hails from Lampsacus, Priapus's hometown. The question is obviously meant to betray her naiveté and her innocence. The pimp's reply drives this point home: "are you ignorant of the fact, wretched girl, that you have entered the house of a greedy pimp?"⁸¹

If we compare this incident with the adventures of Encolpius and Ascyltos, which are discussed in chapter 9, we see that knowledge about brothels was ideally differentiated by gender. The obliviousness that Petronius's heroes display in regard to their surroundings makes them look ridiculous, while Tarsia's ignorance guarantees her respectability and heightens the pathos of her

76. The same holds, of course, for *popinae*, *cauponae*, and so forth: see evidence in Chevallier, *Voyages* (1988) 75.

77. The presence of drunken clients proves nothing either way: Sen. *Contr.* 1.2.10. Nor does evidence for consuming food in a brothel: see chap. 2.

78. Apul. *Apol.* 75.

79. See the legal evidence discussed below in the text.

80. *Hist. Ap. Tyr.* 33.

81. *Hist. Ap. Tyr.* 33: "ignoras, misera, quia in domum avari lenonis incurristi?"

situation. Her failure to recognize the statue of Priapus as a sign that she had been brought to work in a brothel suggests that this was an icon of such establishments, a premise that receives support from the double-barreled painted exemplar found on an interior wall of the Purpose-Built Brothel.⁸² We would not of course expect to find a gold and jewel-encrusted specimen outside of a literary text.

Unfortunately, this cliché, even if it is echoed from time to time in the archaeological record, is of no more service in identifying the material remains of brothels than those which pepper the accounts of Petronius and the other literary sources. The reason should be obvious. Representations of Priapus and, more generally, the phallus, were found in a number of contexts, most of them having nothing to do with brothels.⁸³ At the same time, it would be unreasonable to expect to see Priapus or the phallus in every brothel. We might conclude that while their presence is not irrelevant to identifying a building as a brothel, it is hardly probative, and their absence proves nothing. The two types of evidence, literary and archaeological, seem to pass each other like the proverbial two ships in the night.

Neither the archaeological nor the literary evidence in fact will allow us to distinguish with conviction a tavern, inn, or another form of lower-class dwelling from a brothel, unless the latter is purpose-built.⁸⁴ The scarce legal evidence is of a piece with this. In one passage, for example, the jurist Ulpian appears to distinguish *lupanaria* from other establishments in which prostitutes worked, but draws no legal consequences from this contrast, and we may even argue extends the concept of brothel, at least for specific ends at law.⁸⁵

We must also concede that, given the problems in excavating, reporting, and preserving the material remains, we cannot in many cases distinguish with certainty a tavern from other types of shops.⁸⁶ By the same token, it is impos-

82. See chap. 8.

83. For recent discussions of the place of the phallus in Roman erotic art, see the notes to chap. 7.

84. For inns, see 6.1.1, 6.2.4, 7.1.44–45, 7.11.11, 14, with Jashemski, “Copa” (1963/4), 6.7.15, with Packer, “Middle and Lower Class Housing” (1975) 136; 1.1.6–9, 1.2.24, 7.12.34–35, 1.11.16, 5.2.13, 6.9.1, 14, 6.14.35–36, with Packer, “Inns at Pompeii” (1978). Still more examples in Ruddell, *Business* (1964). For rental housing at Pompeii, see now Pirson, “Rented Accommodation” (1997); Pirson, *Mietwohnungen* (1999). I am not certain that rental housing can be effectively distinguished from inns, and so forth. Pirson (“Rented Accommodation,” 166 n. 7) excludes from consideration “the letting-out of single rooms on a short-term basis.” How can we be certain that subletting did not occur on the premises he does examine?

85. Ulp. D. 23.2.43 pr.; cf. 9; also Ulp. D. 3.2.4.2; Alex. Sev. C. 4.56.3 (a. 225). See the discussion in chaps. 1 and 7.

86. For Pompeii, see Gassner, *Kaufläden* (1986) 21, 37, 80 (and 2–7, 10, for ambiguous terminology); Jongman, *Economy* (1988) 169; for Ostia, see Girri, *Taberna* (1956) 3, 44.

sible to know how many brothels are missing from the list given above.⁸⁷ Even so, it is disappointing how little attention archaeologists have paid to the brothel, especially given the general interest in ancient sexuality that classicists have shown since the 1970s. We still must rely on Matteo Della Corte, whose identifications of Pompeian buildings are widely mistrusted, for the most extensive analysis—as brothels—of the physical remains for too many of these places.

It is not simply a matter of a careful, scientific reexamination of the physical remains and/or their (re)publication according to the more exacting standards that now prevail. The re-excavation of sites is unlikely to turn up much new sexual graffiti or erotic art, though finds of this kind are not utterly impossible. What is more likely to bear fruit and so what is urgently needed is the careful evaluation of the use of space in venues where prostitution has been suspected, always with the understanding that the absence of masonry beds proves little in itself. Disagreement over the identification of individual brothels is inevitable, but such dissension should be regarded as salutary in an environment where absolute certainty is usually impossible. The challenge to archaeologists, in particular to Pompeianists, is simply to raise the issue, presenting the evidence in a manner that allows nonspecialists, such as social historians interested in Roman sexuality, to decide for themselves how convincing they find a conclusion, whether negative or positive, about the presence of a brothel on a given site. It is regrettable to see how often, even in excellent publications of very recent vintage, the question is never raised or, if it is raised, it is summarily dismissed.⁸⁸

For that reason, it is risky to attempt to go further. All the same, a tentative list, set forth pending direct inspection of the material remains and correction by my betters, may be useful. I consider the following candidates to be “more likely” as brothels: cat. nos. 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 36, 37, 38, 40.⁸⁹ The total is twenty-six

87. These may include entire subtypes that have in part or largely vanished, such as the *caupona* with upstairs brothel. See, for example, 7.12.15–16, with Franklin, “Games and a *Lupanar*” (1985/6) 320. Pirson’s work on rental accommodation at Pompeii, *Mietwohnungen* (1999) contains a wealth of information, no small part of which may be of service in the identification of brothels.

88. The superbly documented Pugliese Carratelli, *Pompeii* (1990–1999) is, apart from scattered exceptions, disappointingly reticent on the subject of brothel-identification in regard to the buildings that fall within its scope. The very few close reexaminations of already excavated sites that have been conducted in recent years at Pompeii, though in most respects exemplary, are also disappointing in this one respect. See nos. 4, 5, 6 in the catalog. For less recent and somewhat better treatment of this type, though it still leaves something to be desired, see cat. nos. 29, 30.

89. For the application of the criteria, one should consult the individual entries. I note here only that I tend to weigh the graffiti containing prices as heavily as Wallace-Hadrill does the “hic

brothels, though some of these should perhaps be combined, that is 19/20, 22/23, 26/27, reducing the total to twenty-three. I would rate 13 and 21 as “less likely.”

A minimum of three subtypes of brothel emerges from my survey.⁹⁰ There is the lone example of the Purpose-Built brothel: 26/27. Next there is the tavern or *caupona/popina* with rooms in back and/or upstairs: cat. nos. 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20 (or 19/20), 22, 23 (or 22/23), 24, 25, 30, 31, 33, 35, 39, 40. Other possible examples of this type include cat. nos. 4, 7, 13, 14, 16, 41. The third subtype cannot be differentiated any further at this time, beyond the observation that it appears to fit under the classification of lower-class lodgings.

If the list is more or less correct in its identification of brothels, it is interesting to see the second type, the tavern-brothel, emerge as the dominant subtype.⁹¹ Though generally smaller than our one purpose-built example, these brothels seem to have been far more numerous and would therefore have harbored many more prostitutes overall. If the hypothesis about the numbers of purpose-built brothels in the Regionary Catalogs representing purpose-built brothels is correct (chapter 6), a similar ratio of tavern-type to purpose-built brothel may have held true for Rome and elsewhere in the Roman world.

futui” type. As seen in chaps. 2 and 7, graffiti—of whatever kind—are not an absolutely reliable indicator of the presence of a brothel. A particular instance where this principle holds for price-graffiti can be seen in the case of the House of the Vettii, discussed at the beginning of this appendix. Their absence is of course hardly conclusive either. I should also call attention to the peculiar cases of cat. nos. 29 and 30, where *none* of the criteria are significant, but where the presence of cribs—three in all—speaks very loudly, in my opinion, in favor of the identification of two brothels.

90. Cf. the categorization of modern Nevada brothels into bar houses, parlor houses, and mixed, that Shaner *Madam* (2001) 39 offers. See also Albert, *Brothel* (2001) 20.

91. It may be useful to compare the description of saloons with attached prostitution-quarters in nineteenth-century New York City that Hill, *Their Sisters' Keepers* (1993) 187, 190 provides. Cf. the wine shops operated by brothel-keepers in nineteenth-century Paris: Corbin, *Women for Hire* (1990) 56–57.