



McDONALD INSTITUTE CONVERSATIONS

# Fuel and Fire in the Ancient Roman World

Towards an integrated economic understanding

Edited by Robyn Veal & Victoria Leitch

# Fuel and Fire in the Ancient Roman World





McDONALD INSTITUTE CONVERSATIONS

---

# Fuel and Fire in the Ancient Roman World

Towards an integrated  
economic understanding

Edited by Robyn Veal & Victoria Leitch

*with contributions from*

Jim Ball, H.E.M. Cool, Sylvie Coubray, David Griffiths,  
Mohamed Kenawi, Victoria Leitch, Archer Martin, Ismini Miliaresis,  
Heike Möller, Cristina Mondin, Nicolas Monteix, Anna-Katharina Rieger,  
Tony Rook, Erica Rowan, Robyn Veal, Véronique Zech-Matterne

This book, and the conference upon which it was based, were funded by: the Oxford Roman Economy Project (OxREP), University of Oxford; a private contribution from Jim Ball (former FAO forestry director, and President, Commonwealth Forestry Association); the British School at Rome; and the Finnish Institute of Rome. The editors would also like to acknowledge the support of the McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, and the Department of Archaeology (University of Sydney).



*Published by:*

McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research  
University of Cambridge  
Downing Street  
Cambridge, UK  
CB2 3ER  
(0)(1223) 339327  
eaj31@cam.ac.uk  
www.mcdonald.cam.ac.uk



McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, 2019

© 2019 McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.  
*Fuel and Fire in the Ancient Roman World* is made available  
under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-  
NoDerivatives 4.0 (International) Licence:  
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

ISBN: 978-1-902937-91-5

Cover design by Dora Kemp and Ben Plumridge.  
Typesetting and layout by Ben Plumridge.

Edited for the Institute by James Barrett (*Series Editor*).

---

---

# CONTENTS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| Contributors  | vii  |
| Figures   | viii |
| Tables  | ix   |
| Preface   | xi   |
| <b>Introduction</b> Studying fuel and fire through the integration of ecology, economy, technology and culture  | 1    |
| ROBYN VEAL  |      |
| Research approaches   | 1    |
| Organization of the book  | 2    |
| Discussion  | 3    |
| Further thoughts and questions  | 4    |
| Conclusions   | 6    |
| <b>Part I                Science and technology of fuel</b>   |      |
| <b>Chapter 1     The history and science of fire and fuel in the Roman Empire</b>                               | 11   |
| ROBYN VEAL  |      |
| Characterizing the importance of fuel in the economy  | 11   |
| Calorific potential and efficiency of fuel consumption  | 13   |
| Factors affecting the wood supply   | 13   |
| Roman fuel consuming activities: wood or charcoal?  | 17   |
| Pricing and transport   | 18   |
| Modelling the size of the wood fuel supply  | 18   |
| History of wood charcoal analysis   | 19   |
| The reflectance technique: differentiating raw wood and charcoal fuel   | 19   |
| Conclusion  | 20   |
| <b>Chapter 2     Glass and fuel</b>   | 25   |
| H.E.M. COOL   |      |
| The development of the glass industries   | 25   |
| Glass chemistry, manufacture and melting temperatures   | 26   |
| Putting the numbers together  | 29   |
| <b>Chapter 3     Problems in estimating fuels consumed in buildings: fuel requirements of hypocausted baths</b> | 35   |
| TONY ROOK   |      |
| Simplified calculation of heat loss from buildings  | 35   |
| Openings  | 35   |
| Heat requirements of a simplified <i>caldarium</i>  | 36   |
| Inside temperature  | 36   |
| The structure of a hypocausted building   | 37   |
| The fuel consumption of a hypocaust   | 37   |
| Conclusions   | 37   |
| <b>Chapter 4     Throwing money out the window: fuel in the Forum Baths at Ostia</b>                            | 39   |
| ISMINI MILIARESIS   |      |
| The windows of the Forum Baths at Ostia   | 39   |
| The effects of window glazing   | 42   |
| Heat study method and initial results   | 43   |
| Conclusion  | 47   |

|                   |   |     |
|-------------------|---|-----|
| <b>Part II</b>    | <b>Fuel in ceramics making: ancient and modern examples</b>   |     |
| <i>Chapter 5</i>  | Fuelling Roman pottery kilns in Britain and North Africa: climatic, economic and traditional strategies         | 53  |
|                   | VICTORIA LEITCH   |     |
|                   | Kilns   | 53  |
|                   | Choice, location and collection of North African fuel   | 57  |
|                   | Economic factors  | 58  |
|                   | Conclusions   | 59  |
| <i>Chapter 6</i>  | Kilns in a wood-poor environment: traditional workshops in the western delta of Egypt                           | 63  |
|                   | ARCHER MARTIN   |     |
| <i>Chapter 7</i>  | Necessity is the mother of invention: the fuel of Graeco-Roman pottery kilns in the semi-arid Eastern Marmarica | 71  |
|                   | HEIKE MÖLLER & ANNA-KATHARINA RIEGER  |     |
|                   | The fuel consumers: pottery production and kilns in the Eastern Marmarica                                       | 71  |
|                   | How to generate biomass   | 76  |
|                   | Botanical remains from Wadi Qasaba  | 80  |
|                   | Botanical remains from Wadi Umm el-Ashdan   | 82  |
|                   | Modern pottery workshops – an ethnoarchaeological approach to fuelling kilns                                    | 84  |
|                   | Conclusion  | 84  |
| <i>Chapter 8</i>  | Continuity of production: kilns and fuel in Egypt and the Mediterranean   | 87  |
|                   | MOHAMED KENAWI & CRISTINA MONDIN  |     |
|                   | Hellenistic and Roman kilns: the evidence   | 87  |
|                   | Medieval to Early Modern kilns: the evidence  | 88  |
|                   | Modern Egyptian kilns in Fayoum   | 89  |
|                   | Modern kilns in the Mediterranean   | 92  |
|                   | Discussion  | 95  |
| <b>Part III</b>   | <b>Alternative fuels to wood: olive pressings and oil</b>   |     |
| <i>Chapter 9</i>  | Commercialization of the night at Pompeii   | 99  |
|                   | DAVID G. GRIFFITHS  |     |
|                   | Pompeii: a case study   | 99  |
|                   | Quantifying consumption   | 104 |
|                   | Conclusions   | 106 |
| <i>Chapter 10</i> | The utility of olive oil pressing waste as a fuel source in the Roman world                                     | 109 |
|                   | ERICA ROWAN   |     |
|                   | The properties of pomace  | 110 |
|                   | Quantities generated in the Roman Empire  | 111 |
|                   | Consequences of quantity  | 111 |
|                   | The case of Lepcis Magna  | 113 |
|                   | Rome's challenge and solution   | 114 |
|                   | Conclusions   | 116 |
| <i>Chapter 11</i> | Of olives and wood: baking bread in Pompeii   | 121 |
|                   | SYLVIE COUBRAY, NICOLAS MONTEIX & VÉRONIQUE ZECH-MATTERNE   |     |
|                   | Sampling macro-remains  | 121 |
|                   | Results of the plant remains study  | 123 |
|                   | Interpretation of plant assemblages   | 124 |
|                   | Charcoal assemblage   | 125 |
|                   | Olive pressing by-products used as fuel   | 125 |
|                   | Conclusion  | 131 |
| <i>Epilogue</i>   | Final discussions   | 135 |
|                   | ROBYN VEAL & JIM BALL   |     |
|                   | Introduction (Robyn Veal)   | 135 |
|                   | Wood fuels in the present-day context, or 'What can the past learn from the present?' (Jim Ball)                | 135 |

---

## CONTRIBUTORS

DR ROBYN VEAL

McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research,  
University of Cambridge  
Downing Street, Cambridge, CB2 3ES  
Department of Archaeology, University of Sydney  
Camperdown, NSW 2006, Australia  
Email: rjv33@cam.ac.uk  
Website: www.robynveal.com

DR VICTORIA LEITCH

School of Archaeology and Ancient History,  
University of Leicester  
University Road, Leicester, LE1 7RH  
Email: vl46@le.ac.uk

JIM BALL

Formerly Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome  
Email: jbball1@yahoo.co.uk

DR H.E.M. COOL

Barbican Research Associates  
Email: hilary@coolarchaeology.com

DR SYLVIE COUBRAY

INRAP/MNHN, UMR 7209 Archéozoologie,  
Archéobotanique: sociétés, pratiques et  
environnements)  
National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris  
Email: sylvie.coubray@inrap.fr

DR DAVID GRIFFITHS

Independent researcher  
Email: david.griffiths1973@gmail.com

DR MOHAMED KENAWI

EAMENA Project, School of Archaeology,  
University of Oxford  
Email: mohamed.kenawi@arch.ox.ac.uk

DR ARCHER MARTIN

Independent researcher  
Email: archer.martin@alice.it

DR. ISMINI MILIARESIS

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA, USA  
Email: iam5f@virginia.edu

DR HEIKE MÖLLER

German Archaeological Institute, Berlin  
Email: heike.moeller@dainst.de

DR CRISTINA MONDIN

Padua University and Asolo Museum  
Email: cristina.mondin@unipd.it

DR NICOLAS MONTEIX

Département d'histoire, Université de Rouen  
1 Rue Thomas Becket, 76130, Mon-Saint-Aignan,  
France  
Email: nicolas.monteix@univ-rouen.fr

DR ANNA-KATHARINA RIEGER

Institute for Ancient Studies, University of Graz,  
Austria  
Email: anna.rieger@uni-graz.at

TONY ROOK

Independent researcher  
Email: tony.rook@virgin.net

DR ERICA ROWAN

Department of Classics, Royal Holloway, University  
of London, London  
Email: Erica.Rowan@rhul.ac.uk

DR VÉRONIQUE ZECH-MATTERNE

CNRS/MNHN UMR 7209 AASPE  
Centre national de la Recherche Scientifique  
UMR 7209 team, Muséum National d'Histoire  
Naturelle, Paris  
Email: veronique.zechmatterne@mnhn.fr

## Figures

|      |   |     |
|------|---|-----|
| 1.1  | An example of a microphotograph of deciduous oak from Ostia synagogue.  | 15  |
| 1.2  | Modern 'smallwood' (or coppice) being taken to market in the Sarno valley, Campania.  | 16  |
| 1.3  | Probable fuel types for different activities.   | 17  |
| 4.1  | Plan of the modern remains of the Forum Baths at Ostia.   | 40  |
| 4.2  | Plan of the modern remains of Room 15.  | 41  |
| 4.3  | Plan of the modern remains of Room 16.  | 41  |
| 4.4  | Plan of the modern remains of Room 17.  | 41  |
| 4.5  | Plan of the modern remains of Room 18.  | 41  |
| 4.6  | Plan of the modern remains of Room 19.  | 41  |
| 5.1  | Kiln at Oudhna, Tunisia.  | 56  |
| 5.2  | Schematic plan of the Leptiminus kiln site.   | 56  |
| 5.3  | Kiln at Moknine pottery production site today.  | 57  |
| 6.1  | Location map of the production centres discussed.   | 64  |
| 6.2  | Pots at Idfina.   | 65  |
| 6.3  | Workshop at Idfina with piles of sugar cane pressings and scrap wood and a kiln.  | 66  |
| 6.4  | Adding sawdust to a beginning firing at Rahmaneyah.   | 66  |
| 6.5  | Adding scrap wood to an ongoing firing at Damanhur.   | 67  |
| 6.6  | Ongoing firing with agricultural waste at Gezira Isa.   | 67  |
| 7.1  | Map of the Marmarica showing the investigation area. Pottery production sites in the Eastern Marmarica  | 72  |
| 7.2  | Natural prerequisites along the coastline in the Eastern Marmarica.   | 73  |
| 7.3  | Wadi Qasaba. Trench of the wasters heap. Pressing facility.   | 74  |
| 7.4  | Wadi Umm el-Ashdan. Reconstruction of the pottery kiln. Trench of a pottery kiln.   | 75  |
| 7.5  | Wadi Umm el-Ashdan. Different agricultural areas in the watershed system.   | 77  |
| 7.6  | Wadi Umm el-Ashdan. View on planting mounds as they appear on surface (teleilat el-einab).<br>Wadi Umm el-Ashdan. Excavation of a stone mound.  | 78  |
| 7.7  | Archaeobotanical remains from Wadi Qasaba and Wadi Umm el-Ashdan: Wood of a <i>Tamarix</i> sp.<br>Wood of <i>Vitis vinifera</i> .   | 79  |
| 7.8  | Archaeobotanical remains from Wadi Qasaba: <i>Hordeum vulgare</i> , <i>rachis</i> , and <i>Triticum aestivum</i> ,<br><i>caryopsis</i> . <i>Triticum aestivum</i> , <i>caryopsis</i> .                    | 80  |
| 7.9  | Vegetation in the Wadi Umm el-Ashdan and Wadi Kharouba: <i>Salsola</i> and <i>Artiplex Halimus</i> ,<br><i>Chenopodiaceae</i> species. Vegetation in the desert of the Marmarica Plateau: <i>Acacia</i> . | 81  |
| 7.10 | Archaeobotanical remains from Wadi Umm el-Ashdan: <i>Ficus carica</i> , <i>achene</i> . <i>Fabaceae</i> , <i>seed</i> .   | 83  |
| 8.1  | Small kilns at Tell Timai in the eastern delta.   | 88  |
| 8.2  | Map of the modern production sites mentioned in this chapter.   | 89  |
| 8.3  | Kilns and pottery at al-Nazla, Fayoum.  | 90  |
| 8.4  | Kilns and pottery at al-Nazla, Fayoum.  | 90  |
| 8.5  | Kilns and pottery at al-Nazla, Fayoum.  | 90  |
| 8.6  | Pottery produced in Tunis, Fayoum.  | 91  |
| 8.7  | Kiln at Tunis, Fayoum.  | 92  |
| 9.1  | Number of game days at Pompeii.   | 101 |
| 9.2  | The apodyterium at the Forum Baths.   | 103 |
| 9.3  | Length of daylight hours for Pompeii, Italy.  | 105 |
| 10.1 | Hypothetical divisions of pomace fuel usage in the hinterland of Lepcis Magna.  | 114 |
| 11.1 | Changes in bakery I 12, 1-2 in Pompeii between its building and the Vesuvius eruption.  | 122 |
| 11.2 | Section view of beaten earth layers in bakery I 12, 1-2 during excavation.  | 122 |
| 11.3 | A Pompeiian bakery oven during heating and baking phases.   | 127 |
| 11.4 | Distribution plans for <i>Olea europaea</i> and charcoal fragments in bakery I 12, 1-2 during the first and<br>second phases.   | 128 |
| 11.5 | Distribution plan for <i>Olea europaea</i> and charcoal fragments in bakery I 12, 1-2 during the last phase.  | 129 |
| 11.6 | Oil presses and perfume workshops in Pompeii.   | 129 |
| 11.7 | Known villas with <i>trapetum</i> around Pompeii.   | 130 |
| 11.8 | Variations of land use for olive trees according to the culture mode and the estimated Pompeiian population.  | 130 |

---

## Tables

|      |  |     |
|------|--|-----|
| 1.1  | <i>Approximate relative heat values of different fuel types, drawn from a range of sources.</i>  | 13  |
| 2.1  | <i>Key temperatures in the working of soda-lime-silicate glass.</i>  | 29  |
| 2.2  | <i>Fuel consumption recorded by the Roman Glassmakers furnace project.</i>   | 30  |
| 4.1  | <i>Room 18 with unglazed windows.</i>  | 44  |
| 4.2  | <i>Room 18 with glazed windows.</i>  | 44  |
| 4.3  | <i>Room 18 with windows in January on a cloudy day.</i>  | 45  |
| 4.4  | <i>Room 18 with both glazed and double-glazed windows.</i>   | 46  |
| 4.5  | <i>Room 18 with unglazed, glazed and partially open windows.</i>   | 46  |
| 4.6  | <i>Room 18 with unglazed and glazed windows with no shutters, and unglazed and glazed windows with closed shutters.</i>                                    | 47  |
| 7.1  | <i>Botanical finds from the large pottery production site in Wadi Qasaba.</i>  | 82  |
| 7.2  | <i>Botanical finds from the area of the settlement in Wadi Umm el-Ashdan.</i>  | 83  |
| 8.1  | <i>Calorific value of various natural fuels.</i>   | 94  |
| 9.1  | <i>Lighting equipment from ten Pompeiian households.</i>   | 100 |
| 9.2  | <i>The ceramic oil lamps from Casa del Chirurgo, Insula VI. 1.</i>   | 104 |
| 9.3  | <i>Estimated light fuel consumption for 95 commercial structures, ten households and the Forum Baths.</i>  | 105 |
| 10.1 | <i>Domestic uses of pomace.</i>  | 112 |
| 10.2 | <i>Quantities of pomace required to heat the water used for one press and then all presses in Rome's hinterland during a single 90-day pressing season</i> | 115 |
| 11.1 | <i>Relative importance of the main species identified.</i>   | 123 |
| 11.2 | <i>Fragmentation of the Olea remains: comparison between the concentrations and the occupation levels.</i>   | 124 |
| 11.3 | <i>Summarized results of charcoal analysis: absolute, relative and ubiquity frequency of the taxa.</i>   | 125 |



---

## Preface

This book arises from a conference held at the British School at Rome, and the Finnish Institute in Rome, in March 2013, entitled *Fuel and Fire in the Ancient Roman World*. The conference represented the first real attempt to try to bridge the gap between ‘top-down’ generalized models about Roman energy consumption (itself, still a relatively new area of research), and research carried out by artefact and environmental specialists. In many ways it exceeded our expectations, although it probably raised more questions than it answered. As fuel is used in many different domestic and industrial contexts, the papers were very heterogeneous; some presenters came from a strong archaeobotanical background, which is a central area for fuel research, while others came from social, technical and economic spheres, opening up the discussion beyond archaeobotany. Some papers presented more ‘qualitative’ rather than ‘quantitative’ results but, as a new research area, this was inevitable and qualitative evaluation can provide the framework for approaching quantitative studies. Nevertheless, useful quantitative beginnings are proposed in a number of papers. Although focused on the Roman period, the research often extended beyond this chronological span, to help contextualize the results.

We gratefully acknowledge the support and assistance of the British School at Rome and the *Institutum Romanum Finlandiae* (Finnish Institute of Rome). In particular we thank Professor Katariina Mustakallio, then director of the *IRF*, for generously hosting the conference lunch on the final day. The financial support of the Oxford Roman Economy Project, through

Professor Andrew Wilson, and a significant private donation from Mr Jim Ball, former Commonwealth Forests Chairman (administered through the BSR Rickman Fund) allowed speakers’ travel, accommodation and subsistence costs to be covered, as well as a contribution towards publication costs. Professor Wilson and Mr Ball both provided much appreciated moral support and intellectual input, acting as our major discussants. The McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, through its Conversations series, also helped fund publication. Professor Graeme Barker (McDonald Institute director to September 2014), Professor Cyprian Broodbank (current director), Dr James Barrett (current deputy director) and Dr Simon Stoddart (former acting deputy director) all provided advice and guidance over time. This was much appreciated. Dora Kemp provided initial advice on manuscript preparation, and after her untimely death, Ben Plumridge took over the practical side of production. Maria Rosaria Vairo, then a Masters student of the University of Lecce, and Dana Challinor, a doctoral student at the University of Oxford, provided significant voluntary support during the conference and we thank them both profusely. Robyn Veal would also like to acknowledge the long-term financial and intellectual support of the Department of Archaeology, University of Sydney, through much of her early work on fuel. This led to the opportunity of a fellowship at the BSR, and the idea for this conference. The feedback from reviewers has greatly improved the book.

Robyn Veal & Victoria Leitch



---

## Chapter 3

# Problems in estimating fuels consumed in buildings: fuel requirements of hypocausted baths

Tony Rook

In the 1950s, in addition to advising on conventional heating of buildings I did original research on the introduction of domestic electrical underfloor heating.<sup>1</sup> My excavation of the Welwyn Roman baths (published in full in Rook 1986), and my work on the study of Roman domestic baths in Britain (Rook 1975, 1976)<sup>2</sup> led to my publishing a paper (Rook 1978) in which I attempted to calculate approximately the fuel consumption of a small suite of Roman baths, based on the remains excavated at Welwyn. This was intended to be a *ballon d'essai*. Was the suggested reconstruction feasible? Were the assumed conditions correct? Were my naive mathematics satisfactory? Unfortunately, I received no feedback.

Observations at the reconstructed *mansio* baths at Xanten (Rook 1993) strongly suggested that the conditions assumed in my 1978 paper, which were based on published figures for present-day so-called 'Turkish' baths in England, were incorrect. In particular that a maximum temperature of 40 °C could be assumed for the *caldarium*. Since this article was published, more modern studies, particularly of comfort physics, have made a more sophisticated approach possible.<sup>3</sup> So this present paper attempts to show in relatively simple terms how heat loss calculations from buildings are performed now, and also questions some of the basic assumptions I made in the 1978 article and suggests approaches to correcting some of them.

### Simplified calculation of heat loss from buildings

When calculating the heat input required for a building, it is usual to take a total over a long period, such as a year, taking average conditions over the period. The procedure is as follows:

1. Decide on inside temperature
2. Decide on outside temperatures (based on published meteorological tables)

3. Calculate areas of walls, doors, windows and ceiling
4. Determine U-values<sup>4</sup> of these (from published tables)
5. Calculate heat loss = area × U-value × ( $\theta_i - \theta_o$ ) through:
  - a. walls
  - b. doors
  - c. windows
  - d. ceiling
6. Determine ground-loss U-value from floor dimensions and published tables
7. Calculate ground loss  
Loss = U-value × ( $\theta_i - \theta_o$ )
8. Add these to give total conductive heat loss
9. Calculate volume of room
10. Determine the air changes (depends on type of room)
11. Calculate ventilation loss:  
Loss = volume of room × air changes per second × ( $\theta_i - \theta_o$ ) × 0.33
12. Add together the results of steps 4, 6 and 10.

A real situation can be more complicated, e.g. by having a range of temperature differences across walls (into other rooms).

### Openings

Some of the factors involved in calculating heat losses in ordinary buildings, especially heat loss through openings, pose special problems. The example of windows in Roman baths (in this case, the main baths at Ostia) is discussed in detail by Miliaresis in this volume. Whereas an opening that is *efficiently* closed by a door, shutter or by glass (or double glazing) can be treated as a conductivity issue mathematically; problems with U-values; openings without doors,

shutters or glazing, (involving ventilation, either by convection or by wind), cannot accurately be known.

### Heat requirements of a simplified *caldarium*

The case of a hypothetical *caldarium*, where all the walls are lined with all the *tubuli* functioning as chimneys, is illustrated here. No heat is lost through the walls *from the room*. It is lost only through the ceiling, i.e. through heating the roof space. The roof space loses heat through the (usually) tiled roof. The fuel required *to heat the room* can easily be calculated. A difficulty exists, however, with any attempt to estimate the amount of heat lost in the gases leaving the hypocaust.

It is noteworthy that, like most Roman furnaces, those of hypocausts were without grates; the fire burned on the ground. Most of the air entering the system flowed *over* the fire, and there was no inlet air control or outlet damper (as far as we know).

Although radiation must have been important close to the furnace, the transfer of heat further from the fire was mainly achieved by gas flow, which was powered by convection. With a conventional chimney this depends upon its area of cross section, its height and the temperature difference between its bottom and its outlet at the top. In the wall cavities provided by *tubuli* or *tegulae mammatae*, flow was not greatly restricted, and it is probably convenient to think of the furnace as a bonfire. Actual heat transfer was affected by two factors: gases lost heat as they travelled away from the furnace and they were also actually leaving the system. This probably defies theoretical analysis.

There are two additional ways in which heat is lost by the furnace gases: through the walls from the gases in the *tubuli* and as sensible heat in the gases leaving the system to the outside. In my 1978 article an attempt was made to estimate these and hence to calculate the fuel consumption.

### Inside temperature

The calculation of heat loss (and therefore requirement) of a building relies on the assumption of the temperature inside it. In living/working spaces this is comparatively simple. In the cases of the warm and hot rooms of baths, however, *we do not know what conditions were desired*. Clues are provided, however, by the study of thermal comfort.

The temperature a person perceives depends mainly upon:

- Clothing (in a study of baths we may assume that the person is naked)

- The air temperature
- The air velocity
- Humidity (how much water vapour there is in the air)
- Personal metabolism (heat generated by the body)
- Radiation (infrared) in the environment

The thermal conditions in a room are usually measured by fairly simple instruments:

- T – Air temperature measured by an ordinary mercury-in-glass thermometer
- W – The ‘wet-bulb’ temperature, given by a thermometer with its bulb wrapped in a wick and therefore cooled by evaporation. This takes into account both humidity and air velocity
- B – The ‘black bulb’ temperature, read from a thermometer with the bulb inside a hollow, matt-black, copper sphere. This takes into account infrared radiation. It was not considered when I did my earlier work

For an average person who is naked and not taking exercise, and when infrared is negligible, a simplified formula is:

$$0.7W + 0.3T^5$$

The introduction of cavity walls (e.g. employing *tegulae mammatae* or *tubuli*) led to a considerable increase in the radiant heat in rooms. In fact, it probably resulted in the introduction of unglazed, single-glazed and double-glazed windows in some bath rooms, and in ‘sunbathing lounges’ or *cella solaris*, which can be seen (or postulated) in late public baths (Rook 1975, 2005, 2013). The ramifications of these architectural developments are further discussed by Miliareisis in this volume.

Where infrared radiation is significant, a composite ‘wet-bulb globe temperature (WBGT)’<sup>6</sup> can be calculated using the formula

$$WBGT = 0.7W + 0.2B + 0.1T$$

The US military uses this to produce temperature categories for each of which the quantity of physical work and type of clothing are recommended.

(A more sophisticated ‘*thermal limit algorithm index*’, concerned principally with working conditions, has also now been developed. It uses published experimental studies of human heat transfer and established heat and moisture transfer equations for clothed people doing physical work. Work areas are measured and

categorized based on a metabolic heat balance equation, using dry-bulb, wet-bulb and air movement readings to measure air-cooling power. Instruments are made that measure this directly.)

### The structure of a hypocausted building

The basic idea of a hypocaust, at least at ground level, is so well known as to require no description. Problems arise when a reconstruction is contemplated, because usually insufficient amounts of the structure survive at higher levels. For example:

- How tall was the building? How were the ceiling and roof constructed?
- How large were the windows?
- Were the windows glazed? Double-glazed?
- Were hollow vaults used as flues?
- What sort of chimneys were there?
- What was the ventilation rate?

As with most fires, a hypocaust obtained air by convection and would work only if there were chimneys of some sort connecting the space under the floor to the outside at a higher level. The evolution of these is dealt with in my 1978 paper. Little evidence survives, or has been published or perhaps sought, for what happened at the top of walls that were lined with *tubuli*. I postulated that they all connected to a continuous 'collecting channel' which took the exhaust gases to outlets at the corners of the rooms. A collecting channel of this sort can be seen under a window in the Hadrianic Baths and leading to the chimneys of the 'annex' to the Hunting Baths at Lepcis Magna.<sup>7</sup> In discussions regarding the NOVA reconstruction (Yegül & Couch 2005) this idea was at first fiercely resisted, but an unspecified compromise was tacitly adopted, where only *some* of the *tubuli* were assumed to have been connected to the collecting channel. The reason for this compromise is not clear, and the actual construction was not made public, despite a documentary being filmed.

### The fuel consumption of a hypocaust

A clear error in my 1978 paper, which was not pointed out by anybody, lies in the assumption that for calculations, one can make use of the concept of an *average* temperature of the gases in a hypocaust. The actual conditions are complex. The temperature decreases as the gases flow away from the furnace, since they are losing heat, mainly to the rooms. In addition, their mass and rate of flow are decreasing as more and more are lost up the flues as the distance from the furnace increases. The effect of this is indicated by the inside

surface temperatures that I measured at Xanten. The physics of it probably cannot be theoretically predicted, and experimental reconstruction would be a useful exercise.

Some indication of the scale of the problem can be seen by attempting a description of the combustion process. If wood is the fuel, 1 kg of it requires 6.4 kg of air for complete combustion, and yields about 1.83 kg of CO<sub>2</sub>, 0.52 kg of H<sub>2</sub>O (as a superheated steam) and 5.05 kg of N<sub>2</sub> and about 20 MJ of heat. Damp wood would use some of this heat to evaporate the water, and yield a corresponding quantity of steam. Air-dried wood can contain up to 25 per cent moisture.

Complete combustion of the fuel requires at least 100 per cent excess air: it seems likely that a much larger quantity of air flowed over the fire, and the stoker adjusted the geometry of the fire to ensure that the gases going under the floor were at the optimum temperature: an empirical result. Thus, we cannot know the temperature or mass of the gases entering the hypocaust from the furnace.

Whatever these were, the gases left the 'chimneys' (whatever their form) and took heat with them. 'How much?' is an important question for which we can only estimate possible limits. It is possible to assume an average temperature in this case. In a suite of baths the furnace would have heated at least two rooms, which would make the problem more difficult. It is useful, however, to approximately calculate, for example, the heat lost in the gases leaving the chimneys of a hypothetical hypocaust burning 1 kg of wood per hour.

Thus, for a furnace using five times the theoretical (stoichiometric) quantity of air, with the flue gases leaving the chimneys with an average temperature 100 °C above outside temperature, the heat loss would be 19.4 per cent.<sup>8</sup> Carbon dioxide would be 4 per cent of the gases, assuming that the water vapour/steam has condensed.

Measurements were made in the NOVA baths that were constructed at Sardis.<sup>9</sup> The results, although subject to a number of caveats, were salutary and surprising. It was calculated that only 8 per cent of the (theoretical) heat produced by the combustion of the wood was used!<sup>10</sup>

### Conclusions

To date, we have been able to model various aspects of heating a Roman bath building. The film documentary of the NOVA project that reconstructed a Roman bath at Sardis, and the subsequent work of the coordinators, suggested quite a large loss of heat in the building (only 8 per cent efficiency). Much could be learnt by repeating the exercise of reconstruction,

which also allowed for measurement of gas temperatures as they pass through the system. This would be costly, but it would provide us with a more detailed understanding, at least of one building. However, studying bathing suites in Britain (Rook 1975, 1992) seems to confirm that which is intuitive: every bathing suite was unique, apart from some modularity of plan which is imposed by the dimensions of bipedales used in flooring. There does not appear otherwise to be any standardization of plans and many domestic baths were ‘do-it-yourself’ jobs. Large public baths and their complexity are another thing entirely. Any experimental reconstruction, besides detailed instrumentation, would also need the ability to vary the operation of the flues. At Xanten and at Sardis, I was unable to find a satisfactory configuration of flues, and so in some ways a reconstruction would be hampered until (or unless) archaeology can provide us with more details. Questions also arise as to whether bath furnaces would have been kept burning overnight (probably they would have in most cities), but this too would have varied by demand, climate and fuel availability. Generally speaking, a lot of fuel is required to get a bathhouse up to temperature (from cold), and less fuel is required (per hour) to keep it running. From the point of view of fuel consumption, it would be possible to run a reconstructed bathhouse and observe the fuel used – and to use this data to create a rough model to estimate an annual/per capita basis of fuel consumption for bathing for a small town, and eventually for larger cities.

## Notes

- 1 Unpublished; commercial work for G. Wimpey, Central Laboratories.
- 2 See also Rook (1975).
- 3 See, for example, Parsons (2002).
- 4 U-values measure how effective a material is as an insulator. Thermal performance is measured in terms of heat loss, and is commonly expressed in the construction industry as a U-value (or R-value).
- 5 This formula can also be employed in weather forecasting.
- 6 The wet-bulb globe temperature (WBGT) is a type of apparent temperature used to estimate the effect of temperature, humidity, wind speed (wind chill) and visible and infrared radiation (usually sunlight) on humans.
- 7 Personal observation. See also Rook (2013), fig. 68.
- 8 Assuming that CO<sub>2</sub> is measured *after* water vapour has been condensed, as in Orsat’s apparatus. (The Orsat apparatus consists essentially of a calibrated water-jacketed gas burette connected by glass capillary tubing to two or three absorption pipettes containing chemical solutions that absorb the gases.)
- 9 The full transcript of the film recording the building of the baths may be read at: <https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/transcripts/27rbroman.html>.
- 10 Yegül & Couch (2003) use a Sankey diagram in their figure 4 to demonstrate this (Sankey diagrams are a type of flow diagram in which the width of the arrows is proportional to the flow rate, after a method first documented by Irish engineer Captain Matthew H.R. Sankey, 1853–1925). I am doubtful about the result this diagram represents. Since the temperatures of the exit gases are below 100 °C, some of the heat used to evaporate the water would have been given up in the hypocaust as it condensed, and they omit this consideration in the figure.

## References

- Lucore, S.K., 2009. Archimedes, the North Baths at Morgantina, and Early Developments in Vaulted Construction, in *The Nature and Function of Water, Baths, Bathing and Hygiene from Antiquity through the Renaissance*, eds. C. Kosso & A. Scott. Brill Online, 43–60. <https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004173576.i-538.12>
- Parsons, K.C., 2002. *Human Thermal Environments (2nd Edition)*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Rook, A.G., 1975. *Aspects of the Design and Operation of Roman Hypocaust Baths in Roman Britain*. Princes Risborough: Shire Archaeology.
- Rook, A.G., 1975. *Aspects of the Design and Operation of Hypocausted Baths in Rural Britain*. M. Phil thesis, unpublished. London: University of London.
- Rook, A.G., 1978. The Development and Operation of Roman Hypocausted Baths. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 5, 269–82.
- Rook, A.G., 1986. The Roman Villa Site at Dicket Mead. *Hertfordshire Archaeology* 9, 79–175.
- Rook, A.G., 1993. How to Fire a Roman Bath. *Current Archaeology* 135, 114–17.
- Rook, A.G., 2002. *The Story of Welwyn Roman Baths (Hertfordshire Histories)*. London: Able Publishing.
- Rook, A.G., 2005. *I’ve Come About the Drains. An Adventure in Architecture*. Welwyn: Able Publishing.
- Rook, A.G., 2013. *Roman Building Techniques*. Stroud: Amberley Publishing.
- Yegül, F.K. & T. Couch, 2003. Building a Roman Bath for the Cameras. *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 16, 153–77.

# Fuel and Fire in the Ancient Roman World

The study of fuel economics in the Roman, or indeed in any ancient world, is at a pivotal point. New research in archaeological science, the ancient economy, the ancient environment, and especially, the increasing collection of bio-archaeological datasets, are together providing a greatly enriched resource for scholars. This volume makes a first attempt to bridge the gap between 'top-down' generalized models about Roman energy consumption with the 'case study' detail of archaeological data in the Mediterranean. The papers here are the work of scholars from a variety of disciplines: from archaeobotanists and historians to archaeologists specialising in social, technical and economic fields. A more nuanced view of the organization of the social and industrial structures that underpinned the fuel economy arises. Although focused on the Roman period, some papers extend beyond this era, providing contextual relevance from the proto-historic period onwards. Much exciting interdisciplinary work is ahead of us, if we are to situate fuel economics more clearly and prominently within our understanding of Roman economics, and indeed the ancient Mediterranean economy.

## Editors:

**Robyn Veal** is a researcher at the McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, and a Quondam fellow at Hughes Hall, University of Cambridge. At the time of writing she was an honorary research fellow at the University of Sydney, and spent time as a Raleigh Radford fellow at the British School at Rome. She works with a number of international excavation teams as an environmental archaeology advisor and charcoal specialist.

**Victoria Leitch** has a D.Phil from the University of Oxford on the production and trade of Roman North African cooking wares. She currently works as the Publications Manager for the Society for Libyan Studies.

*Published by the McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research,  
University of Cambridge, Downing Street, Cambridge, CB2 3ER, UK.*

The McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research exists to further research by Cambridge archaeologists and their collaborators into all aspects of the human past, across time and space. It supports archaeological fieldwork, archaeological science, material culture studies, and archaeological theory in an interdisciplinary framework. The Institute is committed to supporting new perspectives and ground-breaking research in archaeology and publishes peer-reviewed books of the highest quality across a range of subjects in the form of fieldwork monographs and thematic edited volumes.

Cover design by Dora Kemp and Ben Plumridge.

ISBN: 978-1-902937-91-5

