

УДК 008:379.8
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32461/2226-3209.1.2020.196555>

Petrova Iryna
Doctor of Sciences in Cultural Studies,
professor of Event-Management and
Leisure Industry Department,
Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts
ORCID 0000-0002-8146-9200
petrovaiw@gmail.com

ANCIENT ROMAN OTIUM AS A CULTURAL PRACTICE AND THEORETICAL REFLECTION

The purpose of the article is to analyze the ancient Roman leisure activity as a theoretical reflection and cultural practice. **The methodology** of the research is reduced to the usage of historical and cultural approach that allows combining diachronic and synchronic methods to the study leisure activity as a polysemantic cultural phenomenon. **Scientific Novelty.** The topicality of the research is to identify and substantiate the conditions that led to the formation and development in ancient Roman intellectual and entertainment leisure activities, contemplative and active leisure activities, leisure activity as a means of self-development and leisure activity as a mass cultural practice. **Conclusions.** Leisure activity was perceived as a rest from work, a day dedicated to God, pleasure, safe for moral values (Virgiliy, Georgiki) in Republican Rome. As a result of the conquests in the East and the expansion of Greek culture, the value system of the Romans underwent significant changes, which was clearly manifested in the development of leisure activity in two interrelated "spheres": spectacular and intellectual. Spectacular otium has become a powerful tool of political impact on masses, a method of mobilization and employment, and consequently reducing the content of leisure activity to "bread and sights", "money and pleasure", the gradual loss of the majority the ability to perceive leisure as a means of self-development, self-improvement and cultural creation. For members of the Roman intelligentsia leisure activity is, first of all, the luxury of companionship, intelligent conversation and literature classes. However, for the majority of the population, the Roman borrowing of otium graecum didn't have an introspective, self-absorbed social character, freed from a sense of moral responsibility, it required only an external, leveled assessment, contrary to the individual and spiritual content of culture.

Key words: culture, otium, intellectual and entertainment leisure activity, leisure infrastructure of leisure activity, leisure activity practices.

Петрова Ірина Владиславівна, доктор культурології, професор, професор кафедри івент-менеджменту та індустрії дозвілля Київського національного університету культури і мистецтв

Давньоримський отіум як культурна практика та теоретична рефлексія

Метою дослідження є аналіз давньоримського дозвілля як теоретичної рефлексії і культурної практики.

Методологія дослідження зводиться до використання історико-культурного підходу, що дозволяє об'єднати діахронічний і синхронічний методи до вивчення дозвілля як полісемантичного культурного феномена і культурної практики. **Наукова новизна** дослідження полягає у виявленні та обґрунтуванні умов, які спричинили формування і розвиток в античному Римі дозвілля інтелектуального і дозвілля видовищного, дозвілля споглядального і дозвілля активного, дозвілля як засобу саморозвитку та дозвілля як масової культурної практики. **Висновки.** У республіканському Римі дозвілля сприймається як відпочинок, день, присвячений божеству, духовну насолоду (Вергілій, Георгіки). Згодом система цінностей римлян зазнає істотних змін, відображаючи розвиток дозвілля на двох взаємопов'язаних «рівнях»: видовищному і інтелектуальному. Видовищний отіум зводиться до «хліба і видовищ», поступово втрачаючи у римлян здатність сприймати дозвілля як засіб саморозвитку, самовдосконалення і культуротворчість. Для представників римської інтелігенції дозвілля є розкішною дружнього спілкування, інтелектуальної бесіди і літературних занять. Однак для більшості населення запозичення римлянами otium graecum не мало інтроспективного, самозаглибленого громадського характеру. Звільнене від почуття моральної відповідальності, воно вимагало тільки зовнішньої, нівельованій оцінки, протилежно пропорційною індивідуально-духовного змісту культури.

Ключові слова: культура, otium, інтелектуальне і видовищне дозвілля, інфраструктура дозвілля, дозвільні практики.

Петрова Ірина Владиславівна, доктор культурології, професор, професор кафедри івент-менеджменту та індустрії дозвілля Київського національного університету культури і мистецтв

Древнеримский отиум как культурная практика и теоретическая рефлексия

Целью исследования является анализ древнеримского досуга как теоретической рефлексии и культурной практики. **Методология** исследования сводится к использованию историко-культурного подхода, позволяющего объединить диахронический и синхронический методы к изучению досуга как полисемантичного культурного феномена и культурной практики. **Научная новизна** исследования заключается в выявлении и обосновании условий, повлекших формирование и развитие в античном Риме досуга интеллектуального и досуга зрелищного, досуга созерцательного и досуга активного, досуга как средства саморазвития и досуга как массовой культурной практики. **Выводы.** В республиканском Риме досуг воспринимается как отдых, день, посвященный божеству, духовное наслаждение (Вергилий, Георгики). Со временем система ценностей римлян претерпевает существенные изменения, отражая развитие досуга на двух взаимосвязанных «уровнях»: зрелищном и интеллектуальном. Зрелищный отиум сводится к «хлебу и зрелищам», постепенно теряя у римлян способность воспринимать досуг как средство саморазвития, самосовершенствования и культуротворчества. Для представителей римской интел-

лигенции досуг является роскошью дружеского общения, интеллектуальной беседы и литературных занятий. Однако для большинства населения заимствования римлянами *otium graecum* не имело интроспективного, самоуглубленного общественного характера. Освобожденное от чувства моральной ответственности, оно требовало только внешней, нивелированной оценки, противоположно пропорциональной индивидуально-духовному содержанию культуры.

Ключевые слова: культура, *otium*, интеллектуальное и зрелищное досуга, инфраструктура досуга, досуговые практики.

The topicality of the research. Leisure is an important life-forming component of a modern society, because it reflects the characteristics of social relations, class stratification, the development of productive forces, ideology, religious beliefs and moral norms. In this context, the analysis of the driving forces and sources of the historical and cultural process is extremely important, in particular, the reconstruction of ideas about ancient Roman leisure activity as a cultural practice and a polysemantic cultural phenomenon.

The disclosing of the ancient Roman leisure practices implemented with the involvement of Strabon's geographical descriptions, Ovidius's poetry, Velleius Paterculus, Titus Livius Lucius, Claudius Cassius Dio Cocceianus's historical works, Marcus Valerius Martialis's epigrams, Gaius Cornelius Tacitus's annals, Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus and Plutarch's biographies, in the works which reflect the diversity of the types of cultural practices of the Roman.

About *otium* intelligent and *otium* entertaining as the opposition of individual and collective leisure activities there could be read in the Publius Vergilius Maro, Quintus Horatius Flaccus's poems, Gaius Plinius Caecilius Secundus's the Young letters, Gaius Sallustius Crispus' works, numerous laws on luxury. Discussions as for the devaluation of spiritual leisure activity values and the reduction of leisure activity to a state of idleness are analyzed on the basis of Tacitus's works and Gaius Plinius Caecilius Secundus's the Young letters. The analysis of recent researches and publications. Conceptual studies of the ancient leisure activities contain studies of foreign scientists A. Alberto, D. Balsdon and J.P. Vyvian, E.K. Gazda and J.R. Clarke, J.N. Robert, J. Pieper and others. At the same time, the problem of functioning of leisure activity in ancient Rome remains without attention and scientific interest of domestic scientists, in particular, there exists contradiction between expediency on the account of ancient achievements in modern culture of leisure activity that would allow to mobilize historical and cultural experience of an era of the ancient Rome for the enrichment of leisure activity as a cultural phenomenon. This problem is of great importance partly due to the lack of scientific research in theoretical and historical trends.

That's why, the aim of our research is to analyze the ancient Roman leisure activities as a theoretical reflection and cultural practice.

Presentation of basic material. The question of the relationship *activa vita* and *vita completativa* in the life of Roman was no argument active life with admitted priority, useful and worthy of a citizen. Therefore, the ideal leisure is, first of all, a day off from work or a day of worshipping the Gods (this is how Virgiliy described the leisure activity of the farmer) [1, 436].

The agrarian basis of the Roman community was decisive in the V-IV centuries BC and the situation has radically changed in the III-II centuries BC: as a result of victorious wars, Rome (III-II cent. BC) reigned throughout the Mediterranean. The expansion of Greek culture undermined the foundations of Roman morality, and the transformations in the content of "*otium*" changed the relationship between the duties and rights of the Romans. However, along with the awareness of the Romans of their individual values in society, there was spread the pride, hedonism, delicacy and love to luxury. Hellenistic borrowings had a double effect: on the one hand, they changed forever the structure of Roman society, on the other, they opposed to two types of social morality – work and pleasure – two opposite models of education and training [12].

The acquired passion for the variety of pleasures by the Romans was constrained by numerous regulations and laws about luxury, aimed at maintaining the Roman traditions. In general, there were adopted more than forty laws on luxury during the III century BC and the I century AD, which were ineffective, however [5].

The handover from the civil wars of the Republic to the Principate of Augustus changed the very sense of *otium*: from a private, individual sphere of life to a socially significant one. The destruction of Republican values led to the transformation of traditional forms of leisure activities into mass performances. It is necessary to consider the passion of the people for public entertainment, despite the religious worldview of the Roman, because religion surrounded him during the war and peacetime; its laws were subjected to the soul and body, private and public life, holidays and people's assemblies, meals and court cases. Roman life consisted of favorable (*dies fasti*) for work and unfavorable (*dies nefasti*) days for any activity. Holidays were considered unfavorable for work, because they were dedicated to the Gods. Thanks to such "*feriae*" (days off from work, rest days, days of obligatory leisure activity dedicated to the Gods) and "the Gods are worshipped and this is not an obstacle for everyday affairs" [16, 315]. Holidays were a religious duty of every Roman, a duty which was as serious and important as work.

"Obligatory" leisure activities were dedicated to the Gods in Imperial Rome, there was slightly declared task - to hold power and form public opinion. This affected the number of organized "entertainments". If in the Republican period there were annually arranged national holidays, which lasted in average 109 days (Roman and Plebeian games, games of Ceres, Apollo, Cybela, Flors, the Triumph of Sulla, Saturnalia), dur-

ing the Empire period the number of holidays increased to 175. The social function of religious holidays has also changed: their own sacred significance has decreased, yielding to the value of entertainment.

Important forms of organization of leisure activity were also significant events of public life, which drew to the top of the mass of citizens. So, the opening of the Colosseum folk festival lasted during a hundred days, the end of the second Dacian war the Romans celebrated during 123 days etc. Multi-day celebrations included not only the rituals of worshipping the Gods: Saturnalia, which "grew" from one day in 217 BC to seven days under the reign of Domitianus, were dedicated to worshipping the Gods only at first day, while others were given to "December freedom" (Horace). The diversity of types and the dimensions of the mass entertainment offered by the emperors to the people, reflected in the works by Valeriy Maxim, Lucius Claudius Cassius Dio Cocceianus, Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus, where there are mentioned usual competitions of pair and four chariots, hiking, horseback riding and sea battles; baiting of wild animals and Gladiator competitions [14, 209].

Public attention to circus competitions was attracted by its splendor as well, and the opportunity to demonstrate their wealth and presence of the nobility at the competition, and entertainment and food after the circus, and the opportunity to socialize. And especially was influenced by the circus of changes in the political orientations of Roman citizens. If in the Republican period the Romans took an active part in the political life of the city, in the era of the Empire they lost the right to vote and their political function was nullified. The introduction of four factions in the circus – white, red, blue and green – was intended to create the illusion of political importance of the people. Two fractions (blue – aristocrats, green – people) had clearly defined political differences, while red and blue, creating controversy and excitement in society, supported the privileged strata of the population, the common people. Namely these "political" debates gave circus performances the greatest popularity among Roman performances [7, 277].

The aristocrats of Roman society, drowning in luxury, created a dangerous precedent, forming a social ideal of wealth and the accumulation of life's benefits, without labor, generating in the minds of free citizens a passion for wealth and idleness. In mournful elegies Ovidiy calls: "Look at your accounts for your entertainments and you be will easily convinced, Auguste, much money were spent for your entertainments" [9, p. 204]. The aversion to work was so ingrained among the Roman citizens, most of whom begged without even a roof over their heads, that the ideal life was perceived as a state of inactive bliss, absolutely free from the necessity to satisfy any physical needs and actions. The people, accustomed to entertainments, fun and games, thought of spending time in fun and entertainments, the only possible and justified, "These distractions had become necessary and idleness had developed their taste" [8, 111].

At the same time, the trend to control private life of the Romans, limited in the period of the Republic of Patriarchal dogmas and the suppression of luxury, turned into the Imperial epoch on the monitoring forms of entertainment. Special attention of the authorities was attracted by the associations of leisure activities type: colleges, groups and taverns [16, 132-133]. The government controlled religious activities of its citizens as well, in particular inhibiting (enabling) to implement new Gods into Pantheon. In end, this led to a complete mismatch of folk rituals that existed within the masses and the official religion. The culmination stage of the formation of leisure activity on the level of state policy of the Roman rulers was the deification of the emperors and the spread of religious rituals on them.

The state ideas of the Empire were most fully embodied in the construction of buildings for purely practical purposes, including in the sphere of leisure activity. Hence, the active construction of forums, baths, porticos, gardens, among which the life of the Roman passed, full of a huge number of ceremonies, participation in which was obligatory. Gymnasiums, palaestras, porticos, baths, poultry houses, menageries, this was all "surplus" with the help of which Roman citizens tried to assert their social position in society. The passion for excessive luxury in the days of the Empire has become almost the only sign of the person's belonging to the privileged class. Not surprising is the fact that for a short time, public establishments, and private homes the privileged elite of Roman society evolved into real museums. A new type of Roman was formed a private collector [2, 452]. The expansion of Hellenistic culture, as a result of which ancient Rome was flooded not only with works of art, but also with foreign artists, philosophers, poets, whose activities contributed to the passion of the Romans for artistic works, was a powerful impetus to the development of leisure activity, saturated with aesthetic and intellectual pleasures.

Was it the basis for the development of the real artistic taste of the Romans, which they didn't have before the conquest of Syracuse in 212 BC according to Plutarch's words nothing beautiful, attractive and sophisticated? [11, 396]. The answer to the question is in the formation of a new socio-psychological type of personality – the Roman intellectual. The intellectuals of Rome were United into *circulus* (lit. – circle), prototypes of modern interest clubs to discuss philosophical, literary problems, issues of political and national importance. The formation of the Roman *intelligentsia* (Mark Terentius Varron, Publius Cornelius Lentulus, Mark Caelius Ruf, Mark Gullius Cicero, Cornelius Nepot, Gaius Valerius Catullus, Lucretius Carus and others) was also influenced by Greek culture: Greek logic transformed Roman thought, and the assimilation of techniques and methods of intellectual activity of the Hellenistic world enriched the Roman elite. However, intellectual maturity, reached the Roman Republic in the last days, contributed not only to the Greek borrowing, but also the interpenetration and synthesis of Roman and Greek cultures.

Modification of the ideal *vir bonus* demanded a valorous Roman, in addition to purely traditional qualities that are important for an active participant in the life of the *civitas* - *virtus*, *fortitudo*, *constantia*, *fides*, *pietas*, *dignitas*, *gravitas*, *auctoritas* – and also education, specific knowledge, ability to self-improvement, which is partly embodied in new qualities – *urbanitas* and *humanitas*. The intellectual elite of the ancient Rome tried to distance themselves from the motley of aristocratic elite of the society with the originality of the life and culture of everyday life that carried out their leisure time in entertainment and idleness.

Thus, Virgiliy created his “*Bukoliki*” in the conditions of rural solitude, which provided the poet with wise serenity, spiritual and mental peace. The real intellectual, spiritual sweetness, according to Virgiliy, is the result of poetic meditation, intense mental search for the truth of life. The train to calm happiness, peace and freedom of the soul is reflected in Horace’s work, who tried to realize his life concept at the *Villa* presented by the Patron in Sabine. Horace repeatedly complained that the people expected from the performances only entertainment: from comedies to fights, from tragedies to luxurious triumphal processions.

If the city was considered the accumulation of unnecessary worries, the rural life was a refuge from them and the possibility of free *otii*. After all, the intellectual *otium* required a special atmosphere corresponding to the lifestyle and the surrounding space. An important emphasis in this discourse was on a decent old age, accompanied by “leisure activity with dignity”, pointing not only onto the civilization of society, but also to the high level of aestheticism of everyday life (remember the letters of Pliniy the Young). The philosophy of intellectual feast was opposed by Lukull’s feasts of luxurious idlers who were not capable of “high” intellectual games.

The growth of interest in the philosophy of scientific and literary work was reflected in the middle of the I century and has gained popularity in this form of activities including public readings, which contributed the involvement of intellectual activities to a wide readership.

The topicality of the research is to identify and substantiate the conditions that led to the formation and development of intellectual and entertainment activity, contemplative and active leisure activity, leisure activity as a means of self-development and leisure activity as a mass cultural practice in ancient Rome.

Conclusions. The ideology and the system of values of the Roman was determined by patriotism, and the ideal model of the citizen was courageous, persistent, loyal to the state, temperate in the pleasures of a disciplined citizen. The main focus on economic equality formed social psychology, focused on moderation in consumption and everyday life as a norm. It is the working morality of the people frugal and modest, valuing labor, condemning luxury and extravagance. Consequently, the leisure was perceived as a rest from labor, a day dedicated to the worshipping of the God, enjoyment, safe for moral values (Virgiliy, Georgiki).

Due to the conquests in the East and the expansion of Greek culture, the system of values of the Romans underwent significant changes. A new type of person was formed, whose social functions were reduced not only to political activity, performance of military duties and observation of religious rites but, first of, various pleasures. The consequence of the loss of stable moral principles, adapted to the aggressive policy, was the cult of pleasure and prestige, which was clearly manifested in the transformation of the content of leisure activity.

The coexistence of particularism and universalism was typical for many spheres of spiritual life, the contradictions between official ideology and reality, the discord between the individual and the state, rights and duties, collectivism and individualism, the spirit of self-sacrifice and the thirst for pleasure led to the functioning and development of leisure activity in two interrelated “spheres”: entertainment and intellectual. The performance is not just a mass action, it is the main collective pleasure to which the subjects had the right, it is the only luxury available to the poor. Hence, reducing the content of leisure to “bread and entertainment”, “money and pleasure”, the gradual loss of the majority of the ability to perceive leisure activity as a means of self-development, self-improvement and cultural creativity.

For the representatives of the Roman intelligentsia it was typical to have high level of education, mastering the complex intellectual work, and most importantly – self-realization in the intellectual sphere of activity - intellectual *otium*. However, for the majority of the population, the Roman borrowing of *otium graecum* did not have an introspective, self-absorbed social character, freed from a sense of moral responsibility, it required only an external, leveled assessment, contrary to the individual-spiritual content of culture.

References

1. Vergiliy. (1968) Georgiki. Antichna literatura: khrestomatiya. (O. Biletskiy, Ed.). Kyiv: Radyanska Shkola, pp. 433-437 [in Ukrainian].
2. Vergiliy. (1968) Yeneida. Antichna literatura: khrestomatiya (O. Biletskiy, Ed.). Kyiv: Radyanska Shkola, pp. 437-458 [in Ukrainian].
3. Goratsiy. (1982). Tvor. (A. Sodomori, Trans). Kyiv: Dnipro [in Ukrainian].
4. Kassiy Dion Kokkeyyan. (2013). Istoriya kesarey. Knigi LVII-LXIII «Istorii rimlyan» (V. N. Talakha & S. A. Kuprienko, Ed.). Kyiv: Vidavets Kuprienko S. A. [in Ukrainian].
5. Kvashnin, V. A. (2006). Zakony o roskoshi v Drevnem Rime epokhi Punicheskikh voyn. Vologda : Rus. [in Russian].
6. Nemirovskiy, A. (Eds.). (1995). Malye rimskie istoriki. Velley Paterkul. Rimskaya istoriya. Anney Flor. Dve knigi Rimskikh voyn. Lutsiy Ampeliy. Pamyatnaya knizhitsa. M.: Lodomir [in Russian].
7. Martsial (2000). Epigrammy. (F. Petrovskiy, Trans). Kharkov: Folio ; Moscow: AST [in Russian].

8. Monteske, Sh. (1955). Izbrannye proizvedeniya. M. P. Baskina (Ed.). Moscow: Gospolitizdat [in Russian].
9. Ovidiy, P.N. (1999). Lyubovni elegii. Mistetstvo kokhannya. Skorbotni elegii (A. Sodomora, Trans.). Kyiv: Osnovi [in Ukrainian].
10. Pliniy, Ml. (1950). Pisma Pliniya Mladshogo. (A. Dovatur, Trans). Moscow-Leningrad: Nauka [in Russian].
11. Plutarkh, M. (1961). Sravnitelnye zhizneopisaniya. (M. Grabar-Passek, ed.). Moscow: Akademiya nauk SSSR, pp. 382-407 [in Russian].
12. Rober Zh.-N. (2004). Rozhdenie roskoshi: Drevniy Rim v pogone za moody. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie [in Russian].
13. Svetoniy. (1993). Bozhestvennyy Tit. Zhizn dvenadtsati tsezarey. (M. Gasparov, Trans). Moscow: Nauka, pp. 202-207 [in Russian].
14. Svetoniy. (1993). Domitsian. Zhizn dvenadtsati tsezarey. (M. Gasparov, Trans). Moscow: Nauka, pp. 208-219 [in Russian].
15. Svetoniy. (1993). Tiberiy. Zhizn dvenadtsati tsezarey. (M. Gasparov, Trans). Moscow: Nauka, pp. 74-100 [in Russian].
16. Tatsit, P. K. (2001). Annaly; Malye proizvedeniya. Istoriya [per. s lat.]. Moscow: AST; Ladomir [in Russian].
17. Balsdon, D., & Vyvian, J.P. (2002). Life and leisure in ancient Rome. Phoenix [in English].
18. Gazda, E. K., & Clarke, J.R. (2016). Leisure and Luxury in the Age of Nero: The Villas of Oplontis Near Pompeii. Kelsey Museum Publication [in English].
19. Papakonstantinou, Z. (2019). Work and Leisure. A Cultural History of Work in Antiquity. London: Bloomsbury Academic. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/37801972/_Work_and_Leisure_in_E._Lytle_ed._A_Cultural_History_of_Work_in_Antiquity_London_Bloomsbury_Academic_2019 [in English].
20. Pieper, J. (2010). Leisure the Basis of Culture. Hardcover-Black & White [in English].

Література

1. Вергілій. Георгіки. Антична література : хрестоматія / [упоряд. О. І. Білецький]. 2-ге вид. Київ: Рад. школа, 1968. С. 433-437.
2. Вергілій. Енеїда. Антична література : хрестоматія / [упоряд. О. І. Білецький]. 2-ге вид. Київ: Рад. школа, 1968. С. 437-458.
3. Гораций. Твори; [пер. з лат. А. Содомори]. Київ: Дніпро, 1982. 254 с.
4. Кассий Дион Коккейян. История кесарей. Книги LVII-LXIII «Истории римлян» / предисл., перевод, комментарии В. Н. Талаха ; под ред. В. Н. Талаха и С. А. Куприенко. Київ: Видавець Купрієнко С. А., 2013. 239 с.
5. Квашнин В. А. Законы о роскоши в Древнем Риме эпохи Пунических войн. Монография. Вологда : Русь, 2006. 160 с.
6. Малые римские историки. Веллей Патеркул. Римская история. Анней Флор. Две книги Римских войн. Луций Ампейлий. Памятная книжица / изд. подгот. А. Немировским ; пер. с лат. Москва: Ладомир, 1995. 387 с.
7. Марциал. Эпиграммы / пер. Ф. Петровского. X. : Фолио ; Москва: АСТ, 2000. 448 с.
8. Монтескье Ш. Избранные произведения / общ. ред. и вступ. ст. М. П. Баскина ; примеч. Р. С. Миндлиной ; АН СССР, Ин-т философии. Москва: Госполитиздат, 1955. 799 с.
9. Овідій. Любовні елегії. Мистецтво кохання. Скорботні елегії / пер. А. Содомори. Київ: Основи, 1999. 299 с.
10. Плиний Младший. Письма Плиния Младшего / пер. А. И. Доватур. Москва-Ленинград: Наука, 1950. 577 с.
11. Плутарх. Марцелл. Сравнительные жизнеописания / Отв. ред. М. Е. Грабарь-Пассек. Москва: Академия наук СССР, 1961. С. 382-407.
12. Робер Ж.-Н. Рождение роскоши: Древний Рим в погоне за модой / пер. с франц. Москва: Новое литературное обозрение, 2004. 400 с.
13. Светоний. Божественный Тит. Жизнь двенадцати цезарей. Москва: Наука, 1993. С. 202-207.
14. Светоний. Домициан. Жизнь двенадцати цезарей. Москва: Наука, 1993. С. 208-219.
15. Светоний. Тиберий. Жизнь двенадцати цезарей. Москва: Наука, 1993. С. 74-100.
16. Тацит П. К. Анналы; Малые произведения. История / [пер. с лат.] Москва: АСТ ; Ладомир, 2001. 986 с.
17. Balsdon D., Vyvian J.P. Life and leisure in ancient Rome. Phoenix, 2002. 463 с.
18. Gazda E. K., Clarke J.R. Leisure and Luxury in the Age of Nero: The Villas of Oplontis Near Pompeii. Kelsey Museum Publication, 2016. 288 p.
19. Papakonstantinou Z. Work and Leisure // A Cultural History of Work in Antiquity. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019. URL: https://www.academia.edu/37801972/_Work_and_Leisure_in_E._Lytle_ed._A_Cultural_History_of_Work_in_Antiquity_London_Bloomsbury_Academic_2019.
20. Pieper J. Leisure the Basis of Culture. Hardcover-Black & White, 2010. 158 p.

*Стаття надійшла до редакції 02.12.2019 р.
Прийнято до публікації 27.12.2019 р.*