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ABSTRACT

Food and dining in the ancient world have been the focus of much recent scholarly attention. From discussions concerning the depictions of symposia or drinking-parties on Greek vases to analysis of ancient writers’ descriptions of lavish banquets, scholars have demonstrated a marked interest in the parties of the ancients. Such inquiries of Greek dining, however, typically focus on the male participants and their activities during symposia. A less explored area of research is the event that comes prior to the drinking parties, namely dining (deipnon), and, in particular, the questions surrounding the presence of women and their roles during marital and ritual feasts. The scholarship on women and dining is limited to studies of courtesans at symposia. A study of women diners who are not courtesans and that uses a more interdisciplinary approach, including archaeological and architectural evidence, is lacking, despite the fact that textual evidence exists that discusses cases of female dining, and votive figurines, vases, and reliefs represent female diners.

This dissertation, therefore, seeks to examine ancient texts, archaeological evidence, dining rooms in sanctuaries, and current gender theory in order to argue two points: first, that ancient Greek women occupied prominent roles during ritual and marital feasts; and second, that their activities took place in the dining rooms of sanctuaries at the ancient sites of Argos in the Peloponnese, Brauron in eastern Attica, and Corinth on the Isthmus. Finally, previous scholarship has argued that women in
antiquity mostly occupied roles within the private household; my dissertation, however, will expand the study of their role from the private spaces of their houses to those spaces that had a more public function, such as sanctuaries where women actively participated in rituals and nuptial celebrations.

Accordingly, the previously low status of ancient women in modern scholarship must be reevaluated in order to account for these public positions. My dissertation will reveal that the traditional view of ancient Greek women as being confined to the household is not accurate. The significance of my research, therefore, will be to acknowledge the place of ancient Greek women in dining that is largely absent in recent scholarship, but can be reconstructed on the basis of texts, imagery, architectural remains, archaeology, gender theory, and our knowledge about women’s roles in religion.
For my parents

There are two lasting bequests we can give our children: one is roots, the other is wings.

~ William Hodding Carter, II
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INTRODUCTION

It has long been assumed that ancient Greek women mostly occupied roles within the private realm of the *oikos* or household. The work of Lisa Nevett, Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, and Eva Keuls has highlighted women’s secluded role in the household. In fact, scholars even assert that women were often locked or hidden away in the remote regions of the houses and rarely ventured outside the confines of the women’s quarters or the so-called “*gynaikonitis*.” When women appear on ancient Greek vases, it is often argued that the setting is the *oikos*, or more specifically the *gynaikonitis*, despite the fact

---

1 Nevett, “Separation or Seclusion? Towards an Archaeological Approach to Investigating Women in the Greek Household in the Fifth to Third Centuries B.C.” 98-112. Nevett argues that the presence of a “male area of house may be read not as part of a balanced pattern of male-female opposition, but as an indication of something far more subtle and complex, involving the segregation of women not from men as a whole, but from men from outside their families” (109-110).

2 Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum* 8. Wallace-Hadrill observes that “[i]n the Greek house the most important single contrast is that between male and female space.” See his figure 1.1 where the court and *andron* are for men and the kitchen and services rooms are reserved for women.


4 Keuls writes, “[o]ne form of physical coercion is, however, documentable, and that is the locking up of women” (Ibid., 109).

5 “Over the past thirty years, it has become broadly accepted commonplace that Athenian women held wholly second-class status as silent and submissive figures restricted to the confines of the household where they obediently tended to domestic chores and child rearing. This has largely been based on the reading of certain well-known and privileged texts, including those from Xenophon, Plato, and Thucydides, and from certain images of women portrayed in Greek drama” (Connelly, *Portrait of a Priestess: Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece* 3). Slater concurs: “one is usually told that the status of women in fifth- and fourth-century Athens achieved some kind of nadir. They were legal nonentities, excluded from political and intellectual life, uneducated, virtually imprisoned in the home, and appeared to be regarded with disdain by the principal male spokesmen whose comments have survived” (*The Glory of Hera: Greek Mythology and the Greek Family* 4).
that it is difficult to identify the women’s quarters in the archaeological record, and the identity of the women on the vases is not clear, wives or courtesans or courtesans behaving like wives or someone else entirely.

In the few instances when ancient Greek women are studied, the subjects are often the disreputable females, such as courtesans and flute-players, who were attendants at *symposia*. In Pierre Brulé’s study of ancient Greek women, his chapter devoted to “women on the outside” discusses only prostitutes. Clearly, scholars perpetuate the notion that only ancient Greek prostitutes occupied roles outside the house and that only prostitutes are worthy of their attention.

More recent scholars, however, such as David Cohen and Joan Connelly, have made a strong case for female roles outside the household, thereby expanding the traditional role of the ancient Greek woman. Cohen writes:

> It is a cornerstone of the prevailing school(s) of thought that the low status of Athenian women was particularly marked by their confinement in their homes, [and] their exclusion from social, public, and economic life. While it is undeniable that women did not operate in the public sphere in the way that men did, it does not necessary follow that they did not have public, social and economic spheres of their own.

6 “A true example of the *gunaikonitis* has yet to be found” (Nevett, “Separation or Seclusion? Towards an Archaeological Approach to Investigating Women in the Greek Household in the Fifth to Third Centuries B.C.” 103).

7 Ibid., 109, fig. 94 from Dallas, private collection, pyxis. See also, Ferrari, “The Spinners,” in *Figures of Speech: Men and Maidens in Ancient Greece* 35-60. She writes, “[t]he well-documented seclusion in which respectable females were kept from their adolescent years onward stands in apparent contradiction to what the pictures show: men of various ages freely approaching girls who are pointedly demure, beautiful, and soigné” (36).


9 “It is a commonplace that, whereas in the Aegean age and in Homer the position of women was a noble one, in Athens of the classical period it was ignoble” (Gomme, “The Position of Women in Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.” 89).

Furthermore, Cohen offers textual evidence from comedy, oratory, and philosophy that women were fully involved outside the household as sellers in markets (Demosthenes 57.30-1, 34; Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 478, *Wasps* 497, 1380-5, *Lysistrata* 445, *Thesmophoriazusae* 405, 440), field workers (Aristophanes, *Peace* 535 and Demosthenes 57.45) and nurses (Demosthenes 57.35, 45; Plato, *Theaetetus* 149). Additionally, wives visited their husbands in prison (Andocides 1.48; Lysias 13.39-41; Plato, *Phaedo* 1.60a). He also argues that they maintained important religious roles, and Connelly concurs: “cult worship offered the single stage on which women could enjoy some measure of prominence.”  These roles included visiting a soothsayer (Theophrastus 11.9-10 and 16.12), “participating in a sacrifice, or in religious festivals” (Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 253), organizing the Thesmophoria (Isaeus 8.19-20; 3.80; 6.49), funerals (Demosthenes 46.63; Lysias 1.8), and being involved in wedding feasts (Hyperides, *Lycophron* 3-4; Isaeus 8.18; Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 1056, 1067-8l Euripides, *Iphigenia in Tauris* 1140). Finally, women also maintained roles as priestesses.

Taken together, the textual evidence for women occupying important positions outside the household is overwhelming by itself, without even considering support from the visual record. Nonetheless, aside from Cohen, who offers copious textual evidence for female roles outside the household, and Connelly, who convincingly argues for women’s public and influential roles as priestesses, little research has been conducted on

---


13 See Connelly, *Portrait of a Priestess: Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece*. In particular, her discussion on page 4 outlines further spheres for women, such as economic ones.
the rich topic of women’s involvement in ritual and marital dining. Furthermore, despite the abundant evidence for female dining from the study of architecture, vases, votives, sculpture, cult activities, and ancient texts, no one has systematically made a case for female dining in ancient Greek sanctuaries. Oswyn Murray says the following only in a footnote: “[t]he question whether Greek citizen women were present even at major religious and family occasions needs investigation.”14 It is exactly these neglected venues, those where ritual and marital dining took place, and in particular women’s presence at these events, that this dissertation will explore. Moreover, this study will not be limited to textual evidence alone, but will also incorporate archaeology (including vase painting, terracotta figurines, reliefs, and sculpture, as well as architecture in the form of dining rooms) and gender theory. The result is that the study of women’s role can be expanded from the private household to the more public sphere of ritual and marital dining.

This is not to say that ancient Greek men are unimportant in ritual and marital dining, only that they have received plenty of attention in the modern literature,15 whereas their female counterparts have often been overlooked. In addition, I am not trying to isolate only cases of female dining, but rather paint a more complete picture of banqueting, and one that includes women alongside men in sanctuaries for different religious functions.


15 For example, a keyword search for “symposium” in the American School of Classical Studies’ on-line library database receives 1105 hits. A title search receives 770 hits.
I will begin by examining textual accounts both of the terminology for and restrictions on drinking and dining, since such evidence provides a more complex and broader understanding of the topic. This first chapter, therefore, will examine the ancient and modern terms for drinking and dining and then discuss the textual evidence for and against female diners in various contexts. Nonetheless, it should be noted that this chapter is merely a survey of ancient texts on dining and is in no way exhaustive.

One may then move on to three architectural and archaeological case studies that will focus on the sites of Argos, Brauron, and Corinth to further support women’s involvement in ritual and marriage feasts. These sites are representative of a sample of dining rooms extending from the Archaic through Hellenistic periods. Each sanctuary offers diverse evidence for female dining in the form of large and small-scale facilities and for women celebrating different stages of life. Supplemental material will also be considered including a discussion of the cult activities at each site, inscriptions, vase painting, reliefs of banqueters from Thasos and Eleusis, and comparanda from other areas of the Greek world, such as reclining terracotta diners from Morgantina, Sicily so that the fullest picture of female dining may be considered. Aside from the material of Argos, chapter 2 will examine evidence for the marriage banquet, considering where such feasts took place and what role women had at the festivities. Once the presence of women at these events has been established at Argos, Brauron, and Corinth, it will be necessary to theorize about the model on which dining was based, consider whether these were public or private occasions, discuss how women’s roles may or may not be integrated with established beliefs about Greek women, and decide if the rites at these sites qualify as rituals of reversal. That will be the task of the final chapter.
In general, my approach is an interdisciplinary one. I want to consider multiple forms of evidence including literary, epigraphical, visual, and archaeological so as to produce the most extensive possible view of ancient Greek women and dining. One problem, however, is that one form of evidence may contradict another. Moreover it may be difficult to consider one type of evidence in relation to another. For example, the Greek term *andron* may or may not relate to an architectural structure identifiable in ancient Greek houses as the dining room. In these cases, I will attempt to be frank about such contradictions and propose why one piece of evidence does or does not complement another. Ultimately, I think the advantages to this approach outweigh the disadvantages. I, therefore, will assemble evidence that has never been considered collectively in order to make the case that women were present in sanctuaries for religious and marital banquets and that the dining rooms found at Argos, Brauron, and Corinth served as their setting.
CHAPTER 1

DRINKING AND DINING, SYMPOSION AND DEIPNON, AND THE FEMALE ROLE THEREIN

1.1 Defining the Terms of Dining

Scholars on ancient dining are the first to admit that the Greek word *symposion* might be over-used and not entirely understood by modern authors. Furthermore, the term is often ambiguous when used by ancient authors. George Paul writes, “[t]he first [question] concerns a problem in the ancient evidence, namely that writers do not always distinguish clearly in their accounts between *symposion* and *deipnon*, or they use terms such as *synousia* or *convivium* where the meaning is not clear-cut.”¹⁶ Likewise, Oswyn Murray observes, “[t]here is a basic problem of definition which has never been wholly resolved: what is the relationship between the activities of eating and drinking, between the moment of the *deipnon* and that of the *symposion*.”¹⁷

The task of this first chapter, therefore, is to examine the vocabulary for eating and drinking, and to reconstruct what a meal (*deipnon*) or drinking party (*symposion*) meant to an ancient Greek in the Archaic and Classical periods.¹⁸ Additionally, I will

---

¹⁶ Paul, “Symposia and Deipna in Historical Writing” 158.

consider the sources that discuss restrictions on female dining. Scholars have assumed that men and respectable women never drank together under any circumstances because sources attest to the fact that they did not do so at symposia; however, it is not clear if drinking was appropriate in other contexts and, likewise, whether or not women and men could eat together. The presence of dining rooms in many Greek sanctuaries, as well as the remains of animals, implies that eating took place there.\textsuperscript{19} Moreover, the finds of female-related dedications and sanctuaries devoted to female divinities lead one to believe that women were present at Argos, Brauron, and Corinth, the focus of the following three chapters.\textsuperscript{20} Therefore, it is necessary to re-examine some of the ancient sources to determine exactly what is meant by the terms that are not even distinguished in modern scholarship, which has largely employed an anthropological rather than a philological approach.\textsuperscript{21}

In addition to restrictions, I will examine the literary evidence that discusses cases of female dining. For instance, the wedding banquet and religious celebrations likely had a dining portion and, therefore, it is necessary to investigate textual sources that mention these types of meals. Finally, this chapter seeks to define and in some cases clarify the terms that will be used throughout the rest of this dissertation. In some places, I may offer alternate words that better capture the activity taking place and the participants. The conclusions in this section will, therefore, lay the groundwork for the rest of this study.

\textsuperscript{18} Pauline Schmitt Pantel admits that modern authors use \textit{symposion} too broadly. Likewise, she emphasizes the possibility that “several forms of commensality” could coexist (“Sacrificial Meal and \textit{Symposion}: Two Modes of Civic Institutions in the Archaic City” 15).

\textsuperscript{19} Bookidis, “Dining in the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth” 3. See also appendix A.

\textsuperscript{20} See Farnell, “The sociological hypotheses concerning the position of women in ancient religion” 70-94.

\textsuperscript{21} See, for example, Weçowski, \textit{Towards a Definition of the Symposium} (Rome, 2002).
1.2 The Greek Terms: Symposion and Deipnon

The seventh century BC lyric poet Alcaeus is the first ancient Greek author to use the term that we translate as drinking party: symposion. He writes, “the lyre, sharing in the banquet, makes merry, feasting with empty braggarts…them. But let him, married into the family of Atridae, devour the city as he did in company with Myrsilus.” From this fragment, we learn that music was a component of symposia and that men attended. Another fragment by Alcaeus states: “I request the charming Menon to be invited, if I am to enjoy the drinking-party.”

These early and fragmentary texts do imply a male audience as the mention of Menon and “him” seems to indicate, but Alcaeus’ symposion does not otherwise appear to be similar to the symposium in the Classical period of Greece, where contests took place and entertainers were invited or at least those details have been left out. Furthermore, it is not clear whether or not the author is discussing a contemporary event or something that happened in the past. Nonetheless, it is noteworthy that the subject of these poems makes no mention of female participants. Unfortunately, texts do not exist that give us any indication of what a canonical symposium may have been like. The body of vases, which are considered symposiastic, oftentimes depict scenes similar to those in

---


23 “κέλομαι τινά τὸν χαρίεντα Μένωνα κάλεσσαι,/ αἱ χρή συμποσίας ἐπόνασιν ἐμιογε γένεσθαι” (Alcaeus, Greek Lyric fr. 386.2; tr. David Campbell [Cambridge, MA and London, 1982].

24 See Ferrari, “Myth and Genre on Athenian Vases” 37-54 for her argument that certain vases depict not contemporary Athens, but the distant past.
which the vases might have functioned. Still, the “symptic” vases of the Archaic and Classical periods offer more questions than answers.

Recent scholarship has debated the origins of the *symposion*, although none have doubted its all-male constituency. Oswyn Murray has contended that it was an elite organization. Likewise, Pauline Schmitt Pantel defines *symposion* as an aristocratic social institution and a practice of communal drinking that began in the Archaic period. More recently, however, Sean Corner argued quite the opposite, saying that it was a development of the common citizens and not the aristocracy, and that it produced a feeling of equality among its participants by sharing food and wine and forging relationships between non-kin. Corner claims that the *symposion* arose alongside the *polis* in the Archaic period and was, in fact, instrumental in its creation. Clearly, there are radically different ideas about the origins and social roles of the symposium. While I may not be able to shed further light on this specific topic, I do wish to highlight the fact that the details of this popularly studied ancient event still remain unclear to modern scholars. Moreover, much scholarship is devoted to determining sympotic origins. For my study, however, the origins are less important; instead, I wish to explore whether *symposia* had a banqueting component, if women could attend that segment, and what part of banquets in other contexts might women have been permitted to attend.

---


28 Ibid., v. Corner presents some provocative ideas, but rarely cites specific evidence.
As Massimo Vetta says, “[t]here is clear evidence that wine drinking took place as a separate activity in many places.” Hermogenes says in Xenophon’s *Symposium*: “my definition of ‘convivial unpleasantness’ is the annoying of one’s companions at their drink.” In fact, literary evidence from philosophy, comedy, and tragedy suggests that domestic *symposia* involved eating and that drinking and entertainment may have been a separate component or an event marked by ritual purification of the space and participants. Michael Goldstein remarks that this involved a cleansing of the banqueters’ hands, the floors, “distribution of wreaths and perfumes, and burning of incense,” which acted as markers in the shift from eating to drinking. Athenaeus’ *Deipnosophistae* reinforces his remarks:

> Since I see then, myself also, that your symposium, like that described by Xenophanes of Colophon, is full of every delight: “Now, at last, the floor is swept, and clean are the hands of all the guests, and their cups as well; one slave puts plaited wreaths on their heads, another offers sweet-smelling perfume in a saucer; the mixing bowl stands full of good cheer; and other wine is ready...But men of good cheer should first praise the god with pious stories and pure words; they should pour libations and pray for power to do the right.”

---


31 Vetta, “The Culture of the Symposium” 96, 100 and Goldstein, *Setting* 1. Goldstein cites Xenophanes ap. Ath. 11.462c, Ar., *Vesp.* 1208 ff., *Ach.* 1085 ff., Plato Comicus, *Lakones*, ap. Ath. 15.665b-d, Plato, *Symp.*, Resp. 372 a ff., and Xen., *Symp.*, *An.* 6.1.4 ff. Birgitta Bergquist has a somewhat different definition: “I use the terms *symposion* and ‘sympotic’ to denote not only the drinking phase but the preceding dining phases as well, i.e. the entire feast, and for practical purposes I enlarge them here to include also pre-Archaic times and civic and ritual meals” (“Symptic Space: A Functional Aspect of Greek Dining Rooms” 37).


33 “όρον οὕν ύμων καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ συμπόσιον κατὰ τὸν Κολοφώνιον ξενοφάνη πλήρες ὑπὸ πάσης θυμίδας; νῦν γὰρ δὴ ζάπεδον καθάρον καὶ χεῖρες ἀπάντων καὶ κυλίκες: πλεκτοὺς δ’ ἀμφίθειστε στεράνους, ἀλλ’ ἐνάδες μύρον ἐν φίαλῃ παρατέινει κρατήρ δ’ ἐστίκεν μεστὸς ἐμφροαύνης...χρή δὲ πρῶτον μὲν θεοῦ ύμων εὐφρονας ἄνδρας εὐφήμους μύθοις καὶ καθαροίς λόγοις: σπείραστας δὲ καὶ εὐξεμένους τὰ δίκαια δύνασθαι πρῆσειν (ταύτα γὰρ ὄν ἐστὶ προχειρότερον) οὐχ ὑβρις πίνειν ὑπόσου κεν ἑχων ἄφικοι οἴκαν. ἀνευ προπόλου, μὴ
Nonetheless, in Aristophanes’ *Acharnians* the herald tells Dicaeopolis to hurry up:

Come quickly to the feast (*deipnon*) and bring your basket and your cup; ‘tis the priest of Bacchus who invites you. But hasten, the guests have been waiting for you a long while. All is ready—couches, tables, cushions, chaplets, perfumes, dainties and courtesans to boot; biscuits, cakes, sesame-bread, tarts, lovely dancing women, the sweetest charm of the festivity. But come with all haste.\(^{34}\)

While this example clearly mixes eating with drinking, it does not seem like a standard meal or even a very filling one, but rather a party with some snacks and entertainment. Moreover, the term *deipnon* may have had a wider meaning to its Greek audience than we would like to prescribe.\(^{35}\)

There was usually a performance aspect of *symposia* and participants followed the eastern practice of reclining.\(^{36}\) In addition to cleaning, the second part of the event began with a song and the pouring of a libation.\(^{37}\) In Plato’s *Symposium* “when Socrates had

---


\(^{35}\) Cf. Donohue on the term “cult statue.” She writes, the term “cult image” “limits our understanding of Greek practice,” since it was “wider and more inclusive than the category of cult image would allow” (“The Greek Images of the Gods: Considerations on Terminology and Methodology” 31, 37).

\(^{36}\) For an argument against the eastern origins, see Burkert, “Oriental Symposia: Contrasts and Parallels” 18: “Thus, we should consider seriously the possibility that dining on couches was introduced not in connection with the symposium proper but with the ritual feast at the sanctuary, with *stibades* supplying the temple space.”

taken his place and had dined (deipnēsantos) with the rest, they made libation and sang a chant to the god and so forth, as custom bids, till they betook them to drinking (poton).”

Scholars often see parallels between symposia and ritual banquets, although few ritual banquets can be identified in the visual record as such. Additionally, the way the participants dined for symposia may have differed from that of ritual dining. Men seem to have reclined for symposia, but during ritual and funerary banqueting men may have reclined while women may have reclined or sat. The postures of dining will be discussed in subsequent chapters. Nonetheless, it is important not to conflate sympotic dining with ritual dining as the two may not have been identical.

Deipnon is the term used to describe a meal, drinking, or banquet, but not necessarily a meal at a particular time of day such as our modern dinner. Clearly ancient authors were less exact in their meaning of this term, which certainly poses a problem when attempting to differentiate between eating and drinking in its ancient contexts. Aristophanes’ Ecclesiazusae uses the word to denote a meal. An Athenian wife named Praxagora says, “[y]our only concern will be to get slicked up and head for d (deipnon) when the shadow stick’s at ten feet.” Presumably the statement is all the


39 Goldstein, Setting 1. Goldstein states that domestic and sacred banquets “differed little in overall form.” And scholars also see parallels between symposia and marriage banquets. Oakley and Sinos, The Wedding in Ancient Athens 24: “the wedding feast was so similar to other symposia.”

40 Goldstein, Setting 1. For examples see Cooper and Morris, “Dining in Round Buildings” 80. However, Cooper and Morris write, “[a]n examination of potential criteria segregating diners and dining customs, both domestic and scared, produces many possible reasons but no single principle (“Dining in Round Buildings” 79).

41 Corner, Philos and Polites: The Symposium and the Origins of the Polis 129. See also his discussion of dais, 129-131. Corner notes that dais is “associated with communal, sacrificial commensality” (157).

42 Aristophanes, Ecclesiazusae 651; tr. Jeffrey Henderson (Cambridge, MA, 2002): “σοι δὲ μελῆσει, 
more hilarious because Praxagora’s character is a woman dressed as a man, but likely played by a man.

Nonetheless, as Corner notes, “even in Aristophanes’ comic fantasies of gender role-reversal, where women take over men’s roles, women are not depicted as having symposia, this despite abundant indulgence in the stereotype of women as lusches.”

Perhaps this is because the term symposion does refer to an all-male drinking party. Women, therefore, may have only been admitted to the eating portion or the deipnon of such festivities. Other contexts, such as religious or nuptial banquets, might have been more accessible. Walter Burkert writes, “as communal sacrifice with the extensive meat courses moved from private homes to the temple, the ‘feast’ in the private house was mainly confined to drinking.”

The Greek word for meal is found also in plays such as Sophocles’ Oedipus Tyrannus and, here, it refers to a banquet where drinking could also take place. Oedipus says, “[a] roisterer at some banquet, flown with wine, shouted.” In Sophocles’ Electra, Electra states, “oh, fearful burdens of inutterable dinners my father saw the mortals, shameful with double hands.”

---

45 “ἀνήρ γὰρ ἐν δείπνοις μ’ ὑπερπλησθείς μέθης καλεῖ” (Sophocles, Oedipus Tyrannus 779; tr. Sir Richard Jebb [Cambridge, 1887]).
46 “ὡς δείπνων ἀρρήτων ἐκπαγαλ’ ἀχθη’ τοῖς ἐμός ἵδε πατὴρ θανάτους αἰκεῖς διδύμαιν χειρόιν” (Sophocles, Electra 203; tr. F. Storr [London and New York, 1912]).
Corner reasons that “where deipnon and symposion are bound up together as elements of a whole, but where each exists in contradistinction to the other…the banqueters are symposiasts, who, earlier in the evening, were necessarily deipnistas, but who may not be both at once.” Corner’s observation is an important one. Symposiasts are not diners and diners are not symposiasts, although one may occupy the role consecutively.

It is not clear, however, from this discussion if and how the terms deipnon and symposion were gendered. One is left with the impression that a proper Greek woman did not attend the all-male symposion, but it is not clear if she was permitted to attend a function that involved deipnon or eating. Likewise, it seems very likely that during a ritual or marital setting, the rules changed. Whereas it may not be appropriate to find a woman attending symposia in her home, the ritual and marital aspect of dining might have permitted women to inhabit spaces they would not be found normally, such as the private dining rooms in a house. It is, therefore, necessary to more closely scrutinize the texts in order to determine more precisely when such occasions for female dining were and were not permitted.

1.3 Women’s Prohibition at Drinking Parties

It is commonly assumed that respectable women did not attend the symposion as confirmed by both Greek and Roman literary sources, but there is no conclusive evidence that women were denied attendance to ritual or marital meals or even the eating portion

---


48 “In primitive cultures—including the Ancient World..., social categories are so firmly fixed that in ritual reversal, however revolutionary its images, the playful alternatives never carry the germs of structural social change” (Versnel, *Transition and Reversal in Myth and Ritual* 118).
of *symposia*. The following survey begins with the sources that make restrictions on women, including the writings of Theopompos, Demosthenes, Isaeus, Cicero, Cornelius Nepos, and Vitruvius. It is necessary to examine this evidence because by deduction, one may then determine more precisely where women were permitted and in what contexts. Then, the following sections will present textual sources in favor of female dining. The artistic representations of female dining will be reserved for succeeding chapters, and, for the most part, will be organized by site.

Finally, I acknowledge the large chronological period and variation in genre covered by these texts. I do not mean to imply that the roles of women remained static during these periods. In fact, as Joan Burton notes, women seemed to become more prominent and active in the Hellenistic period.\footnote{Burton, “Women’s Commensality in the Ancient Greek World” 149.} Nonetheless, the textual sources are largely Homeric or clustered around the fifth and fourth centuries BC. As valuable and rare sources, I would prefer to recognize their historical context and the limitations they pose, rather than ignore them because they are too early or too late in relation to the archaeological material I will then consider. Finally, when appropriate, I note the problems presented by the sources.

Fear of being considered a prostitute, barbarian, Etruscan, or flute player was enough to prevent respectable Athenian women from attending a *symposion*. According to Athenaeus, Theopompos chastises Etruscan women for their dining practices: “they [Etruscan women] dine \textit{deipnein}, not with their own husbands, but with any men who happen to be present, and they pledge with wine any whom they wish.”\footnote{Burton, “Women’s Commensality in the Ancient Greek World” 149.}
are the model of what the Greek wife should not be, then the inverse of Theompompos’ statement would logically describe “normal” Greek practices. Presumably, therefore, it is appropriate for Greek women to dine with their husbands, but not anyone they choose. This restricted notion for female drinking will reoccur in many other ancient sources.

In Demosthenes’ Against Neaera, the prosecutor reproaches Neaera for her behavior: “[a]gain after this, men of Athens, Simus the Thessalian came here with the defendant Neaera for the great Panathenaea. Nicarete came with her, and they lodged with Ctesippus, son of Glauconides, of Cydantidae; and the defendant Neaera drank and dined together (sunepinen and sunedeipnei) with them in the presence of many men, as any courtesan would do.”

In a later passage, he writes:

When he came back here, bringing her with him, he treated her without decency or restraint, taking her everywhere with him to dinners (deipna) where there was drinking and making her a partner in his revels; and he had intercourse with her openly whenever and wherever he wished, making his privilege a display to the onlookers. He took her to many houses, to gay parties, and among them to that of Chabrias of Aexone.


51 “Πάλιν τοίνυν, ὃ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, μετὰ ταῦτα Σίμος ὁ Θετταλός ἔχων Νέαιραν ταυτηνί ἀφικεῖται δεῦρο εἰς τὰ Παναθήναια τὰ μεγάλα, συνηκολοῦθε δὲ καὶ ἡ Νικαρέτη αὐτή, κατηγοῦντο δὲ παρὰ Κτηπίππῳ τῷ Γλαυκώνιῳ τῷ Κυδαντίδῃ, καὶ συνέπιπεν καὶ συνεδέπτει ἐναντίον πολλῶν Νέαιρα αὐτὴ ὡς ἄν ἢταίρα οὖσα” (Demosthenes, Against Neaera 59.24; tr. Norman W. DeWitt [Cambridge, MA, 1949]).

52 “‘Ἀφικόμενος τοίνυν δεῦρο ἔχων αὐτὴν ἀσέλγειας καὶ προπετῶς ἐχρήτο αὐτῇ, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ δείπνα ἔχων αὐτήν πανταχοὶ ἐπορεύετο ὅπου πίνοι, ἐκώμαζε τ’ ἀεὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ, συννὴ τ’ ἐμφανῶς ὅποτε βουλήθητε πανταχοῦ, φιλοτιμίαν τὴν ἐξουσίαν πρὸς τοὺς ὀρόντας ποιούμενος, καὶ ὡς ἄλλους τε πολλοὺς ἐπὶ κώμιον ἔχων ἠλθεν αὐτήν καὶ ὡς Χαβρίαν τὸν Αίξονέα” (Demosthenes, Against Neaera 59.33).
Despite the use of the word *deipnon*, Demosthenes further qualifies their activities by stating that the dinners also had a drinking aspect, much like a *symposion*. Indeed, it seems that dinners could easily turn into drinking parties. Moreover, in the first passage, the verb *sundedeipnein* is used, which may be crucial in understanding dining practices. The verb means to dine together and again, it may indicate that the dining portion was acceptable itself, but Neaera’s dining, and even worse, her drinking with strange men, was not proper behavior for an ancient Greek woman.

The orator Isaeus writes: “[y]et no one, I presume, would dare to serenade a married woman nor do married women accompany their husbands to banquets (*deipna*) or think of feasting in the company of strangers, especially mere chance comers.”

Isaeus’ use of the word *deipnon* certainly presents a problem for the theory that women could attend banquets (*deipna*), but not *symposia*. Nonetheless, there are several ways that this passage could be explained. First, the dinner party may be one immediately followed by a *symposion*, which would prevent any wife from attending. Second, the attendants may be all strange men as the second part of the statement implies, which would also preclude women from attending. Third, Isaeus may be less concerned with using exact Greek terminology than are modern scholars who are attempting to reconstruct the limits of Greek social practices. Fourth, it seems likely that Greek dinners could be all male occasions much the same way that some Greek festivals, like the *Thesmophoria*, are exclusively for women.  

---

Cicero’s *Verrines* states that women did not sit at a *convivium*:

They come early. They sit down to supper. Conversation takes place among them, and an invitation is given to drink in the Greek fashion…When the business appeared to Rubrius to have got warm enough, “I would know of you, O Philodamus,” says he, “why you do not bid your daughter to be invited in hither to us?” The man, who was both a most dignified man, and of mature age, and a parent, was amazed at the speech of the rascal. Rubrius began to urge it. Then he, in order to give some answer, said that it was not the custom of the Greeks for women to sit down at the banquets of men (*negavit moris esse Graecorum ut in convivio virorum accumberent mulieres*). On this some one else from some other part of the room cried out, “But this is not to be borne; let the women be summoned.” And immediately Rubrius orders his slaves to shut the door, and to stand at the doors themselves. But when Philodamus perceived that what was intended and being prepared was, that violence should be offered to his daughter, he calls his servants to him, he bids them disregard him and defend his daughter, and orders some one to run out and bear the news to his son of this overpowering domestic misfortune.55

The conversation, however, does not reveal what type of banquet occurred or what activities took place there.

In addition, Cornelius Nepos writes, “[b]ut it is very different in Greece; for there a woman is not admitted to a dinner party, unless relatives only are present, and she keeps to the more retired part of the house (*multo fit aliter in Graecia; nam neque in convivium adhibetur nisi propinquorum, neque sedet nisi in interiore parte aedium*).”56 Vitruvius records, “[i]n these oeci the men’s banquets take place. For it was never part of their

---

54 Versnel, “The Festival for Bona Dea and the Thesmophoria” 34. Pseudo-Lucian, *Affairs of the Heart* 10.3-14; tr. M. D. Macleod (London and Cambridge, MA, 1967): “Charicles, however, had in attendance a large band of dancing girls and singing girls and all his house was full of women as if it were the Thesmophoria, with not the slightest trace of male presence except that here and there could be seen an infant boy or a superannuated old cook whose age could give even the jealous no cause for suspicion” (Χαρικλεί τις μην πολύς ὁρχηστρίδων καὶ μουσικῶν χορὸς ἔπετο καὶ πάντα δωμάτιον ὡς ἐν Θεσμοφορίοις γυναικῶν μεστόν ἢ ἀνδρὸς οὖθ’ ἀκαρῆ παρόντος, εἰ μή τι που νῆπιον ἢ γέρων ὑπερηφᾶς ὁμοποίως ὀρθεῖ, χρόνου ἕλπιτως ὑποψιάν οὐκ ἤχοντος).

55 Cicero, *Verrines* 2.1.26/66; tr. C. D. Yonge (London, 1903): “mature veniunt, discumbitur. fit sermo inter eos, et invitatio ut Graeco more biberetur; hortatur hospes, poscunt maiorum poculis, celebratur omnium sermones laetitiae convivium. posteaquam satis calere res Rubrio visa est, 'quaeso,' iunct, 'Philodame, cur ad nos filiam tuam non intro vocari iubes?' homo, qui et summa gravitate et iam id actatis et parens esset, obstipuit hominis improbi dicto. instare Rubrius. tum ille, ut aliquid responderet, negavit moris esse Graecorum ut in convivio virorum accumberent mulieres. hic tum alius ex alia parte, 'enim vero ferendum hoc quidem non est; vocetur mulier!' et simul servis suis Rubrius ut iauum clauderent et ipsi ad foris adisterent imperat. Quod ubi ille intellexit, idagi atque id parari ut filiae suae vis affertetur, servos suos ad se vocat; his imperat ut se ipsum neglegant, filiam defendant; excurrat aliquid qui hoc tantum domestici mali filio suo nuntiat.”

custom for the ladies of their house to join the men at dinner (In his oecis fiunt virilia conviva; non enim fuerat institutum matris familiarum eorum moribus accumbere).”57

Cicero, Cornelius Nepos, and Vitruvius state that women did not join men for *convivium*, despite the fact that both the English terms “dinner party” and “banquet” were used in the translation. The word dinner, in the translation of Vitruvius, is rather misleading, since as we know, there may have been two parts to a meal, domestic or ritual, and it is possible that the women attended the earlier and not the latter part. Likewise, Cicero’s and Nepos’ stipulations are specifically for domestic not ritual dining as the term “interiore parte aedium” and “domestici” would imply, and Vitruvius’ passage comes from a description of ancient Greek houses. Moreover, it is not clear what the Greek equivalent of the Latin term *convivium* would be. These Roman authors may be referring to *symposia*, but not *deipna*. Furthermore, as Burton points out, the passage states that “women could attend dinner parties that included only relatives as guests.”58 Cohen suggests that “intimate friends are said to be like part of the household,” which is certainly considered private.59

In general, the most severe stipulations are specifically against women and domestic, not ritual, dining and are written by Roman writers of the first century BC. These authors are writing centuries after the Archaic and Classical periods and, therefore, it may not always be appropriate to apply their words to our understanding of Greek dining practices. Indeed, Vitruvius tends to standardize Greek architectural forms

58 Burton, “Women’s Commensality in the Ancient Greek World” 147.
59 Cohen, “Public and private in classical Athens” 79.
including the orders and domestic architecture, and it may be possible that he is doing something similar for Greek dining practices. Nonetheless, if the term *convivium* may be the Latin way to express the Greek *symposion*, then the Roman authors may simply be re-enforcing the Greek sources that state that Greek women did not attend drinking parties. Thus, both Greek and Roman sources are unanimous in asserting women’s prohibition against attending *symposia*.

1.4 Divine and Tragic Female Diners

There are further texts that do mention cases of women and dining. Burton’s article, “Women’s Commensality in the Ancient World,” presents a comprehensive look at the textual sources for women and dining. She begins with Homer because of the “importance given to Homeric values by later Greeks.”60 Likewise, since myth often becomes practice in the Greek world, such as the daughters of Cecrops becoming the *arrephorae*, it is important to begin here.61

Fictional wives, like Homer’s Penelope, as well as the Homeric lifestyle generally were available models for group behavior in classical Athens. The Homeric texts commonly place women at the banquets of men, and the same can be said of many artistic representations, including reliefs and vases, which will be examined later, that show a seated female next to a reclining male.62

---

60 Burton, “Women’s Commensality in the Ancient World” 144.

61 I am not saying that every aspect of the Homeric lifestyle was adopted by Greek society as Edith Hall’s book *Inventing the Barbarian* (Oxford, 1989) demonstrates, only that dining may have been one instance where Greeks did adopt a Homeric lifestyle in a similar way that *symposia* may have been modeled on Homeric drinking parties (Homer, *Odyssey* 16.409-33, 18.206-90, 21.57-49, Burton, “Women’s Commensality in the Ancient Greek World” 146).

62 See Van Wees, “Princes at Dinner: Social Event and Social Structure in Homer” 154-163. Vases, such as the cup by the Codrus Painter in London, show Zeus and Poseidon reclining with Hera and Amphitrite
In Homer’s *Odyssey*, wives are routinely included in banqueting. It is simply assumed that Odysseus will dine with his wife: “in thy halls thou art feasting with thy wife and children (*dainuēi para sēi t’alochōi kai soisi tekessin*).” Arete also sits with her husband at a banquet (7.136-43). Hans van Wees observes that usually it is unmarried women who are denied access to Homeric banquets. Nausikaa says, “[y]ea, I would myself blame another maiden who should do such thing, and in despite of her dear father and mother, while yet they live, should consort with men before the day of open marriage.” Indeed, many of the previously examined authors specified that it was married women (*gametai gunaikes*) who were forbidden from symposia.

Women represented in tragedy also dine. In Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon*, the chorus speaks of Iphigenia’s music-making in the guest hall, which brought about good luck (243-7). Likewise, in Sophocles’ *Oedipus Tyrannus*, Oedipus says, “[m]y two girls, poor hapless ones--who never knew my table (*trapez*) spread separately, or lacked their father’s presence, but always had a share of all that reached my hands.”

As the title of this dissertation suggests, my main theory is that humans dined in the manner of divinities. Homer attests to feasts where men and women dined together seated beside them at a banquet, which may also have been a model for Greek meals. (London, British Museum, 82, ARV² 1269, Dentzer, J.-M. *Le Motif du banquet couché dans le Proche-Orient et le monde de grec du VIIème au IVème siècle avant J.-C.* [Paris, 1982], fig. 114). If Murray’s assumption is correct that women sat while eating, then this vase, on which a male divinity reclines and a seated female divinity, his wife, sits, may have been the model for Greek dining practices (Murray, “Symptotic History” 6). This vase is discussed in more detail in chapter 2.

---


64 Van Wees, “Princes at Dinner: Social Event and Social Structure in Homer” 157.


22
and later archaeological evidence attests to a similar occurrence. Likewise, the restrictions against dining have been specifically against *symposia* or meals with strangers. Presumably, women were familiar with the guests of a ritual or marital banquet, especially if it took place in the dining rooms found in their own homes.

### 1.5 Female Dining at Wedding Banquets (*gamikos deipnon*)

Wedding banquets offered ancient Greek women another venue in which to dine. Even so, John Oakley and Rebecca Sinos assume that a wedding banquet is identical to a drinking party, but this was probably not the case if women could attend the former and not the latter. As Aphrodite Avagianou writes, “[f]or women the wedding was one occasion to participate in a feast together with men.” On the other hand, Frederick Cooper and Sarah Morris write, “even on the occasion of marriage, when they were admitted to their husband’s phratry, and though the feast was celebrated on their behalf, they [women] did not attend.” Cooper and Morris also cite the *gynaikonomoi* as evidence that “mixed” dining was “unusual,” but B. J. Garland writes that it was the task of women to prepare the wedding and that the wedding feast was certainly a place where women could participate. Garland, however, distinguishes between the *gamelia,*

---

67 Van Wees: “Conceivably, therefore, the gods’ meals are meant to correspond to mortals’ family dinners. If so, the fact that gods and goddesses dine together might mean that in human households, too, all members of the family eat and drink together when no guests are present” (“Princes at Dinner: Social Event and Social Structure in Homer” 163).


70 They cite Demosthenes 57.43, Is. 3.79, *IG* xiv.759 (“Dining in Round Buildings” 80).


72 Ibid., 174.
a feast for men only and the *gamoi*,\(^73\) which included women and may account for the differing opinions on women’s presence at nuptial banquets.\(^74\) Clearly there is no consensus in the modern scholarship concerning women at wedding feasts. Therefore, let us look to the ancient textual evidence.

The man in Euangelos’ play, the *Unveiling of the Bride*, says to his servant about the *gamoi*, “I told you to set four tables for women and six for men.”\(^75\) In Menander’s *Samian Woman* the cook asks: “[h]ow many tables are you going to set up, how many women are coming?”\(^76\) Yet, Oakley and Sinos say that: “Euangelos’ passage informs us not only that these [wedding] feasts could run to excess, but also that the men and women were segregated, with separate tables for men and women.”\(^77\) Oakley and Sinos interpret the passage to mean that the genders were segregated, an idea which is supported by Isaeus.\(^78\)

\(^73\) Garland admits, “[t]he fact that the *gamelia* is usually mentioned in connection with a phratry leads to the tentative conclusion that it was an all-male celebration preceding the marriage” (Ibid., 172).

\(^74\) Ibid., 155. Hague concurs with Garland: “this was the one feast that women attended together with men” (“Marriage Athenian Style” 34).


\(^77\) Oakley and Sinos, *The Wedding in Ancient Athens* 22.

\(^78\) It seems likely that women and men dined in the same location for the wedding feast. In Aristophanes’ *Acharnians*, the bridegroom appears to Dicaeopolis from his wedding feast with a message from his bride (1049-1053). The bridegroom and bride must be able to see each other in order for the bride to give the groom a message.
It is possible, therefore, that men and women dined in the same room, but at different tables or even that they dined in separate rooms and at separate tables. The issue of segregated dining areas will again be considered when I examine the dining rooms at Corinth.

In Euripides’ *Iphigenia Aulidensis*, Clytemnestra says to Agamemnon, “[a]nd then will you celebrate the marriage feast afterwards?” to which he replies in the affirmative. She then asks, “[b]ut where am I to make ready the feast for the women?” to which he answers, “[h]ere beside our gallant Argive ships.” Euripides’ play, despite being set in the heroic past, corroborates the gendered division of dining found in Menander and Euangelos.

In Plutarch’s *Quaestiones Convivales* or Table Talks, the author asks why so many guests are invited to wedding dinners. The text is worth quoting at length. He writes:

At the wedding of my son Autobulus, Sossius Senecio was present in Chaeronea as one of our guests. Among many subjects that he brought forward which were particularly appropriate for the occasion, he raised the question why people invite more guests to wedding dinners (*gamika deipna*) than to other

---

79 Garland writes, “[t]he fact that women were present at the *gamoi* is demonstrated by New Comedy fragments (*Gynaikonomoi: An Investigation of Greek Censors of Women* 173).

80 Euripides, *Iphigenia Aulidensis* 720, 722-23; tr. E. P. Coleridge (London, 1891): “[Κλυταιμήστρα] κάπετα δαίσεις τούς γάμους ἐς ύστερον...[Αγαμέμνων] ἡμεῖς δὲ θοίνην ποῦ γυναιξὶ θησαμεν: ἐνθάδε παρ’ εὐπρύμονισιν Ἀργείων πλάταις.” An inscription from Cos (Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* 177 (hereafter cited as LSCG), ED 150, Paton-Hicks, *The Inscriptions of Cos* 36, SGDI III, 1.3634, HGK 10) apparently provides instructions for wedding feasts in a sanctuary. Another inscription (Segre, *ED* 178) states that women had to sacrifice to Aphrodite Pandamos within one year of their marriage, see Dillon, “Post-Nuptial Sacrifices on Cos (Segre, ED 178) and Ancient Greek Marriage Rites” 63-80.

parties. For it is true, he observed, that those lawgivers who have campaigned most vigorously against extravagance have particularly sought to limit the number of guests at weddings.82

Senecio responds by saying that the philosopher Hecataeus’ point is the following: “[a]t their marriage men invite a crowd to the banquet so that there may be many witnesses to testify that the hosts themselves are of good family and that their brides come from good families.”83 According to Plutarch’s same work, Menander wrote, “[t]his fencing-in you talk about befits a frightful debauchee, but not a bride.”84 Later he says:

of all occasions for a banquet, none is more conspicuous or talked about then a wedding. When we offer sacrifice to the gods, or honour a friend on the eve of a journey, or entertain guests from abroad, it is possible to do so unnoticed by many of our intimates and relatives; but a wedding feast (gamelios trapeza) betrays us by the loud marriage cry, the torch, and the shrill pipe, things which according to Homer even the women stand at their doors to watch and admire. Consequently, since no one is unaware that we are receiving guests and must have invited them, we include all our relatives, acquaintances, and connections to any degree, because we are afraid to leave anyone out.85

The listeners applaud and another speaker, Theon, concludes:

But add, if you will, a further point, that these particular banquets are not merely friendly entertainments but important family occasions, which solemnize the incorporation of a new set of

82 “Διὰ τὶ πλέιστους ἐν γάμωις ἐπὶ δεῖπνον καλοῦσιν Ἐν τοῖς Ἀυτοβούλου τοῦ ὧδι γάμωις συνεώρταζεν ἡμῖν παρών ἐκ Χαιρωνείας ὁ Σ. Σ. Σ. καὶ πολλῶν <λόγων> ἄλλων τῇ τῷ ἵερτῇ μάλα πρεπόντων <παρέσχεν> ἀφορμὰς καὶ περὶ τῆς αἴτι-ας, δὴ ἢ πλείστων τῶν ἄλλων ἐπὶ τὰ γαμικά δείπνα παραλαμβάνονται, διήπορον· καὶ γὰρ τῶν νομοθέτων τοὺς τῇ πολυτελείᾳ κατὰ κράτος πολεμίζαντας ὁρίασι μᾶλιστα τῶν εἰς τοὺς γάμους καλουμένων τὸ πλῆθος” (C. Hubert, Plutarchi Moralia, vol. 8, (Leipzig 1938, repr. 1971): 1-335).

83 “λέγει δὲ τοὺς ἀγομένους γυναικας πολλοὺ παρακαλέαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἑστίασιν, ἵνα πολλοὶ συνειδώσαι καὶ μαρτυρῶσιν ἐλευθέροις ὅσι καὶ παρ’ ἐλευθέρων γαμοῦσι” (Plutarch, Moralia VIII, Table Talks 4, question 3.1, 666E, tr. Paul Clement).

84 “ὡς οὖν βεβαιῶς οὐδὲ θαρραλέως ἐπισυνάπτοις· ὡς Μένανδρος (fr. 865) πρὸς τὸν κελεύντα ταῖς λοπάσι περιφράττειν ...ὦπων δεινῶς ...οὐ πράγμα νύμφης λέγεις” (Plutarch, Moralia VIII, Table Talks 4, question 3.1, 666F, tr. Paul Clement).

85 “καὶ περιβόητων ὡς τὴν γαμοῦντων καὶ γὰρ θυώντας θεοῖς καὶ προπόμπουντας φίλων καὶ ξενίζουσας ἐστὶ πολλοὺς διαλαθεὶν τῶν ἐπιτηδείων, ή δὲ γαμήλιος τράπεζα κατήγορον ἔχει τὸν ὠμέναν | μέγα βοῶντα καὶ τὴν δάδα καὶ τὸν αὐλὸν, ἀ ηηπαί “Ομηρος καὶ τᾶς γυναίκας ἱσταμένας ἐπὶ τᾶς θύραις βαυμάζεως καὶ θεάσατε, διὸ μηδένος ἀγνοοῦντος τὴν ὑποδοχὴν καὶ τὴν κλήσιν, αἰσχυνόμενοι παραλιπέσιν πάντας τοὺς συνήθεις καὶ οἰκεῖους καὶ ἀμφογέτως προσηκοντας αὐτοῖς παραλαμβάνουσιν” (Plutarch, Moralia VIII, Table Talks 4, question 3.2, 666F, tr. Paul Clement).
relatives into the family. What is more important than this, at the union of two houses, each father-in-law regards it as a duty to demonstrate good will to the friends and relatives of the other, and so the guest list is doubled. Besides, many or most of the activities relating to a wedding are in the hands of women, and where women are present it is necessary that their husbands should also be included.86

Plutarch’s text emphasizes the important role of women at weddings, as well as the family bonding that likely took place there, thereby answering Oswyn Murray’s question about their presence at such events.87 While Plutarch was a Greek historian, who was writing in the second century AD, scholars believe that his Table Talks were based on real people and historical events like the marriage of his son.88 His observations about marriage may post-date the other ancient sources and material evidence examined in subsequent chapters, but his views are in agreement with earlier authors. Likewise, the Menander citation indicates that the events, while heavily populated, allowed space for the bride.

Finally, the women in Lucian’s Convivium sit on couches during a wedding feast: “[o]n the right as you enter, the women occupied the whole couch, as there were a good many of them, with the bride among them, very scrupulously veiled and hedged in by the women. Toward the back door came the rest of the company according to the esteem in which each was held. Opposite the women, the first was Eucritis, and then

86 “Αποδεξαμένων δὲ ἡμῶν ὑπολαβῶν ὁ Θέων ὑπὲρ τούτου· ἐφεσε γὰρ ἡ κείσθω, οὐκ ἀπίθανον γὰρ ἐστὶν, κὰκεῖνο πρὸς ἡμᾶς, εἰ δεότας ἡ ἐστίν ἡ πληροφορίαν μὴ μόνον φιλικὰς ἀλλὰ καὶ συγγενικὰς εἶναι, καταμεμεμένης εἰς τὸ γένος ἑτέρας οἰκείστητος. δὲ τούτου μείζον εἶναι, οἶκων εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ συνιόντων δυοῖν ὁ τοῦ λαμβάνων τοὺς τοῦ διδόντος οἰκεῖοι καὶ φίλους ὁ τε διδοὺς τοὺς τοῦ λαμβάνοντος οἴμον ὤν φιλοφρονεῖσθαι διπλασιαζοῦσιν τὴν ὑποδοχήν. ἔτι πολλά τῶν γαμικῶν ἢ τὰ πλείστα δράται διὰ γυναικῶν ὁποῦ δὲ γυναίκες πάρεισι, καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἀναγκαῖον ἐστὶ παραλαμβάνεσθαι.” (Plutarch, Moralia VIII, Table Talks 4, question 3.3, 667A-B, tr. Paul Clement. Emphasis added by the author).

87 Garland says, “[p]erhaps the most likely explanation for the custom of inviting more guests to the wedding feast than to any other feast was the fact that it was the only type of feast in which women could participate” (Gynaikonomoi: An Investigation of Greek Censors of Women 174). Plato even states that the bride and groom are each allowed to invite five guests (Laws 775a-b).

88 Teodorsson, A Commentary on Plutarch’s Table Talks, vol. 1 13.
Aristaenetus." The text indicates that men and women did dine together, but it does not specify their location, proximity, and the postures of the two sexes and, admittedly, Lucian is a very late source and may not be applicable to practices in the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods. Nevertheless, his description of the wedding banquet reflects that of Plutarch as a well-attended family celebration.

1.6 Women Dining with Their Husbands, at Picnics, Social Events, and Ritual Dining

The evidence for women dining in a ritual or other contexts has yet to be considered. First, it seems likely that women did attend major religious and social events since some, like the *Thesmophoria*, Stenia, and Scira, were all-women affairs. Second, archaeological evidence, the subject of the next several chapters, attests to women’s presence in sanctuaries where dining rooms were found.

There are several sources that confirm women dining with their husbands. For example, Herodotus implies that it is unusual for women not to banquet with their husbands when he points out the Milesian custom, which is the opposite: “[f]or this slaughter, these women made a custom and bound themselves by oath (and enjoined it on their daughters) that no one would sit at table with her husband (*homositêsai*) or call him by his name, because the men had married them after slaying their fathers and husbands and sons. This happened at Miletus.” Herodotus does not specify whether these meals

---


were public or private, what he does imply, however, is that it was a normal practice for women and men to eat together. In addition, the Theopompos passage cited above also implies that Greek women normally dined with their husbands, just not with strangers.

Menander’s *Dyskolos*, Pindar’s *Pythian*, and Athenaeus’ *Deipnosophistae*, among others, offer evidence for picnics, as well as social and familial dining. In Menander’s comedy, straw couches and tables are placed on the ground (943-944), and the women are accused of drinking too much wine. According to Pindar, the victor’s

---

91 Conversely, the Macedonian practice is for men and women to sit apart. In his *Histories*, Herodotus discusses a dinner for the Persians and Macedonians. One Persian says, “Macedonian, our host, it is our custom in Persia to bring in also the concubines and wedded wives to sit by the men after the giving of any great banquet. We ask you, then, (since you have received us heartily, are entertaining us nobly and are giving Darius our king earth and water) to follow our custom.” To this Amyntas replied, “We have no such custom, Persians. Among us, men and women sit apart, but since you are our masters and are making this request, it shall be as you desire.” With that, Amyntas sent for the women. Upon being called, the women entered and sat down in a row opposite the Persians.”

92 Burton also points out that Menander wrote a comedy called *Sunaristosai* or “Ladies Who Lunch Together,” which is recorded by Athenaeus (Burton, “Women’s Commensality in the Ancient Greek World” 150, Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* Loeb 6.248 a, Kaibel 6.52.30; tr. Charles Burton Gulick [London and New York, 1961]. In the passage, Athenaeus says: “Menander uses *oikositos* in a special sense in *Ladies at Luncheon*: ‘A clever scheme this, not to get a lot of women together and entertain a crowd, but to get up a wedding, as you have done, for those who eat at home’” (fidvw d’ Sunarist≈saiw ¶fh sunãgein guna›kaw mhd¢ deipn¤zein ˆxlon, éll’ ofikos¤touw toÁw gãmouw pepoihk°nai).

93 Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazusai* 834-835: “she should receive some honor, and be given front-row seating at the Stenia and the Scira and other festivals that we women celebrate” (lambãnein timÆn tina, proedr¤an t’ aÈtª d¤dogsyai Sthn¤oisi ka‹ Sk¤roiw ¶n te ta›w êllaiw •orta›w âsin ≥gomen). Jeffrey Henderson notes, “[l]ike the Thesmophoria, these festivals honored Demeter and were celebrated only by women” (Thesmophoriazusai 560, n. 57).

94 Menander, *Dyskolos* 950-952; tr. W.G. Arnott (Cambridge, MA and London, 1979): “καὶ τις βραχείσα προσπόλων εὐθλικός προσώπου ἀνθος κατεκκισμενή χορεύων εἰσέβαυε ῥυθμῶν” (one of the maids who’d quaffed too much now shrouded the bloom of her fair youthful face and then began the rhythmic dance). See also Pherecrates, *Tyranny* in Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 11.481.b-d.
daughter, Kyrene, “did not care for pacing back and forth at the loom nor for the delights of meals with companions at home (oute deipnón oikourian meth' hetairan terpsias).”

Kyrene’s potential meal companions are all female. In Athenaeus’ *Deipnosopistae*, family dining also occurs according to Menander: “[i]t’s a big job to be plunged into a family dinner party, where father will take the cup and lead the talk; and after words of advice to the young man is in a jocose mood; then comes mother after him; then the old aunt mutters some nonsense aside.”

Women also dined and participated in ritual contexts during the Rural Dionysia. In the *Acharnians* Aristophanes’ characters Dicaeopolis, his wife, and daughter celebrate the Rural Dionysia by setting out a basket and cakes, holding the phallus-pole, and making sacrifices. Women acted as *deipnophoroi* at the Oschophoria: “and the women called Deipnophoroi, or *supper-carriers*, take part in the procession and share in the sacrifice (hai de deipnophoroi paralambanontai koinónousi tés thusias)” (Plutarch *Thes. 23.2-3*).

Plato’s *Laws* states that “they [priests, priestesses, and lawgivers] shall ordain also women’s festivals, prescribing how many of these shall be for women only, and how many open also to men.” In Euripides’ lost play, *Captive Melanippe*, it is “women who

---


96 “ἐγκυρον ἐστίν εἰς τρίκλινον συγγενείας εἰσπεσεῖν· οὐ λαβὼν τὴν κύλικα πρῶτος ἀρχεται λόγου πατήρ, καὶ παρανέσας πέπαικεν, εἶτα μήτηρ δευτέρα, εἶτα τηῆς παραλαλεῖ τίς” (Athenaeus, *Deipnosopistae* 2.71 ef; tr. Charles Burton Gulick [London and New York, 1961]).


hold the central role in things religious.”

Last, women also seemed to have sacrificed as part of a family to Zeus Herkeios (Euripides’ *Heracles* 925-28) and to Zeus Meilichos during the Diasia (Aristophanes’ *Clouds* 407-8). While sacrifices such as these may not leave any remains in the material record, they, nonetheless, indicate that ritual dining did occur and that women held roles during the events.

Sacred laws in epigraphic form also attest to women’s presence in sanctuaries for ritual dining. Osborne cites one specific example from a fifth century BC inscription found at the sanctuary of Demeter Thesmophoros on Thasos where women did receive part of the sacrifice: “[t]o Athena Patroia sacrificial rites are performed every other year and women obtain a cut.” He later notes, “[i]n my view we have to conclude that women were not as a rule excluded from sacrificial meat.” As Sarah Peirce points out, two stamnoi, which comprise the Lenaia vases, show females involved in *thusia*, which she defines as “the common ritual of Greek religion in which a domestic animal was ceremonially slaughtered, parts were offered to the gods in the altar fire, and the meat was eaten by the worshippers at a feast.” Indeed, Connelly states, “[t]he thought that

---


101 Zaidman, “Religious practices of the individual and family: Greece” 434.

102 For more on sacred laws, see Cole, “*Gynaiki ou Themis: Gender Difference in the Greek Leges Sacrae*” 104-122.

103 Osborne, “Women and Sacrifice in Classical Greece” 392, first published by Rolley, *BCH* 89 (1965): 441-83. The inscription was found in the sanctuary of Demeter Thesmophoros on the island of Thasos: “καὶ γυναικὲς λα-/ [γ]ιάμωσιν.” Other examples include the deme calendar of Erchia in Attica where women ate goat (published by Daux, “La grande démarche: un nouveau calendrier sacrificiel d’Attique,” in *Bulletin de correspondence hellénique* 87 [1963]: 606) and at Olympia during the *Heraia*. Women who won a race were given part of sacrificial cow (Pausanias 5.16.2-4).

104 Osborne, “Women and Sacrifice” 403.
women, who had been actively engaged in every step of the ritual process, would be
excluded from this culminating [sacrificial ritual] moment is unthinkable.”

Indeed, Connelly’s recent book brings to light the numerous ways women
functioned in the religious sphere as priestesses and participants. There is evidence that
women even dined ritually without men. For example, men who interrupted the banquets
of women celebrating the rites of Demeter at Messene were punished.\textsuperscript{107} In addition, at
the Panathenaia, women also received a cut of the sacrifice, judging by an inscription
from 335-330 BC.\textsuperscript{108} Osbourne notes that while many inscriptions specifically exclude
women, “women were not excluded from sacrificial meat” except in certain situations,
and it is because of the exceptions that the laws were inscribed.\textsuperscript{109} For instance, the cult
of Artemis Pergaia at Halikarnassos permits women to have an equal share of the
sacrifice during the month of Herakleion.\textsuperscript{110} From this brief survey, one can conclude that
women in ancient Greece did, in fact, eat meals with their husbands before \textit{symposia} took
place and in other contexts, such as ritual and marital dining.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{105} Peirce, “Visual Language and Concepts of Cult” 74. The vases are London E 452, \textit{ARV}^{2} fig. 1073.9, Eupolis Painter and Paris G 407, \textit{ARV}^{2} 1073.10, Eupolis painter.

\textsuperscript{106} Connelly, \textit{Portrait of a Priestess: Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece} 190.


\textsuperscript{108} \textit{IG II}^{2} 334, Sokolowski, \textit{LSCG} 33.

\textsuperscript{109} Osbourne, “Women and Sacrifice in Classical Greece” 403.

\textsuperscript{110} \textit{SIG}^{3} 1015.11
\end{flushleft}
1.7 Ancient Greek Terminology for Dining Rooms: Andron, Syssition, and Hestiatorion

*Andron* is the Greek word that has been used by modern scholars to designate the location of male drinking. In domestic contexts, dining spaces are consistently referred to as *andrones*, thereby gendering and limiting the users, but Goldstein informs us that the term *andron* does not appear in ritual contexts during the Archaic or Classical periods. The Greek term is variously translated into English as “men’s apartments” in Herodotos (1.34.1), “father’s hospitable table” in Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon* (238), “men’s lodging” in *Libation Bearers* (712), “men’s chamber” in Euripides’ *Heracles* (954), and “dining room” in Xenophon’s *Symposium* (1.4). Certainly, the variation in English terminology is a result of individual translators. Nonetheless, the term itself is relatively infrequently attested in the literature. Furthermore, the room that we believe is most easily identifiable in the domestic architectural record received very little attention in the textual record and may not, in fact, be what is identified as such in vase painting and excavated house plans. The rooms are hypothesized to be dining rooms because of their dining couches, lavish decoration, and off-center door, but they lack labels to testify to their identity. In fact, we cannot be sure that such rooms would have been called

---

111 Cooper and Morris write, “[t]he very name for a domestic dining-room with couches—*ανδρων*—expresses its exclusive association with a male privilege,” yet, it is not clear if this room was, in fact, used exclusively by men (“Dining in Round Buildings” 80). If we are to argue for continuity between the Greek and Roman world, then adapting the Roman model, as understood by Ray Laurence, the rooms had multiple uses and changed function based on the time of day (Laurence, *Roman Pompeii: Space and Society* 122, 125, fig. 8 and 128, fig. 8.3).

112 Goldstein, *Setting* 295.

**andrones** when the word is so infrequently used by ancient authors. Moreover, it may not be appropriate to apply a literary term to architecture.

Van Wees argues that one of the two differences between Homeric feasts and later ones is that later banquets feature an “exclusion of wives from the feast, leading eventually to the dining room being renamed ‘men’s room’, *andreion*.”\(^{114}\) Still, there is no evidence that dining rooms in other contexts were reserved for men only or that the ones in houses should be called *andrones*. Perhaps the term *andron* requires a more appropriate name such as *deipneterion*, *deipnisterion*, or *hestiatorion* or maybe the name of the room changed depending on its usage or occupants.\(^{115}\)

Finally, if wedding feasts did take place in the house of the bride, as Gloria Ferrari suggests,\(^{116}\) women would have to have been present in the male *andrones*. Nonetheless, not every Greek house had an *andron*. For example, in house A vii 4 at Olynthos, the *andron*, which is located in the southeast part of the house, has space for seven couches accessible through an anteroom. Of the excavated houses, nineteen rooms have been identified as functioning *andrones* and forty-four, that is to say nearly half, of

---

\(^{114}\) Van Wees, “Princes at Dinner: Social Event and Social Structure in Homer” 178.

\(^{115}\) Will defines the *hestiatorion* as a banqueting complex with three rooms such as that found at the Argive Heraion (“Banquets et salles de banquet les cultes de la Grèce et de l’Empire romain” 353-354). It is not clear from the scholarship precisely what the requirements are for such a designation. Bookidis uses this term to describe the dining rooms at Corinth, and the complexes there have more than three rooms. Likewise, it may refer to a hearth, but to my knowledge, no hearth was uncovered at the Argive Heraion. Goldstein Setting 294-296 for a discussion of these terms, especially *deipnisterion*.

\(^{116}\) Ferrari, *Figures of Speech: Men and Maidens in Ancient Greece* 182: “On the Anakalypteria there would be a banquet for the two families and friends, normally at the bride’s house.” Ferrari does not provide a citation for this statement, however, Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 6.245, cites a quotation from Philochorus, in his seventh book of his history of the Affairs of Attica (fr. 65) where the *gynaikonomi* visited private houses in order to count the number of guests at wedding banquets. Perhaps the setting for the banquet depended on the financial status of those throwing the party, since Athenaeus says these same officials visited sacrifices and festivals. Avagianou notes that the feast may be given by the groom’s father (Luc., *Symp.* 5) or the bridegroom himself. Alternatively, both families could host the feast. A second century AD inscription from Tenos attests to the latter (*IG* XII 5, 863).
the excavated homes have what appear to be kitchen complexes.\textsuperscript{117} On the basis of the proximity of the houses and the fact that some houses are without \textit{androns}, one might hypothesize that such male banqueting rooms were shared among homes. If these rooms are used for dining by people other than men, perhaps they, too, require a more appropriate name such as \textit{deipneterion} or \textit{hestiatorion}.

\textit{Syssition} refers to a common meal or public mess, particularly Spartan ones, but also public ones in Athens.\textsuperscript{118} \textit{Prytaneis} refers to those rulers who ate a meal paid for by the state, typically in Athens. These terms do not directly concern this study because Spartan practices are not being considered and the public meals in Athens were likely attended by men exclusively.\textsuperscript{119} The dining rooms that this dissertation seeks to examine are limited to those set in sanctuaries and those in which women could frequent, although I leave open the possibility for ritual dining in domestic settings. The issue of whether or not these spaces were public or private will be taken up in chapter 5.

Recently, scholars such as Nancy Bookidis have been using the term \textit{hestiatorion} to refer to a dining room.\textsuperscript{120} The word simply means the setting for the feast or allowance

\textsuperscript{117} Cahill, \textit{Household and City Organization at Olynthos} 154.


\textsuperscript{120} Bookidis, “Ritual Dining in the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth: Some Questions” 86. One such structure can be found in the Asklepieion at Corinth, but Bookidis notes, “Corinth apart, we have no extant \textit{hestiatoria} that have been identified as such in sanctuaries to the two goddesses in Greece” (86). Burkert also endorses the term: “[l]ater the dining halls—\textit{hestiatoria}—were separate from the \textit{naos}; they were regularly equipped with couches…The appropriate halls are in evidence at least from the sixth century. They could be called by an old term, \textit{leschai}” (“Oriental Symposia: Contrasts and Parallels” 18). See also Börker, “Festbankett und griechische Architektur,” in \textit{Xenia} 4 (1983): 5-48. Finally, Goldstein notes the existence of four \textit{hestiatoria} on Delos, named in \textit{IG} 11.2.161.A.114, 199.A.27, 165.43, and 163.A.34, as well as a \textit{lex sacra} from Delos (\textit{IG} 11.4.1030.4-5).
of food. While the term *hestiatorion* is less attested in literature,\(^\text{121}\) it is more appropriate to the spaces themselves, since *andron* or *andrones* genders the spaces male and rules out the possibility of female diners. *Hestiatorion* inversely genders the space female. Thus, perhaps *deipneterion* is the most neutral word to be applied to the architectural space when it is being used by ancient Greeks for eating.\(^\text{122}\) The Latin equivalent may be *triclinium*. It should, however, be noted that we cannot be sure that this is the actual word ancient Greeks would have applied to such a structure, only that the term *andron* is problematic.

### 1.8 A Note on Modern Terminology for Drinking and Dining

Finally, modern scholars use the words conviviality, commensality, or symposium indiscriminately to describe eating, drinking or both, but these words should be used keeping in mind a more nuanced understanding of the terminology, both ancient and modern.\(^\text{123}\) Seemingly, the ancient terms can be somewhat broad in their meanings, and the modern terminology is too broad and not limiting enough. It is inappropriate to use the term *symposia* when talking about meals respectable women may be present at, since they were not to be found there. Moreover, the terms conviviality and commensality refer to Latin dining practices and may, in fact, be synonyms for *symposia*.

---

\(^{121}\) Herodotus, *Histories* 4.35, Theopompus, *Histories* 32, Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 5.15.12, and Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 2.2.85.36. Strabo, *Geography* 10.5.11.3; tr. Horace Leonard Jones (New York and London, 1928): “Tenos has no large city, but it has the temple of Poseidon, a great temple in a sacred precinct outside the city, a spectacle worth seeing. In it have been built great banquet halls (*hestiatoria*)—an indication of the multitude of neighbors who congregate there and take part with the inhabitants of Tenos in celebrating the Poseidonian festival.”

\(^{122}\) Goldstein (*Setting* 294) notes that it is relatively unattested, as well, with the exception of a *lex sacra* found at Chalkis (*IG* I\(^2\) 190.B.3).

\(^{123}\) For instance, Pauline Schmitt Pantel writes, “[a]s a general rule, banquet invitations in the classical period went to men of quality, although one does begin to see hesitant signs of change. Except for rare occasions, women, children, and slaves were excluded” (“Greek Meals: A Civic Ritual” 94). Here, *symposion* is probably the correct term, and not banquet.
or a Roman equivalent. Throughout the rest of this dissertation, I will use the English term dining as a synonym for *deipnon* and drinking party as a synonym for *symposion*. Moreover, I will use the English terms “dining” and “banqueting” interchangeably.

1.9 Conclusion

Thus far we have examined the textual sources for female dining, which indicate that respectable married women did not attend *symposia*, but they attended the dining (*deipnon*) portion of a ritual or marital banquet, either with or without their husbands. Greek authors, not to mention modern scholars, are not entirely specific in their meaning of the words for dining and drinking, but what can be reconstructed is that a meal was oftentimes followed by drinking and that women could attend the earlier part of the event, but not the later. Additionally, women were normally permitted to attend ritual banquets unless sacred laws stated otherwise. Nonetheless, these few exceptions should not lead us to believe that women never dined, but only that there were very specific cases in which they were forbidden.

One should, therefore, expect to see a correlation between these texts and the visual and archaeological record, since female dining practices have been established in perhaps the most direct form of evidence: the written word. Next, it is time to consider exactly where female banqueters dined, how, seated or reclining, and what type of dining took place. A survey of the ancient sites of Argos, Brauron, and Corinth will organize the following chapters. I will consider the archaeology, architecture, and information about the cults at each site. Lastly, chapter 5 will offer some suggestions about how the female diner may have been thought of and how the sacred space should be characterized when women were present.
CHAPTER 2

THE WEST BUILDING AT ARGOS:
FEMALE DINING ON ANALOGY WITH DIVINE MODELS

2.1 Introduction

Having established the role of ancient Greek women at marital and ritual dining events on the basis of ancient literature, it is now possible to examine the archaeological and architectural record for female dining. The following chapters will consider the function and possible female occupants of the dining rooms located in Argos, Brauron, and Corinth. This chapter will look specifically at the west building at the Argive Heraion and the possible ritual activity, expressly related to Hera, which involved women at the site. Furthermore, rituals for Hera known elsewhere in Greece will supplement what is known to have happened at Argos. I will also explore the evidence for women’s roles during human wedding banquets at the west building and divine models for human dining. Artistic representations will help to indicate some of the positions women could have occupied in the west building. Finally, I will examine Argos’ associated votive finds as they relate to female dining in order to make the new argument that women were present at the sanctuary for ritual and marital dining celebrations.

An interdisciplinary methodology also marks a new approach to the evidence for female ritual dining; this practice will be employed throughout the following chapters.
Unlike Michael Goldstein’s dissertation on ritual dining, which is strictly architectural, and Lewis Farnell’s books on cult, which are largely textual,\textsuperscript{124} I will attempt to draw on multiple forms of evidence in order to gain a more cohesive and interdisciplinary understanding of female dining at Argos and other sites. The combination of various forms of evidence will better reveal the presence of women diners in the west building, a theory that has not yet been proposed for this site.

Argos was chosen as a focus of study for a variety of reasons. First, the ancient site of the Argive Heraion received almost uninterrupted worship from the Early Helladic period on,\textsuperscript{125} and its importance in antiquity was noted by Homer, Pausanias, and Strabo.\textsuperscript{126} Second, the dining rooms are early examples of organized, monumental, and permanent stone dining structures\textsuperscript{127} and have been dated to the Archaic period, although their date, as will be noted below, is somewhat controversial.

\textsuperscript{124} I am deeply indebted to the work of Michael Goldstein. In his 1978 dissertation, \textit{The Setting of the Ritual Meal in Greek Sanctuaries 600-300 BC}, the author lays much of the groundwork for ritual dining in Greek sanctuaries, including Argos, Brauron, and Corinth. My hope is to expand on Goldstein’s study, adding to it by offering an interpretation for the dining rooms. In addition, Lewis Farnell, in particular, his three volumes \textit{Cults of the Greek States}, discusses the ancient sources for individual divinities and their related cultic activities.

\textsuperscript{125} Kelly, \textit{A History of Argos to 500 B.C.} 5ff.

\textsuperscript{126} Homer’s \textit{Iliad} 4.50 lists Argos, Sparta, and Mycenae as the cities dearest to Hera. Pausanias, \textit{Description of Greece}, 2.15.5, 22.4. Strabo 8.6.10.

\textsuperscript{127} Goldstein has argued that some dining was done in less permanent structures, probably by utilizing tents, as early as the fifth century. He believes that both permanent and impermanent dining rooms (both listed in appendix A) are the exception rather than the rule. I, on the other hand, would argue that organized dining was probably more common than Goldstein would like to admit, given the number of dining rooms that continue to be excavated in Greece (\textit{Setting} 8-59).
Finally, the Argive Heraion was associated with ceremonies connected to the “sacred marriage” of Zeus and Hera, divine paradigms for ancient marriage, and a central organizing principle for both the worship and artistic representations at the site.

2.2 The Argive Dining Rooms in the West Building

The archaeological site of the Argive Heraion in the Peloponnese was initially discovered by General Gordon in 1831, and it received the attention of Heinrich Schliemann, as well. Comprehensive excavations began in 1892, and the dining rooms were excavated in 1893 by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens under the direction of Charles Waldstein.

Three limestone dining rooms were identified in the northern half of the west building at the Argive Heraion (fig. 2.1). Each room measures approximately 6 X 8 m. Of great scholarly interest is the date of the building. According to Edward Tilton, who wrote the excavation report on the architecture of the Argive Heraion, the structure should be dated to the sixth century on the basis of the paving in the central court, the use of swallow-tail clamps (fig. 2.2), the number of the channels on the Doric columns


129 Baumbach, The Significance of Votive Offerings in Selected Hera Sanctuaries in the Peloponnese, Ionia and Western Greece 74: “[t]he Heraion is located approximately 8 km north of Argos.”


132 Miller, “The Date of the West Building at the Argive Heraion” 9-18 and Pfaff, “The Date of the West Building at the Argive Heraion” 314.

133 Waldstein received credit for this publication as its primary author, but Edward Lippincott Tilton actually wrote the section entitled “The Architecture of the Argive Heraeum” in volume 1 of the Argive Heraeum. I will cite Tilton for all architectural sections.
(fourteen or sixteen, a feature which is typical of early Archaic columns),\textsuperscript{134} and the pancake-like shape of the echinus (fig. 2.3).\textsuperscript{135} Christopher Pfaff most recently dated the structure to the more precise date of 540-520 BC on the basis of the architectural elements, which he examined, found near the building.\textsuperscript{136}

The easternmost room of the west building lacks couches (fig. 2.4), although Goldstein notes that the cuttings in the east and north walls of this dining room indicate that originally the room had couches for reclining.\textsuperscript{137} The western and central rooms, however, still retain stone benches or couches.\textsuperscript{138} These two rooms were equipped with approximately eleven or twelve couches that vary from 1.61 to 1.84 m in length.\textsuperscript{139}

\textsuperscript{134} Unfortunately, the channels were not well-preserved on the echinus that I photographed, and I was unable to find any other columns at the site.

\textsuperscript{135} Tilton, “The Architecture of the Argive Heraeum” in \textit{The Argive Heraeum, vol. 1} 131. Later columns have twenty channels (Ibid., 131). The swallow-tail clamps typically come from the Archaic or the Roman period. The Roman date is far too late for the sanctuary. I adopt Pfaff’s dating for the building on the basis of the evidence mentioned.

\textsuperscript{136} Pfaff, “The Date of the West Building at the Argive Heraion” 314. It should be noted, however, that Steve Miller believes the building is Classical because it helps to create “classical unity” among the new temple terrace, the new temple, and the south stoa. In addition, he sees the building as comparable to one at the spring of Lerna in Corinth, which dates to the late fourth century BC. Further, he argues that the hawksbeak epikranitis is an archaizing feature and not actually Archaic, and the clamps are indicative of Hellenistic use, but not an Archaic construction. Additionally, he says that the couch supports have no parallels until a later time. Finally, he believes that the letter forms from one of the few inscriptions found on a krater near the foundations of the west wall of the west building suggest a mid-fifth century date. The foundation was presumably dug before the west building was built and, therefore, Miller asserts that the building could not have been in existence before the mid-fifth century (Miller, “The Date of the West Building at the Argive Heraion,” in \textit{American Journal of Archaeology} 77 [1973]: 9-18). The building is a bit of an anomaly given its large size and formalized dining rooms. Nonetheless, an unparalleled existence in the Archaic period should not cause us to date the structure to a later period.

\textsuperscript{137} Ibid., 239.

\textsuperscript{138} Tilton, “The Architecture of the Argive Heraeum” in \textit{The Argive Heraeum, vol. 1} 132. Tilton writes, “[t]he most easterly of the three rooms has no indication of stone couches, and may have been used as a strong room to keep the gifts, money and tokens, received from the patients” (Ibid., 132). These couches are difficult to see today. I rely on Tilton’s state plan (pl. XXIV) of \textit{The Argive Heraeum, vol. 1}, which shows couches.

\textsuperscript{139} Goldstein, \textit{Setting} 236-240. Cf. Corinth, where in one room the couches range from 1.77 to 2.42 m and half-couches measure .8 to 1.00 m long (Bookidis, “Ritual Dining at Corinth” 88).
Unfortunately, the westernmost room is not well-preserved today. It appears to be eroding down the western slope of the site (fig. 2.5). All three rooms had off-center doors.\(^{140}\)

To the south of the dining rooms is a portico with columns that ran along the west, east, and south sides of a peristyle court. The building’s entrance, the area of which constitutes a vestibule, is on the north side between the western and middle dining room (fig. 2.6). Occupying the center of the west building is a poorly preserved paved courtyard (fig. 2.7) with columns on all four sides. Tilton reconstructs a second story for the entire west building (fig. 2.8).\(^{141}\) A second story might double the number of dining rooms from three to six, and the number of couches would be sixty-six or seventy-two, depending on whether there was eleven or twelve couches in each rooms. Another possibility for the second story is a four-sided colonnaded gallery. Unfortunately, the nature of this possible second story is unclear from the remains.

No hearths were found in the west building, which has led scholars to conclude that “the meal was simply the sacrifice, which was taken from the altar to the table without further preparation.”\(^{142}\) Alternatively, the nearby, but late, south stoa (fig. 2.9), to the east of the west building, could have contained rooms for the preparation of food,

\(^{140}\) Goldstein, Setting 238 and plan by Will, “Banquets et salles de banquet les cultes de la Grèce et de l’Empire romain,” 354, fig. 1.


\(^{142}\) Bookidis and Stroud, Corinth XVIII, iii: The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: topography and architecture 410. It may be possible that burning took place in the central court of the west building, though C. Pfaff has found no evidence for such (informal discussion, December 14, 2007).
although access between the two areas is not clear; there may have been a passageway on the eastern side of the west building, which would allow travel to the entrance on the north side. The northern stoas, which are contemporary with the west building, may also have provided a setting for food preparation, assuming such was necessary (fig. 2.9).

Finally, a very large number of bronze spits were found at Argos and catalogued by the excavators. These spits perhaps point to less permanent and formal structures for cooking. A stone drain, which exits out the south wall, still remains today (fig. 2.10).

The function of the west building has been much debated. Tilton believed that the rooms were used for a women’s hospital because of Hera’s association with marriage and childbirth. This may be possible, but it has not been proven and, ultimately, it seems unlikely. First, the hospital interpretation would be convincing if there was evidence for the worship of Asklepius in the building or even at the sanctuary, but there is not. Second, the blood produced by the pregnant women during childbirth would not be welcome within the walls of a sanctuary. The hospital theory is, therefore, doubtful. Nonetheless, Tilton is correct in asserting that the rooms were used by women.

---

143 See Herbert Fletcher De Cou, “The Bronzes of the Argive Heraeum” in *The Argive Heraeum*, vol. 2 nos. 2273-2711. Again Waldstein is listed as the general author for volume 2, but Herbert Fletcher De Cou wrote the section on the bronzes found at the Argive Heraion.


145 Ibid., 132.

146 It should be noted, however, that Pausanias records a white image of Asklepius, which was set up in the Asklepius sanctuary at Argos (2.23.4). According to the Blue Guide, a relief of Asklepius has been found, but, to my knowledge, no such sanctuary has been located in any proximity to the Argive Heraion (Charles Freeman et. al., *Blue Guide Greece* 7th ed. 218). Several miles away, near the agora of Argos, is a bath complex, which dates to the late first century AD, and has been “provisionally identified as a sanctuary for the worship of Asklepios, Serapis, and the Roman emperors” (Mee and Spawforth, *Oxford Archaeological Guides: Greece* 190).
A. Frickenhaus later suggested that the west building functioned as a banquet hall, a hypothesis that is now commonly accepted. In addition, Frickenhaus was the first one to suggest that the rooms held the most distinguished citizens of Argos, an interpretation which is even maintained in an archaeological guide to Greece by Christopher Mee and Antony Spawforth. In fact, Ernest Will goes so far as to define the term “hestiatorion” as a banqueting complex with three rooms, using those found at the Argive Heraion as his primary example, despite the fact that there is no set formula for Archaic dining rooms and few comparanda exist.

Most scholars are, therefore, in agreement that the west building was used for dining. Nevertheless, the small number of rooms with their proposed thirty-six or seventy-two dining couches has led numerous scholars, including Goldstein, to interpret the room as the setting for ritual meals by the elite of Argos, an assumption that is not necessarily sustained by the evidence. Indeed, this interpretation is primarily a result of Frickenhaus comparing the Argive rooms to those discussed in a passage from Athenaeus’ Deipnosophistae. There, Athenaeus mentions a banquet for Ptolemy.

---

147 “At Lindos more serious ones [ritual pollutants] included loss of virginity, abortion, menstruation, contact with a corpse, and intercourse including a visit to a prostitute” (Williams and Schaus, “The sanctuary of Athena at ancient Stymphalos,” in Susan Deacy and Alexandra Villing, edd., Athena in the Classical World [Leiden, 2001]: 80. They cite C. Blinkenberg, Lindos II [Berlin and Copehagen: 1941], cols. 871-878). See also Pausanias, Description of Greece 2.27.1.

148 Frickenhaus, “Griechische Banketthäuser” 121-130.

149 Ibid., 130.

150 Mee and Spawforth, Oxford Archaeological Guides: Greece 197.

151 Will, “Banquets et salles de banquet les cultes de la Grèce et de l’Empire romain” 353-354. As mentioned in chapter 1, it is not clear what the qualifications are for a structure to be designated as such. The dining rooms at Corinth are described using the same terms. I will return to this issue in chapter 4 on Corinth.

152 Goldstein, Setting 238, 242.
Philadelphus in Alexandria: “I will describe the pavilion [skene] which was set up inside the enclosure of the citadel, at a distance from the place where the soldiers, artisans, and tourists were entertained…it could hold one hundred and thirty couches in a circle.”\footnote{Loeb: 5.196, Kaibel 5.25.1: “πρὸ δὲ τοῦ ἀρξασθαὶ τὴν κατασκευασθέναι σκήνην ἐν τῷ τῆς ἁκρας περιβόλῳ χωρίς τῆς τῶν στρατιωτῶν καὶ τεχνῶν καὶ παρεπιδήμων ὑποδοχῆς ἐξιγνήσουμε... τὸ μὲν οὖν μέγεθος αὐτῆς ἑκατὸν τριάκοντα κλίνας ἐπιδεχομένου κύκλω” (tr. Charles Burton Gulick).} It also had a roof to support the “symposium,” and the “multitude of reclining guests [katakeimenon]” were wreathed and lay “scattered profusely [exoregeito] on the floor of the pavilion.”\footnote{Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae 5.196b: “ἐφ’ ὄν ἐπιστύλιον καθημόσθη τετράγωνον, ὑπερεῖδου τὴν σύμπασαν τοῦ συμποσίου στέγην.”}

The problem with Frickenhaus’ comparison is that it is not appropriate to ascribe Hellenistic dining practices in Alexandria to those of the Archaic period in the Peloponnese. Athenaeus uses the word “symposion” to describe the activity, but symposia are not the same as ritual meals, as argued in chapter 1. The fact that a pavilion had to be set up may indicate a very informal and temporary celebration. In fact, Athenaeus may be describing something similar to a public meal, such as a syssitio. The syssitio could take place in a round building, as is the case of the tholos in the Athenian Agora.\footnote{Cooper and Morris, “Dining in Round Buildings” 75-76.} Furthermore, the couches in Athenaeus’ description are said to be arranged in a circle, but this is not feasible at Argos, at least in the west building. Indeed, as Cooper and Morris tell us, a synonym for skene, a word which appears in the Athenaeus’ text, may be tholos, but there is no evidence for tholoi at Argos.\footnote{Ibid., 71.}
At the heart of Frickenhaus’ interpretation is the notion that the three dining rooms correspond to three tribes of Archaic Argos. As Jonathan Hall observes, at Argos, the “population [was] divided among the three standard Dorian phylai of the Hylleis, the Dymanes, and the Pamphyloi (along with the exclusively Argive Hynathioi).”\textsuperscript{157} Inscriptional evidence attests to these tribes, but as R. A. Tomlinson observes, “the name of the fourth Argive tribe, the Hynathioi, first appears in inscriptions of the fifth century B.C. and it is possible that it was not fully integrated into the Argive constitution until that date...it is tempting to attribute the first introduction of this non-Dorian tribe into the political life of Argos, if not its first creation as a tribe, to Pheidon and to date it to the seventh century B.C.”\textsuperscript{158}

Therefore, it not clear whether there were three or four Argive tribes in existence at the time when the west building was constructed.\textsuperscript{159} The members of three Dorian tribes would fit perfectly in the three dining rooms, but this does not account for the fourth non-Dorian Hynathioi, the date of whose organization is not known, nor would it account for the occupants in the second story. The explanations for the function of the dining rooms offered by previous scholars may, therefore, not be correct.

One interpretation for the rooms’ function may be that they were used by people other than the members of the tribes. In fact, the colonnade, only the column bases of

\textsuperscript{157} Hall, \textit{Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity} 69. The fourth, non-Dorian tribe appears in inscriptional evidence: \textit{IG} 4.600, 601, 602. Likewise, Ephoros, \textit{FGH} 70 F 15 also records the fourth tribe.

\textsuperscript{158} Tomlinson, \textit{Argos and the Argolid} 189.

\textsuperscript{159} See also Kõiv, \textit{Ancient Tradition and Early Greek History: The Origins of States in Early- Archaic Sparta, Argos, and Corinth} 220-221: “The phylai of the fifth century are therefore not likely to tell us much about the organization of the Argive population in the Archaic period, which also means that we have no evidence of the fourth phyle before the fifth century...The case of Archaic Athens with its four phylai and nine archons is clear proof that the number of higher officials does not inevitably correspond to the number of subdivisions of the citizens.”
which remain, may have had fittings for benches or couches as is found in the palaestra at Epidauros;\(^{160}\) these would have provided seating for more people to dine or at least take part in the sacrifice in a less structured way.\(^{161}\) Likewise, the proposed second story could also allow more people to dine. Finally, the introduction of the Classical temple\(^{162}\) indicates that the west building or at the very least the site of Argos was probably still in use during the Classical period, the same period in which the fourth tribe is known to have existed. At least by the Classical period, therefore, the four tribes would not have fit comfortably into the three rooms, and the west building is in need of a new interpretation.

Goldstein notes, “[u]nfortunately, only the stones remain to testify to the use of the West Building, and they do not reveal who was selected to enjoy its special accommodations.”\(^{163}\) Still, the support of other forms of evidence, which this chapter will examine, may better determine who was using these dining rooms and may lead us away from the Argive tribes, how ever many there were.\(^{164}\)


\(^{161}\) Tomlinson writes, “the inventory of equipment at Chorsiai suggests provision for people eating outside as well as those on couches and, presumably, under cover” (“The Perachora Hestiatorion” 100).

\(^{162}\) Unfortunately, the Classical finds are sparse. Red-figure vases have been found, which are later than the fifth century, but “the number of vases of any kind of a later date than the Persian wars found on the site are so scarce as to have little value...We must suppose, therefore, that somewhere about the beginning of the fifth century the activity of Argos as an industrial centre for vase-painting ceased entirely, and there being no foreign importations to serve as substitute, the custom of dedicating vases at the Heraeum fell into abeyance” (Joseph Clark Hoppin, “The Vase and Vase Fragments” in The Argive Heraeum, vol. 2 180). Nonetheless, the lack of vase production alone does not indicate that the site fell out of use. The Classical temple was being built in this period, which implies use of the site and a local population.

\(^{163}\) Goldstein, Setting 342.

\(^{164}\) The three tribes and three dining rooms seem almost too convenient. Moreover, there is no evidence to suggest how many tribal members might have dined in these rooms.
2.3 Hera, Her Rituals, and the Sacred Marriage at Argos and Elsewhere

First, it is important to note that the sanctuary at Argos is dedicated to the city’s patron divinity, Hera. In most myths, she is married to Zeus and worshipped for marriage and childbirth. An exploration of the cultic activities that took place at the site may reveal the function of and participants in the dining rooms at Argos. Farnell’s work on the cults of individual gods and goddesses is helpful in reconstructing some of the rituals that took place at the sanctuary. Herodotus, Euripides, Dionysius of Halikarnassos, Ovid, and Pausanias provide further information specific to Argos, and, in particular, those who worshipped Hera.

Herodotus is one source for cult activity at Argos. He records the story of Kleobis, Biton, and their mother in his *Histories* through a response of Solon to a question by Croesus:

They were of Argive stock, had enough to live on, and on top of this had great bodily strength. Both had won prizes in the athletic contests, and this story is told about them: there was a festival of Hera in Argos, and their mother absolutely had to be conveyed to the temple by a team of oxen. But their oxen had not come back from the fields in time, so the youths took the yoke upon their own shoulders under constraint of time. They drew the wagon, with their mother riding atop it, traveling five miles until they arrived at the temple. When they had done this and had been seen by the entire gathering, their lives came to an excellent end, and in their case the god made clear that for human beings it is a better thing to die than to live. The Argive men stood around the youths and congratulated them on their strength; the Argive women congratulated their mother for having borne such children. She was overjoyed at the feat and at the praise, so she stood before the image and prayed that the goddess might grant the best thing for man to her children Cleobis and Biton, who had given great honor to the goddess. After this prayer they sacrificed and feasted. The youths then lay down in the temple and went to sleep and never rose again; death held them there. The Argives made and dedicated at Delphi statues of them as being the best of men.

165 For more information on the cult of Hera, see Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States* vol. 1 179-240.
166 Isabelle Clark characterizes Hera as a “marriage deity” (“The Gamos of Hera: Myth and Ritual” 13).
167 Herodotus, *Histories* 1.31: “Τούτοις γὰρ ἔοικε γένος Ἀργείοισι βίος τε ἄρκεσιν ὑπῆρχαι καὶ πρὸς τούτω ὑπὸ ἁμάρτωλος τοιχής ἀσβοροφοί τε ἄμφοτέροι ὁμοίως ἦσαν, καὶ δὴ καὶ λέγεται ὅτε ὃς λόγος ἐσόμεθα ὀρθῆς τῇ Ἡρη τοῖς Ἀργείοις ἔδει πάντως τὴν μητέρα αὐτῶν ζεύγης κοιμᾶνται ἐς τὸ ἵπον, οἱ δὲ φρί βοῖς ἐκ τοῦ ἄγρου οὐ παρεγίνοντο ἐν ὑπ’ ἐκκλησιενούντο δὲ τῇ ὑρῇ οἱ νενυκτεὶς ὑποδύνατε αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τὴν ζεύγην ἐλκὺν τὴν ἄμαξαν, ἐπὶ τῆς ἁμάξις δὲ σφὶ ωχέτο ἡ μήτηρ, σταδίους δὲ πέντε καὶ τεσσάρακοντα διακομίσαντες ἀπίκοντο ἐς τὸ ἵπον.
This passage is important because it tells us that women visited the site of Argos and that they were present for sacrifice and feasting there.

In Euripides’ *Electra* the chorus says, “the Argives are proclaiming a sacrifice for the third day from now, and that all maidens are to go to Hera’s temple.” While, the *Electra* may not be representing events that took place in contemporary society, the author implies that women were active at the sanctuary, which likely reflects a reality of the site. If women were not permitted to be there, the statement would make little sense to the audience.

Dionysius of Halikarnassos, in his *Roman Antiquities*, discusses the similarities between Roman practices in honor of Zeus’ wife and ones in Greece:

the temple of Juno at Falerii...[was] built in the same fashion as the one at Argos; here, too, the manner of the sacrificial ceremonies was similar, holy women served the sacred precinct, and an unmarried girl, called the canephorus or ‘basket-bearer,’ performed the initial rites of the sacrifices, and there were choruses of virgins who praised the goddess in the songs of their country.

Thus, Dionysius reveals that women, priestesses and virgins, actively participated in the cult at Argos.

---

168 171-174: “ἀγγέλλει δ’ ὦτι νῦν τριταίαν καρύσσουσιν θυσίαν Ἀργείοι, πάσαι δὲ παρ’ ἸΗραν μέλλουσιν παρθενοῖς στείχεν” (tr. E. P. Coleridge).

Likewise, Ovid’s *Amores* mentions the rites of Juno, claiming that they originate from Argos: “the priestesses were making ready to Juno a chaste festival of solemn games and a cow of native stock…snowy heifers are led along mid the plaudits of the crowd, heifers reared in their native meadows of Faliscan grass, and calves that threaten with brow not yet to be feared, and, lesser victim, a pig from the lowly sty…From Argos is the form of the pomp.” Accordingly, we learn that a procession occurs at Argos and is imitated by the Italian tribe of the Falisci probably at their city, Falerii.

Book two of Pausanias’ *Description of Greece* describes the site of Argos:

[†]fifteen stades distant from Mycenae is on the left the Heraeum. Beside the road below flows the brook called the Water of Freedom. The priestesses use it in purifications and for such sacrifices as are secret…Before the entrance stand statues of women who have been priestesses to Hera and of various heroes, including Orestes…In the fore-temple are on the one side ancient statues of the Graces, and on the right a couch of Hera and a votive offering, the shield which Menelaus once took from Euphorbus at Troy. Pausanias reveals that priestesses were present at the site, that sacrifices were secret, and that a couch for Hera was located in the *pronaos*.

Inside the temple, Pausanias describes a seated, chryselephantine cult statue of Hera, which was said to have held a pomegranate in its hand. Pausanias calls this a holy mystery. Additionally, a cuckoo, which is meant to signify Zeus, was seated on her scepter. One of the votive offerings in the temple was an altar with a relief depicting the

---

170 3.13: “casta sacerdotes Iunoni festa parabant/ per celebres ludos indigenamque bovem/…ducuntur niveae populo plaudente iuvencae,/ quas aluit campis herba Falisca suis,/ et vituli nondum metuenda fronte minaces,/ et minor ex humili victima porcus hara/…Argiva est pompeae facies” (tr. Grant Showerman).

171 2.17.1-4: “Μυκηνῶν δὲ ἐν ἄριστερά πέντε ἀπέχει καὶ δέκα στάδια τὸ Ἡραῖον. Ῥέει δὲ κατὰ τὴν ὀδόνυίδωρ Ἐλευθερίῳ καλοῦμενον ἵππον ἐπὶ καθάρσει αἱ πρὸς τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ τῶν θυσιῶν έπὶ τῶν ἀπορρήτων…ἀνδριάν τε ἐστήκασι πρὸ τῆς ἐσόδου καὶ γυναικῶν, ἀι γεγόνασι ἑρείας τῆς Ἡρᾶς, καὶ ἱρώνων ἀλλῶν τε καὶ Ὀρέστου…ἐν δὲ τῷ προναῷ τῇ μέν Χάριτες ἀγάλματά ἔστιν ἄρχαία, ἐν δεξιᾷ δὲ κλίινη τῆς Ἡρᾶς καὶ ἀνάθημα ἀστίν ἑν Μενέλαος ποτε ἄφελετο Εὐφορβὸν ἐν Ἵλιῳ” (tr. W. H. S. Jones).

172 “τὰ μὲν οὖν ἐς τὴν ροιαν—ἀπορρητότερος γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ λόγος—ἀφείσθω μοι” (2.17.4ff).
marriage of Hebe and Heracles.\textsuperscript{173} The iconography, as described by Pausanias, emphasizes marriage. In fact, Farnell notes that Pausanias does not mention a veil for the cult statue of Hera because the lack of one alludes to Hera’s role as both a “maid” or \textit{parthenos} and a “wife;” each year Hera bathes, becoming \textit{parthenos} again in order to marry Zeus again.\textsuperscript{174} According to Pausanias, the spring called Canathus at Nauplia (modern Nauplion) is the site of the Hera’s bath, where every year she recovers her virginal status.\textsuperscript{175}

In Pausanias’ account, Temenus, the one who raised Hera, “established three sanctuaries for the goddess, and gave her three surnames: when she was still a maiden, Girl; when married to Zeus he called her Grown-up; when for some cause or other she quarreled with Zeus and came back to Stymphalus, Temenus named her Widow.”\textsuperscript{176} These three roles of Hera encompass the stages of a Greek woman’s life and make Hera an appropriate goddess for women to worship.\textsuperscript{177} Moreover, Hera’s bath each year

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{173} Pausanias, \textit{Description of Greece} 2.17.6: “\'Αναθήματα δὲ τὰ ἄξια λόγου βωμὸς ἔχον ἐπειργασμένον τὸν λεγόμενον Ἡβής καὶ Ἡρακλέους γάμον· οὕτως μὲν ἄργυροῦ.”

\textsuperscript{174} Farnell, \textit{Cults of the Greek States} vol. 1 218-219.

\textsuperscript{175} Pausanias, \textit{Description of Greece} 2.38.2: “

\begin{quote}

υταὐθὰ τὴν Ἡραν φασὶν Ἀργεῖοι κατὰ ἄτος λοιμένην παρθένου γίνεσθαι.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{176} Pausanias, \textit{Description of Greece} 8.22.2: “καὶ Ἡραν ὑπὸ τοῦ Τημένου τραφῆναι τοῦτο καὶ αὐτὸν ίερὰ τῇ θεῷ τρία ἱδρύσασθαι καὶ ἐπικλῆσεις τρεῖς ἐπ’ αὐτῇ θέσθαι παρθένῳ μὲν ἑτὶ οὐσῇ Παιδί, γημαμένην δὲ [ήτι] τῷ Δίῳ ἐκάλεσαν αὐτὴν Τελείαν, διενεχθείσαν δὲ ἐφ’ ὄτω δὴ ἐς τὸν Δια καὶ Τελείαν, διενεχθείσαν δὲ ἐφ’ ὄτω δὴ ἐς τὸν Δια καὶ ἐπανήκουσαν ἐς τὴν Στύμφαλον ὄνομασαν ὁ Τήμενος Χήραν” (tr. W. H. S. Jones).

\textsuperscript{177} Farnell’s thoughts are similar: “Hera was essentially the goddess of women, and the life of a woman was reflected in her; their maidenhood and marriage were solemnized by the cults of Hera Παρθένος and Hera Τελεία or Νυμφευμένη, and the very rare worship or Hera Χήρα might allude to the not infrequent custom of divorce and separation. That the idea clashed with the highest Greek conceptions of Zeus and Hera need not have troubled the people of Arcadia...” (\textit{Cults of the Greek States} vol. 1 191).
\end{flushleft}
enables her to occupy multiple roles in a short amount of time. As a result, cycles of women, going through the same events in their own lives, could relate to Hera.

Additionally, the sanctuary of Hera at Argos was thought to have been the location of the “sacred marriage” of Zeus and Hera.178 Theocritus provides details about the sacred marriage in his *Idylls*. He writes, “so too in heaven was the holy wedlock (hieros gamos) accomplished of those whom august Rhea bore to be rulers of Olympus, so too the myrrh-cleansed hands of the ever-maiden Iris lay but one couch for the slumbering of Zeus and Hera.”179 A deme inscription from Thorikos records that the sacred marriage rituals took place in the month of Gamelion, which Isabelle Clark states

---

178 Farnell writes, “[w]e have record direct or indirect of the ceremony, or a myth that points to it, in Plataea, Euboea, Athens, Hermione, Argos, Arcadia, Samos, Crete, and in the Italian Falisci, and we may believe that it existed in other sites of the Hera-worship than these” (Cults of the Greek States vol. 1 184-185). Further, he says, “we have scattered indications showing that the performance of the sacred marriage was a necessary part of the yearly ceremony at Argos as at Samos” (Ibid., 187). Farnell then proceeds to outline the ceremony, but he does not directly cite his sources. Conversely, Clark writes, “[i]t has sometimes been suggested that the gamos of Zeus and Hera was enacted as part of the rituals of a hieros gamos festival, although there is no evidence for this. There is some evidence that a gamos of Zeus and Hera was initiated by worshippers at a place near Knossos in Crete, but the details remain obscure, and there is nothing to suggest that this was paralleled in Athens” (Clark, “The Gamos of Hera: Myth and Ritual” 20). Diodorus Siculus (5.72.4) tells of sacrifices made yearly and how the natives on Crete imitate the ceremony of marriage: “[m]en also say that the marriage of Zeus and Hera was held in the territory of the Cnosians…the natives of the place annually offer holy sacrifices and imitate the ceremony of the marriage, in the manner in which tradition tells it was originally performed” (λέγουσι δὲ καὶ τοὺς γάμους τοῦ τε Διὸς καὶ τῆς Ἡρας ἐν τῇ Κνωσῶν χώρᾳ γενέσθαι…ἐν ὡς θυσίας κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν ἁγίους ὑπὸ τῶν ἐγχωρίων συντελεῖσθαι, καὶ τοὺς γάμους ἀπομιμεῖσθαι, καθάπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς γενέσθαι παρεδέδησαν). (Tr. C. H. Oldfather). See also Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* 6.4 who mentions Hera being worshipped as a wife at Argos. In Statius’ *Thebaid* 10.54 ff., Hera is not yet a wife, but promised to Zeus.

179 “ὡδὲ καὶ ἄθανάτων οἰρός γάμος ἐξετελέσθη οὕς τέκτο θρείουσα Ὁρέα βασιλῆς Ὅλυμποι ἐν δὲ λέχος στόρυσιν ἵνα Ἰζύν Ζηνὶ καὶ Ἡρη χεῖρας φοιβήσασα μύροις ἐτὶ παρθένος Ἰρίς” (17.131, tr. J. M. Edmonds).
is the modern equivalent of January. Moreover, the month was likely named after the ritual, and it seems that couples may have chosen that month for their own nuptials.

In Attica, the sacred marriage was celebrated on the same day in two demes: Thorikos and Erchia. Here, Hera was worshipped as Hera Teleia. From a fragment of Menander, we learn that couples celebrated the rites for Hera and Zeus in their own homes. Clark believes couples may even have honored their own wedding anniversaries during the celebration of the sacred marriage. Indeed, Aristophanes’ *Birds* may be mocking the sacred marriage ritual that occurred in Athens. The Chorus says, “[o]nce were Olympian Hera/ and the mighty lord of the lofty/ throne of the gods/ united by the Fates/ with such a wedding song./ Hymen Hymenaeus!/ Hymen Hymenaeus!/ And the blooming Eros/ of the golden wings guided/ the straining reins/ as best man at the wedding/ of Zeus and thriving Hera!”

---


182 Ibid., 17.


184 Ibid., 17.

185 Ibid., 19. Menander fr. 265: “Chairephon, that most boastful of men, thwarted me, saying he was going to celebrate the *hieros gamos* on the twenty-ninth so that he could dine out on the twenty-seventh; the business of the goddess would go just as well” (μὲ γὰρ διέτριψεν ὁ κομψότατος ἀνδρῶν Χαιρεφῶν ἱερὸν γάμον φάσκων ποιήσειν δευτέρα μετ’ εἰκάδας καθ’ αὐτὸν, ἱνα τῇ τετράδι δειπνῇ παρ’ ἐτέροις: τὰ τῆς θεοῦ γὰρ πανταχῶς ἔχειν καλῶς) (tr. Isabelle Clark).


187 Ibid., 20.

188 1731-1741: “Ἡρα ποτ’ Ὀλυμπία/ τὸν ἡμιβάτων θρόνων/ ἄρχοντα θεαί μέγας/ Μοῖραι ἑυνεκοίμισαν/ ἐν τοῖς γέμνῃ ὑμεναιῷ./ Ὑμὴν ὃ, Ὑμέναι’ ὃ./ Ο δ’ ἀμφιβαλῆς Ἐρώς/ χρυσόπτερος ἡμίας/ ἡδυνμεν παλιντόνους./ Ἰμνὸς πάροχος γάμων/ τῆς τ’ εὐδαίμονος Ἡρας” (tr. Jeffrey
At Plataia, rituals called the “little” and “great” Daidala were celebrated. There was a famous temple at the site with two statues, one of which was made by Praxiteles.\(^{189}\) One of the statues was named Hera the bride and the other one was called married Hera. Hera the bride was the focus of the “little Daidala,” according to Pausanias.\(^{190}\) Every four years, during the “little Daidala,” a small statue of Hera the bride was made. Every sixty years, the “great Daidala” occurred. At this ritual, one of the small statues made during the “little daidala” was chosen to represent the bride. The statue underwent all of the typical bridal preparations and was then wheeled to the top of Mount Kithairon where sacrifices took place. One mythological explanation for the event is that Hera withdrew from Zeus after a fight. In response, Zeus tried to marry one of the wooden statues. Hera then became jealous and burned the statue. The two eventually reconciled their differences.\(^{191}\)

At the site of Olympia, the Heraia was the one event in which women could participate in an otherwise Zeus and male-dominated setting. Sixteen women organized the occasion and weaved the *peplos* for Hera every four years. Additionally, women of marriageable age ran races in three age groups.\(^{192}\) Hippodameia apparently set up the games when she got married as an offering to Hera.

---

\(^{189}\) Clark, “The Gamos of Hera: Myth and Ritual” 22. Information on the Daidala is taken from Clark, 22-25, unless otherwise noted.

\(^{190}\) Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 9.3.1-9.

\(^{191}\) Plutarch, fr. 157.

Unfortunately, Clark’s article does not explore the rites at Argos, but only at Plataia, Athens, and Olympia. Moreover, Clark cautions her reader that it is not appropriate to compare Attic rites to those practiced elsewhere; local variations do exist. Nonetheless, the theme of marriage unites the cities in Attica and the Argolid, even if they are, as Clark argues, “articulated in different ways.” Thus, individual ceremonies may have differed slightly, but Hera as the wife of Zeus is celebrated throughout Greece.

At Argos, priests and priestesses could have acted out the marriage perhaps as substitutes for the divine couple as is thought for the sacred marriage ritual of ancient Sumer. According to Hesychius, one of the sacrifices, which was part of this wedding rite, was to the goddess “lexéρνα,” likely alluding to the consummation of the marriage and possibly referring to the couch that was dedicated in the pronaos. The notion of nuptials occurs repeatedly at the site, namely the relief of the marriage of Hebe and Herakles, the couch, and the sacred marriage rituals. Moreover, ritual processions, a known element of weddings, are commonly mentioned in the sources. Finally, the sources for Argive events consistently note female involvement in the rituals for Hera.

193 This even after she notes that the cult of Hera is more prominent at sites such as Argos and Samos (Clark, “The Gamos of Hera: Myth and Ritual” 17).

194 Ibid., 15.

195 Ibid., 25.

196 The ancient Sumerian version is that of Inanna and Dumuzi as shown on the Uruk Vase, and the participants are thought to be the king acting as Dumuzi and a priestess acting as Inanna. (See Bahrani, “Performativity and the Image: Narrative, Representation, and the Uruk Vase” 18).

The dining rooms in the west building could, therefore, have served as the terminus for the Argive processions, a possible setting for the secret sacrifices that Pausanias mentions, and if a sacred marriage rite occurred, the place where ritual dining could happen. Since ritual sacrifices were known to have taken place at the site, they may be part of the sacred marriage rite. While it is difficult to construct exactly what took place at the sanctuary, the primacy of Hera at Argos coupled with the evidence for her rituals in Attica make a case for marriage-related ceremonies. The following section will offer one more possibility for the function of the dining rooms.

2.4 Human Wedding Banquets in the Dining Rooms at Argos

The dining rooms at Argos may have also held human wedding receptions, since they were said to have taken place in sanctuaries and included women, as chapter 1 demonstrated. Louis Gernet notes that “marriages occurred at festivals.” In particular, these human banquets likely took place during the month of Gamelion, an appropriate time since the sacred marriage of Zeus and Hera happened on the 26th of this month. Menander’s Dyskolos and Samia indicate that it was the responsibility of both the bride and groom’s family to co-host the wedding banquet.

---

199 Oakley and Sinos, *The Wedding in Ancient Athens* 26-34.
199 For depictions of weddings, see Oakley and Sinos, *The Wedding in Ancient Athens*.

200 Oakley and Sinos, *The Wedding in Ancient Athens* 22: “[e]very wedding included a feast…men and women celebrated together in the same room, the men on one side and the women on the other.” Goldstein makes no mention of marital banquets in his dissertation.


202 Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians* 104. See also Nilsson, “Wedding Rites in Ancient Greece” 244-245.

203 Oakley and Sinos, *The Wedding in Ancient Athens* 22. Hague also notes that the “legitimacy of a marriage could be established in court by proving that a wedding feast had been celebrated” (“Marriage Athenian Style” 34). The idea being that the people who attended the wedding banquet could testify to the
Indeed, these banquets must have been popular events; ancient sources attest to
wedding banquets in Athens becoming so excessive that in the fourth century laws were
enacted to limit the number of guests at these parties. Moreover, *gynaikonomoi*
(officials of women) were enlisted to supervise the number of visitors. In Timokles’
*Lover of Lawsuits*, a character says: “throw open the doors, so that we may be seen in the
light, in case the *gynaikonomos* watching wants to count the number of guests, as he is
accustomed to do according to the recent law. He ought to count instead the homes of
those without dinners.” In Menander’s *Hairnet*, another character says, “I have learned
from the *gynaikonomoi* that all cooks serving at the wedding banquets (*gamoi*) have been
registered according to some recent law, so that they may learn the names of the invited
guests, in case someone should be entertaining more than the permitted number.”
Menander uses the word *gamoi*, which is the type of wedding feast that could include
women, as I argued in chapter 1. Finally, in Athenaeus’ *Deipnosophistae* (6.245a),
Charaephon was told to leave a wedding party because he was not invited, and when the
*gynaikonomoi* counted the company, his presence exceeded the “legitimate” number of
validity of a couple’s marital status, which might also explain why so many people were invited to the
banquet.

---

204 See also Oakley and Sinos, *The Wedding in Ancient Athens* 22 and Garland, *Gynaikonomoi: An


206 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae*, Loeb 6.245 bc: “ἀνοίγετε ἡδη τὰς θύρας, ἵνα πρὸς τὸ φῶς ὣμεν
καταφανείς μᾶλλον, ἐφοδεύων ἐὰν ὣμεν καταφανείς μᾶλλον, ἐφοδεύων ἐὰν βούληθ’ ὁ
γυναικονόμος λαβέιν ἀριθμόν, κατὰ τὸν νόμον τὸν καινὸν ὅπερ εἴσεθη δρᾶν, τῶν ἐστιωμένων.
ἐδει δὲ τούμπαλιν τὰς τῶν ἀδείπτων ἐξετάζειν οἰκίας” (Translation by Garland, *Gynaikonomoi: An
Investigation of Greek Censors of Women* 170).

207 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae*, Loeb 6.245 c: “παρὰ τοῖς γυναικονόμοις δὲ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς γάμοις
dιακονοῦντας ἀπογεγράφθαι πυθόμενος πάντας μαγείρους κατὰ νόμον καινὸν τινα, ἵνα
πυνθάνωνται τοὺς κεκλημένους ἐὰν πλείους τις ὧν ἐξεστίν ἐστὶν τύχη, ἐλθόν” (Translation by
thirty guests. Thus, the need for *gynaikonomoi* indicates that guests were excessive in the fourth century, and their title suggests that women, in particular, were present at these events.

The most crucial aspect concerning this study is the evidence that wedding feasts took place in sanctuaries. An inscription from Cos, dating to 300 BC, gives the most detail about this particular type of banquet. The relevant portion of the lengthy text is as follows:

If any one of the descendants on the male side seems to those who share the rites to need (the sanctuary) for his private use when it is time for him to celebrate a wedding, let him have the wedding in the month Petageitnyos: on the sixteenth day, the feast; on the seventeenth day, the distribution (of meat), so that the sacrifice to Herakles may be celebrated according to ancestral tradition; on the eighteenth day, the assembly*; and on the remaining days, let the wedding be celebrated. Let the couch and statues to Herakles stay as they are throughout the building** until the wedding celebration is completed. Take from the sacrifices whatever seems fitting for the table for the god, and as for all the rest (of the meat), let the man holding the wedding use as much as is needed for his household’s entertainment. And let the priest for the wedding give his priestly share to the one having the wedding, having received eight drachmas from the public offerings. Let those occupying the men’s and women’s houses provide the houses for the wedding, keeping aside rooms for storing the equipment. Let the one who has the men’s house provide the house both for the sacrifice and for the entertainment of Herakles throughout all the days. And [let the monthly officers take care of these things so that the weddings will be celebrated with all decorum and so that]*** you provide all that is needed for the children. For those who take care, as far as they are able, that each of these things is accomplished according as they have been described, may it be well both for them and for their offspring.

---

208 *The Greek here is [*συναγωγή*], a word commonly used for gatherings of people for religious or political assemblies; thus the translation I’ve chosen. But I have wondered if here it means the “leading together” in the sense of “union” of the couple, or the wedding procession which brings them together, since the verbal element of the word is the same verb used commonly for the groom leading the bride to their new home. Earlier in the inscription, there is mention of the sacrificial activities honoring Herakles on the sixteenth and seventeenth days of this month, but there is no mention of the assembly on the eighteenth elsewhere. This may be because no provisions need to be made for an assembly, as they do for the feast (first of meat, then a fish sacrifice, on the seventeenth!). But it may be because the event is not linked to the usual rituals for Herakles, but belongs instead to the wedding.

209 **Segre’s restoration of the text at this point is “area”(χώρα) instead of “building” (οἰκία).

***Two lines are missing on the stone, so these two lines are the result of conjecture.

Translation and critical comments by Rebecca Sinos with her permission. The Greek (*LSCG* no.177.86-119) is as follows:


http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions/search_main.html.}
Consequently, the sanctuary reception was a cost-efficient option for families on Cos, who could use the festival meat for their own banquets and the dining rooms for seating. Likewise, other Greek sanctuaries may have also hosted economical weddings banquets, combining a religious holiday with a personal celebration.

Unfortunately, ancient sources are lacking on the precise details about what occurred at an ancient Greek wedding banquet\(^{210}\) with Pindar’s *Olympian Ode* 7.1-6 as the only exception. Pindar, however, does not explicitly mention women:

\[
\text{[a]s when someone takes a goblet, all golden, the most prized of his possessions, foaming with the dew of the vine from a generous hand, and makes a gift of it to his young son-in-law, welcoming him with a toast from one home to another, honoring the grace of the symposium and the new marriage-bond, and thereby, in the presence of his friends, makes him enviable for his harmonious marriage-bed.}\]

---

\(^{210}\) Most of the ancient sources discuss the sacred marriage, such as Hesychius’ entry on the *hieros gamos* and Photius s.v. *ieron gamon*. Garland writes, “[l]acking any narrative account of an Athenian wedding ceremony, we are forced to rely on evidence patched together from vase-painting, drama, and other sources” (219). Garland, nonetheless, is able to outline the various parts of the ceremony based on the few ancient sources that discuss it (Garland, *The Greek Way of Life* 217-225, and he also has a section on husbands and wives, see 225-233.).

---

\(^{211}\) “Φίάλαν ὡς εἰ τις ἀρ´νειας ἀπὸ χειρὸς ἐλὼν/ ἐνδον ἀμμέλου κακλάζοιασαν δρόσου/ δωρήεται νεανία γαμβρῷ προπῖνων/ οίκοθεν οίκαθε, πάγχρουσον, κορυσᾶν κτεᾶνων,/ συμποσιοῖς τε χάριν καθός τε τιμάσαις ἔλεον, ἐν δὲ φίλων/ παρενεύσαν θηκε νῦν ζαλωτόν ὀμόφρονος εὐνάς/ καὶ ἐγὼ νέκταρ χυτοῦ, Μοισίαν δόσιν, <ἄεο>θλοφόροις/” (Translation by William Race).
It seems likely that here Pindar is referring to the marriage banquet called the *gamelia,* since only men are mentioned, and not the *gamoi,* a nuptial banquet where women could attend. Nonetheless, the sources examined here and in chapter 1 demonstrate the presence of women at these events.

Sadly, the visual evidence also does not contribute to our knowledge of wedding banquets. Vases of the Archaic and Classical period show weddings gone awry, such as the calyx krater by the Nekyia Painter or mythological guests on their way to the wedding feast of Peleus and Thetis, such as on the volute-krater by Kleitias and Ergotimos. Yet, vases never show the feasting portion of the ceremony and never non-mythical diners. The vases, therefore, do not supplement our knowledge about marital feasts themselves. Furthermore, while the bride was likely unveiled during the wedding feast, the event is also never explicitly depicted, only suggested by figurines, such as those that will be examined in chapter 4.

This section has brought to light the possibility that a sanctuary could serve as the setting for a wedding banquet. Indeed, the importance of women in the preparation, execution, and celebration of the wedding is emphasized by the various sources

---

212 See chapter 1 for a full discussion.

213 Garland notes that the “ritual bath was followed by a wedding feast in the bride’s house at which the bride herself, who remained veiled throughout, sat with other women apart from the men. It is probable that neither the groom nor any other members of his family were present on this occasion” (Garland, *The Greek Way of Life* 220-221). Garland, however, does not cite his sources for this information, but as chapter 1 argued, ancient texts note that seating at the wedding banquet was gendered, but not necessarily segregated.


215 Burton notes that this event was attended by both male and female deities. She cites Euripides, *Iphigenia Aulidensis* 1036-79 (“Women’s Commensality in the Ancient Greek World” 158).

examined. The very existence of the *gynaikonomoi* at *gamoi* indicates that wedding banquets were attended by women and that nuptial dining needed restriction in the fourth century and possibly before. Indeed, sanctuaries offered an inexpensive venue where participants could make use of the dining rooms and sacrifices from other rituals occurring at the same time.\footnote{Reynolds, *The Nuptial Ceremony of Ancient Greece and the Articulation of Male Control Through Ritual* 18.} Finally, the west building at Argos would be an appropriate place for humans, wishing to celebrate their own marriage feasts, to dine and honor Hera, and the sacred marriage would provide the perfect ritual opportunity for such an event.

### 2.5 The Codrus Cup and Others: A Divine Model for Human Dining?

Aside from Hera’s prominent position at Argos, she appears elsewhere, along with her husband Zeus. Vases, such as the cup by the Codrus Painter in London (fig. 2.11),\footnote{London, British Museum, 82, *ARV*² 1269\textsuperscript{3}, Dentzer, *J.-M. Le Motif du banquet couché dans le Proche-Orient et le monde de grec du VII\textsuperscript{e} au IV\textsuperscript{e} siècle avant J.-C.* (Paris, 1982), fig. 114.} show Zeus and Poseidon reclining with Hera and Amphitrite seated beside them at a banquet. We know the names of the subjects because the painter inscribed them on the cup itself. The Codrus Painter was active in the 430s.\footnote{Carpenter, “A Symposion of Gods?” 145.}

On the exterior of the vase, Zeus lets his scepter rest beside him as he touches Hera’s veil.\footnote{According to Cooper and Morris, it is rare to see a male god reclining with the Codrus Cup being an exception (Cooper and Morris, “Dining in Round Buildings” 80).} He holds a *phiale* in one hand. To the viewer’s left, Poseidon reclines, holding his trident in one hand and a *phiale* in the other, while Amphitrite is seated,
holding an *alabastron*. Here, instead of *skyphoi*, which commonly appear on scenes from sympotic pots, the painter has substituted ritual vessels.

T. H. Carpenter has suggested that this vase shows an interior scene due to the Doric column on the side showing Zeus,\(^{221}\) and that this scene “is a common one for fifth century depictions of mortal *symposia.*”\(^{222}\) Carpenter then argues that the scene inappropriately borrows from the imagery of a drinking party,\(^{223}\) but ultimately the scene refers to marriage, perhaps even the sacred marriage, and the dining couches are in fact nuptial ones.\(^{224}\) Similarly, the vessel that Amphitrite holds is one typically associated with women and marriage,\(^{225}\) but the “erotic elements of the *symposion*, where men cavort with *hetairai*, have been taken over for divine couples.”\(^{226}\)

I would argue that the divine couples, in particular, the way they are seated or reclining on the Codrus cup, were a model for human meals.\(^{227}\) The men recline and the

---

222 Ibid., 146.
223 Ibid., 161.
226 Ibid., 163.
227 Speaking about the Eurymedon vase, Pinney writes, “[i]n type the joke is Old Comedy humor, in the tradition of mythological burlesque, where, in Hunter’s words, ‘the gods and heroes are given entirely “human” reactions in “ordinary”, i.e. non-mythological situations’” (“For the Heroes are at Hand” 182). She cites R. L. Hunter, *Eubulus: The Fragments* (Cambridge, 1983): 44. Jennifer Larson says, “before the fourth century, figures of women seated on chairs by themselves appear in association with figures of banqueting men; from the fourth century on, the female figure sits on the *kline* or couch of the banqueting man. This pattern parallels the development of the reliefs” (*Greek Heroine Cults* 54). The Codrus Cup, while depicting divinities, may be a counter-example to Larson’s observation, showing that men reclining and women seated may have happened earlier.
women are seated.\textsuperscript{228} They are shown in an interior scene and perhaps the joke is not that they are gods at a \textit{symposion} as Carpenter believes,\textsuperscript{229} but rather that they dine ritually like humans or rather humans dine like them in ritual contexts. While it is impossible to determine the original model in this classic chicken-or-the-egg problem, what may be funny to the viewer is the use of libation vessels, normally employed by humans as offerings to gods, by the gods themselves. Moreover, it seems likely that the seated female terracottas, examined below and found in the sanctuary, mimic not only the cult statue of Hera, but also the way that goddesses and women would normally dine in the sanctuary, as illustrated by this cup. Additionally, as Aphrodite Avagianou notes, the songs that would have been sung during the actual wedding ceremony often compare the human couple to divine ones or heroes.\textsuperscript{230} In this case, the humans are analogous to the divine.

In addition to the Codrus cup, there are many examples of Hera and Zeus pictured together. In Avagianou’s book, she catalogues such representations in the form of vase painting, sculpture, and relief. Fourteen examples show Hera as a bride on a chariot (nos. 15-29, see catalogue at the end of this chapter for specific details),\textsuperscript{231} thus maintaining one aspect of Hera’s divine persona, which has already been discussed above.

\textsuperscript{228} If Murray’s assumption is correct that women sat while eating, then this vase, on which a male divinity reclines and a seated female divinity, his wife, sits, may have been the model for Greek dining practices (Murray, “Sympotic History” 6).
\textsuperscript{229} Carpenter, “A \textit{Symposion} of Gods?” 147.

\textsuperscript{230} Avagianou, \textit{Sacred Marriage in the Rituals of Greek Religion} 110. See also Huddleston, \textit{The Wedding Songs of Ancient Greece} (diss., The Johns Hopkins University, 1980).

\textsuperscript{231} See the catalogue at the end of this chapter for Avagianou’s numbers. See also Cooke, “The Hieros Gamos” 1048-1062.
Several more examples represent Zeus with Hera unveiling herself (nos. 32-34, 37, 40, 42-43).\textsuperscript{232} Finally, many scenes show the divine couple on the \textit{epaulia} day (nos. 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 44-46).\textsuperscript{233}

A series of carved reliefs, commonly referred to as \textit{Totenmahlreliefs}, have also been connected with dining, although their contexts vary. The earliest one dates to 520 BC and comes from Tegea.\textsuperscript{234} In general, these reliefs come from all over the mainland, as far as the island of Thasos, and show ritual dining, funerary banquets, or banquets at hero shrines. Most commonly, the women are shown seated, while the men recline.

In particular, the Eleusis and Thasos reliefs have been frequently used by scholars to understand how women may have dined. In the Eleusis relief (fig. 2.12),\textsuperscript{235} one male reclines on the viewer’s right while three seated women are also present. There is also a wine-pourer on the left of the relief, which might indicate a setting where drinking was an option. The Thasos relief (fig. 2.13)\textsuperscript{236} shows five men reclining on the upper level with five women seated below. The women’s bodies are smaller in scale, but this may be so that the artist can illustrate their entire bodies, which are shown seated on chairs or stools. The relief is not well preserved, and it is not clear if the viewer is meant to see one scene with some figures further away, a single scene that shows a section of a dining room, or

\textsuperscript{232} Avagianou, \textit{Sacred Marriage in the Rituals of Greek Religion} 111.

\textsuperscript{233} Ibid., 111.


\textsuperscript{235} Dentzer, \textit{Le Motif du banquet couché dans le Proche-Orient et le monde de grec du VII\textsuperscript{e} au IV\textsuperscript{e} siècle avant J.-C.} 509, R 234, fig. 487.

\textsuperscript{236} Ibid., 517, R 506, fig. 726.
two scenes in two different places. Regardless, these scenes offer two potential models for
the way women and men could have dined in the west building at Argos.

Cooper and Morris write that both reliefs belong to ritual feasting, where men
recline and women sit.\textsuperscript{237} Certainly, the Codrus Cup also indicates that women, albeit
goddesses, would sit at the feet of their reclining mates. As a result of these examples,
scholars argue that if women were present at meals “they will have been seated”\textsuperscript{238} and
that only \textit{hetairai} recline like men; the “seated pose is the marker of a respectable female
at a banquet.”\textsuperscript{239} One must ask, if the \textit{hetairai} were meant to imitate respectable women,
how then are we to distinguish between respectable women and courtesans? The only
distinct marker of \textit{hetairai} may be that they are shown reclining and often in sympotic
contexts, while proper women sit. The reliefs, therefore, seem to be showing respectable
women, although the roles of the participants are unclear. Moreover, the Codrus Cup also
shows respectable women because, contrary to what Carpenter argues, it is not a
sympotic scene, and the women are seated and not reclining like courtesans.

The Thasos and Eleusis relief are but two examples that derive from a much
larger corpus of similar monuments. A fuller catalogue of reliefs, which highlights the
banquet couch, is J. M. Dentzer’s \textit{Le Motif du banquet couché dans le Proche-Orient et le
monde de grec du VII\textsuperscript{e} au IV\textsuperscript{e} siècle avant J.-C.} (Paris, 1982). She divides the reliefs
chronologically and also by geography, medium, and subject. Nonetheless, while

\textsuperscript{237} Cooper and Morris, “Dining in Round Buildings” 80.

\textsuperscript{238} Murray, “Sympotic History” 6.

\textsuperscript{239} Peirce, “Visual Language and Concepts of Cult” 78. Likewise, Carpenter notes that “[n]aked women
reclining with men on \textit{klinai} appear as early as 590 on Corinthian vases where couples are shown on
adjacent \textit{klinai}…It is generally accepted that the women in these scenes are \textit{hetairai} (“A \textit{Symposion of
Gods?” 147).
Dentzer’s extensive study is helpful in its assembly of images of the dining couch, it does not treat women as an individual topic. Therefore, what are we to do with these reliefs where women seem to be dining?

While Cooper and Morris assert that these are scenes of ritual, the subject of these reliefs is not entirely secure. It seems equally possible that the Thasos relief could illustrate a funerary or wedding banquet. One clue might come from the couches on the reliefs, which Carpenter argues, may actually be marital ones.\textsuperscript{240} W. K. Pritchett believes that the \textit{klinter}, mentioned by Lucian in his \textit{Convivium}, was the ancient version of a chaise longue, and the choice of this word for the description of a wedding feast indicates that the \textit{klinter} may have been used by women at nuptial banquets.\textsuperscript{241} It is not apparent if the reliefs feature the \textit{klinter} or if the couches at Argos could be identified as such. Perhaps the dining rooms on the second floor featured this type of couch and the fragmentary nature of the relief does not convey this detail.

Still, it is not evident in what situations the reliefs show the women or the identity of the women themselves. The reliefs may show the deceased, divinities, heroes and heroines, or human banqueters at various events. If the diners are divine or human, they seem to be representing what is normal for ancient Greek dining practices of humans, i.e., men and women dining together, as the textual sources in chapter 1 confirm. If they represent a funerary banquet, they may be representing human diners and may be a model for other sorts dining practices like ritual and marital. Finally, if they are heroes, like divinities, they may also serve as models for human dining.

\textsuperscript{240} Carpenter, “A \textit{Symposion} of Gods?” 163.

\textsuperscript{241} Pritchett, “The Attic Stelai ii” 230.
Unfortunately, one cannot be sure what type of dining is occurring, whether it is marriage feast, ritual meal, or funeral banquet. One can only rule out the idea that the scene shows *symposia* because the women are seated, not reclining. The poses of the women on the reliefs are consistent with the female divinities on the Codrus Cup and with the expected position of respectable women. Furthermore, while one can not determine the precise identity of women, their position as models for human dining is still possible.

Like the Codrus Cup, these artistic representations may be created because female diners acted in similar ways to divinities and women in other contexts when they were within the walls of a sanctuary, such as that at Argos, with women sitting and men reclining. The evidence offered by the Codrus cup and the various reliefs, therefore, are in concert with the architectural and literary record, which would permit women to sit in the colonnade or sit at the men’s feet in the dining rooms.

A final possibility for female dining at Argos, not suggested by the archaeological evidence, but rather the architectural remains, is the possibility that women reclined on couches, if only temporarily and only permissible because of the ritual setting. The two floors may even permit gendered dining in the same way that Lysias and Menander

---

242 Sourvinou-Inwood, “Part II. The Ritual Context” 82-89. Sourvinou-Inwood believes she has identified scenes of ritual banqueting. She writes that the “iconographic schema ‘reclining on the ground against a cushion in a religious contexts’ is deployed on non-Attic vases to represent worshippers reclining on *stibades* in the course of ritual dining and drinking in sanctuaries in which such a rite took place.” (Ibid., 82). One should not rule out the possibility of such portable structures at Argos, perhaps in the colonnade; however, there is no direct evidence for their use at the site.

243 The women in Lucian’s *Convivium* sit on couches during a wedding feast: “[o]n the right as you enter, the women occupied the whole couch, as there were a good many of them.” See chapter 1, n. 74.
gender space in the private Greek house with the men below and the women above.\textsuperscript{244} In this way, the women of Argos could imitate the men; only in this case, they are physically on top, a usual position for domestic contexts, but an unusual position for more public settings. Moreover, if we reconstruct benches in the colonnade, women could have joined the celebrations by sitting there, as well. Indeed, female dining in any form may have been permitted on account of the ritual setting.\textsuperscript{245} Nonetheless, if only mixed dining by men and women occurred at Argos, the divine model would be best.

At Argos, therefore, artistic representations suggest that there was a variety of ways that women could have dined. Most remarkable is the possibility that women could have inhabited their own separate floor either above the men like domestic settings or below men as the Thasos relief suggests.\textsuperscript{246} One bold possibility is that women might

---

\textsuperscript{244} The fifth century BC Attic orator Lysias, who wrote \textit{on the Murder of Eratosthenes}, records a certain Euphiletus saying, "I must tell you, my dwelling is on two floors, the upper being equal in space to the lower, with the women’s quarters [\textit{gunaikonitin}] above and the men’s [\textit{andronitin}] below. When the child was born to us…in order that, each time that it had to be washed, she might avoid the risk of descending the stairs, I used to live above and the women below." (Lysias, \textit{On the Murder of Eratosthenes} 1.9; tr. W.R.M. Lamb: "οἰκίσθων ἦστι μοι διηπτοῦν, ἵνα ἔχω τὰ ἄνω τοῖς κάτω κατὰ τὴν γυναικωνίτιν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀνδρωνίτιν. ἐπειδὴ δὲ τὸ παιδίου ἐγένετο ἡμῖν…ίνα δὲ μή, ὅπως λοῦσθαι δέοι κινδυνεύῃ κατὰ τῆς κλίμακος καταβαίνουσα, ἡγώ μὲν ἄνω διηπτώμην, αἱ δὲ γυναικεῖς κάτω.") Conversely, another passage from Lysias’ \textit{Against Simon} 3.6 (tr. W. R. M. Lamb) suggests that women’s quarters could be on the first floor and were, therefore, not fixed. Simon “knocked at the door and entered the \textit{gunaikonitis}” (ἐκόμψας τὰς θύρας εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν θυνακωνίτιν). Finally, the late fourth century Greek playwright Menander associates women with the production of woven goods, as well as attesting to a second story in his play \textit{Samia}: “[j]ust then, while I was there, a woman came, Descending from an upper storey, from above/ Into the store-room’s antechamber.—For with us,/ There’s an apartment, as it happens, for the looms,/ So placed that through it is the entrance to the stairs/ And to the store rooms.” (Menander, \textit{Samia} 3. 231-236: “καθ’ ὐν δ’ ἦν χρόνον ἐγώ ἐν ταῦτα, κατέβασι’ ἀρ’ ὑπερῶσον τις γυνὴ ἀνωθέν εἰς τοῦπροσθε τοῦ ταμειόν σίκμα τυχὴν γάρ ἵστεον τις ὁμ., ὁμεθ’ ἓ τ’ ἀνάβασις ἦστι διὰ τοῦτου, τό τε ταμειόν ἡμῖν.”) Translation of the text is taken from Cahill, \textit{Household and City Organization at Olynthos} 171.

\textsuperscript{245} One is reminded that Zeitlin characterizes women in same way when they are portrayed in the \textit{Thesmophoriazusai} (“Travesties of Gender and Genre in Aristophanes’ \textit{Thesmophoriazusai}” 375). See also the discussion of rituals of reversal in chapter 5.

\textsuperscript{246} The visual evidence offered by this chapter indicates that there were several possible options for the way men and women dined together. For example, the Thasos relief shows gendered dining with the women...
recline in a male fashion. More likely, if women wanted to imitate the divine, they could sit like Hera and Amphitrite with their husbands in the west building at Argos.

2.6 Terracotta Votives of Hera and Her Bed?

Unfortunately for this study, the majority of the finds from the Argive Heraion are lacking in context.\(^{247}\) According to the authors of the Argive Heraeum volume II, it was not possible to keep track of where, for instance, the pottery came from. Furthermore, their opinion that “[l]ittle advantage is to be gained from the knowledge (in the case of the vases, at least) whence each separate fragment came”\(^{248}\) makes it clear why such information was never recorded. On the other hand, Miller writes that one small find from the foundation of the western wall of the west building is significant. It is a fragment of a rim from a krater with the words “ταξιασες ειμι” incised on it.\(^{249}\) Miller argues that the form of the letters date the fragment to the end of the sixth century.\(^{250}\) For my purposes, this krater merely re-enforces Hera’s prominent role at the site and demonstrates the importance conferred on the written word over other forms of evidence by the excavators of Argos. Finally, the krater indicates that drinking likely occurred in the west building.

---

seated and the men reclining, but the Codrus Cup shows mixed dining with seated females and reclining men. From this evidence it seems most likely that the couches in the west building were inhabited by men reclining with women seated at their feet. Alternatively, the Thasos relief may be inverted with the men below and reclining with the women seated above. It is possible, too, that women were reclining on the couches as they likely did at Corinth (see chapter 4), although there is less visual support for this idea.

\(^{247}\) Baumbach, The Significance of Votive Offerings in Selected Hera Sanctuaries in the Peloponnese, Ionia and Western Greece 78. Moreover, the finds are housed in a museum in Nauplion, which is currently closed.


\(^{249}\) Miller, “The Date of the West Building at the Argive Heraion” 17. See also Argive Heraeum, vol. 2.

\(^{250}\) Miller, “The Date of the West Building at the Argive Heraion” 17.
Among the most copious finds at Argos are bronze pins,\textsuperscript{251} various jewelry items,\textsuperscript{252} and mirrors,\textsuperscript{253} all of which belong to the female realm and may have been the result of female dedications.\textsuperscript{254} In addition, Jens David Baumbach writes, “[m]ore than two thousand nine hundred terracotta figurines were found during the excavations at the Heraion…Forty further figurines come from the excavation in 1949. They were made by an Argive workshop…Most statuettes depict women. This not only indicates that the cult belonged to a goddess but also suggests that it was particularly related to women.”\textsuperscript{255} Only sixty-six figurines are male.\textsuperscript{256} 2557 figurines are “pre-archaic,” while 308 are Archaic and later. The figurines were found below the foundation walls of the Classical temple, as well as the southern slope of the temple’s terrace, but not in the old temple.\textsuperscript{257}

Since it is not possible to examine all of the votives from ancient Argos, I will be examining only a few female votive figurines, although it should be noted that not all scholars agree about their identity, whether human or divine. One representative example

\textsuperscript{251} Herbert Fletcher De Cou, “The Bronzes of the Argive Heraeum” in \textit{The Argive Heraeum}, vol. 2 nos. 52-807.

\textsuperscript{252} Ibid., nos. 950-1559.

\textsuperscript{253} Ibid., nos. 1560-1589a. Pottery was also found including lekythoi, oinochoai, pyxides, skyphoi, aryballoi, jugs, and plates, although their provenance was not recorded (see volume 2 of \textit{The Argive Heraeum}).

\textsuperscript{254} Catherine Keesling notes that “the gender of the votive statue dedications should match that of the recipient deity” (Keesling, \textit{The Votive Statues of the Athenian Acropolis} 115). Rouse also says, “[t]he immense preponderance of female figures suggests that the goddess is represented by most of them; for men worshipt Hera, and men were not forbidden in her temple; moreover…the reader will I think not be inclined to admit special deities for males and females in the ancient days” (Rouse, \textit{Greek Votive Offerings} 303).

\textsuperscript{255} Baumbach, \textit{The Significance of Votive Offerings in Selected Hera Sanctuaries in the Peloponnese, Ionia and Western Greece} 100-101.


\textsuperscript{257} Ibid., 3.
is a twelve cm high figure of Hera (fig. 2.14), who wears several necklaces, earrings, a pin for her chiton, and has the Archaic smile.\textsuperscript{258} Traces of black paint were found on her hair, as well as red paint for the pin, earrings, and necklace.\textsuperscript{259} She comes from a group of 409 similar figures of the “Advanced Argive” group that were mold-made and commonly have “elaborate ornamentation.”\textsuperscript{260} The seated figure likely derives from one of three statues of Hera and Hebe that Pausanias saw in the temple (2.17.4-5).\textsuperscript{261} One was a seated figure of Hera, smaller versions of which were also dedicated at Tiryns.\textsuperscript{262} It is thought that these figurines arose from earlier seated Heras with bird-heads because their form is similar, but the later ones have developed anthropomorphic heads. In fact, like the cult statue, most of the figurines were seated (1800), while only 400 stand.\textsuperscript{263}

Another figure is an 18 cm high Κυροτρόφος (fig. 2.15)\textsuperscript{264} which, according to Waldstein and George Henry Chase, is one of many figurines who are “much better explained as human mothers, especially as Hera…[who] is rarely represented with an infant in her arms”\textsuperscript{265} as this figurine is. She, too, wears a necklace and has a pin for her

\textsuperscript{258} Ibid., 26, no. 94, pl. XLV. 13 and Baumbach, \textit{The Significance of Votive Offerings in Selected Hera Sanctuaries in the Peloponnes, Ionia and Western Greece} 101, fig. 4.56. Dimensions: 12cm high.


\textsuperscript{260} Ibid., 7, 9.

\textsuperscript{261} Altroth, \textit{Greek Gods and Figurines} 41.

\textsuperscript{262} The other two statues were a chryselephantine one made by Polykleitos and an old image of Hera on a pillar (Altroth, \textit{Greek Gods and Figurines} 41).

\textsuperscript{263} Baumbach, \textit{The Significance of Votive Offerings in Selected Hera Sanctuaries in the Peloponnes, Ionia and Western Greece} 101.


chiton. She sits in a chair that was made separately. Red paint was added to the body of the presumably male child while the female was painted white. Thus, the votive figurines emphasize dedications that celebrate human motherhood.

Finally, miniature beds are also among the votives dedicated at Argos. For example, one small terracotta bed dates to the seventh or sixth century and may be an imitation of the bed set up in the pronaos of the temple (fig. 2.16), only on a smaller scale. A second fragment of a bronze bed may be interpreted similarly.

A couch was known to have been located in the pronaos of the temple according to Pausanias (2.17.3). Scholars have been quick to associate the dining rooms with the prominent men of the city of Argos, however, they are ignoring the evidence of Hera’s kline in the temple and the rites that took place in the sanctuary, which emphasize marriage and were primarily carried out by women, respectively. The kline, therefore, may allude to the marriage bed or perhaps even the stone couches found in the west building or both.

Altogether, Hera’s association with children and marriage, the ancient testimonia, the votives of Hera, and the kline in both the temple and in the form of a dedication permit the west building to be the possible site of a place to celebrate ritual dining by ancient Greek women.

---

266 Ibid., 25.
267 Waldstein and Chase agree that the iconography is consistent with Hera (“The Terra-Cotta Figurines” in Argive Heraeum, vol. 2 13), but the figurines may represent a variety of goddesses.
268 Ibid., 42, no. 271, fig. 80. Dimensions: 3.5cm high, 4.24cm long, 2.75cm wide.
269 Ibid., 328-9, no. 2787. Dimensions: 22.1cm long, 23.5cm wide.
270 Avagianou, Sacred Marriage in the Rituals of Greek Religion 43.
It is unfortunate that more material remains have not survived or been analyzed. Perhaps these missing items might paint an even fuller picture of female dining at Argos.

2.7 Conclusion

While it is possible that elite citizens of Argos did use the dining rooms in the west building for their own personal feasts as Frickenhaus first proposed, it is also feasible to imagine that this was not its only function; women and men celebrating the rites of Hera in the Archaic period may also have dined in the three or six rooms provided by the west building and around the peristyle in tents, since we know women and men visited the site together, as Herodotus attests in his story of Kleobis and Biton. Moreover, other ancient authors confirm that women were quite active in the cult there.

The association between Hera and marriage, the statue, which depicted Hera with Zeus that was located inside the Argive Heraion, and Hera’s kline in the pronaos, combined with dedications of Hera, human mothers, and couches, make a strong case for women’s presence at the sanctuary, especially to use the dining rooms. Moreover, banquets relating to the celebration of the sacred marriage may have taken place in the west building, not to mention human marriage feasts, too.

Finally, divine models, such as that offered by the Codrus cup, may even serve as models for the ways that humans dined in sanctuaries. Indeed the female terracottas found at Argos, which may represent human or divine women, are shown seated. These, too, may have been a model for female dining. Moreover, it is rare to find a woman in any medium reclining and the terracottas at Argos are no exception. Although, one

---

should not rule out the possibility that ritual conditions allowed the status quo to be temporarily changed and permitted women to recline.

The most logical interpretation for the use of the west building is that female banqueters joined the male counterparts on the couches in the same way that Hera is shown seated at Zeus’ feet on the Codrus cup, since it was couples who were celebrating the sacred marriage or their own nuptials at Argos. Herodotus also suggests that families visited Argos. The two reliefs examined would also support female dining in a seated or gendered manner. Thus, the evidence, in its varied forms, shows overwhelming evidence for women, virgins, priestesses, and mothers being active at the site, permitting a new interpretation for the use of the west building at Argos. As a result, female dining could have taken place in the west building as women celebrated the rites of Hera or their own marriages and priestesses reenacted the sacred marriage of Hera who annually became a *parthenos* once again. The west building at the Argive Heraion, therefore, permitted ritual and marital banqueting in connection with the sacred marriage ceremony and on analogy with divinities in one of the earliest permanent dining structures in Greece by ancient Greek women.

Bridal Procession:

No. 15 Clay Perirhanterion, Metapontium Museum St. 12504, from Incoronata, 3rd quarter of the 7th c., *LIMC* “Hera” nr. 272 a
No. 16 Exaleiptron, Thebes, Paris, Louvre CA 616, 570/560 BC, *LIMC* “Hera” nr. 273
No. 19 Amphora, Etruria. Paris, Louvre, F 208, 520 BC, *CVA* Louvre 3, taf. 23 (160) 4
No. 21 Hydria, Naples, Mus. Naz. 112847, 520 BC, *ABV* 333, 29: Priamos Painter
No. 22 Amphora, Tarquinia, Tarquinia Mus. Naz. 645, 530/520 BC, *CVA* Tarquinia 2, taf. 31 (1180) 6
No. 23 Hydria, San Simeon, State Hist. Mon. inv. 5433 (Hearst SSW 9518) 520/510 BC, *ABV* 324, 33: Euphiletos Painter
No. 24 Amphora, Vulci, Rouen, Mus. Dep. 447 (9820034) 520/510 BC, (Para 148, 5 quarter): Rycroft Painter
No. 26 Amphora, London, BM. 1928, 5-17.1, 440 BC, *CVA* Brit. Mus. 4, taf. 61 (206) 3 a
No. 27 Amphora, South Italy, Munich, Antikenslg. 1406 (J.592), 510 BC, *ABV* 368, 208: Leagros Group

Zeus sitting, Hera unveiling:

No. 32 Metope, Heraion, Temple E, Selinus, Palermo, Mus. Reg., 470 BC, O. Benndorf, *Die Metopen von Selinunt* 1873, 54-56, taf. 8
No. 34 Relief, Thasos, 2nd half of the 5th c, G. Daux, *BCH* 86 (1961), 939-940
No. 35 Red-Figure Apulian Amphora, Santangelo Collection, Naples Mus. Naz. Stg. 24 *LIMC* “Aphrodite” nr. 1407
No. 36 Red-Figure Scyphus, Tarentum, New York, MMA 11.212.12, 420/410 BC, G. M. A. Richter, *BullMMA* (1912): VII, 97, fig. 5
182, 189, fig. 12
No. 38 Krater, Santa Agata dei Goti, Coll. Santa Agata dei Goti, Heydemann, Die
Vasensamml. Neapl. 244 ff. no. 2202.
No. 39 Red-Figure Hydria, “Oianthe Painter,” Vulci, Leiden, Rijksmus. PC 73, 460/450
BC, ARV² 580, 3
No. 40 Document Relief (Treaty Athens – Kerkyra, 375/74 BC) from the Asklepieion of
Athens, Athens NM 1467, 375/374 BC, IG II/III² 97.
No. 41 Epichysis, Apulian, Bern, Hist. Mus. 12406, 330 BC, ARV II 538, 320:
Underworld Painter
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No. 43 Apulian Vase, Sir William Hamilton’s Collection, 330/320 BC, ARV II 485:
Dareios Painter?
No. 44 Wall painting, from Pompeii, VI 8, 3 (Casa del poeta tragico), Naples, Mus. Naz.
9559, Time of Nero, after a Hellenistic original, Simon, Jdl 76 1961, 148-150
No. 45 Marble relief, Rhodes, Rhodes, Mus. 5900, Hellenistic, LIMC “Hera” nr. 264
No. 46 Marble relief, Rhodes, London, BM 2150, Hellenistic, BM Cat. Sculpture III 223
f., no. 2150
Figure 2.1. Plan of the west building at Argos. (Ernest Will, “Banquets et salles de banquet les cultes de la Grèce et de l’Empire romain,” in Pierre Ducrey et al, edd., Mélanges d'histoire ancienne et d'archéologie offerts à Paul Collart [Lausanne, 1976], 354, fig. 1)
Figure 2.2. Swallow-tail clamps from the west building at Argos. (author’s photo)

Figure 2.3. Echinus from the west building at Argos. (author’s photo)
Figure 2.4. Eastern room of the west building, looking south. (author’s photo)

Figure 2.5. Western room of the west building at Argos, looking south. (author’s photo)
Figure 2.6. Vestibule from the west building at Argos, looking south. (author’s photo)

Figure 2.7. Paved courtyard in the distance of the west building at Argos, looking southwest. (author’s photo)
Figure 2.8. Restoration of the elevation of the west building by Tilton. (Charles Waldstein, *The Argive Heraeum, vol. I* [Boston, 1902-5], pl. xxvi)

Figure 2.9. Stoas at the Argive Heraion (6 is the north stoa, 10 is the south stoa, 7 is the west building). (Christopher Mee and Antony Spawforth, *Oxford Archaeological Guides: Greece* [Oxford, 2001], 196, fig. 76)
Figure 2.10. Stone drain in the west building at Argos. (author’s photo)

Figure 2.11. Cup by the Codrus Painter, 430s, London, British Museum, E 82. (J.-M. Dentzer, *Le Motif du banquet couché dans le Proche-Orient et le monde de grec du VIIème au IVème siècle avant J.-C.* [Paris, 1982], fig. 114 and *Thesaurus cultus et rituum antiquorum* [Los Angeles, 2004], 44, Gr. 6)
Figure 2.12. Relief from Eleusis, R 234. (J.-M. Dentzer, *Le Motif du banquet couché dans le Proche-Orient et le monde de grec du VIIe au IVe siècle avant J.-C.* [Paris, 1982], pl. 81, fig. 487)

Figure 2.14. Archaic terracotta figurine of Hera from Argos. (Jens David Baumbach, *The Significance of Votive Offerings in Selected Hera Sanctuaries in the Peloponnese, Ionia and Western Greece* [Oxford, 2004], 101, fig. 4.56)

Figure 2.15. Terracotta *kourotrophos* figurine from the “Advanced Argive” group. (Charles Waldstein and George Henry Chase, “The Terra-Cotta Figurines” in *The Argive Heraeum, vol. 2* [Boston, 1902-5], 25, no. 86, pl. XLIV.3)
Figure 2.16. Couch dedication. (Charles Waldstein and George Henry Chase, “The Terra-Cotta Figurines” in *The Argive Heraeum, vol. 2* [Boston, 1902-5], 42, no. 271, fig. 80)
CHAPTER 3

PRE-MARITAL RITUALS, POST-MARITAL DINING IN THE SANCTUARY OF ARTEMIS BRAURONIA

3.1 Introduction

The second case study for female dining focuses on the ancient site of Brauron, modern Vravrona, which is situated on an inlet of the Aegean Sea in the eastern part of Attica. Ten so-called dining rooms, dating to the Classical period, were found among the remains of a sanctuary dedicated to Artemis Brauronia. These rooms are notable because they are very well-preserved; thresholds are still visible, tables remain in situ, and the indications of couch legs are still present. I will argue that women and girls, representing at least three distinct age groups, visited Brauron for various ritual and dedicatory purposes and that they used the rooms for dining and sleeping.

The Archaeological Society of Athens under the direction of John Papadimitriou excavated the ancient site of Brauron from 1948-1950 and again from 1956-1962 (fig. 3.1). Unfortunately, a complete excavation and publication of the sanctuary is still

---

272 Artemis is associated with the site because of inscriptional evidence found there (a bronze mirror with the phrase “Hippylla the daughter of Onetor has dedicated it to Artemis”) and the reference to Artemis Brauronia in Euripides’ Iphigenia in Tauris (Papadimitriou, “The Sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron,” in Scientific American [1963]: 113, 115). Vravrona is identified as ancient Brauron on account of the remains of stairs in the church of St. George. Again, Euripides’ Iphigenia in Tauris 1442-1461 is the source for this (“by the holy stairs”).

273 Goldstein, Setting 114.
lacking due to Papadimitriou’s untimely death in 1963.\textsuperscript{274} Charalambos Bouras was given the task of restoring and publishing the architecture.\textsuperscript{275} Lily Kahil has published some of the vases,\textsuperscript{276} and John Papadimitriou published the article, “The Sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron,” which remains the most accessible, though short, survey of the site in English.\textsuperscript{277} Likewise, Petros Themelis’ \textit{Brauron: Guide to the Site and Museum} is the only publication of the objects in the museum, but it is brief and not comprehensive.\textsuperscript{278} Nevertheless, what has been published, including some information on the stoa, temple, dining complexes, and select vases, reliefs, and sculptures, is a source of great interest to scholars and this study.

Using the published material, this chapter will investigate who used the dining rooms at Brauron by exploring the different rituals that occurred there.\textsuperscript{279} The first section will briefly discuss the site and then the architecture of the dining rooms. Next, I will argue at least two rituals occurred at Brauron: one for young girls and another for

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Bouras, \textit{Η αναστήλωσις της στοάς της Βραυρώνως: τα αρχιτεκτονικά της προβλήματα} (Athens, 1967).
\item Papadimitriou, “The Sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron,” 110-120.
\item Themelis, \textit{Brauron: Guide to the Site and Museum} (Athens, 1971).
\item Marinatos, “The Arkteia and the Gradual Transformation of the Maiden into a Woman” 29-42, Goldstein, \textit{Setting} 114-125 and Bouras, \textit{Η αναστήλωσις της στοάς της Βραυρώνως: τα αρχιτεκτονικά της προβλήματα} (Athens, 1967): 71-102. Ekroth writes, “it has to be emphasized that dealing with Brauron entails proceeding with great care, since the excavation is still to a large extent known only from preliminary reports” (“Inventing Iphigeneia? On Euripides and the Cultic Construction of Brauron” 60).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
young ladies of marriageable ages. Moreover, I will suggest that female visitors to Brauron are depicted on small kraters called *krateriskoi*. In particular, these *krateriskoi* found at the site help to reveal the multiple uses of the dining rooms. I will also explore the form of the *krateriskos*, proposing some possible meanings for its unique shape.

Then, in order to demonstrate that another group of females were present at the site, I will survey the types of dedications known to have been made by adult women. I will propose that these women, who celebrated one or both of the rites at Brauron, returned there and offered female-related items in order to commemorate their successful marriages and children. The rites at Brauron, therefore, created a life-long connection between the sanctuary and the female participants.

Finally, I will propose two ways that the nine rooms could have functioned. First, they were used as a dormitory by the younger girls attending rituals. Second, I will argue that the rooms should be identified as dining rooms because of their features. To that end, the rooms acted as places to eat and drink for slightly older girls participating in pre-marital rituals and for the adult women who returned to the site with their families.

As in the previous chapter, my contribution will be to use an interdisciplinary approach to the evidence from Brauron, examining diverse material associated with the site including architecture, inscriptions, vase-painting, reliefs, and sculpture. This methodology will produce the most comprehensive view of the rituals enacted there by the ancient Greek girls and women and their possible uses of the dining rooms.

---

280 Scanlon, “Race or Chase at the Arkteia of Attica?” 139-174. On two age groups represented in the vase painting, see Perlman, “Plato Laws 833C-834D and the Bears of Brauron” 123ff.
3.2 The Sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron and its Unusually Well-Preserved Dining Rooms

Brauron was active in the Neolithic period and most wealthy from 2000 to 1600 BC, judging by finds from the chamber tombs and those found on the nearby acropolis.\textsuperscript{281} Some time around 1300 BC, the site was abandoned and was not re-occupied until the Archaic period when it flourished until the third century.\textsuperscript{282} In the Archaic period, a simple Doric temple was constructed. The temple consisted of a \textit{pronaos}, \textit{cella}, and possible \textit{adyton} and measured 19.90 X 10.35m.\textsuperscript{283} The Classical temple was built on top of the Archaic one, suggesting that the earlier temple was destroyed by the Persians.\textsuperscript{284}

The Classical period also saw the construction of a pi-shaped stoa, which can be dated to the last quarter of the fifth century, made of poros and marble.\textsuperscript{285} It measures 75 X 55m, but was never completed.\textsuperscript{286} Today, eleven columns run along the north and one stands on the west and east sides.\textsuperscript{287} Some time between 400 and 300 BC, the Erasinos

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{281} Papadimitriou “The Sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron” 112. Hollinshead, \textit{Legend, Cult, and Architecture at Three Sanctuaries of Artemis} 30. On the pottery from the cemetery, see C. Paschalidis, “New Pictorial Finds from Brauron, Attica: Stylistic Evidence for Local Production” 93-110.
\item \textsuperscript{282} Papadimitriou, “The Sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron” 112. Deposits, especially in the spring, are dated from the 8\textsuperscript{th} to late 3\textsuperscript{rd} century (Themelis, “Contribution to the Topography of the Sanctuary at Brauron” 109).
\item \textsuperscript{283} Hollinshead, \textit{Legend, Cult, and Architecture at Three Sanctuaries of Artemis} 34-35.
\item \textsuperscript{284} Ibid., 35.
\item \textsuperscript{285} Ibid., 37, 39.
\item \textsuperscript{286} Themelis, “Contribution to the Topography of the Sanctuary at Brauron” 104.
\item \textsuperscript{287} Hollinshead, \textit{Legend, Cult, and Architecture at Three Sanctuaries of Artemis} 38.
\end{itemize}
river flooded, covering the entire site.\textsuperscript{288} The later history of the site is slight; the only building to be constructed was the post-Byzantine church of St. George.\textsuperscript{289}

Nine so-called dining rooms, found within the stoa, are worthy of special attention.\textsuperscript{290} Along the north side, there were six dining rooms (fig. 3.3), all of equal size (6.10 X 6.10m).\textsuperscript{291} They were constructed of local sandstone, which is still visible, although the superstructure would have been of mud brick, perhaps with the addition of stuccoed walls.\textsuperscript{292} A small “porter’s room” was situated in the northwest corner, while a passageway separated the rooms into two sets of three.\textsuperscript{293} Along the west side, there were three more rooms of the same material, but smaller in size. Two of the rooms were situated at the northwest corner and one was at the southwest corner. A \textit{propylon} separated the rooms on the west.\textsuperscript{294} The southern-most room on the west side was likely used for storage.\textsuperscript{295} Joannis Mylonopoulos and Friederike Bubenheimer suggest that two rooms, the porter’s room and storage room, in the dining area held wooden stairs leading to a proposed second story.\textsuperscript{296}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{288} Papadimitriou, “The Sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron” 120.
\textsuperscript{289} Ibid., 113.
\textsuperscript{290} Themelis, “Contribution to the Topography of the Sanctuary at Brauron” 104.
\textsuperscript{291} Papadimitriou “The Sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron” 118. Goldstein, \textit{Setting} 115.
\textsuperscript{292} Goldstein, \textit{Setting} 115.
\textsuperscript{293} Hollinshead, \textit{Legend, Cult, and Architecture at Three Sanctuaries of Artemis} 38.
\textsuperscript{294} Themelis, “Contribution to the Topography of the Sanctuary at Brauron” 105.
\textsuperscript{295} Ibid., 104-105.
\end{footnotesize}
Each dining room was furnished with eleven couches and seven accompanying tables of sandstone and marble; occupants in the corners, therefore, shared tables.297 The couches themselves were wooden, and their feet were affixed to the floor of the rooms with lead that is still visible today (fig. 3.4).298 North of the dining rooms was an open-air corridor with propyla at each end. This area may have been the site of dedications by older women, discussed below.299 The dining rooms, therefore, had ninety-nine couches. If there was a second story, the couches could have numbered nearly two hundred.

Scholars have debated the identity of these so-called dining rooms. Indeed, Goldstein suggested that the rooms were used for dining because of their architectural form and features;300 the rooms have couches, tables, and off-center doors, all of which are typically associated with dining.301 In fact, in an inscription found in the eastern section of the sanctuary records furnishings for some rooms at Brauron: “ἐν τῷ τέταρτῳ κλίναι/δέκα τράπεζαι/ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ κλίναι/ἐνδeka τράπεζαι ἐννέα/ἐν τῷ ἐκτῶ κλίναι ἐννέα/τράπεζαι ἐξ τεθυρωμένως ἐν τῷ ἔβδομῳ


299 Themelis thought this area was a stable (“Contribution to the Topography of the Sanctuary at Brauron” 105).

300 Goldstein, Setting 122. On the rooms being the oikoi in a recently published inscription, see note 30, consult Borker (Review of Charalambos Bouras Η ἀναστήλωσις της στους της Βραυρωνος: τα αρχιτεκτονικα της προβληματα in Gnomon 41 [1969]: 806) and Kahil (“L’Artémis de Brauron: Rites et Mystère,” 96-97).

The inscription should be associated with the nine dining room because the textual discussion of couches, tables, and doors matches what is found in the dining rooms. The furnishings found in the rooms and the details of this inscription, therefore, indicate that the so-called dining rooms were used for dining.

### 3.3 Brauronian Krateriskoi and Cult

Unique to sanctuaries of Artemis in Attica, including Brauron, are krateriskoi or small bowls that rest on tall feet. The general dates for the vessels are 510-420 BC. The fragments are not much larger than 12 cm in height. While the majority of the Brauronian krateriskoi are black-figure and somewhat hard to read (fig. 3.5), several red-figure krateriskoi survive that are more finely painted than the black-figure vases, but

---

302 Themelis “Brauron, la stoa della arkoii” in Magna Grecia 21 (1986): 6-10. Hollinshead, Legend, Cult, and Architecture at Three Sanctuaries of Artemis 48. She cites Papadimitriou’s entry on Brauron in Ergon (1961): 24, but does not translate the text. Moreover, Eric Brulotte suggests that the dining rooms may actually be the “τὸν τε θυρωμάτων τὸν άρθρων καὶ τῶν τραπεζῶν” from another inscription because the word *thuroma* normally refers to a door with its sill, post, and lintel. For more on the *thuroma*, see Brulotte, The Placement of Votive Offerings and Dedications in Peloponnesian Sanctuaries of Artemis (334) and Liddell and Scott, Greek-English Lexicon s.v. “thurōma.” For that inscription, see Themelis, “Contribution to the Topography of the Sanctuary at Brauron” 112-113.

303 Brauron, Archaeological Museum, Neils and Oakley, edd., Coming of Age in Ancient Greece: Images from the Classical Past (New Haven, 2003), 152, fig. 11. Scanlon, “Race or Chase at the Arkeia of Attica?” 74. This study does not examine all of the known krateriskoi, rather only a few representative of the group. These shapes have also been found in Athenian Agora, Salamis, the Athenian Acropolis, and Mounichion. For the Mounichion krateriskoi, see Palaiokrassa, Τό ιερό της Αρτέμιδος Μουνιχίας (diss., University of Thessaloniki, 1983). Osborne also includes Halai Araphenides, Melite, and the Cave of the Pans at Eleusis as sites with krateriskoi (Demos, the discovery of classical Attika 155, hereafter cited as Demos).

304 Scanlon, “Race or Chase at the Arkeia of Attica?” 75.


306 Attic black-figure krateriskoi, 5th century BC, Brauron, Archaeological Museum, Neils and Oakley, edd., Coming of Age in Ancient Greece: Images from the Classical Past (New Haven, 2003), 152, fig. 11. Hamilton conducts a detailed analysis of the krateriskoi in his article, “Alkman and the Athenian Arkeia” 449-472. It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to examine each *krateriskos* in detail.
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fragmentary (fig. 3.6). \textsuperscript{307} They date to 430-420 BC and correspond to the construction of the stoa and dining rooms at Brauron. These fragments were said to be found at Brauron and are now in the private collection of David Cahn in Basel.\textsuperscript{308}

Christopher Faraone, who limits his study to the texts relating to Brauron, believes the sources refer to at least two ritual activities, which have been conflated in the literary evidence, especially our later sources.\textsuperscript{309} On the basis of these sources, Faraone determined that these two rituals were called the \textit{Brauronia} and the \textit{arkteia}. According to a scholion to the Leyden manuscript of the Aristophanes’ \textit{Lysistrata}, during the \textit{Brauronia} young girls played or imitated the bear (\textit{arkton mimoumenai}).\textsuperscript{310} In the same scholion, the \textit{Brauronia} is described as a festival whose goal is to placate Artemis through sacrifice (\textit{thusia}).\textsuperscript{311} In another scholion to the same work, the \textit{Brauronia} is also called a secret rite or \textit{mustêrion}.\textsuperscript{312}


\textsuperscript{308} Cahn’s collection is said to be from Brauron. Indeed, the shape and iconography suggest that they do belong with the rest of the \textit{krateriskoi}.

\textsuperscript{309} Faraone, “Playing the Bear and Fawn for Artemis” 51. “These paintings on the \textit{krateriskoi} could, for instance, quite easily be evidence for some other festival of Artemis celebrated at the sanctuary…all who argue that ‘playing the bear’ for Artemis was an initiation rite in one way or another combine the ceramic material with the literary testimony to describe a single rite” (Ibid., 46). See also Sale, “The Temple-Legends of the Arkeia” in \textit{Rheinisches Museum für Philologie} 118 (1975): 265-284.

\textsuperscript{310} Faraone, “Playing the Bear and Fawn for Artemis” 55, L1. Faraone uses three scholia, which he numbers L1, L2, and L3. I will indicate the source for the specific scholia by using his system of numbering. The scholia comment on lines 644-5 of Aristophanes’ \textit{Lysistrata}.

\textsuperscript{311} “And the girls also performed the sacrifices (\textit{thusia}) placating (\textit{ekmelissomenai}) the goddess” (Faraone, “Playing the Bear and Fawn for Artemis” 52, L1).

\textsuperscript{312} Ibid., 55, L2. Indeed, the \textit{adyton} in the temple of Artemis at Brauron may have served as the place where rites were revealed for the \textit{arkteia}. The \textit{adyton} may have also have served as the place of mysteries for the \textit{Brauronia}. See Perlman, “Acting the She-Bear for Artemis” 124, 126. The \textit{adyton} may be the “parthenon” in an inscription transcribed by Themelis (Themelis, “Contribution to the Topography of the Sanctuary at Brauron” 112-113). This assignment makes sense if \textit{parthenoi} used this space. \textit{Pace}
What is missing from Faraone’s discussion, however, is the connection between these two rites and the artistic and architectural evidence offered by the small kraters and the dining rooms. I believe that the vases themselves feature the young participants of the *Brauronia* (fig. 3.7).\textsuperscript{313} Furthermore, the young girl on our far left in figure 3.7 can be distinguished from the older one because her hair is down, she wears a short *chiton*, and she is clearly younger due to her shorter height.

It seems unlikely that all Athenian girls participated in the *Brauronia*; rather a small chosen group likely represented all young Athenian citizen girls as the term *epilegomenai*, found in one scholion to the *Lysistrata*, implies.\textsuperscript{314} Likewise, a limited number of participants coincides with the architectural remains at the site of Brauron, which had nine dining rooms with eleven couches or beds in each.\textsuperscript{315} These rooms could not possibly house all Athenian girls at one time, but ninety-nine at most or perhaps double that number if there was a second story.\textsuperscript{316}

---


\textsuperscript{314} Faraone, “Playing the Bear and Fawn for Artemis” 52, 55, L1. Conversely, Sourvinou-Inwood states that as a penteteric festival, every girl who would be past age five, but not yet ten, could participate. She believes their service would last a year and would be completed before the girls turned ten (*Studies in Girls’ Transitions: Aspects of the arkteia and age representation in Attic iconography* 21). See also Walbank, “Artemis Bear-Leader” 277.

\textsuperscript{315} Hollinshead, *Legend, Cult, and Architecture of Three Sanctuaries of Artemis* 38: “In each of the large chambers on the north and west side were found fittings for eleven couches, and cuttings for a table in front of each.”

\textsuperscript{316} Professor Graf has suggested that *krateriskoi* have been found in locations other than Brauron, Munichian, or Athens. If there were dining rooms and rites celebrated all over Attica, all girls could play the bear at a more local sanctuary.
The Aristotelian Constitution of Athens states that the Brauronia was celebrated every four years. 317 One scholion to the Lysistrata states that the participants were between five and ten years old. 318 This range of ages would allow the selected girls to participate at least once in the penteteric festival, but would create various ages, between five and ten, to be present at one Brauronia. The selected girls, therefore, could visit the site at least once in their lifetime.

A second and separate event was known as the arkteia, a festival that is described as a rite or teletê. 319 Faraone has shown that the verb arkteuein is synonymous with the verb kathieroun (to dedicate). 320 He, therefore, believes that the young women either dedicated themselves or made a dedication during the arkteia. 321 Supplementing information from Plato’s Laws, the girls are probably between the ages of thirteen and twenty, 322 though as young as ten according to Harpocration. 323 Because sources specify that the girls perform these rites before marriage, the arkteia may have prepared the

317 [Aristotle], Constitution of the Athens 54.7: “One of the four-yearly festivals is… the Brauronia.”

318 Faraone, “Playing the Bear and Fawn for Artemis” 52, L1: “neither older than ten nor younger than five.”

319 Hesychius, s.v. arkteia: The Ritual (teletê) of the parthenoi who ‘play the bear’ (Faraone, “Playing the Bear and Fawn for Artemis” 52).

320 Ibid., 54. Faraone shows that the active form of the verb arkteuein can be equated with kathieroun (to dedicate) and dekateuein (to pay as a tenth, to tithe).

321 Ibid., 52, 56. Harpocration s.v. arkteusai states that to play the bear means “to tithe” (dekateusai).

322 Plato, Laws tr. R.G. Bury, 833D: “[girls] over thirteen shall continue to take part until married, up to the age of twenty at most, or at least eighteen” (ταῖς δὲ τριακατεκέται μέχρι γάμου μενούσαι κοινωνίας μή μακρότερον εἶκοι ἐτῶν μηδὲ ἐλαττον ὀκτωκαίδεκα). For a discussion, see Perlman, “Plato Laws 833C-834D and the Bears of Brauron” 121.

323 Harpocration writes, “ten-year old girls used to play the bear” (Faraone, “Playing the Bear and Fawn for Artemis” 53).
participants for their future nuptials. Unlike the Brauronia, the arkteia could be celebrated by all girls before they marry and would explain the decree recorded in the tenth century Suda that all girls play the bear.

The corresponding visual evidence for the arkteia shows girls of a slightly older age, helping the younger ones and making dedications in some scenes on the krateriskoi. In fact, two such girls can be seen on the fragment discussed above (fig. 3.7). To the immediate right of the younger girl and at the far right of the fragment stand two female figures. These older girls are shown with her hair up in a bun, and they wear a floor-length dress, much longer than the one the younger girls are wearing.

It is also necessary to consider the implications of the term arkteia coming from the Greek word arktos, meaning bear, for the older girls. Two explanations seem likely. First, Brauron’s patron goddess, Artemis, is intimately associated with the wild, and wild animals such as bears are sacred to her. Thus, bears as animals are appropriate for a sanctuary to Artemis. Second, the wild nature of both the young girls before they are tamed by marriage may explain their connection to bears. Scanlon writes: “the girl…may be seen as a type of ritual half-breed, girls and not girls, bears and not bears, on the margin between savage and civilized, maidens and married women.” Nanno Marinatos echoes Scanlon’s thoughts: “bears are promiscuous,” pointing to a passage in

---

324 These sources include a scholion to the Leyden manuscript of Aristophanes’ Lysistrata 644-5 and Bekker, Anecdota Grecca s.v. arkteusai.

325 Faraone, “Playing the Bear and Fawn for Artemis” 56: “every parthenos” (Suda) or “korai” (Harpocratio) “were required to play the bear” (Suda, s.v. “I was a bear [arktos] at the Brauronia” and Harpocratio, s.v. arkteusai).

326 Farnell writes that she is “patroness of the wild beasts…the animals of the chase” (Cult of the Greek States vol.2 431).

327 Scanlon, “Race or Chase at the Arkteia of Attica?” 87.
Oppian for this characterization.\textsuperscript{328} She believes that the term bear is a code name for their age group.\textsuperscript{329} In the words of Scanlon, the “girls interact with the wild in a final acknowledgment of that aspect of their nature—their ‘Artemisian nature’.”\textsuperscript{330} Girls of all ages race around the vases (lowest fragment in fig. 3.6) nude\textsuperscript{331} and in a manner similar to the animals in the frieze below the girls.\textsuperscript{332} The \textit{arkteia} thus emphasizes the animals sacred to Artemis and the untamed nature of all girls, those of the \textit{Brauronia} and the \textit{arkteia}, before they marry.

The vases themselves, therefore, offer two contexts for understanding the girls portrayed on them: the \textit{Brauronia}, where girls experience mysteries, and the \textit{arkteia}, where girls of marriageable age make pre-marital dedications.\textsuperscript{333} Nonetheless, the untamed nature of both girls celebrating the \textit{Brauronia} and \textit{arkteia} is highlighted by their nude races and bear-like behavior.\textsuperscript{334} Fortunately, the dedications that the girls of the \textit{arkteia} make for Artemis prepare them to be tamed by marriage. There may even be one

\textsuperscript{328} “For evermore by day and night the females lust for mating and themselves pursue the males, seldom intermitting the pleasures of union and conceiving young when already pregnant” (ἡματα γὰρ καὶ νῦκτας ἐξελόμεναι φιλότητος αὐταὶ βυλύτεραι μᾶλ’ ἐπ’ ἀρσεαίν όρμαινοι, παύρα μεθίςμεναι γαμίς παντερπέος εὐνής, τέκνα κυκόκομεναι νηδὼν ὑπ’ ἰμαίνοις) Oppian, \textit{Cynegetica} tr. A. W. Mair, 3.147-150.

\textsuperscript{329} Marinatos, “The \textit{Arkteia} and the Gradual Transformation of the Maiden into a Woman” 36, 37.

\textsuperscript{330} Scanlon, \textit{Eros and Athletics} 156. These rites may be reversal of every day practices, as H. S. Versnel argues (Versnel, \textit{Transition and Reversal in Myth and Ritual} 115-117).

\textsuperscript{331} Scanlon, “Race or Chase at the Arkteia of Attica?” 78-79. And although “there are no clearly identifiable ‘chases’ held at Greek festivals,” for the races, the closest parallel is the girls’ footrace at the Heraia at Olympia (Ibid., 74).

\textsuperscript{332} This observation was made by John Oakley on February 14\textsuperscript{th}, 2008 at an invited lecture at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

\textsuperscript{333} Scanlon, “Race or Chase at the Arkteia of Attica?” 104.

more opportunity for women to visit the sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia, and we shall see shortly how the dining rooms relate to these rituals.

**3.4 Does Form Lead to Function?**

One final, related question about the *krateriskoi* is their function. One clue to help answer this question might come from a krater on which there is a scene of a *krateriskos* leaning up against an altar (fig. 3.8).335 Perhaps we are to understand this as a dedication made by one of the girls who visited the site, a ritual vessel for wine, or something else. This section will discuss the somewhat unique shape of the *krateriskos* in comparison to the krater, how the shape relates to their function, the symbolic aspects of women and vessels, the meaning of the vessel’s function, and the possible operators of these vessels.

Clearly, the small size and krater-like shape are significant. The *krateriskos* can first be compared to the krater, a much larger traditionally male vessel that is associated with drinking, parties, and Dionysos. The krater functioned as a mixing vessel and was also common for male burials. The *krateriskos* shape indicates mixing, but on a smaller scale. This shape might seem somewhat bizarre for a sanctuary of the female goddess Artemis because of its male connotations.336 Nonetheless, the diminutive size of the *krateriskos* might make it appropriate to women. Further analysis will posit some more ways that this vase is, in fact, fitting to Artemis and women.

---


336 “The associations of the krater, a mixing bowl for wine and water, are with the symposium, a social gathering of particular significance for males, male competition, and male solidarity” (Pedley, *Greek Art and Archaeology* 121).
There is often a direct relationship between the form and decoration of the vase and its function, as Richard Neer has demonstrated for sympotic vases.\textsuperscript{337} Symptic vases often depict symposia; and the eye-cup, for instance, when used for sipping, covers the owner’s face, but the handles act as ears and the painted eyes of the vase stand in for the owner’s eyes.\textsuperscript{338} Similarly, the krateriskoi is appropriate for Brauron because the decoration illustrates two rituals and the participants could use the vessels to mix wine for drinking as part of those rituals. Indeed, in Aristophanes’ \textit{The Peace}, Trygaeus says: “[w]hy, it’s the same Theoria,” to which the servant replies, “[t]he one we used to go to Brauron with, to get tipsy and frolic” (873-874).\textsuperscript{339} Thus, Brauron had a reputation of drinking by women, and it may have even been comical for women to use vessels that, on a larger scale, are typically associated with men. The krateriskoi, therefore, could serve as vessels for wine mixing, and the nine dining rooms at the site simply provided the setting where up to ninety-nine diners used their diminutive vessels to mix wine.\textsuperscript{340}

Indeed, it is worth considering the ancient analogies about women and vessels to better determine who used the krateriskoi at Brauron.\textsuperscript{341} Francois Lissarague writes, “boxes, chests, and other containers occupy a place that seems important in a woman’s world…many of these objects, as iconographical signs, allow a metaphorical expression


\textsuperscript{338} Ibid., 41.


\textsuperscript{340} I am connecting the vases to the site of Brauron, however, it may be possible that similar rituals took place at other find spots of krateriskoi.

\textsuperscript{341} I wish to thank Kathryn Topper for this suggestion.
of views about women.”

Indeed, Hippocrates viewed female anatomy as being similar to vessels. In particular, he saw the uterus as a jug. Moreover, as the inactive receptacle, women were often viewed as mere containers to incubate babies.

More specifically, the action thought to take place in kraters may have had a double entendre. As Ann Hanson notes, “μιγνυναι, [is] a verb for the mixing of liquids within a container and a verb for intercourse.” Gloria Ferrari writes that in the metaphor of uterus as jug, “the male and female seed are mixed as water with wine after the seal on the wine jug has been removed.” Indeed, she notes that women, especially parthenoi, are often compared to water in poetry and myth. Thus, the vessel contains symbols of men and women, namely wine and water.

Using this interpretation, the krateriskoi is most appropriate to the arkteia because it was a pre-marital ritual; symbolically, the girls were both the water and the vessel itself. Moreover, the girls used a diminutive vessel, normally associated with men, but made on a smaller and perhaps more feminine scale. The shape of the krateriskoi may even symbolically represent the woman’s womb. More significantly, both the krateriskos and the womb were places where fluids mixed.

---

344 Aristotle, de generatione animalium 727b31ff, 729a23ff, 729b6ff, 732a5ff.
345 Hanson, “The Medical Writers’ Woman” 325.
346 Ferrari, Figures of Speech: Men and Maidens in Ancient Greece 67.
347 Ibid., 66-67.
The iconography of the vessels, as well as their shape, is important. The scenes depict the rituals of the *arkteia* and the *Brauronia*, while the *krateriskoi* themselves were used for mixing water and wine. The shape may imply the female uterus, while the contents symbolize women through water and men through wine. It seems likely that they were ritual vessels, perhaps used by girls celebrating the *arkteia* for mixing wine, since the symbolism is most appropriate for a group of girls not yet married; during the ritual the girls would experience the first definition of *mignunai*, but completing the *teletê* and consummating marriage, they would experience the second one.

3.5 Adult Female Dedications

In Euripides’ *Iphigeneia in Tauris*, Iphigeneia is said to receive dedications of clothing on behalf of the women who had died in childbirth: “and they will dedicate for your delight the finely woven garments which women who die in childbirth leave behind in their houses.” These items, along with other female dedications, were likely displayed behind the dining rooms in the open-air corridor.

Clothing and other types of dedications were also made by adult women who suffered less dire fates. Robin Osborne has worked on the names and dedications at Brauron. He says that of the sixteen names that can be recognized and provide a husband or father’s name, “[a]ll of the known women come from the more distant of the demes represented. Two of the families were certainly wealthy…and all were of high

---


349 These dedications were meant for Artemis or Iphigeneia, since Euripides records dedications for Iphigeneia and a scholion to Callimachus’ *Hymn to Zeus* (77b) records dedications for Artemis (Brulotte, *The Placement of Votive Offerings and Dedications in Peloponnesian Sanctuaries of Artemis* 344).

350 Osborne, *Demos* 158-160. For a complete list of the dedicators’ names, see Cleland, *The Brauron clothing catalogues: text, analysis, glossary and translation* 148-158.
status."  

Some of the female dedications were single, some of the names are appropriate to slaves, while other inscriptions record husbands or fathers. Our information about these women comes from inscriptions found in Athens, duplicate records of what was documented in Brauron. Papadimitriou, thus, postulated that during the Peloponnesian war, the offerings made at the sanctuary of Brauron were taken to Athens to protect them. The duplicate lists were made to accompany the items to their new and safe location in Athens.

Osborne notes that most of the dedications were in the form of clothing items and that many were *chitoniskoi* or short *chitons*, a garment that may have been worn during the *Brauronia* as the visual evidence attests. Inscriptions also mention such dedications as embroidered garments and even hair nets. Extant dedications found at Brauron include an inscribed bronze mirror, jewelry, statues of babies and

---

351 Osborne, *Demos* 159.


355 Osborne, *Demos* 158.

356 Ibid., 132-147.

357 A mid-4th century BC stele 3 from the Akropolis records the dedications to Artemis at Brauron (*IG I² 1522.17-18*): Glukera (wife/daughter) of Aristodikos (dedicated) three hair-nets in an oblong box (...*Glukê*ρα Ἀριστοδίκον------/) πη κεκρυφάλους τρεῖς ἐμ πλασίοι...) (Linders, *Studies in the Treasure Records of Artemis Brauronia Found in Athens* 27).

358 Papadimitriou, “The Sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron” 115.

children, and reliefs. The clothing included men’s, women’s and children’s, but the dedicator was usually a woman. Finally, clothing is “one form of property which almost all women owned at least some, and which was clearly felt to fall under female control.” Unfortunately, dedications of clothing items no longer remain.

While it is impossible to consider all of the dedications made at the site, especially with its museum being currently closed, the evidence that has been discussed does emphasize women as dedicators. Like at Argos, “offerings to Artemis Brauronia are characteristically of a feminine nature.” Indeed, the dedications of chitoniskoi illustrate how the cycle of rituals at Brauron celebrated the many stages of a woman’s life. These garments were worn by girls celebrating the Brauronia, as the pottery attests. Later, married women returned and dedicated chitoniskoi to Artemis. Finally, dedications of infants in the form of statues might indicate the dedicator’s participation in the arkteia and the thought that Artemis should be celebrated for her prosperous rituals.

3.6 Two Uses for the Dining Rooms

Now that the three types of female visitors to the sanctuary have been discussed, it is time to consider how the dining rooms relate to their activities. One theory for the

360 Themelis, *Brauron: Guide to the Site and Museum* 66, 70. “We must not be astonished to find, now and then, the image of baby boys or little boys. As a goddess of fertility, Artemis may well receive from a grateful woman an image of a male descendent” (Kahil, “Mythological Repertoire of Brauron” 237). Hollinshead notes that terracottas of Artemis kourotrophos also underscore her connection with children (*Legend, Cult, and Architecture at Three Sanctuaries of Artemis* 65-66).

361 Osborne, *Demos* 158.

362 Foxhall and Stears, “Redressing the Balance: Dedications of Clothing to Artemis and the Order of Life Stages” 5, 11.

363 On dedications by women in Greece, see Ridgway, “Ancient Greek Women and Art: The Material Evidence” 399-409.

function of the rooms was proposed by Papadimitriou, namely that they served as bedrooms for the girls celebrating the festivals. This theory seems likely based on the information examined in the cult section. Since the Brauronia was a ritual for young girls that involved mysteries, it is likely that these events could have happened at night or over multiple days. The girls would, therefore, need a place to stay, and the dining rooms could double as dormitories for the participants of the Brauronia.

In addition, Goldstein’s study of the couch length demonstrates that they are long enough for “adult female worshippers,” “although the possibility that children were entertained in these rooms cannot be excluded.” There is reason to believe, therefore, that the rooms were also used as dining rooms for those celebrating the arkteia and returning older women, who came to make dedications at the site. The discussion of the krateriskoi indicates that the mixing of wine occurred and that the vessels were most appropriate for girls celebrating the arkteia. The dining rooms, therefore, may have hosted ritual dining for the arkteia.

Finally, Brauron may have also had mixed dining. Indeed, the passage from Aristophanes’ Peace implies that both men and women visited the site of Brauron. Family dining is also a possibility, since reliefs that were found in the stoa show men, women, and children standing before Artemis (fig. 3.9) and the rooms are big enough to fit adult men, women, and children. It may be possible that the dining rooms were also

---


366 Goldstein, Setting 122.

367 Family relief, Brauron Museum, 1153, Antoniou, Βραυρών: συμβολή στην ιστορία του ναού της Βραυρωνίας Αρτέμιδας (Athens, 1990), 304, fig. 5. Hollinshead, Legend, Cult, and Architecture at Three Sanctuaries of Artemis 43, 63.
used by young men and women present for rites that are not recorded. Finally, adult women, either alone or with their families, who came to the site to make dedications, might have also used the rooms for ritual dining.368

Thus the dining rooms at Brauron had two functions with a variety of possible female and even male participants. The rooms could have been used as dormitories by the younger girls celebrating the Brauronia and as sites of ritual dining by older girls at Brauron for the arkteia and by adult women and their families for dining. Thus, the dining rooms at Brauron hosted little girls, girls of marriageable age, and adult women and men.

3.7 Conclusion

In conclusion, the sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia witnessed at least two ritual events: the Brauronia and the arkteia. The better preserved vases may even show these very rituals that took place at the sites involving two age groups: girls of an older age in long gowns, making dedications, and younger girls who are shown in short dresses being helped by the older ones. Indeed, the literary sources describe the events shown on the vases: the mustêrion and teletê that were performed at Brauron by two groups of girls. Women and perhaps their families subsequently returned to the site to dedicate statues, clothing, and other items to Artemis following a successful childbirth. The goddess of the sanctuary at Brauron, Artemis, looked after women from a young age, housed them in her sanctuary, let them drink using small kraters as mixing vessels, and even permitted them to return as adults when they had children of their own.

368 This seems likely since we know many of the women dedicators were from demes that were far from Brauron (Osborne, Demos 159).
The form of the visual evidence points to the use of wine at the site, which is corroborated by the features of the dining rooms with their off-center doors, couches, and tables. Indeed, it may have been comical to mix wine for young girls in vessels typically associated with men. Alternatively, the krateriskoi may have had a symbolic function as places of mixing like the wombs of the girls who would soon marry following the pre-marital arkteia. In this way, the vessels signify the young girls and the small form of the krater is appropriate to them.

Finally, the nine rooms in the pi-shaped stoa are best interpreted as dining rooms on account of their architectural remains and dormitories for the younger girls to sleep. Thus, the ninety-nine couches functioned as beds for younger girls and dining couches for older girls and adult women and their families.

The dining rooms at Brauron, therefore, offer a different experience from those at Argos. While both settings are for ritual activities, the rooms at Brauron housed girls of specific ages, as well providing the setting for family dining. At Brauron, it seems likely that drinking occurred, a possibility for Argos, but an event that seems extremely likely given the presence of dining rooms, drinking vessels, and evidence for female drinking there. Finally, the dining rooms were used for different, but related reasons at the two sites. At Argos, dining celebrated the sacred marriage of Hera and Zeus and perhaps even human wedding feasts occurred in the dining rooms. At Brauron, the dining rooms functioned as dormitories and places for wine to be mixed. Eventually, the young girls could return to the site, make dedications to Artemis for her role in their marriages and childbirths, and use the dining rooms once again. The rituals at Brauron created a lasting relationship between the female participants and the dining rooms.
Figure 3.1. Plan of the site of Brauron after Papadimitriou. (John Papadimitriou, “The Sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron,” in *Scientific American* [1963], 114)
Figure 3.2. Plan of the dining rooms at Brauron. (Ernest Will, “Banquets et salles de banquet les cultes de la Grèce et de l’Empire romain,” in Pierre Ducrey et al, edd., Mélanges d'histoire ancienne et d'archéologie offerts à Paul Collart [Lausanne, 1976], 355, fig. 2)
Figure 3.3. Photograph of the northwest dining room at Brauron. (http://www.stoa.org/athens/sites/brauron/index.html)

Figure 3.4. Lead remains for the couches at Brauron. (author’s photo)
Figure 3.5. Attic black-figure *krateriskoi*, 5th century BC, Brauron, Archaeological Museum. (Jenifer Neils and John Oakley, edd., *Coming of Age in Ancient Greece: Images from the Classical Past* [New Haven, 2003], 152, fig. 11)
Figure 3.6. Attic red-figure fragments from krateriskoi, Basel, Collection of David Cahn, HC 501, 502, 503. (Ellen Reeder, ed., Pandora: Women in Classical Greece [Baltimore, 1995], 323, no. 98, 324, no. 99, 327, no. 100)
Figure 3.7. Attic red-figure fragment from a krateriskos, Basel, Collection of David Cahn, HC 501. (Ellen Reeder, ed., Pandora: Women in Classical Greece [Baltimore, 1995], 323, no. 98)

Figure 3.8. Red-figure krater fragment from Brauron, found in the small heroon of Iphigenia. (Richard Hamilton, “Alkman and the Athenian Arkteia,” in Hesperia 58.4 [1989], pl. 86a after Lilly Kahil “Quelques vases du sanctuaire d’ Artémis à Brauron,” in Antike Kunst Beiheft 1 [1963], pl. 14:3)
Figure 3.9. Votive family relief, Brauron Museum, 1153. (G. Despinis, “Il rilevo di Aristonike ad Artemis Brauronia” in Bruno Gentili and Franco Perusina edd., *Le orse di Brauron. Un rituale di iniziazione femminile nel santuario di Artemide* [Firenze, 2002], 271, fig. 9)
CHAPTER 4

A SETTING FOR THE THESMOPHORIA:
THE SANCTUARY OF DEMETER AND KORE AT CORINTH

4.1 The Plentiful and Irregular Dining Rooms of Corinth

Situated on two terraces on the northern slopes of Acrocorinth, fifty-two dining rooms with their own cooking and washing facilities have been found in the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore, dating from the sixth to second centuries BC (fig. 4.1).369 This chapter will argue that these rooms were used for the *Thesmophoria*, an interpretation that was briefly proposed by Nancy Bookidis, but never fully explored.370 To support this claim, I will investigate specific evidence for the ritual practices in honor of Demeter and Kore in this sanctuary, including terracotta figurines of reclining diners, the remains of organic material, and vessels for eating, drinking, and serving. These materials strengthen the notion that women were present at this sanctuary for ritual dining and drinking. Additionally, comparison of the finds from Corinth with those from other sites where the *Thesmophoria* is known to have taken place, such as Eleusis and Bitalemi.


370 Nancy Bookidis mentioned that this is a possible interpretation of the dining rooms in a talk to members of the American School at Corinth (November, 2007). Likewise, she mentions Thesmophoria in connection with Corinth in Bookidis et al., “Dining in the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth” 52. Because Bookidis only briefly raised the possibility, however, the argumentation that follows will be my own. Further information may appear in more detail in a forthcoming Corinth volume on the cult of the Demeter and Kore by Bookidis.
(ancient Gela) on Sicily, identifies one of the festivals celebrated at this sanctuary as the Thesmophoria.

Although late Helladic remains have been found, the Demeter and Kore sanctuary flourished most in the fifth century,\textsuperscript{371} and the fourth century marks the last major construction period for the Corinthian dining rooms.\textsuperscript{372} At the end of the fourth century, major destruction of the rooms and site occurred. The area was not rebuilt until the end of the third century BC.\textsuperscript{373} The cause of the destruction is unknown, but excavators postulate an earthquake because other areas of Corinth were also damaged at this time.\textsuperscript{374}

The identity of patron goddesses of the site is secure for two reasons. First, Pausanias (2.4.6-7) mentions a sanctuary dedicated to Demeter and Kore at Corinth that scholars have consequently used as evidence that the site belonged to the goddesses. Second, pottery was found inscribed with the word “Demeter” on it.\textsuperscript{375} Ronald Stroud excavated the sanctuary beginning in 1961. In 1965, Nancy Bookidis and Ronald Stroud uncovered the dining rooms that were later published in a Corinth volume.\textsuperscript{376} Unlike Argos and Brauron, there has been no debate here over the function of these rooms as

\textsuperscript{371} Bookidis and Stroud, \textit{Corinth XVIII, iii: The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: topography and architecture} 13.

\textsuperscript{372} Ibid., 94.

\textsuperscript{373} Ibid., 430-431.

\textsuperscript{374} Ibid., 430-431.

\textsuperscript{375} Bookidis and Stroud, \textit{Demeter and Persephone in Ancient Corinth} 11. For more on Kore, see Diodorus 16.661-5 and Plutarch, \textit{Life of Timoleon} 8.

\textsuperscript{376} Bookidis and Stroud, \textit{Corinth XVIII, iii: The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: topography and architecture} 393ff.
dining rooms, although no one has yet found exact parallels for them or made an argument for their interpretation.377

The dining rooms themselves were built in rows and form an independent unit on the Lower Terrace, northeast of Acrocorinth. They are irregular in shape due to the topography.378 The dining rooms are small and self-sufficient379 units. The shape of the rooms is not uniform and, therefore, scholars conclude that the rooms were unplanned.380 The rooms are typically rectangular and constructed of fieldstones, limestone, and breccia. In general, they were roofed and lacked windows.381 In the Archaic and Classical period the rooms were plastered, and waterproof cement began to be used in the late fifth century.382 Generally, the dining rooms had clay floors.383 Finally, most of the rooms had off-center doors, though excavators note some exceptions.384

Some of the dining rooms were independent units, but others shared common walls in the Archaic period.385 About fifteen dining rooms existed on the Lower Terrace


378 Bookidis and Stroud, Corinth XVIII, iii: The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: topography and architecture 393, 395.

379 Ibid., 393.


381 Bookidis and Stroud, Corinth XVIII, iii: The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: topography and architecture 394, 395.

382 Ibid., 395.

383 Ibid., 400.

384 Ibid., 396.
in the late Archaic period (fig. 4.2), indicating communal dining by that time, if not before. \(^{386}\) An estimated 101 people could dine there simultaneously. \(^{387}\) In subsequent periods of use, the dining rooms followed the plan laid out in the Archaic period\(^ {388}\) with the addition in the fifth century of service rooms, which become more abundant in the fourth century. \(^{389}\) Additionally, ten of the Archaic dining rooms continued to be used in the Classical and succeeding periods. \(^{390}\) Thus, by the middle of the fifth century, twenty-five dining rooms existed with 182 couches. \(^{391}\) By 400 BC, a total of thirty-six dining rooms existed with even more couches for dining (fig. 4.3). \(^{392}\)

The couches in the dining rooms are not free-standing, rather they are built directly into the wall and continuous. The excavators call these units “banquettes,” but I will use the terms banquettes and couches interchangeably throughout this chapter. \(^{393}\) The dining couches vary in number from seven to nine per room, \(^{394}\) and their lengths are not consistent. They have peculiar rims, which may have helped hold mattresses in

\(^{385}\) Ibid, 22.

\(^{386}\) Ibid., 49.

\(^{387}\) Ibid., 50.

\(^{388}\) Ibid., 393.

\(^{389}\) Ibid., 394.

\(^{390}\) Ibid., 85, 150.

\(^{391}\) Ibid., 150.

\(^{392}\) Bookidis et al., “Dining in the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth” 4.

\(^{393}\) Bookidis and Stroud, Corinth XVIII, iii: The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: topography and architecture 22.

\(^{394}\) Ibid., 22.
Furthermore, the couches do not always have an armrest and “as a result, we cannot say with certainty that such units were used primarily as couches.” The large number of these banquets indicates that “more than the priestesses participated in the meal.” In a few cases, stone foundations survive for wooden tables.

The most peculiar features of these rooms are the variation in couch length and the presence of what Bookidis calls a half-couch. The short or half-couch measures 0.8-1.0m long and is typically situated near the doorway. Bookidis believes that the seats were used for someone who oversaw or helped with meal in some way. Another possibility is that the half-couch may have been “intended for children holding a special position within the cult.” Additionally, niches in the rooms may have served as storage units, areas to place lamps or other forms of lighting, or places to house an image.

As early as the late sixth century, bathing rooms existed at the site; these become common in the Hellenistic period (fig. 4.4) and signify the connection between washing

---

395 Goldstein, Setting 186.
396 Bookidis and Stroud, Corinth XVIII, iii: The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: topography and architecture 99.
397 Ibid., 50.
398 Ibid., 400-401.
399 Bookidis and Stroud, Corinth XVIII, iii: The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: topography and architecture 401 and Bookidis, “Ritual Dining in the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth: Some Questions” 88.
400 Ibid., 88.
401 Bookidis, “Ritual Dining at Corinth” 49.
402 Bookidis and Stroud, Corinth XVIII, iii: The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: topography and architecture 399.
403 Ibid., 401.
and eating at the sanctuary. In Plato’s *Symposium* (175a), Aristodemos cleans himself before dining. At least ten rooms have been securely identified as bathing rooms with cement floors, though we may be able to add four more to the total. The existence of such rooms likely means that complete washing took place either by a servant pouring water or with a basin, many of which have been found at the site.

Six certain and eight possible kitchens with hearths have also been found in the dining complex. Most of the rooms date to the second half of the fifth century with one room possibly dating to the late sixth century BC. The excavators state that cooking could have been done “directly on the floor.” The presence of these rooms, therefore, indicates the great need for cooking and washing facilities that is less of a concern at other sites of ritual dining. Indeed, Argos had no such provisions, and there is no evidence for these facilities at Brauron. The formal kitchen structures, therefore, seem to show that food preparation was a priority at Corinth in the fifth century.

---

404 Ibid., 403.
405 Ibid., 403. “So the attendant washed him and made him ready for reclining” (Plato, *Symposium* 175a tr. Harold N. Fowler [Cambridge, MA and London, 1925]: “Καὶ ἐ μὲν ἔφη ἀπονιζεῖν τὸν παῖδα ἵνα κατακέοιτο.”)
407 Ibid., 403.
408 Ibid., 407.
409 Ibid., 408.
410 Ibid., 407.
Finally, eight long “sitting” rooms with benches have been found at the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore.\textsuperscript{411} Although no windows have been found in these rooms, the large number of Hellenistic lamps may indicate that windows were not needed.\textsuperscript{412} The proper function of these rooms, however, is unknown. Bookidis offers a number of suggestions: “a place where votive offerings were displayed, where food was set out prior to eating, or where women sat to eat while men reclined on the couches,” all of which she then argues against.\textsuperscript{413} First, despite the presence of dedications at the Lower Terrace, far more votives were found in another nearby area, known as the Middle Terrace. Second, there is no direct relationship between the sitting rooms and the kitchens. This phenomenon, therefore, precludes the sitting room as a location for food. Third, Bookidis rules out the possibility that women sat for dining there. She writes that it is “difficult to believe that a cult that must have addressed primarily women would have reserved the larger dining area for men, the narrower one for women. That the bench room invariably opens off the dining room suggests to us that its function was directly related to the act of dining, and that it served either as a place from which to begin or as one to which to retire.”\textsuperscript{414} The importance of women at the site will be considered further when I propose an interpretation for the dining rooms there.

4.2 A Survey of Individual Corinthian Dining Rooms

Because the number of Corinthian dining rooms is vast, it will be beneficial to consider in detail three dining complexes, which are representative of the Archaic,

\textsuperscript{411} Ibid., 405.
\textsuperscript{412} Ibid., 395.
\textsuperscript{413} Ibid., 406.
\textsuperscript{414} Ibid., 406.
Classical, and Hellenistic periods. The Archaic rooms are mostly small with several couches and have either an off-center or axial door.\textsuperscript{415} Unlike rooms from later periods, there is no evidence for cooking, and only one table was recovered.\textsuperscript{416}

Building N-O:25-26 is a single dining room built in the sixth century and remodeled in the fifth (fig. 4.5), measuring 5.0m by 3.70m.\textsuperscript{417} The entrance is on the northeast side. The room contained eight couches or banquettes that stood continuously along the walls.\textsuperscript{418} In addition, support for a round table was found in the northeastern corner near the couches.\textsuperscript{419} Broken votives, found in the dining room, help date the building.

Building K-L:23-24 (fig. 4.6) represents the more complex dining structures from the middle to late fifth century. Bookidis and Fisher first discuss this building in a preliminary report\textsuperscript{420} and in more detail in the Corinth volume about the architecture of the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore. The three-room structure is located to the east of the stairway on the Lower Terrace and measures 9.8 X 4.95m.\textsuperscript{421} It should be noted, however, that single dining rooms continue to be constructed in this period.\textsuperscript{422} The

\textsuperscript{415} Ibid., 22.
\textsuperscript{416} Ibid., 23.
\textsuperscript{417} Ibid., 34, 36.
\textsuperscript{418} Ibid., 36.
\textsuperscript{419} Ibid., 37.
\textsuperscript{421} Bookidis and Stroud, Corinth XVIII, iii: The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: topography and architecture 106.
\textsuperscript{422} Ibid., 150.
northern-most room, which was used for dining, was entered on the north and consisted of six couches and a half-couch on the northeast side.  

The central room of building K-L:23-24 functioned as a service room, probably a bathing stall because of a drain in the north. The central room also had a clay floor, waterproof cement on its walls, and benches along the eastern side. To the south lies another room, likely a kitchen, with a bench along the north wall. The southeast corner had what appears to be a fireplace. Pottery dates the structure to the third quarter of the fifth century. Finds from this complex include coarse-ware sherds from the dining room, votives, saucers and a skyphos in the service room, as well as terracotta figurines, an oinochoe, and a saucer in the kitchen.

Buildings in the Classical period were made of fieldstones in a rubble construction and replaced in the fourth century by buildings of ashlar masonry. These newer complexes usually consisted of three rooms, but some had four (fig. 4.4). Since many of these structures have eroded in more recent times, the number of the surviving

---

423 Ibid., 106.
424 Ibid., 108.
425 Ibid., 108.
426 Ibid., 108.
427 Ibid., 108.
428 Ibid., 108.
429 Venit notes that skyphoi are commonly used by women (“Women in their Cups” 122ff).
431 Ibid., 134, 171.
432 Ibid., 171.
dining rooms may actually be greater.\textsuperscript{433} Building complex M:21-22 (fig. 4.7), which comprises a dining room, kitchen, and possible bath, was built over M-N:20-26.\textsuperscript{434} The rooms are of different sizes and the entrance is on the west.\textsuperscript{435} The western-most room is a small, almost square dining room, measuring 4.5 X 4.55m and covered in waterproof cement.\textsuperscript{436} Six couches occupied the room with a half-couch on either side of the door.\textsuperscript{437} Two of the couches on the southern side of the room have receptacles built into them, perhaps for dining supplies, but probably not food.\textsuperscript{438}

Room 2 on the plan (fig. 4.7) of M:21-22 was likely a kitchen due to the hearth found in its southeast corner.\textsuperscript{439} In addition, banquettes line the southwest corner of this structure.\textsuperscript{440} The third room was destroyed and is, therefore, difficult to interpret. The excavators believe that the small size likely makes it a bathing room.\textsuperscript{441} This complex has been dated to the late fourth century BC with abandonment in the late third, although finds, such as a lamp disc, also indicate re-use in the Roman period.\textsuperscript{442} In general, the Hellenistic period exhibits more monumentalization than previous periods of dining,\textsuperscript{443} as

\textsuperscript{433} Ibid., 171.
\textsuperscript{434} Ibid., 185.
\textsuperscript{435} Ibid., 185.
\textsuperscript{436} Ibid., 185.
\textsuperscript{437} Ibid., 187.
\textsuperscript{438} Ibid., 187.
\textsuperscript{439} Ibid., 187.
\textsuperscript{440} Ibid., 187.
\textsuperscript{441} Ibid., 188.
\textsuperscript{442} Ibid., 188-189.
evidenced by a propylon at the entrance to the stairway that split the sanctuary into eastern and western halves and the construction of walkways, which allowed for processions.\textsuperscript{444}

The dining rooms at Corinth seem to occupy a distinct position in the history of ancient Greek architecture even in comparison to the unique rooms of Argos and Brauron. The Corinthian rooms are more numerous than those previously examined complexes at other ancient sites and their shape and size varies widely. Moreover, these rooms were re-used in subsequent periods and clearly functioned for a long period of time. Finally, the half-couch is a peculiar feature that is not easily explained. Indeed, it is necessary to examine the possible ritual uses for the dining rooms, as well as the material finds, in order to better understand these complexes and their features.

4.3 Cult at Corinth and Comparanda from Eleusis and Bitalemi

To date, only Ernest Will has advanced a theory for the specific use of the dining rooms, arguing that the rooms were meant for families, as others have suggested for Brauron.\textsuperscript{445} Certainly the variety of couch sizes, as well as the half-couches, suggests that the rooms were meant for people of varying heights, such as a family, including women and children; however, Will’s interpretation does not mention a specific cult.\textsuperscript{446} In addition, family dining may not be the Corinthian dining rooms’ only or most appropriate

\textsuperscript{444} Ibid., 229.

\textsuperscript{445} Ibid., 229.

\textsuperscript{446} Will, “Banquets et salles de banquet les cultes de la Grèce et de l’Empire romain” 358.

\textsuperscript{446} For couches, “a minimum length of 1.75 to 1.8m is needed to fit two adults, more if their legs were to be extended,” while the couches in the Demeter sanctuary measure 1.45-2.5m (Bookidis, “Ritual Dining at Corinth” 49 and Bookidis and Stroud, Corinth XVIII, iii: The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: topography and architecture table 3).
function; a survey of cult activities for Demeter and Kore may better determine who was using the rooms and for what reason. Finally, comparison between Corinth and other sites of Demeter and Kore worship may best show the rituals possible for the dining rooms at Corinth.

Most recently, Bookidis has proposed that the dining rooms provided the setting for the *Thesmophoria*.447 However, her idea is only a suggestion, and she does not explore the evidence offered by Corinth’s dining rooms beyond mentioning the idea after a discussion of faunal and floral remains from the sanctuary; the finds “are a testimony to an autumnal festival. Nor would this be surprising; the Thesmophoria comes to mind as a primary festival to Demeter and Kore that was celebrated over all of the Greek world.”448

In another publication, Stroud and Bookidis write that the architecture of the site “suggest[s] some sort of initiatory or secret rites, and Demeter’s capital sanctuary at Eleusis was not the only shrine of the goddess where mysteries were celebrated.”449

Moreover,

On Acrocorinth there is perhaps another indication of religious activity limited to smaller groups in the two rock-cut theatrical areas...Here, up on the steep face of the rising bedrock, no more than about 85 to 90 people at a time could be gathered together, presumably to witness some activity or performance which took place in a very confined space below. It is by no means unlikely that initiates into the mysteries of Demeter, her daughter, and possibly Dionysos (who was also worshipped at this site) were here shown some of the closely guarded secret rituals which provided glimpses into the underworld and a life after death.450

Their suggestion is convincing. I will argue more persuasively that the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore did receive women for the *Thesmophoria*.

447 Bookidis et al., “Dining in the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth” 52.
448 Ibid., 52.
449 Bookidis and Stroud, *Demeter and Persephone in Ancient Corinth* 20.
450 Ibid., 20.
It should be noted that the dedications found at the sanctuary clearly show that cultic activities centered on Demeter and Kore. In particular, excavated items, such as votives, loom-weights, jewelry, mirrors, and female terracotta figurines, mark a strong female presence at the sanctuary, and the excavators believe that it is entirely reasonable to think that women had their own feasts there.\textsuperscript{451} This evidence will be examined in more detail in the subsequent section, but it is worth mentioning here.

Farnell reminds us that \textit{thesmophoros} was an epithet of Demeter.\textsuperscript{452} In fact, Diodoros Siculus specifically states that Demeter “introduced laws by obedience to man…this being the reason, we are told, why she has been given the epithet Thesmophoros or Lawgiver.”\textsuperscript{453} There is disagreement, however, by scholars about the meaning of this epithet. For example, Farnell does not agree that it should be translated as a festival where one carries \textit{thesmoi}, as is possible to interpret other festivals names containing the word \textit{phoros}.\textsuperscript{454} Indeed, H. W. Parke does not believe that \textit{thesmos} should be translated as having to do with law at all: “Demeter does not appear to be concerned with legislation.”\textsuperscript{455} Allaire Brumfield’s explanation, nonetheless, is the most logical: “[t]he \textit{thesmoi} that Demeter brings to men are not decayed pigs, but the divine rites, not only the Mysteries of Eleusis, but all of the women’s traditional rituals, whose correct

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Bookidis and Stroud, \textit{Corinth XVIII}, iii: \textit{The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: topography and architecture} 90-91.
\item Farnell, \textit{Cults of the Greek States} vol. 3 75.
\item Diodoros Siculus, \textit{Bibliotheca historica} 5.5; tr. C. H. Oldfather (Cambridge, MA and London, 1939): “καὶ νόμους εἰσηγήσατο καθ’ οὓς δικαιοπραγεῖν εἰδίσθησαν... δι’ ἣν αἰτίαν φασίν αὐτὴν θεσμοφόρον ἐπονομασθῆναι.”
\item Farnell, \textit{Cults of the Greek States} vol. 3 77 cites Frazer, \textit{Encyclopedia Britannica} (new ed.) s.v. “Thesmophoria.”
\item Parke, \textit{Festivals of the Athenians} 83.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
performance was first revealed by her."456 Indeed, in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Demeter says, “[a]nd I myself will teach my rites, that hereafter you may reverently perform them and so win the favour of my heart.”457 Thus, Demeter’s epithet may relate to law, but the laws of the very specific rites that were to be carried out in her honor.

Several ancient sources mention the festival of the *Thesmophoria*. Herodotus writes, “[l]et me preserve a discreet silence, too, concerning that rite of Demeter which the Greeks call Thesmophoria except as much of it as I am not forbidden to mention.”458 In Plutarch’s *On Isis and Osiris*, we are told that the fasting took place on the ground at the *Thesmophoria*.459 Likewise, in Plutarch’s *Life of Demosthenes*, Demosthenes is said to have died “on the sixteenth of the month Pyanepsion, the most gloomy day of the Thesmophoria, which the women observe by fasting in the temple of the goddess.”460 In Aristophanes’ *Thesmophoriazusai*, we are told slightly more information than Herodotus: “an Assembly will be held at dawn of the middle day of the Thesmophoria, when we

456 Brumfield, *The Attic Festivals of Demeter and Their Relation to the Agricultural Year* 72-73. See also more recently Stallsmith, “The Name of Demeter Thesmophoros” 116: “[m]ost of Demeter’s cult epithets fall into one of these two categories: she is giver of mystic rites, whether the Eleusinian or the more local orgia, and the giver of the civilized way of life made possible by the knowledge of another kind of secret, the techniques of growing grain.”


459 “καὶ γάρ Αθήναις νηστεύουσιν αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν Θεσμοφορίοις χαμαί καθήμεναι...” (69; W. Sieveking, ed. [Leipzig, 1935, repr. 1971]).

460 “κατέστρεψε δ’ ἐκτι μέσα τοῦ Πυανεψιών μηνός, ἐν ἦ τὴν σκυθρωποτάτην τῶν Θεσμοφορίων ἡμέραν ἄγουσιν παρὰ τῇ βασιλεία δόξῃ νηστεύουσιν αἱ γυναῖκες.” (Plutarch, *Life of Demosthenes* 30; tr. Bernadotte Perrin [London and New York, 1926])
have the most free time.” According to Parke, therefore, the Thesmophoria takes place on the 11th, 12th, and 13th of Pynapsion, which is the equivalent to the mid to late part of our month of October.

In Aelian’s History of the Animals, “[w]ater-mint and the Agnus-castus [a plant] are a potent means of expelling snakes. The latter, you know, is strewn by the women of Attica on their pallets [stibasi] at the Thesmophoria.” The Greek word here may either refer to the straw mattresses thought to be used in early symposia or the straw that was strewn at a sacrifice. Indeed, Aelian may be alluding to the very mattresses, thought to have been contained by the rims of the banquets, that may have been used in the Corinthian dining rooms. It may also be possible to imagine the mattresses as having a second function. In the Thesmophoriazusae, Mnesilochos is asked by Cleisthenes: “[a]nd who’s your roommate here?” Presumably the women celebrating these rites had to sleep somewhere for at least a few nights. The continuous banquets in the dining rooms

---


462 Parke, Festivals of the Athenians 26-27 and 87-88.

463 “Ελαύνει δὲ ἵσχυρός τούς ὀφείς ἢ ἐνδροσός τε καὶ νοτερὰ καλαμίνθη φασὶ καὶ ὁ ἄγνος. τούτων τοι καὶ ἐν Θεσμοφορίων ἐν ταῖς στιβάσι τὰ γύναια τὰ Ἄττικα ὑποστορύνται” (Aelian’s History of the Animals 9.26; tr. A. F. Scholfield [London and Cambridge, MA, 1959]). The source for this information is Harrison, Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion 130.

464 Liddell and Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon s.v “stibas.”

465 Aristophanes, Thesmophoriazusae 624; tr. Jeffrey Henderson: “Καὶ τίς σούστι συσκήνητρια;” Parke writes, “[i]t must have been an extensive open space which was surrounded by some wall or fence so that it could be shut to unauthorized male intruders. The large area was needed because once the festival began the women taking part camped there for three days and two nights. They set up booths and shelters in rows with gangways between them and slept in groups in these huts” (Festivals of the Athenians 85). Parke’s description would apply to Corinth’s dining rooms on the Lower Terrace.
of the Demeter and Kore sanctuary may have also provided beds for visiting women, explaining Aelian’s comment.

Though Aristophanes’ *Thesmophoriazusae* is a parody of the all-female ritual, the play also mentions a few details that may help reconstruct the number of days for the celebration. The first day consisted of a procession where the women went up to a sanctuary. The second day, as was already mentioned, was the fast, which is the setting for Aristophanes’ play. Similarly, Demeter fasts at the house of Celeus in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Her fasting, therefore, may be imitated by the women of the *Thesmophoria* on the second day. The third day of the *Thesmophoria* was called the *Kalligeneiai* or the day of good offspring.

Parke states that during the *Thesmophoria* women called *Antletriai* recovered the items thrown into pits during the festival called the *Skira*, which happens a few months earlier. These items included pigs and models of snakes and male genitalia. Pigs seem to be a common animal for Demeter as Pausanias records similar rites, which also involve pigs, in other places in his *Description of Greece*:

> Across the Asopus, about ten stades distant from the city, are the ruins of Potniae, in which is a grove of Demeter and the Maid. The images at the river that flows past Potniae... name the goddesses. At an appointed time they perform their accustomed ritual, one part of which is to let loose young pigs into the

466 Parke calls this day the “Road Up” and states that this happened on the 11th (*Festivals of the Athenians* 85). The source is, however, Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazusae* 1045.

467 Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians* 86, 87.

468 [Homer], *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 2.200.


470 Ibid., 83.

471 Ibid., 83.
what are called “the halls.” At the same time next year these pigs appear, they say, in Dodona. This story others can believe if they wish.472

Other sources provide more detail about the specific activities and who could attend. For example, Aristophanes’ play attests to sacrifices being performed and the use of torches:

Oh Thratta, look! The torches are burning, and such a crowd is moving up to the sanctuary through the smoke! O Twain Thesmophori, surpassingly lovely, grant that good luck attend me both coming here and going home again! Thratta, put down the box and take out the cake, so I can make an offering to the Twain Goddesses. Demeter, reverend Mistress mine, and Pherrephatta, grant me plenty for plenty of sacrifices to you, and if not grant at least that I get away with this! And may my daughter Pussy meet a man who’s rich but also childishly stupid, and may little Dick have brains and sense! Now where, where do I find a good seat for hearing everything the speakers say? You go away from here, Thratta; slaves aren’t allowed to listen to the speeches.473

A conversation between Mnesilochos and First Woman in the Thesmophoriazusae reveals that one of the first activities done at the Thesmophoria is drinking.474 Isaeus also refers to the Thesmophoria in one of his cases, On the Estate of Philoctemon, where a woman is discussed because she should have never entered the temple or seen the rites on account of her status as slave (6.49-6.50). In another passage from Aristophanes’

---

472 9.8.1: “διαβεβηκότι δὲ ἥδη τὸν Ἀσωπὸν καὶ τῆς πόλεως δέκα μάλιστα ἀφετηκότι σταθὼς Ποτινῶν ἐστιν ἐρέπια καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἄλος Δήμητρος καὶ Ὀρίης. τὰ δὲ ἀγάλματα ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ τῷ παρά τὰς Ποτινίας τὰς θέας οὐνομάζουσιν. ἐν χρόνῳ δὲ εἰρήμενῳ δρόσι καὶ ἄλλα ὅποσα καθηστηκαὶ φριαί καὶ ἐς τὰ μέγαρα καλούμενα ἀφίαν ὑπὸ τῶν νεογνῶν τοὺς δὲ ὑς τούτους ἐς τὴν ἐπίγοναν τὸν ἑτοὺς ὤραν ἐν Δωδώνῃ φαινέν ἐπτ ὁμόγ τῷ ἀλλὸ ποὺ τίς πειθήσεται” (tr. W. H. S. Jones).


474 Aristophanes, Thesmophoriazusae 626-631. Although there are attestations for drunk women (see chapter 1), the prominence of women drinking may be an exaggeration for comic effect because they are a source of humor, especially in this play.
Thesmophoriazusae, men are forbidden from the festival: “[c]ome too, gracious happy sovereigns, to your own precinct, where men are forbidden to behold the divine rites that by torchlight you illumine, an immortal sight.”475 Finally, during the Stenia, the women were said to insult and even hit one another, acts that were probably related to Iambe’s attempts to make Demeter laugh, which are also described in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter (2.200ff.).476 Thus, these ancient authors may be revealing a few facts about the Thesmophoria, namely that it took place at night with torches, baskets, cakes, and perhaps drinking, insults were hurled, and neither slaves nor men were permitted to attend.

Brumfield notes that the pan-Hellenic festival was celebrated in “at least thirty cities in Greece, Asia Minor, and Sicily.”477 In Attica, Piraeus seems to be one of the locations of the Thesmophoria.478 The Thesmophoria even occurred in the Greek city of Cyrene in Africa. Cooper and Morris believe that “[b]oth literary sources and archaeological remains indicate a deliberately frugal and primitive setting for the celebration of the Thesmophoria. The small rectangular skenai of Sicily and Cyrene did not hold couches; sitting is emphasized.”479 Since dining rooms have not been found at

---

475 Aristophanes, Thesmophoriazusae 1147-11531 tr. Jeffrey Henderson: “‘Ηκετ´... ἄλοσ ἐς ύμέτερον,/ ἀνδράσιν ὦ θεμίτ’ εἰσοράν/ ὄργια σεμνὰ θεοῖν ἵνα λαμπάσι/ φαίνετον, ἄμβροτον ὃνιν./”

476 Parke, Festivals of the Athenians 86 cites Hesychius and Photius, Στήνια; Cleomedes, de motu circulari 2.1; Diodorus 5.4.7.

477 Brumfield, The Attic Festivals of Demeter and Their Relation to the Agricultural Year 70.

478 IG II² 1177. For more on the Athenian and Attic celebrations of the Thesmophoria, see Clinton, “The Thesmophoria in Central Athens and the Celebration of the Thesmophoria in Attica” 111-125. In particular, Clinton writes, “it is clear that there were at least several, probably many, simultaneous celebrations of the Thesmophoria throughout Athens, i.e., throughout Attica, and these celebrations were administered (with the possible exception of Eleusis) by the demes in which they took place” (117).

479 Cooper and Morris, “Dining in Round Buildings” 81, n. 49.
Cyrene, there is no evidence to determine if their characterization is correct, whether the dining was elaborate or frugal.\textsuperscript{480} The dining rooms at Corinth, on the other hand, are evidence for monumental dining by large numbers of women, where both sitting and reclining are possible.\textsuperscript{481} It seems likely that the Corinthian \textit{Thesmophoria} was for women living in the area and that other celebrations of the \textit{Thesmophoria}, such as Attic ones, took place more locally in cities of Attica.\textsuperscript{482}

Comparison between Corinth and two other cities known to have hosted rites for Demeter and Kore, namely the \textit{Thesmophoria}, will show that Corinth also likely celebrated this festival. At Bitalemi (ancient Gela) on Sicily, dedications were made in the form of women holding piglets from the sixth to fourth century BC, and pig bones were found at the sanctuary.\textsuperscript{483} Finally a pyxis lid preserves the name of the \textit{Thesmophoria}.\textsuperscript{484} These finds should be kept in mind when we examine the archaeological evidence for the Corinthian sanctuary and other cities known to have hosted the \textit{Thesmophoria}.

\textsuperscript{480} White writes of Cyrene, “it seems probable that ritual feasting took place on a regular, repetitive basis to judge from the large quantity of discarded cooking, eating, and drinking vessels of plain, coarse ware found inside the sanctuary limits and apparently dating to virtually all phases of its occupation…No traces of dining rooms or kitchens similar to those from Acrocorinth have thus far come to light, but their presence may be safely assumed nearby ” (“Cyrene’s Sanctuary of Demeter and Persephone: A Summary of a Decade of Excavation” 24).

\textsuperscript{481} Since there is little evidence for dining at Cyrene, it is not possible to generalize about the dining practices of those celebrating the Thesmophoria there. See White, “Cyrene’s Sanctuary of Demeter and Persephone: A Summary of a Decade of Excavation” 22.

\textsuperscript{482} Locations include Piraeus, Eleusis, Cholargos, Melite, Pithos, Halimous, Oe, and Phrearrihoi (Clinton, “The Thesmophoria in Central Athens and the Celebration of the Thesmophoria in Attica” 121-122).

\textsuperscript{483} Sguaitamatti, \textit{L’offrante de porcelet dans la coroplathie géléenne: étude typologique} (Mainz am Rhein, 1984).

\textsuperscript{484} Rebecca Miller Ammerman, Review of M. Sguaitamatti, \textit{L’offrante de porcelet dans la coroplathie géléenne: étude typologique} in \textit{American Journal of Archaeology} 90 (1986): 112.
At Eleusis, both the Mysteries for Demeter and the *Thesmophoria* took place. A votive relief found at Eleusis (fig. 4.8) may even show Demeter and Kore banqueting. The inscription on the relief mentions a god and goddess, but the torch and scepter indicate the presence of the divine mother and daughter pair. A further similarity among Bitalemi, Eleusis, and Corinth is the use of pigs. A scholiast to Lucian says that pigs were thrown into pits at Eleusis, symbolizing the animals that fell into the hole produced by Hades’ ascent to capture Persephone. At Eleusis, pits containing the remains of pigs were excavated. Corinth, like Eleusis and Bitalemi, had pigs, both animal remains, which will be discussed below, and votives. The Corinthian votives include individual pigs and pigs carried in the arms of 400 figurines.

The two primary rituals for Demeter and Kore were the Eleusinian Mysteries and the *Thesmophoria*. Although the Eleusinian Mysteries only took place at certain locations in Attica, the *Thesmophoria* is not a specifically Attic festival; rather, it was celebrated at many locations throughout the Greek world. For the Corinthia, it seems quite probable that the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth hosted the local *Thesmophoria* especially when one compares this site to other sites where the festival is known to have taken place. The dining rooms in the sanctuary there would have been the perfect venue for the festival.

---


488 Clinton, “Pigs in Greek Rituals” 177: “I have suggested that the initiates dedicated the piglets to Demeter by depositing them in the *megara* in front of the Telesterion [at Eleusis].”

489 Bookidis et al., “Dining in the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth” 42.
for the sacrifices that are known to have been part of the all-female ritual. Indeed, the dining rooms contained evidence for the preparation of ritual feasts, cleansing of the participants, cooking of the sacrifices, dining, and even meager and shared accommodations. Furthermore, finds at Corinth, Bitalemi, and Eleusis all emphasize pigs, an animal intimately connected with Demeter. Now that I have shown the likelihood of the Thesmophoria being celebrating in the dining rooms at Corinth, I will argue for a stronger connection between the Demeter and Kore sanctuary and the Thesmophoria on the basis of the material evidence and remains found there.

4.4 The Equally Numerous Terracotta Votives from Corinth

From deposits in the nearby Potter’s Quarter at Corinth, excavators have uncovered twenty-three hundred terracotta figurines, dating from the seventh century to the late fourth century BC. Even though these figurines were not excavated from the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore, a subset of reclining figurines, which come from the larger group found at the Potter’s Quarter, are similar to those found in the dining rooms at Corinth. Moreover, because the Potter’s Quarter was the likely site of manufacture for all of these terracotta figurines, it is possible that the figurines found at the Potter’s Quarter and those at the sanctuary were ultimately meant for the same purpose or were at the least products of the same workshop. Thus, I will examine both Potter’s Quarter terracottas and those found within the walls of the sanctuary.

Scholarship, much of it debating the figurines’ gender, deals primarily with the Potter’s Quarter figurines because they were excavated at the beginning of the twentieth century. 

---

490 See above, n. 105 (Aristophanes, Thesmophoriazusae 279-294).

491 Stillwell, Corinth XV, ii: The Potter’s Quarter 1.
century. As David Robinson writes, “Lenormant does not believe that the type of reclining woman exists, but among the figures found at Corinth are some whose female sex cannot be doubted.” The three terracottas illustrated (fig. 4.9) here, dating to the fifth and fourth centuries BC, come from a group of 108 mold-made figurines, which Agnes Newhall Stillwell said were “without exception male.” The figures appear to be veiled. They are all portrayed reclining and nude from the waist up. Nudity is usually only acceptable for males, and it may be for this reason that they are often identified as reclining men.

Similar terracotta figurines from the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore come mainly from the Classical and Hellenistic periods and have been published in a Corinth volume. Gloria Merker has studied and catalogued the finds and organized them chronologically and by type. From the dining rooms come figurines numbered SF-61-8 to

---

492 Robinson, “Terra-Cottas from Corinth” 169, n. 1. Pemberton notes, “[t]hat all these figurines from the Demeter Sanctuary are male does not obviate against female dining” (“Wine, Women and Song: Gender Roles in Corinthian Cult” 104).

493 Stillwell, Corinth XV, ii: The Potter’s Quarter 109-110, Class XIV, 19 (KT 19-90), XIV, 20 (KT 19-86), XIV, 26 (19-66). Dimensions for XIV, 19: 6.9cm high, 6.9cm long. XIV, 20 measures 6.4cm high and 6.9cm long. XIV, 26 measures 6.7cm high and 6.8cm long.

494 Stillwell, Corinth XV, ii: The Potters’ Quarter 104. See also Broneer who writes, “[t]he reclining figures, always male, likewise wear a polis” (“Hero Cults in the Corinthian Agora” 129).

495 “The significance of the reclining type has been a subject for argument for well over a century. Since the Potters’ Quarter has provided no fresh material on this subject, any discussion here for the possible meaning of the type is pointless” (Stillwell, Corinth XV, ii: The Potter’s Quarter 106).

496 A similar terracotta, MF 72-30 is simply referred to as a banqueter by Merker, although he/she is discussed among other terracottas thought to be goddesses (“Corinthian Terracotta Figurines: the Development of an Industry” 237).

SF-69-29, most of which were found in well 1961-11. In addition, several more figurines that were found in the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore are appropriate to the discussion, since they are similar to the above-mentioned group, but can be used in contrast because they are clearly male. C210 and C213 represent reclining, half-nude males from the Classical period (fig. 4.10). Both are youthful men with short hair, reclining on couches. C210 has some longer locks that fall at his sides. He holds a phiale in his left hand and the fabric is buff. C213 has white slip and pink paint on the torso. Of these figurines, Merker writes, “[a]s far as can be determined from the preserved figurines, the banqueter type was entirely redesigned in Corinth during the Early Classical period but without reference to any of the local predecessors... and the source is to be found in Early Classical Tarantine terracotta banqueters.” Because the figures from Taranto have large headdresses, many are bearded, and they are clearly male, the Corinthian figurines seem significantly different.

Also from the Classical Period is figure C218, which may have been part of a plaque (fig. 4.11). This terracotta seems to be less well-preserved, but it is clear that

---

498 The complete list is as follows: SF-61-8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 18, 22, SF-64-5, 12, 13, SF-65-14, 16, 27, 43, SF-69-5, 6, 21, 29.

499 C210 (MF-10378), C213 (MF-11887), Merker, Corinth XVIII, iv: The sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: terracotta figurines of the Classical, Hellenistic, and Roman periods 106. Dimensions for C210: 6.1cm high and 6.6cm long. C213 measures 11.3cm high, and 10.6cm long.

500 Ibid., 106.

501 Ibid., 106.

502 Ibid., 65.

503 See some of the plates, such as 98 and 99, in Iacobone, Le Stipi Votive Di Taranto.

this figure wears a *polos*, is half-nude, reclines, and has an elongated body.\textsuperscript{505} The color is “yellowish buff.”\textsuperscript{506} I believe that C218 is female.

Now that all of the figurines have been described, the gender of these figurines can now be discussed. Although Merker asserts that all the banqueters are males, certain features indicate that the three Potter’s Quarter terracottas mentioned above and C218 are female rather than male. First, all the figurines that I identify as women wear the *polos*. *Poloi* are typically attributes of women and mostly female divinities.\textsuperscript{507} All of the figurines also wearing the *polos* have long hair, which distinguishes them from the short-haired figurines without the *polos* as Stillwell herself notes.\textsuperscript{508} Short-haired figurines lacking *poloi*, such as C210 and C213, are clearly male, and the long-haired figurines with *poloi* appear to be female. While long hair is not unique to women, the *polos* and other additional factors about to be examined point to a female subject.

An unusual feature of these terracottas is their partial nudity, usually a sign of maleness. The painter used a white slip and painted the flesh pink on all examples, which is rather atypical for a man who would normally be depicted in a red color or left in reserve. The left and lower figurines in figure 4.9 have drapery covering the left shoulder, while the one on the right has drapery only up to the waist. The standard argument against these figurines being normal, respectable women is that only *hetairai* would be

\textsuperscript{505} Ibid., 107.

\textsuperscript{506} Ibid., 107.

\textsuperscript{507} Müller notes that Aphrodite, Artemis, Demeter, Dione, Ge, Hekate, Helen, Hera, Persephone, Kourotrophos, Nemesis, Nymphs and the Potnia Theron wear the *polos* (Der Polos: die griechische Göterkrone 68).

\textsuperscript{508} Stillwell writes, “the late 5\textsuperscript{th} century [examples] have short hair and no polos, while the polos and long hair are more popular in the 4\textsuperscript{th} century” (Stillwell, *Corinth XV, ii: The Potter’s Quarter* 104.)
shown nude. Nonetheless, comparanda for the figures come from Morgantina where the gender of the figurines is much clearer.

From the sanctuaries at Morgantina, six deposits of votive terracottas were uncovered. Out of 446 total terracottas, 150 are thought to depict Persephone. Three representative examples come from the north sanctuary annex and the south sanctuary, all of which date to the third century BC (fig. 4.12). Malcolm Bell writes,

One of the most remarkable terracotta types from the Morgantina sanctuaries represents the goddess in the guise of a banqueter... She rests on a kline; in her right hand she holds a phiale, and her himation is drawn over the high polos, revealing her shoulders and breasts. Because of its very strangeness this type ought to have a more specific meaning than the standing figures...Two factors insist that the subject of the Morgantina group is female: the veiled polos, which is otherwise worn only by Persephone, and the pale pink flesh, which is easily distinguishable from the dark pink or red flesh of male figures.

Bell considers the figurines to be both female and divine because of their veils, which can be worn by either Demeter or Persephone. In addition, Bell believes that human men and women did not actually wear the *polos*; “instead they mostly document an expectation of a higher, godlike existence after death... One suspects that the *polos* was by nature an imagined object, taking physical form only in representations of the

---

509 “Naked women reclining with men on *klinai* appear as early as 590 on Corinthian vases where couples are shown on adjacent *klinai*. In each instance the man and the woman gaze at each other. Beside each *kline* is a table with food and a stool, and lyres hang from the walls above them. It is generally accepted that the women in these scenes are *hetaira*” (Carpenter, “A Symposion of Gods?” 152).

510 For plans of the north sanctuary, north sanctuary annex, and south sanctuary at Morgantina, see Bell, *Morgantina Studies I: The Terracottas* (Princeton, 1981), 253, fig. d and 255, fig. e.

511 Ibid., 81.

512 Ibid., 137-138, pl. 21, nos. 85 (63-2459), 87 (58-2144), 89 (59-1997). Dimensions for 85: 20.4cm preserved height. 87: 13.9cm preserved height. 89: 13.3cm high, 14.0cm long.

513 Ibid., 83. It is worth noting that the reclining figurines seem to be more popular in the west, particularly on Sicily. It may be possible that the tradition of reclining females derives from Etruscan examples, such as the late sixth century BC Cerveteri sarcophagus (see Ramage and Ramage, *Roman Art* [Upper Saddle River, 2005], 43, fig. 1.28).

514 Bell, *Morgantina Studies I: The Terracottas*, 82.
gods...in Attic representations it is mostly Demeter’s, while in the west it seems to be Persephone’s.”

For Bell, the combination of the veil and polos seems to indicate that the female being portrayed is Persephone “at her wedding in the underworld.” In fact, Ridgway argues that the polos may carry a funerary connotation, which is certainly appropriate for Persephone, who spent part of the year in the underworld with Hades. Even though the figurines from Corinth, also half-nude women, may be imitating Persephone, she is, nonetheless, an appropriate model for human imitation. Similar, unpublished figurines have also been found at Syracuse, Scornavacche, Gela, Butera, and Akragas. Recent finds at the Greek colony of Apollonia in Albania have also revealed reclining female terracotta banqueters, which are not yet published. These figurines may also represent Persephone.

Bell maintains that the gesture of the Morgantina figures is one of unveiling, which would have been done at the ἄνακαλύπτεια festival, possibly on the eve of the

515 Ibid., 82.
516 Ibid., 83. The polos, as argued by Erika Simon, should be connected to Hera and, therefore, marriage (Simon, “Hera und die Nymphen: ein böotischer Polos in Stockholm” 214).
517 Ridgway, The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture 108-112.
518 Bell, Morgantina Studies I: The Terracottas 83. Bell writes, “[t]here are to my knowledge no reclining female figurines with polos beyond Sicily” (Ibid., 104, n. 22), but in the same footnote, he mentions figurines from Priene, which may be female.
second or third day of the *gamos*. The Corinth figurines are making the same gesture.

Gloria Ferrari, speaking generally about the ἀνακαλυπτήρια, says that it never means the act of unveiling. The term was used to designate *the day* on which the bride was ‘uncovered,’ or ‘unveiled,’ for the groom to see, and also for *the gifts* she received on that day…One source [the *Anecdota Graeca*] specifies that the bride was uncovered at the wedding feast for the husband and guests to see…[but, we] have literary and visual evidence to the effect that the bride was well-covered during and after the banquet.

This evidence includes Lucian’s *Convivium* 8.

Explaining Ferrari’s reservations about the unveiling, the nudity of the *anakalypteria* might have been metaphorical during the wedding banquet, but actual following the feast. Perhaps these figurines show what few Attic vases are willing to portray: the moment before or after Hades and Persephone consummate their marriage.

Alternatively, the scene may not represent the unveiling, but rather the day after the

---

520 Bell, *Morgantina Studies I: The Terracottas* 84. See also Oakley and Sinos, *The Wedding in Ancient Athens* 25-26 and Oakley, “The Anakalypteria,” in *Archäologischer Anzeiger* (1982): 113-118. He thinks that this festival likely took place on the second day of the wedding between the banquet and the procession in the Classical period (114). Hague suggests that the actual unveiling took place in the bridal chamber (“Marriage Athenian Style” 34).

521 Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca* vol. 1, 200.6-8 (=390.26): “anakalypteria: gifts given to brides whenever they are first unveiled at the wedding banquet while being seen by husbands and others banqueting” (ἀνακαλυπτήρια δόρα διδόμενα ταῖς νύμφαις ὅταν πρῶτον ἀνακαλύπτωνται ἐν τῇ ἑστίασίᾳ τῶν γάμων, τοῖς ἀνδράσι καὶ τοῖς ἐστιωμένοις ὄρωμέναι).

522 Ferrari, “What Kind of Rite of Passage Was the Ancient Greek Wedding?” 32.

523 Lucian, *Convivium* 8; tr. A.M. Harmon (London and New York, 1913): “On the right as you enter, the women occupied the whole couch, as there were a good many of them, with the bride among them, very scrupulously veiled and hedged in by the women. Toward the back door came the rest of the company according to the esteem in which each was held. Opposite the women, the first was Eucritis, and then Aristaenetus.” (ἐν δὲ δεξίᾳ μὲν εἰσόντων αἱ γυναῖκες ὅλον τὸν κλητήρα ἐκείνον ἐπέλαβον, οὐκ ὄλγαι οὐσαι, καὶ ἐν αὐταῖς ἡ νύφη πάνω ἄκριβώς ἐγκεκαλυμμένη, ὑπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν περιεχομένη· ἐς δὲ τὸ ἀντίθεμον ἢ ἄλλη πληθύς, ὣς ἔκαστος ἄξιος εἶχε, κατὰ ἀντικρύ δὲ τῶν γυναικῶν πρῶτος ὁ Ἐυκρίτης, ἐίτα Ἀρισταίνετος.)

524 Conversely, Cooper and Morris write: “[t]he reclining Persephone figurines popular in Sicily indicate the conjugal bed she shares with Hades, not a dining couch” (“Dining in Round Buildings” 80, n. 45).
wedding, ἦ ἐπαυλία,\footnote{On this day, see Eustathius’ commentary on Homer’s *Iliad* 24.29 where the author quotes Pausanias.} as on a fourth century *lebes gamikos* in Athens (fig. 4.13), where a woman is half-nude and receiving gifts.\footnote{Athens, National Museum, 1371, Oakley and Sinos, *The Wedding in Ancient Athens* (Madison, 1993), 73, fig. 41. Oakley and Sinos note that this is one of several vases that may be showing the *epaulia* or the ceremony that takes place the day after the wedding (*The Wedding in Ancient Athens* 42). Hague believes the nudity is meant to imitate Aphrodite: “objects with which the bride are often surrounded are the same accoutrements seen in vase paintings of Aphrodite. In some scenes the bride even adopts the pose of this goddess, letting her clothes drop down around her waist so that her breasts are prominently exposed. This signifies her full passage from the chaste sphere of Artemis to the sexuality of Aphrodite, and glorifies her charms by comparing her to the goddess of love” (“Marriage Athenian Style” 36).} Likewise, a late sixth century black-figure amphora in New York (fig. 4.14) shows a *kline* with Dionysos and woman, who is hesitantly called Ariadne\footnote{New York, Shelby White and Leon Levy collection, Carpenter, “A Symposion of Gods?” 152. See also von Bothmer, *Glories of the Past* 140-141, no. 107.} because she is half-nude.\footnote{T. H. Carpenter writes, “[n]ot the least of the problems is the idea of depicting the wife of a god in such an immodest pose” (Carpenter, “A Symposion of Gods?” 152).} It may be possible that both these vases and the figurines from Corinth and Morgantina depict a similar moment of the wedding ceremony, and that the nudity of the woman in this bridal context is acceptable, although it would normally be inappropriate.

Thus, the iconography of the terracottas from Corinth and Morgantina, in particular the veil, *polos*, and nudity, is at least a sign of marriage. Unfortunately, it is not possible to determine if the woman represented is human or divine. The possibility of nuptial banquets being celebrated in the dining rooms at Corinth permits an interpretation of the terracottas as brides, but it is not clear whether they are human or divine. Wedding iconography aside, Persephone is still an appropriate subject for the terracottas because of her intimate association with the *Thesmophoria*.\footnote{Persephone is the reason for Demeter’s mourning and thus deeply connected to the Thesmophoria.} In turn, women could dedicate
terracottas of the young goddess and celebrate the *Thesmophoria* as a way to combat infertility for human participants and promote a fertile crop season. According to the scholia to Lucian’s *Dialogues on Courtesans* 2.1, one aspect of the *Thesmophoria* is that it promotes both human and agricultural fertility. Thus, Persephone is a fitting goddess to serve as a dedication at the setting for the *Thesmophoria*.

Aside from the single banqueter, which may represent Persephone, other terracottas from different contexts at Corinth may also be appropriate to the discussion as evidence of mixed dining. A terracotta man who reclines while a woman is seated at his feet (fig. 4.15) was found in deposit VI. This example, which dates to 250 BC, mimics the pose of Zeus and Hera on the Codrus Cup. The male is draped from the waist down and the woman wears a *chiton* and *himation*. He holds a bowl while she holds an *oinochoe*. The figures were painted using a white slip with pink flesh. Red was used on the border of the couch. Although this is a late example, this mixed dining couple may represent the way men and women were posed during, for example, wedding feasts like those discussed at the west building at Argos, a possible use for the rooms when the *Thesmophoria* was not taking place. Like the examples from the Potter’s Quarter, it
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530 Stallsmith, “The Name of Demeter Thesmophoros” 120: “[t]he purpose of the ritual was essentially to guarantee the fertility of the earth and produce a good harvest.”

531 Goff, *Citizen Bacchae* 126.

532 First published in *Hesperia* XI (1942): 107-109, no. 3. A black-and-white photograph can be seen in Davidson, *Corinth XII: The Minor Finds* (Princeton, 1952), 48, no. 302, pl. 25. Deposit VI comes from a shop of the South Stoa, found in 1933.


534 See Uhlenbrock, *The Coroplast’s Art* 125, in particular, Merker’s catalogue entry for a third century standing terracotta female: “they appear to have been votive gifts connected with marriage rituals.”
seems that an ancient visitor could have purchased this group for a dedication, since the
deposit was found in a shop of the South Stoa.

The terracotta evidence, therefore, points to the possibility of two types of dining.
First, figures from the Potter’s Quarter and the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore are best
interpreted as a single, reclining, half-nude, female banqueter, representing Persephone.
The terracotta may serve as an offering to assure fertility at the *Thesmophoria* that
women, visiting the sanctuary, may have dedicated. Moreover, human women may have
been imitating the terracotta representation of Persephone when they used the dining
rooms in the sanctuary. Thus, the figurines suggest the ritual activity, which occurred in
the space where they were found, and represent a figure related to the *Thesmophoria*.
Second, other dedications include couples, reclining and seated, and may indicate that
mixed dining for wedding banquets or other rituals was also possible at the sanctuary of
Demeter and Kore at Corinth.

4.5 Corinthian Pottery and Animal and Plant Remains

Elizabeth Pemberton studied and published the Greek pottery found in the
sanctuary, organizing the material by shape, context, fabric, and decoration. The
pottery found includes coarse and cooking wares, storage and pouring vessels, perfume
jars, perirrhanteria, bowls, plates, and saucers. Unlike the finds from Argos and
Brauron, pottery found in the dining complexes at Corinth was properly recorded. The


536 See Pemberton’s table of contents in *Corinth XVII, i: The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: The Greek Pottery*. 
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most popular item, aside from votives, were cups, specifically the *kotyle*. Specific coarse wares included mixing bowls, but only some cooking vessels were found. Bookidis and Stroud note that *krateriskoi* were a popular gift to Demeter and Kore at Corinth, a link to the site of Brauron, where similar vessels were found. Finally, wine amphorae suggest that drinking may have taken place, as well.

Other decorated vases from Corinth that date to the sixth century BC show scenes exclusively of women. The illustrations are called *Frauenfest* and are comprised of processions of females. In addition, some vases feature scenes of these women with padded male dancers or *komasts*. In four unusual cases, vessels show the female dancers with one male banqueter; these scenes have not been interpreted as *symposia* because one person does not constitute a party. Interestingly, only two of the vases that show padded male dancers came from the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore, while six show the chain dance of women. Of this phenomenon, Pemberton writes, “[t]he rarity

537 Bookidis et al., “Dining in the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth” 14.
538 Ibid., 15.
539 Bookidis and Stroud, *Demeter and Persephone in Ancient Corinth* 13.
540 See chapter 3, figure 3.5 (Neil and Oakley, eds., *Coming of Age in Ancient Greece: Images from the Classical Past* [New Haven, 2003], 152, fig. 11).
542 Dillon, *Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion* 129.
544 Ibid., 87.
545 Ibid., 90. Pemberton, *Corinth* XVII, i: *The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore, The Greek Pottery* 83, pl. 27 (plate) and 121, pl. 255 (pyxis).
of padded dancers from the Demeter Sanctuary may be support for the idea that it was women who dined (and drank) in the Demeter sanctuary *hestiatoria*.”

Unfortunately, the *Frauenfest* vases from the sanctuary are largely fragmentary. A better preserved example is a pyxis now in Berlin (fig. 4.16). This sixth century vase shows the padded males alongside a procession of females. Pemberton writes, “[i]f this vase refers to a specific Corinthian festival, I would suggest it was one in which male and female worshippers had separate and discrete cultic activities.” Thus, the ceramic evidence represents processions of women, which may relate to the types of activities occurring at the *Thesmophoria* and Corinth. In fact, the monumentalization of the walkways, which involved destroying some of the dining rooms in the fourth century, better accommodates a ritual procession in the sanctuary. Less popular scenes for vases include men and women together, perhaps attesting to the primary function of the dining rooms in the Demeter and Kore sanctuary as places for women.

Of the sacrifices at the site, Bookidis writes, “[w]e know virtually nothing about the sacrifices performed in the sanctuary, except that pig was clearly the preferred animal. Whether those sacrifices were holocaustic or not is unclear; the material remains


547 Ibid., 96. For more on the Corinthian dancers, see Seeberg, *Corinthian Komos Vases* no. 224, 225, 228, 240.

548 Berlin 4856, possibly from Russia, Seeberg, *Corinthian Komos Vases* 42, no. 220.

549 Pemberton, “Wine, Women and Song: Gender Roles in Corinthian Cult” 98.

are slight.” Bookidis and her team analyzed the floors and fills in the dining rooms. 88 pig bones were found. 21 of the 88 bones were burned. Likewise, at Cyrene, “pig bones makes up nearly 78 percent of all identified faunal materials.” Thus, it is clear that pigs were important to the participants at Corinth as an animal sacred to Demeter. Nonetheless, it is not clear if the pigs were dedicated or part of a sacrifice. What can be said is that the bones “are more directly pertinent to the identification of the contents of ritual meals consumed within these rooms.”

Specialists also analyzed plant remains from the dining rooms at Corinth, which include wheat, barley, grapes, figs, and olives. Similarly, the provisions for the Thesmophoria of Cholargos in Attica include “barley, wheat, barely oats, flour, figs, wine, oil, honey, white and black sesame, poppy seed, cheese, and garlic” and were given by women called archousai. Clearly, the food decreed for the festival at Cholargos and the remains at Corinth are similar. Likewise, the animals sacrificed at Corinth, Eleusis,

---

551 Bookidis et al., “Dining in the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth” 17.
552 Ibid., 43 and table 7.
553 Ibid., 43 and table 7.
554 Ibid., 43.
555 Clinton, “Pigs in Greek Rituals” 167-168: “Sacrifice of full-grown pig to any good is not particularly remarkable, but Demeter had a penchant for it, especially the pregnant sow.”
556 Bookidis et al., “Dining in the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth” 43.
557 Ibid., 29. Bookidis is cautious in her suggestion that the Thesmophoria took place at Corinth. In an informal email correspondence, she wrote, “critics of our report on water-sieving argued that grapes, pomegranates and figs could have been dried and therefore are not a firm indication of a late summer festival. That is why we had to be less firm about our interpretation. A woman from the Wiener Lab looked at one grape and feels that it was fresh when it was dropped” (August 11, 2008).
558 IG II² 1184 and Bookidis and Stroud, Corinth XVIII, iii: The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: topography and architecture 410.
and Cyrene were predominantly pigs, more support that one of the festivals at the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore was the *Thesmophoria*.

Ceramic, animal, and plant evidence points to similar activities at Corinth and other sites dedicated to Demeter and Kore. Since there were many local *Thesmophoria* festivals, it is probable that a local version also took place in this sanctuary. Ceramics attest to eating and drinking in the sanctuary at Corinth; both activities are known to have been a part of the *Thesmophoria*. Painted pottery found in the sanctuary shows an all-female procession, which is consistent with one part of the *Thesmophoria*. Animal remains, specifically pig bones, are specific to Demeter and would also indicate the sacrifices appropriate to the celebration of the *Thesmophoria*. Finally, the plants found at Corinth are consistent with those found at other known sites of the *Thesmophoria* and point to a fall festival. Evidence in a variety of forms suggests that the *Thesmophoria* is the most fitting festival to have been celebrated in the dining rooms of the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth and that women were present to dine in these rooms.

**4.6 What Type of Dining Occurred and How Does the Andron Relate?**

The presence of dining rooms and terracottas of female banqueters most strongly supports the idea that female dining could have taken place in the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth. Other forms of evidence, which relate to the *Thesmophoria* and were examined above, also strengthen the hypothesis that the sanctuary at Corinth permitted all-female dining. The reclining male and seated female terracottas indicate that perhaps mixed dining occurred, as well. Corinth is, therefore, an example of mixed and female only dining.
One goal of this dissertation is to determine if the dining rooms in sanctuaries show any sign of gendered use, and if we can determine what rooms were used exclusively by women, by men and women together, or by men alone. One way to see if there are any distinct characteristics of female dining is to compare the Corinthian rooms, which I propose hosted female only and mixed dining, to the andron or all-male dining rooms found in domestic settings.

Birgitta Bergquist examines dining rooms for “private, civic, and ritual meals” meaning that she considers “sympotic” space, but also “the preceding dining phase as well, i.e., the entire feast.” Bergquist defines the common characteristics of general dining rooms as being a “regular square shape,” which, of course, the dining rooms at Corinth are not. Another common feature is the seven or eleven couch room. Unfortunately, the rooms at Corinth lack any uniformity in their number of couches. As this dissertation has shown, dining rooms at Corinth, Brauron, and Argos do not fit in with Bergquist’s characterization.

Despite the variation in ritual dining rooms, it may be useful to compare them to dining rooms found in houses, which are thought to be used by males exclusively. According to Carla Antonaccio, the normally domestic andron or male dining room “frequently has characteristic features which clearly identify it.” The most conspicuous feature is the floor, which is often paved and marked to indicate the positions of

---


560 Ibid., 37.

561 Ibid., 37.

562 Ibid., 37.

563 Antonaccio, “Building Gender into Greek Houses” 526.
couches. One fourth century house at Eretria, the House of the Mosaics, has two well-preserved andrones (fig. 4.17), rooms 7 and 9, with eleven and seven couches respectively. Room 9 has mosaics in the center of the rooms, leaving space around the border for couches. In addition to its all-male dining rooms, the House of the Mosaics has what scholars identify as gynaikonitis or a separate area for women to dwell. This area includes a court and porch or pastas. Like the andron, the women’s quarters are difficult to securely identify in the archaeological record.

An additional feature of the andron is that the door is normally offset in order to place the couches around the walls. In some cases, one finds an antechamber, which may also be decorated. Surviving rooms that have been termed andron have walls that were typically decorated or painted. As Sarah Pomeroy writes, “[t]he andron was the most elaborately decorated and expensively furnished of all the rooms in the house.” Domestic dining rooms are generally small in size. For examples, the andrones at Olynthos are mostly square, measure around 4.7m on each side, and have about seven

564 Ibid., 526.
566 On this matter, Lisa Nevett suggests that it may be possible that “there was no specialized female area and that what we are seeing is a true pattern of asymmetry” (“Separation or Seclusion? Towards an Archaeological Approach to Investigating Women in the Greek Household in the Fifth to Third Centuries B.C.” 103).
567 H.G. Liddell and R. Scott define the Greek word pastas as a “porch in front of the house,” “inner room,” “bridal chamber,” or a “colonnade;” the Latin equivalent is a porticus (Liddell and Scott, Greek-English Lexicon s.v. “pastas”).
568 Antonaccio, “Building Gender into Greek Houses” 526.
569 Nevett, “Spatial Organization in Greek Houses” 92.
570 Pomeroy, Families in Classical and Hellenistic Greece 30.
couches. Finally, it was common for one couch of an *andron* to accommodate two reclining men as visual evidence from painted pots and tombs shows.

The position of the *andron* in the home, as noted by Antonaccio, is not consistent. In fact, at places such as Olynthos, not every home has a preserved *andron*, which may indicate that *andrones* were sometimes on the second floor that is not preserved or shared between houses. At Olynthos, less than a quarter of the houses have rooms securely identified as *andrones*. Indeed, chapter 1 demonstrated how rarely the term *andron* appears in Greek literature. Perhaps only richer members of society could afford such dining rooms, and less affluent families shared them.

There are several differences between dining rooms in houses versus those in sanctuaries; the dining rooms at Argos are larger than those in the domestic sphere, measuring 6 X 8, and contained eleven or twelve couches. At Brauron, the rooms are square, measuring 6.10 X 6.10m with eleven couches in each. At Corinth, the rooms can be square or rectangular and measure less than 4m on one side and as much as 18m on the longest side, and the number of couches varies widely. As Pemberton has observed for Corinthian banqueting rooms, “[w]here the couches are preserved, it would appear that...”

---

571 Cahill, *Household and City Organization at Olynthos* 93. Other *andrones* measure 4.4 X 4.5m with seven couches (house A vii 4) or a smaller one is 3.6 X 3.5m with only four couches (A 10).

572 Examples include the Attic red-figure kylix by the Tarquinia Painter, 470-460 BC in Basel, Antikenmuseum Basel und Sammlung Ludwig, the “Potter Portraits” by Euphronios, and the tomb of the diver at Paestum.

573 Antonaccio, “Building Gender into Greek Houses” 526.

574 Cahill, *Household and City Organization at Olynthos* 154.

575 See Bookidis and Stroud’s appendix 1 in *Corinth XVIII, iii: The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: topography and architecture* 413.
insufficiently long to accommodate more than one person;\textsuperscript{576} this is in contrast to domestic dining where couches commonly held two banqueters. Finally, the Corinthian dining rooms do not exist in isolation; rather, they are accompanied by bathing rooms, sitting rooms, and kitchens.

Thus, there are many differences between domestic dining rooms and the ritual dining rooms at Corinth. First, ritual dining rooms are usually larger than domestic ones, but ritual rooms are not necessarily square or decorated. Second, the ritual dining rooms at Corinth have the addition of the sitting room, bathroom, and kitchen, features that are not common in Greek houses. Third, the single couch is typical at Corinth whereas the double couch appears in domestic dining rooms. Additionally, the half-couch and rim on the edge of the banquets are absent from domestic contexts. Fourth, dining rooms in sanctuaries could have been used for a variety of festivals, ones which included mixed dining and gendered dining, whereas domestic rooms seem to be reserved for men only. The only similarity between domestic \textit{andrones} and the dining rooms at Corinth, therefore, is that both have off-center doors.

While there are clear differences between \textit{andrones} and the ritual dining rooms at Corinth, particularly in regard to shape, size, couches, and decoration, it is still not clear whether this is a gendered distinction or if the difference is due to the public nature of ritual dining in contrast to the private nature of the all-male \textit{andron}. The public/private dichotomy will be further explored in chapter 5. Nonetheless, this section has shown that it is not appropriate to consider dining rooms from different contexts and occasions altogether. Dining rooms vary widely. Unfortunately, the room identified by

\textsuperscript{576} Pemberton, “Wine, Women and Song: Gender Roles in Corinthian Cult” 100-101.
archaeologists as andrones shares few features with their counterparts in ritual settings, and thus, one can only conclude that domestic and ritual dining rooms are quite different. These differences may relate to the gender of the dining rooms’ occupants, but even this is not entirely certain.

4.7 Conclusion

Unlike the previously examined sites, the rooms at Corinth are unambiguously dining rooms. Even though there are more here than at any other site, the dining rooms have been lacking a viable interpretation since their discovery in the 1960’s. The rooms themselves are more irregular in shape than the previously examined complexes at Argos and Brauron. Moreover, sitting rooms, wash rooms, and kitchens are attached to the dining rooms, which are absent from other sanctuaries of ritual dining. In addition, a continuous banquette runs along the wall in all periods of use at Corinth and a rim could hold pillows or mattresses for the diners. Likewise, the banquettes may have doubled as beds. The varied length of these couches may be explained by the possibility that they were used for both sleeping and dining by women of various heights.

The most logical interpretation for one cult activity at the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth is the all-female Thesmophoria, although it is possible that other activities, which were open to both men and women, took place in the dining rooms there, as well. The material evidence overwhelmingly supports all female dining and reclining, as terracotta figurines attest. The half-nude terracottas figurines were likely representations of Persephone, as counterparts found in Sicily suggest, and the humans would have mimicked her reclining pose during ritual. Scholars may be uncomfortable assigning the female gender to these half-nude figurines, but the unveiling ceremony or
more likely the *epaulia*, which they may represent, gives them two possible and appropriate contexts. Furthermore, situating these votives within the context of the *Thesmophoria* offers a clear interpretation related to fertility and Demeter.

On analogy with other sites of similar worship, the finds from Corinth support Demeter as the patron goddess and maintain the sanctuary as a place of eating and drinking for the *Thesmophoria*. *Krateriskoi*, in addition to many other drinking, eating, and serving vessels, could have been used at the sacrifices of the *Thesmophoria* and make a strong case for the presence of women at the sanctuary for sacrifice. The predominance of vases from Corinth that show women processing, which could have easily taken place in the sanctuary, are further evidence for the *Thesmophoria* interpretation. Finally, the remains of pigs and specific foods found in Corinth, as well as at other sanctuaries to Demeter and Kore, are appropriate foods for the autumnal *Thesmophoria* celebration. It has been said that cults to Demeter upset the normal order of things “by allowing women access to male activities and privileges;”\(^{577}\) women drinking, as Aristophanes tells us, reclining in the dining rooms, and celebrating a ritual together certainly qualifies as a disruption of ancient Greek women’s normal routines.

Ritual dining rooms at Corinth are hardly similar to *andrones* found in the domestic sphere. Notable differences are that Corinthian dining rooms are more irregular, larger, and more numerous than those found in houses. The ritual dining rooms have half-couches and the complexes included more rooms than the single *andron*. Moreover, the continuous couch made for one diner, not paralleled in the domestic sphere where couches fit two banqueters, may have been more appropriate for female dining and

\(^{577}\) Pemberton “Wine, Women and Song: Gender Roles in Corinthian Cult” 105-106.
perhaps sleeping. The large size of the Corinthian dining rooms obviously indicates that more people could be accommodated here than at other sites of ritual dining. The differences between domestic dining and ritual dining may be due to the occupants; women were banned from using the andrones, but not ritual dining rooms.

Additionally, it has been suggested that the sanctuary was used for private family dining,\textsuperscript{578} which is possible given the half-couch. The copious dining rooms and the material evidence found at the sanctuary, however, make it a more appropriate setting for the Thesmophoria. Again, these rooms were used for women only festivals, but mixed dining is also possible for other events.\textsuperscript{579} The half-couch may not have been designed for children, but rather it may have held an attendant or priestess who oversaw the ritual dining.

Finally, since nuptial celebrations could have occurred in sanctuaries, the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore may have also held marriage banquets, which might explain the presence of terracottas of men reclining with women seated at their feet. As Matthew Dillon writes of the dining rooms at Corinth, “[i]t seems reasonable to assume that women made use of these dining rooms, particularly during the celebration of any women-only festivals at Corinth, though men presumably made use of them as well on other occasions.”\textsuperscript{580} In conclusion, the dining rooms of the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore are unparalleled in their number, size, complexity, permanence, and newly argued ritual use for the Thesmophoria by the women of ancient Corinth.

\textsuperscript{578} Bergquist, “Sympotic Space: A Functional Aspect of Greek Dining Rooms” 44.

\textsuperscript{579} “Perhaps even more important…is the recognition that a single sanctuary could have been used for a variety of festival, as Kevin Clinton has recently argued for the sanctuary at Eleusis” (Bookidis et al., “Dining in the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth” 52).

\textsuperscript{580} Dillon, Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion 126.
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CHAPTER 5

THE THEORETICAL DINERETTE: PARADIGMS, DICHOTOMIES, AND RITUALS OF REVERSAL FOR FEMALE DINING IN ANCIENT GREECE

5.1 Introduction

This goal of this dissertation is to investigate the claim that ancient women were confined to their households. The previous chapters have shown this assumption to be incorrect and have proved that women did, in fact, leave their homes to attend ritual and marital banquets. The last task of this dissertation is to theorize about the position that these women occupied in ancient Greek society. Therefore, this chapter attempts to describe the phenomenon of female dining that I have observed at Argos, Brauron, and Corinth.

One general thread that will run through this chapter is how to categorize ancient Greek women. Scholars in the past have considered them private non-citizens, but I have shown that these women dine socially or ritually in public at sanctuaries for religious purposes or during wedding banquets. There are several ways to explain this.

---

581 Slater: “women in fifth- and fourth-century Athens achieved some kind of nadir...were legal nonentities, excluded from political and intellectual life, uneducated, virtually imprisoned in the home, and appeared to be regarded with disdain by the principal male spokesmen whose comments have survived” (The Glory of Hera: Greek Mythology and the Greek Family 4). More recently, “[o]ver the past thirty years, it has become broadly accepted commonplace that Athenian women held wholly second-class status as silent and submissive figures restricted to the confines of the household where they obediently tended to domestic chores and child rearing” (Connelly, Portrait of a Priestess: Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece 3).
problem. Their public status may only be a temporary one. Their status may be a challenge to the normal social hierarchy. The ancient sanctuary may have operated under rules different from those governing daily life. It is also possible that the ambiguities and contradictions created by these women make only modern scholars uncomfortable, whereas Greek society may not view the situation as problematic.

Fortunately, current scholarship on women and ritual can help untangle this complex situation. Within a new framework offered by David Cohen, Michael Warner, Mary Ann Tetrault, and Michel Foucault, among others, I can reexamine notions about the previously unacknowledged and more public role of ancient Greek women. Using these theories and the ancient evidence, the position of women in society may be better understood, and a more accurate view of their place in the ancient world can emerge.

First, this chapter will examine paradigms on which ritual dining may have been based, since scholars and theorists often find models useful in helping to understand complex situations. I will attempt to determine if mythical, domestic, political, or divine models are informative ways of thinking about dining women. Thus, each paradigm will be assessed on the basis of its suitability to women and dining in ancient Greece.

---

582 When women are parodied in literature and take on manly roles, the men are uncomfortable. The male reactions likely expressed a real concern and fear. For example, a play like Aristophanes’ *Ecclesiazusae* reveals the fears of men should women have actual power in the public sphere. See also Cohen’s section on “the politics of reputation” in Law, Sexuality, and Society 54-69.


Second, I will explore the public/private dichotomy that is the subject of much recent scholarship and certainly influences the characterization of women in sanctuaries. I will determine if these are valuable categories and whether or not these terms should be applied to the ancient Greek sanctuaries I have examined. This section will discuss how women and the space they occupy should be described. I may offer alternate terms for space in dining rooms at sanctuaries based on modern gender theory. Since these theories come from radically different disciplines and perspectives, this section might, at first, seem less unified. Nonetheless, I will attempt to highlight the useful ideas from each theorist in order to understand female dining at Argos, Brauron, and Corinth better.

Third, throughout this dissertation, I have suggested that a ritual context permits women to act in ways that are opposite to their roles in everyday life. The final section of this chapter will, therefore, posit that the women at Argos, Brauron, and Corinth experienced rituals of reversals. I will define this special type of ritual and suggest how it applies to the three cases of female dining in ancient Greece.

5.2 Paradigms for Dining

Homeric models, as I suggested in chapter 1, may have been utilized in the sphere of female dining. Nonetheless, even though Homeric models do persist, they may have done so less seamlessly than we would like to admit. As Van Wees observes, “the poet is likely to present us with an idealised rather than realistically humdrum version of the customs of this day.” Moreover, we should be equally cautious in using tragic women and other women represented in literature as models, since their portrayals vary widely.

585 Burton, “Women’s Commensality in the Ancient Greek World” 146.

586 Van Wees, “Princes at Dinner: Social Event and Social Structure in Homer” 163.
While Homer’s Penelope is an ideal, trustworthy wife who is similar to her husband with respect to her like-mindedness, cunning, and endurance, the women described in works of Hesiod are deceitful and quite the opposite of Odysseus’ wife. Therefore, I am reluctant to use Homeric or literary models as it may not be appropriate; the portrayal of women in these texts is not consistent.

Other scholars, however, hypothesize that the model for women’s role in religious meals is identical to their role in the domestic dining. For example, Goldstein writes: “we should understand the meal taken in the home as essentially the same in nature as that consumed in sanctuaries.” Oakley and Sinos make a similar statement, comparing nuptial banquets, which included men and women, to all-male drinking parties: “the wedding feast was so similar to other symposia.” Likewise, Robin Osborne also views the ritual meal as akin to domestic ones, only he notes the differences between sacrificial meals and symposia: “where men and women ate the sacrificial meat together, may well have been as homologous to everyday life as it was different from life in army, Council, or symposion.” Ritual dining, however, probably did not resemble domestic meals, since men and women could dine together in ritual settings, but they were normally segregated in the domestic sphere. Thus, rituals meals did not mimic domestic ones.

Still other scholars argue that women’s roles in religious matters mirrored their political roles. Marcel Detienne suggests that there is “homology between political power

---

587 Compare Homer’s Odyssey 24.210-222 to Hesiod’s Theogony 607-616.

588 Goldstein, The Setting of the Ritual Meal in Greek Sanctuaries 600-300 BC 4.


590 Osborne, “Women and Sacrifice” 404.

591 In fact, textual evidence presented in chapter 1 showed that women did not attend domestic meals.
and sacrificial power [and], the place reserved for women perfectly corresponds to the one they occupy—or rather do not occupy—in the space of the city.” Detienne, therefore, suggests that because women have no place in the political sphere, they likewise have no place in sacrifice. Detienne’s focus on sacrifice obscures many important aspects of Greek religious life. The problem with Detienne’s model, therefore, is that this dissertation has shown that women did have a role in religious affairs. Ultimately, women’s role in ritual dining does not mirror their political role.

When one considers religious activity more comprehensively, women do occupy religious roles. As Osborne remarks, “it is not merely that any cult involved in the political structure of the city may involve priest(esse)s in quasi-magisterial duties, but that these priesthoods are in at the foundation of the city, part of the way in which the city identifies itself as a city.” In addition, he observes that the cults which exclude women “seem more often to be marginal to the city.” Thus, Osborne further highlights the primary roles women did occupy in ancient religion.

Josine Blok even argues that women’s religious roles were also political ones. “Importantly, she [Blok] has shown that their leadership roles in matters of cult were, in effect, political offices that directly engaged women with the broader enterprise of *politeia*.” Moreover, Blok “has now argued on linguistic grounds that Athenian women

---

594 Ibid., 403.
of citizen families were, in fact, recognized as citizens."596 Pericles’ citizenship law of 450 BC, which is described in Aristotle’s Politics 3.1278a, implies that in order for a son to be a citizen, both parents had to be citizens.

Detienne was correct in associating women’s religious and political roles. Yet, it is not possible to successfully employ political paradigms to understand ritual dining because women’s roles in religion were intimately connected to their position in politics and, therefore, the two are difficult to parse. Homeric, domestic, or political paradigms, therefore, are not useful in every case, since female commensality itself is not necessarily mirrored by these roles.

One major theme that has emerged throughout this dissertation is that human dining was modeled on divine dining. Texts and images suggest that women in sanctuaries imitated divinities during social practices. Ancient texts, in particular weddings songs, compare human and divine couples.597 Rebecca Hague has shown that “[v]ery often, the comparison is made to the gods or heroes, sometimes implicitly, by describing a divine or heroic wedding whose action parallels that of the wedding at hand, and sometimes directly, in a simile.”598 The result, she says, is that the comparison “glorifies not only the couple being wed, but also the guests and the ceremony in general by a comparison to the mythical scene.”599

596 Ibid., 4.

597 Avagianou, Sacred Marriage in the Rituals of Greek Religion 110. Unfortunately the dissertation by Huddleston, The Wedding Songs of Ancient Greece (diss., Johns Hopkins University, 1980) was not available for me to read. Instead, see Hague, “Ancient Greek Wedding Songs: The Tradition of Praise” 131-143.


599 Ibid., 134.
One example is fragment 44 of Sappho, who describes the wedding of Hector and Andromache and compares them to gods (fr. 44.24-35):

and the sweet-sounding aulos was mixed with the noise of castanets, and the maidens sang a sacred song and the holy sound reached heaven ... bowls and goblets ... perfume and cassia [cinnamon] and incense were mixed and all the older women shouted out, and all the men cried out a fair loud song, calling on Paean, the far-shooter, the lyre player, to sing of Hector and Andromache, who were like gods (theoeikelois).\(^\text{660}\)

It is probable, but not certain that Sappho’s poem was intended for performance at human weddings.\(^\text{601}\) If this is a wedding song, the human couple would be compared to a heroic couple and then to the gods.\(^\text{602}\) Nonetheless, at the very least the poem tells us about weddings, even if it was not sung at the actual celebration.

Furthermore, in artistic representations gods and goddesses are shown dining together just as men and women could have dined during ritual and nuptial meals. Women may have even imitated the seated pose of Hera and Amphitrite as seen on artistic representations like the Codrus Cup (fig. 2.11) or reclined like terracotta figurines of Persephone found at Corinth (fig. 4.9) and Morgantina (fig. 4.12). In fact, there was no better place to feel closer to a divinity than his or her sanctuary. Indeed, dining in the room adjacent to the temples of the gods brought the diners as close to the divine as humanly possible.

\(^\text{600}\) "αὐλὸς δ’ ἀδυμέλησι[ ]. . . τ’ ὀνειμίγυν[ ] ἵκαις ὑφοφ[ ] κροτάλ[ ] ὄνω . . . δ’ ἀρά πάρθενοι/ ἀειδὸν μέλος ἀγν[ ] ἰκ[ ] ἐς αἰθρ[ ] ἀχω[ ] θεοπε[ ] γελ[ ] . . . πάνται δ’ ἂς κάτ[ ] δυ[ ] . . . κράτηρες φιαλαὶ τ’ ὀ[ ] . . . ἔδε[ ] . . . ε[ ] . . . μύρρα καὶ κασία λιθ[ ] ἄνω τ’ ὀνειμίχυτο/ γύναικες δ’ ἐλέλυσθον[ ] ὀ[ ] προ[ ] ἔνεστ[ ] . . . πάντες δ’ ἀν[ ] ἐπ[ ] ἄρ[ ] ἱκ[ ] ὁ[ ] . . . Πάο[ ] ὄ[ ] ε[ ] . . . έκβο[ ] . . . / . . . ἔτοκα κ’ Α[ ] χρομάχσ[ ] θεοεικ[ ] . . . ἐμ[ ] ὀ[ ] δ’ ἔκτορα" (Translated by Lefkowitz and Fant, Women’s Life in Greece & Rome [Baltimore, 1992]: 4).

\(^\text{601}\) "It is suggested, but cannot be proved, that the poem was written for the performance at a real wedding” (Campbell, Greek Lyric Poetry: A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry 270)

\(^\text{602}\) Hague writes, “[t]here is a two-fold comparison here; sung at an actual wedding, the couple is compared by implication to the heroic bride and groom of the song, who are themselves compared to gods” (“Marriage Athenian Style” 36).
Certainly, any of the women at Argos, Brauron, or Corinth could be temporarily endowed with the status of a goddess. At Argos, Hera, both a bride and maiden, was the perfect model for brides to be or women celebrating the sacred marriage. The rituals at Brauron let young girls run wild, like their patron goddess Artemis, before they were tamed by marriage. At Corinth, participants in the *Thesmophoria* fasted, jested, and feasted for Demeter similar to how Demeter did for her daughter Kore in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Thus, the divine model, in textual sources and artistic representations, is the best model for female dining in the sanctuaries at Argos, Brauron, and Corinth.

### 5.3 The Public/Private Dichotomy

Determining a more precise and exact characterization for women dining in sanctuaries is difficult since few scholars recognize the possibility. Moreover, a Greek woman defied the position conventionally ascribed to her as private and *oikos*-based when she functioned outside her home. Nonetheless, this dissertation has shown that women did occupy roles in the religious sphere, particularly for celebrations of ritual and nuptial dining. This section will examine both the characterization of women and men in their respective spheres and consider some ways to contemplate the nature of specific banquets and sanctuaries when women were visiting them. Finally, I will briefly consider the public/private dichotomy for ancient divinities. Through this survey, we will better understand Greek thought about this modern fascination.

First, scholars have shown that the dichotomy between public and private did exist in ancient Greece because they had the ancient terms for it (*idios* and *dēmosios*). Additionally, the terms public and private are and were gendered; scholarship typically

---

uses the term public to refer to male roles and private to refer to female roles.\textsuperscript{604} In antiquity, the agora, baths, court, and athletic grounds are where men gather, while that which is “enclosed, hidden, guarded, [and] dark” is female space.\textsuperscript{605} Men, however, had roles in both the private and public spheres, but these roles were flexible.\textsuperscript{606}

David Cohen, who writes on Classics and rhetoric, proposes some ideas about the nature of the Greek household: “social functions of friends and neighbors made the Athenian \textit{oikos} far less private than some scholars have imagined.”\textsuperscript{607} He also mentions the possibility that wives and daughters served dinner to husbands and their friends, allowing the public world to enter the private sphere.\textsuperscript{608} Thus, the normally private female encounters the public in her home by means of her husband and the company of other families. Cohen reminds us that the always private characterization of Greek women, even in the \textit{oikos}, may not be correct.

Cohen also describes how the private/public dichotomy applies to other ancient spaces. He writes, “[a]nother law barred women taken in adultery from temples and religious festivals ([Dem.] 59.85-7), the public areas appropriate to them.”\textsuperscript{609} Cohen, therefore, believes temples were public, but an appropriate place for women, and that women in the Greek household were less private than scholars would like to imagine.

\textsuperscript{604} Ibid., 70.
\textsuperscript{605} Ibid., 72.
\textsuperscript{606} Ibid., 71.
\textsuperscript{607} Ibid., 87.
\textsuperscript{608} Ibid., 87.
\textsuperscript{609} Cohen, \textit{Law, Sexuality, and Society} 73.
Specific events are also categorized as public or private. The “wedding feast, for instance, that one gives for one’s deme is usually characterized as a public obligation, the one which one gives for friends and relations as a private one.”610 Because wedding celebrations include friends, Cohen views them as private and intimate.611 According to Cohen’s theories on ancient space, wedding feasts might have been normally a private celebration in the house, but public when celebrated in sanctuaries because of the public nature of that ancient dining rooms and the potential of women interacting with public life on the way to the wedding banquet.

Cohen has, therefore, proposed that women are normally considered private and men are public; nevertheless, the domain of women was less private, and certain public places, such as sanctuaries, were appropriate for women. Activities may also be categorized as public or private, but the female participant seems to shift her private status to a more public one when in a sanctuary with males from outside her household. The male categorization, however, remains consistently public, so the assignment of private or public to space depends on the presence of the male. Although the Thesmophoria might be seen as a private occasion, since men were barred from attending, women were, nonetheless, engaging in the public sphere.612 Since the space outside the household is considered public, women in sanctuaries should also be regarded as public, whether they are dining with men or not; on the way to the sanctuary and at the sanctuary itself, women were exposed to public life.

610 Ibid., 78.
611 Ibid., 86.
612 As one scholar notes of mystery rites, “they were not public ceremonies attended by the entire citizen body of the polis, but were secret” (Stallsmith, “The Name of Demeter Thesmophoros” 131).
It may also be interesting to consider the public/private implications of Greek divinities. In particular, the work of historian and anthropologist Jean-Pierre Vernant and philologist Louis Gernet both enlighten and complicate our notions of the public/private dichotomy. Vernant’s essay discusses the complementary activities of Hermes and Hestia. Both divinities are related to the “terrestrial sphere, the habitat of the settled people,” but Hestia resides in the house, the symbol of “immutability, and permanence,” while Hermes represents “movement and flow.”

Gernet’s essay complements Vernant, yet he highlights the more public role Hestia can have: “[i]n any case we can see a preestablished association between the *Hestia* and the organs of public authority.” While, “in principle the Hearth is a family matter” it is also “synonymous with eating publicly…We know what it means to welcome someone to the Hearth: whether it involves a permanent or hereditary right, and whether it concerns an occasional invitation or the obligatory participation of magistrates, the etymology can be seen in related terms.”

Certainly, the existence of a public hearth causes one to question Vernant’s dichotomy of the private, unmoving Hestia and the public, centrifugal Hermes. The example of Hestia would imply that even an immobile divinity had a place in public.

In the human sphere, the ancient Greek woman is like Hestia, while men are like Hermes. Marriage causes the woman to be the “mobile social element, whose movement

---


615 Ibid., 107.
creates the link among different family groups whereas the man remains tied to his own hearth and home.”\textsuperscript{616} Practitioners of Greeks religion worshipped divinities who, like them, maintained public and private roles. Taken together, Vernant and Gernet highlight the complementary roles that opposites may occupy, as well as the contradictory roles of men, women, and divinities.

Indeed, this discussion of Greek divinities indicates that Greek thinking was perfectly comfortable with contradictions for the divine and, by extension, the human. Hestia might have been the perfect model for the wife as both occupy roles in the public and private arenas. The wife as mobile and immobile, public and private was, therefore, operative in Greek thinking.

The black-and-white public/private dichotomy is not always clear or especially important in Greek society, as I have shown. Cohen cautions his readers against a strict public/private dichotomy: “taking this dichotomy over-literally as an opposition has led many classical scholars to misapprehend the social role of women by assuming that they were virtual prisoners in their houses.”\textsuperscript{617} Likewise, Connelly writes, “when it comes to ancient women, it may be not only impossible but also inappropriate to make hard-and-fast distinctions between public and private life.”\textsuperscript{618} Indeed, the social theorist, Michael Warner points out, “public and private are not always simple enough that one could code them on a map with different colors…the terms also describe social contexts, kinds of

\textsuperscript{616} Vernant, “Hestia-Hermes: The Religious Expression of Space and Movement in Ancient Greece” 118.

\textsuperscript{617} Cohen, \textit{Law, Sexuality, and Society} 41.

\textsuperscript{618} Connelly, \textit{Portrait of a Priestess: Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece} 5.
feelings, and genres of language.”  Moreover, there is overlap between the two: “most things are private in one sense and public in another” and the public/private is “more than a dichotomy.”

In assessing ideas of the public and private, we must remember the three ruptures that separate “our own time from the classical culture in which the world-making dimension of public action was understood,” namely Christianity, Romantic individualism and the “rise of the social.” Warner ends his essay by noting that we live in “mediated publics” not the ancient *polis*, and “the utopian ideals of the public and private have been contradicted by the social conditions for realizing them in modern mass culture.” The French historian and philosopher Michel Foucault expressed a similar idea: “historical descriptions are necessarily ordered by the present state of knowledge, they increase with every transformation and never cease, in turn, to break with themselves.”

Thus, theorists highlight the idea that the public and private are relative, shifting, and perhaps on a continuum that allows for overlap. Moreover, since there are ruptures that separate the modern period from the antiquity, the two periods may not necessarily be thought of in the same way. Even though the terms for public and private existed in antiquity, these concepts may not have had the same meaning or distinction in antiquity.
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that we ascribe to them today. While we may see a contradiction in having a private person in the public sphere, Warner’s notion that the two are not such distinct physical areas helps to ease the seeming contradiction.

A more neutral and perhaps appropriate word for spaces that are both public and private has been coined by Mary Ann Tetreault, who works on International Affairs. In an article, Tetrault focuses on the idea of spatial categorization, in particular the notion of “meta-space.”624 In these areas, termed meta-spaces, the public male space and the private female space overlap, and the definitions for gender are adjustable. Meta-space, according to Tetrault, is both physical and metaphorical. There is no line to separate meta-space from other types of space; rather it constitutes a domain itself that is characterized by fluidity. Indeed, the term meta-space may be used to describe the setting of ancient Greek dining, namely sanctuaries. Ritual dining can potentially bring both the private female and public male figures together. The sanctuaries, therefore, as meta-spaces, retain both of these qualities, but become a place where the two can co-exist and negotiate both space and roles.

The term meta-space also acknowledges the presence of women in a public, typically male sphere. In ancient Greece, this may have been permissible merely because of the special circumstances afforded by ritual or the company of male relatives; these men may protect the women if necessary and validate and ensure the social and normally private position of them. Conversely, if men are not present for dining, women are still occupying a space that is public and typically identified as male, only one that is potentially more dangerous. Women may encounter men on their journey to the sanctuary
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624 Tetrault, “Frontier Politics, Sex, Gender, and the Deconstruction of the Public Sphere” 29-50.
or in the sanctuary, such as strangers or male priests, but they were trusted to visit the sanctuary and return to their homes. The idea of meta-space allows us to step beyond the public/private dichotomy and show how respectable wives can be present in what is, in some sense, a public space.

Tetrault’s definition of the term meta-space describes not only the space itself, but the actions permissible therein: “[o]ccupants/proprietors…wish to be exempt from responsibility of their behavior there.” 625 This usage of term meta-space appropriately describes the activities of women in sanctuaries where they may do secret or unusual things. One wonders what other spaces of ancient Greek life can be termed meta-spaces. Tetreault seems to think that male dining rooms or andrones, located in the Greek house, but occupied by male diners, are also meta-spaces. Since Cohen notes that wives and daughters likely entered those spaces, the term meta-space may be quite appropriate in describing andrones.

The ideas offered in this section are wide-ranging. Nonetheless, it is useful to examine a variety of approaches as one theory is not sufficient to understand women and ritual dining in antiquity. Instead, taken together, these scholars offer new ways of conceiving of the women who occupied roles outside the private sphere and the way we can describe the spaces where they can be found. The ancient Greeks may have been the first documented culture to conceive of the public and private. Indeed, ancient space was gendered male and female, and the social roles of each gender corresponded with these divisions. Men unlike women, however, were capable of moving freely between the private and public spheres, while women normally only left their home to join a new one

625 Ibid., 32.
in marriage. Nonetheless, women seem to take on a somewhat public status during ritual dining because the sanctuary space may be termed public. When women dine with men, their status is an even more public one. Yet, a better way of describing the sanctuary space is as a meta-space, thereby incorporating the private and public nature of its occupants and accounting for the presence of both men and women or the existence of women in a typically public and male space. Finally, it is important to keep in mind the way the Greeks may have thought of such things. Seeming contradictions operated in less problematic ways in ancient Greek society. The Greeks had terms to describe the public and private, and one model, such as the goddess Hestia, was both a private and public figure like her human counterpart.

5.4 Rituals of Reversal?626

This last section will attempt to define rituals of reversal; in particular, I will discuss the timing of these events and how the ancient Greeks might have viewed ritual time. Additionally, I will investigate the result of such rituals for the individual involved, including the status of the participant during and after the experience. I will also briefly discuss the inconsistencies created by rituals of reversal and how the Greeks might have perceived these contradictions. Finally, I will apply the concept of rituals of reversal to the three sites of dining that I examined in previous chapters.

The cultural anthropologist Evon Vogt defines rituals of reversal as activities “in which sexual identity or other behavior patterns are reversed or inverted (e.g., men impersonate animals; ritual actors change their identity by means of masks or special
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I adapt this term from Versnel, Transition and Reversal in Myth and Ritual 118.
costumes)…“627 This definition suggests that ritual dining by women, like many Greek religious practices, should be viewed as sometimes inconsistent with, contradictory to, and even occasionally the reversal of every day practices, as the historian H. S. Versnel argues.628

Versnel also observes that these reversal rituals often occur at particular times, such as

in the ceremonies accompanying a critical passage in the agricultural or social year, moments of stagnation and rupture at which chaos threatens, such as initiation, festivals of the dead, and in particular the opening, eating/drinking or offering of the first fruits of the harvest or the first wine as recurrent, or the accessions of new rulers as incidental incisions in the progress of time.629

Finally, Thucydides’ Pericles generally characterizes religious time as break from life: “[w]hen our work is over, we are in a position to enjoy all kinds of recreation for our spirits. There are various kinds of contests and sacrifices regularly throughout the year.”630 Thus, there is a specific time of the year that these rituals occur, and the time during which a ritual could take place may be viewed as a respite from daily life.

The sociologist Henri Hubert and anthropologist Marcel Mauss believe that the person involved in any ritual experiences change; he has “acquired a religious character which he did not have before.”631 Moreover, these rituals of reversal create a “source of solidarity and legitimation.”632 Another theory for the status of women celebrating
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627 Vogt, “Rituals of Reversals as a Means of Rewiring Social Structure” 201.
628 Versnel, Transition and Reversal in Myth and Ritual 115-117.
629 Ibid., 119.
630 Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War 2.38.1: “Καὶ μὴν καὶ τῶν πόλεων πλεῖστας ἀναπαύλας τῇ γνώμῃ ἐπορεύσατο, ἀγωγον μὲν γε καὶ θυσίας διετησίοις νομίζουσι...” See the discussion in Yatromanolakis and Roilos, Towards a Ritual Poetics 18-19.
Dionysiac rites states that women are “given license to act this way by being temporarily endowed with the status of men, a status that allows them to constitute an all-female sacrificing and commensal group. In this they are signally honored.” Ritu...d temporary status, and certainly a position that is different from the one they occupy in their normal lives. The participants, therefore, change in some way, may temporarily gain a new status during the ritual, and bond with those who also experience that same reversal.

Hubert and Mauss also highlight the oppositions inherent in religious practice. As they say, sacrifice could “serve two such contradictory aims as that of inducing a state of sanctity and that of dispelling a state of sin...there cannot exist between these two states the clear-cut opposition that is generally seen.” The man or woman involved in a ritual is a profane person attempting to become at least temporarily sacred, but Hubert and Mauss would argue that what is pure and what is impure “are two aspects of religious reality” and “not mutually exclusive opposites.” As Vernant says of Hestia as goddess of movement and permanence: “in this twofold and contradictory interpretation of the name of the hearth goddess we recognize the very foundations of the relationship which opposes and unites.” This thinking suggests that the Greeks might not have seen the presence of two opposites as problematic or so different. Perhaps the modern obsession with classification and distinction obscures the reality of ancient thinking.
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Generally, rituals of reversal can apply to ancient Greek women dining because it was unusual, though not impossible, for them to be in the public, outside of their home and sometimes outside of their cities. Furthermore, the activities in which they were involved can be characterized as rituals of reversal, since they are abnormal, as well. Finally, the result from rituals of reversal is that the participants are often changed in some way, endowed with a temporarily new status, and unified as a group.

The idea of ritual reversal is a theme that is appropriate to each ancient sanctuary examined in chapters 2, 3, and 4. In the subsequent paragraphs, I will more firmly show that each element of rituals of reversal is appropriate to the three sanctuaries I examined. For the women using the dining rooms in these locations, the rituals temporarily permit them to act differently from their normal lives. These rituals of reversal likely provided the license to dine like their male counterparts and take part in the sacrificial feast. At all three sites, women were active outside of their houses and engaged in abnormal activities. At Argos, women could dine and recline like men, certainly marking a reversal of everyday practices. At Brauron, young girls ran nude, women of marriageable age mixed wine in *krateriskoi*, and adult women used the dining rooms to recline like men with their families. Finally, the women at Corinth could sit on benches or more likely recline and celebrate a festival without men.

The timing of the rituals at each site also seems crucial. For participants at Argos, Gamelion, the month during which Hera and Zeus celebrate the sacred marriage, was the time when the sacred marriage ritual could occur, as well as human wedding banquets and perhaps even anniversaries. At Brauron, no certain time is known for the
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celebration of the *arkteia* and *Brauronia*, but the foundation myth specifies that the rites are performed to appease Artemis following a plague, thereby fulfilling Versnel’s definition that the time for such rituals could be a “rupture at which chaos threatens.”

Finally, the *Thesmophoria* marked a specific time in the farming calendar, taking place in the autumn.

One final point about the results of rituals of reversal is made by Versnel, who writes: “[i]n primitive cultures—including the Ancient World—, social categories are so firmly fixed that in ritual reversal, however revolutionary its images, the playful alternatives never carry the germs of structural social change.” But, rituals of reversal, such as the *arkteia* at Brauron or the marriage banquets at Argos, may result in the women entering a new social class, namely marriageable or married women, respectively. The women who celebrate the *Thesmophoria* may not change themselves, but their actions may temporarily gain them appreciation for the role in successful crops. Thus, the
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638 Faraone, “Playing the Bear and Fawn for Artemis” 55, 62. *Suda* (10th c. lexicon) s.v. “I was a bear at the *Brauronia*”: “Once a wild bear was wandering about the deme of Philaidae [where Brauron is located] and was wreaking havoc. (They say) that the bear, once it had been tamed, became a companion to the humans, and that a *parthenos* was playing with it, and when the child treated it roughly, the bear was provoked and scratched the *parthenos*. And that because of this, her brothers shot it down (*katakontisai*). And for this reason a plague-like illness (*loimôdês nosos*) fell upon the Athenians. And when they petitioned the oracle, it said that there would be a release from these misfortunes, if as payments (*poinai*) for the slain bear they forced their own *parthenoi* to ‘play the bear’ (*arkteuein*). And the Athenians voted that a *parthenos* could not live together (*synoikizesthai*) with her husband, until she had played the bear” (tr. Christopher Faraone). Also, in a scholion to the Leyden manuscript of Aristophanes’ *Lysistrata* 644-5: “And the girls also performed the sacrifices placating (*ekmelissomenai*) the goddess” (Faraone, “Playing the Bear and Fawn for Artemis” 52)


640 The faunal and floral remains from Corinth are appropriate to an autumn festival (Bookidis et al., “Dining in the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth” 52). The Thesmophoria often took place in the fall (*Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd ed., s.v. Thesmophoria).

641 Versnel, *Transition and Reversal in Myth and Ritual* 118.
roles women occupy during the ritual may not reflect their roles in daily life, but their ritual may change their status when they return to their normal routines.

This section has first attempted to define rituals of reversal and then apply what is known about them to the rituals at Argos, Brauron, and Corinth. All three sites offer rituals of reversal because women are dining in the sanctuary, a clear contradiction of their lives at home. Likewise, activities such as drinking mark a reversal from daily practices. Furthermore, many of the rituals occur at an important time of year and create a sense of unity among the participants. Finally, I have argued that the girls and women visiting these sites may leave with a new status. While this status may not enable them to create social change, in the case of women at Brauron and Argos, they enter a class of marriageable or perhaps even recently married women.

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter has sought to explore the theoretical implications of this project. First, I have shown that divine models are the most appropriate ones for dining by women in ancient Greece. For the reasons outlined above, Homeric, domestic, and political models are not suitable paradigms for this study. Second, the public/private dichotomy is a complex one, especially as it applies to antiquity. While space was typically public or private, male or female, there were occasions when it was appropriate for women to be in public, such as marriage and ritual banquets. Likewise, there were places where it was also appropriate for women to be present, such as sanctuaries. Indeed, women took on public roles when they entered a sanctuary with or without men. Moreover, the term meta-space may better describe the sanctuary space as men and women brought aspects of both the public and private to the dining rooms at Argos, Brauron, and Corinth.
Furthermore, even if the women dined alone, the space was still considered male, and thus the term meta-space is most appropriate. Finally, all three sanctuaries have aspects of rituals of reversal. The activities, timing, and results associated with the rituals celebrated there all fit within the definition established for rituals of reversal.

Now that the roles of ancient Greek women have been expanded from the home to more public spheres of activity, it is my hope that this chapter has advanced the understanding of ritual and marital dining by women in ancient Greece. Indeed, the incorporation of ideas offered by prominent scholars in other fields has created a more nuanced, dynamic, and fascinating view of the phenomena of female dining observed in the preceding chapters. Paradoxically, the use of modern critical theory can make the theoretical female diner less theoretical.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

6.1 Introduction

This dissertation answers Oswyn Murray’s call for the investigation of “whether Greek citizen women were present even at major religious and family occasions.” The preceding pages have attempted to address this question by means of a textual, archaeological, architectural, comparative, and theoretical study of women at ritual and marital dining. To organize the investigation, three sites were chosen as case studies, since clear remains of dining rooms were found there, along with material pointing to a female presence.

In this concluding chapter, I first wish to speculate about why Murray’s question had not been answered; I believe that the reason is because most of the evidence for women dining is indirect and fragmentary. Therefore, I will acknowledge the problems associated with working on such a topic, and I will also explain why my particular methodology was adopted for this study. Next, I will highlight the main points of the arguments made in this study. This is also an appropriate time to make connections across the case studies that can only be seen at the end of a project. Here, I will discuss the cult activities available to young girls and women that this dissertation has revealed.

Moreover, I will compare the building materials of the dining rooms from the three sanctuaries, analyze the quality of these rooms for female dining, and discuss the significance of dedications found at the sites. Furthermore, in light of this study, I will suggest avenues for future research. Finally, I will highlight some conclusions I made that may have larger implications for the general study of ancient Greek women.

6.2 A Difficult Undertaking and a Method to Compensate

Women are problematic figures for our knowledge of classical Greek antiquity because direct evidence about their lives is lacking. Pauline Schmitt Pantel writes: “[w]e who write of the ancient world thus face a dilemma: either say nothing about women or submit to the tyranny of familiar images. Is there no other choice?”643 Schmitt Pantel highlights three significant problems with the study of women. First, the textual sources are largely produced by and for Athenian men; the voice of women remains unheard, at least directly, and this is certainly a problem when reconstructing anything women might have done. Second, the identities of women in artistic images are not secure. Scenes of dining typically represent women at symposia, not the respectable women who are in need of investigation. Third, texts and images are representations and may not attest to actual behaviors.

In an attempt to combat the problems of studying ancient women, my study uses an interdisciplinary methodology. Previous studies on ritual dining focused primarily on architectural remains. At the same time, the study of ancient ritual looked mostly at ancient literature and inscription. Scholarship that helped to create a more accurate
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portrayal of ancient Greek women and dining was limited to textual descriptions, such as Burton’s article.644 My approach, however, draws on various forms of ancient evidence. Chapter 1 uses texts exclusively to the lay the groundwork for the rest of the study. Chapters 2, 3, and 4 draw on the foundation of chapter 1, but consider multiple forms of evidence, including texts, to show that women were present at Argos, Brauron, and Corinth for ritual and marital dining. The theoretical discussion in chapter 5 helps consolidate the results of the preceding chapters.

Thus, for this study, I have sought to consider multiple forms of evidence, which have never been examined together, for the purpose of understanding women and dining. The combination of ancient texts, architecture, archaeology, and theory has yielded a more precise and clear view of women and dining in ancient Greece. This approach will hopefully prove useful to future analyses, yielding even more fruitful studies on the topic of women and dining.

6.3 Dining Highlights and Cross-Chapters Observations

In order to lay the groundwork for the argument, I began with the most copious evidence. Chapter 1, therefore, explored the textual evidence for female dining. Greek and Roman authors all agree that women did not attend symposia; however, texts from various periods of Greek history and multiple genres clearly state that women were involved in ritual dining and were present and vital to the wedding celebrations that included banquets, called gamoi.

Another goal of chapter 1 was to define the terms for eating and drinking more precisely. Unfortunately, my study revealed a disconnect between Greek deipnon and its

644 Burton, “Women’s Commensality in the Ancient Greek World” 143-165.
common English translation dining. The word *deipnon* encompasses banquets that also include drinking, and some of these dining events resemble *symposia*, where only men and prostitutes can be found. Unlike *symposion*, the ancient term *deipnon* can describe eating by men only, women only, or men and women dining together. There are instances where a *symposion* follows a *deipnon*. In these cases, women could attend the earlier, but not the later part of the occasion. Finally, modern terminology is equally unhelpful in discerning dining practices. Scholars use Latin terms to describe Greek practices, and they rarely make the distinction between all-male *symposia*, ritual and marital banquets, and instances of female only dining. For future research, it is important to distinguish who was dining and what modern words best describe these practices.

The following chapters were case studies of ritual dining in the Argolid, Attica, and the Corinthia. From the Archaic to the Hellenistic periods and at sites for Hera, Artemis, and Demeter and Kore, female dining was a widespread practice in mainland Greece. Scholars have advanced many theories concerning the use of dining rooms in sanctuaries. To insert women into these architectural spaces is the most logical conclusion, since it fits in with the character of these sites and the rites celebrated at each location. It is certainly possible that male dining took place at Argos, Brauron, and Corinth, but this is not the only dining possible there. Women of all ages, from young girls to married women celebrating their own anniversaries to any woman attending the *Thesmophoria*, were present in the dining rooms of ancient Greek sanctuaries.

In chapter 2, I suggested that the west building at Argos was more likely used by women in connection with rites of Hera than by the elite citizens as scholars have suggested previously. The cult statue in the Argive Heraion, Hera’s *kline* in the *pronaos,*
and dedications of female terracottas clearly mark a female presence at the site. Moreover, Hera served as both maiden and wife, renewing her *parthenos* status each year through a ritual bath and making herself the perfect model for married and unmarried women. In addition, the sacred marriage of Hera and Zeus could have been celebrated at the site and the dining rooms may have been used for ritual feasting. Rites of Hera at other sites in Greece also involve the celebration of the sacred marriage. Furthermore, the dining rooms could have also received human couples for their own wedding banquets.

Artistic representations of feasting show goddesses seated with gods reclining. In addition, reliefs commonly show women seated; however, the context of the setting is not clear. What can be gained from these representations is that Argive women had several options for dining; they could sit at their husbands feet, sit on the benches that could be reconstructed in the peristyle court of the west building, or recline alone. Small couch votives may even allude to Hera’s *kline* in the *pronaos* or the stone couches in the west building.

The site of Brauron hosted young girls for the *Brauronia* and girls of marriageable age for *arkteia*, as chapter 3 demonstrated. Aspects of both the *mustêrion* and *teletê* can be seen on the vases said to be found at the site, emphasizing the relationship between the two groups of girls visiting the site and their ritual activities. During one ritual, the dining rooms could act as dormitories for the younger girls celebrating the *Brauronia*. During the *arkteia*, the dining rooms could hold the *krateriskoi* in which wine and water could be mixed. The mixing creates a double entendre. First, *parthenoi* are often compared to water and second, the verb for mixing could also be translated as intercourse, a reality for the girls once married. Finally, the
sanctuary also hosted women and perhaps even their families as reliefs and inscriptions suggest. These women returned to the site to celebrate their marriages and births for which Artemis was responsible.

The Corinthian dining rooms, examined in chapter 4, offer a third type of female dining, namely that devoted to all-female celebrations, such as the Thesmophoria. The numerous structures found on the slopes of Acrocorinth, which include washing and kitchen facilities, would perfectly accommodate women of the Corinthia gathering for a religious ceremony, although men may have used them on other occasions. The continuous banquettes found in the dining rooms, which are unique to the site, could serve as couches for both dining and sleeping. The variation in couch length may be explained by women of various heights using them. Furthermore, reclining terracottas dedicated at the sanctuary may represent Persephone, whom human banqueters could imitate when in the sanctuary. Indeed, the sanctuary was dedicated to Demeter and Kore, and Kore’s abduction is the aition for the Thesmophoria. Finally, plant and animals remains found at Corinth are similar to those found at other sites where the Thesmophoria was known to have taken place. The similarities between Corinth and other sites of the Thesmophoria helps secure that ritual as one celebrated at Corinth.

The three sites, which comprise the case studies, offer a variety of dining experiences. At Argos, mixed dining could have occurred in the three dining rooms of the west building. It is also possible to imagine gendered dining with women in one room and men in another or women in an upper story and men below or vice versa. At Brauron, there were nine dining rooms where maidens celebrating the arkteia and married women
returning with their families dined. At Corinth, the *Thesmophoria* permits an all-female group of celebrants, where men were banned.

Now that the case studies have been summarized, one can consider the ritual activities available to Greek girls and women as outlined by Aristophanes *Lysistrata*:

“[a]t seven years old I was performing the *arrêphoria*, next when I was ten I was a ‘flour-grinder’ for the founding goddess and then while wearing the saffron robe, I was a bear (*arktos*) at the Brauronian festival. And at some point while I was a beautiful child I carried the basket while wearing a necklace of dried figs.”645 Aristophanes reveals some of the ritual activities available to Athenian girls. This dissertation has shown that Greek women, outside of Attica, also participated in religious rituals, sometimes involving dining. For instance, they could also partake in rites to Hera at Argos, perhaps even celebrating the marriage banquet in the sanctuary, or rites for Demeter and Kore at Corinth through the *Thesmophoria*. It seems unlikely that every ancient Greek girl could participate at every sanctuary; nonetheless, this study has shown that there were a variety of rituals for women of different ages in which they could be involved.

Since this study covers three different geographical areas, as well as a variety of periods, it is possible to theorize about the development of female dining rooms. Unfortunately, there does not appear to be a progression in the building techniques of the dining rooms over time. The most permanent structures are those found in the west building at Argos. Less structured buildings can be found at Corinth where limestone was used in the Archaic period, but rubble construction was common until the fourth century
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645 ἐπτά μὲν ἔτη γεγόσα/ εὐθὺς ἤρρηφόρουν/ εἴτε ἀλετρῆς ἢ, δεκέτις/ οὔσα, τάρχησετε/ κατ’ ἐχοῦσα τὸν κροκωτόν ἄρκτος ἢ βαυρωνίος/ κάκαυηφόρουν ποτ’ οὔσα παῖς καλὴ χοῦσ/ ἵσχάδων ὄρμιαθόν (tr. C. Faraone, “Playing the Bear and Fawn for Artemis”45).
when ashlar masonry became predominant. At Brauron, a local sandstone was used for the dining rooms. One wonders if the gender of the occupants affected the quality of the dining rooms. Future research might consider more examples of Greek dining rooms and answer the question of the relationship between building material and clientele.

A common feature of the three sites is an abundance of dedications. In particular, finds from all three sites indicate dedications by women. Moreover, there is a prevalence of seated and reclining figurines, which likely represent a divine woman. At Argos, the figurines are probably Hera, who could be imitated by women as maid or wife at the sacred marriage ceremony or at wedding banquets. At Brauron, statues of small children are common and are thought to represent the offspring of adult women who hold Artemis responsible for successful birth. Corinthian figurines are best interpreted as representations of reclining Kore, which could have been purchased at the nearby Potter’s Quarter and offered in the dining room at the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore.

Chapter 5 treated the topic of the theoretical female diner and explored the ideas of scholars from a variety of disciplines in order to explain the phenomenon of female dining observed in the preceding four chapters. First, I revealed that human dining is based on models of the divine. Wedding songs that compare couples to divinities, the Codrus Cup, and terracottas of Persephone indicate that human diners imitated their divine counterparts. Although the words for public and private existed in ancient Greek, the dichotomy was not black-and-white. Women who inhabited the private oikos did enter the public male spaces on certain occasions. For example, sanctuaries were considered public spaces and women took on a public nature when they visited these areas at Argos, Brauron, and Corinth. An alternate and perhaps better way to view the
space in sanctuaries is to consider them “meta-spaces” where the qualities of public, represented by the men, and private, represented by women, can co-exist and mix. Finally, the sanctuaries of Argos, Brauron, and Corinth celebrate rituals of reversal because women are dining outside of their homes, thereby participating in activities that are contrary to their daily lives. Moreover, the rituals mark a specific time of the year or important event. Lastly, the women may leave the sanctuary having been changed in some way. At Argos, women may celebrate their wedding banquets in the dining rooms and then return home a married woman. For the young girls of the arkteia at Brauron, they are now prepared for marriage. The women of the Corinthian Thesmophoria may be recognized for their role in producing a good crop, and elevate their status, if only temporarily.

6.4 Future Research: Dining like Divinities, the Sequel

Dining rooms in houses, called andrones, were discussed in both chapters 1 and 4. A comparison of dining rooms in houses and sanctuaries in chapter 4 revealed that the two are quite different, and I suggested that this may be due to the gender of the occupants. I also noted that women may have been present in domestic dining rooms, but only for marriage banquets. The dining rooms in sanctuaries, however, were open to both genders and, therefore, should not be termed andrones. Future research might attempt to define the terms for dining spaces more aptly and perhaps offer an alternative word that better encapsulates the sanctuaries and the occupants, such as deipneterion. For now, meta-space might best describe dining rooms in sanctuaries.
Future research might also examine the concept of rites of passage as they relate to the rituals at Argos, Brauron, and Corinth and are defined by Arnold van Gennep.646 Recent scholars, such as Gloria Ferrari, question the categorization of the wedding as a rite of passage for women.647 Religious theory might also help to determine if the rites at Brauron should be termed rites of passage or not.648

Finally, I argued that the terracotta figurines from Corinth may be female and represent Persephone. A future endeavor might broaden the scope of the evidence and consider similarly half-nude terracottas from other sites, perhaps reaching a similar conclusion about their gender and perhaps examining more sites of female dining.

6.5 The Larger Implications of This Study

The larger significance of this dissertation is that it uncovers a more accurate, nuanced, and interdisciplinary understanding of ancient Greek women’s significant roles in ritual and marital dining, which has great implications for the public/private dichotomy in ancient Greece.649 It has long been thought that women in antiquity mostly occupied roles within the household, but as this dissertation has shown, the study of women’s roles can be expanded from the private spaces of the house to those spaces that had a more
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646 Arnold van Gennep, *The Rites of Passage* tr. Monika B. Vizedom and Gabrielle L. Cafee, as summarized by Victor Turner in *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* 94: Rites of passages are “marked by three phases: separation, margin (or *limen*, signifying ‘threshold’ in Latin), and aggregation.”


648 Faraone, “Playing the Bear and Fawn for Artemis” 60. Faraone argues that the rites to Artemis are not rites of passage.

public function, such as dining rooms in sanctuaries. As Medea says in Euripides’ *Medea*, “women of Corinth, I have come out of the house.”

Our current understanding of the status of women in antiquity must, therefore, be reevaluated in order to account for these newly revealed roles. My study has shown that the traditional view of Greek women in antiquity as being confined to the private household and rarely allowed to be in public is not true. Moreover, I have suggested that the spaces in dining rooms should be termed meta-spaces, accounting for the possibility of both male and female diners.

In conclusion, this study acknowledges the place literally, physically, and theoretically of women in dining that has been largely overlooked in recent scholarship. This place can, however, be reconstructed on the basis of texts, imagery, architectural remains, archaeology, gender theory, and our knowledge about women’s roles in religion. This project has enabled me to give voices to the infrequently heard women in antiquity and reexamine their role in ancient Greek society. Finally, although we may not have many sources written by ancient Greek women, we do know that women in Greek antiquity were dining like divinities; more precisely, we now know where, when, how, and why. Let us now be at least temporarily satisfied with this answer to the question posed in Murray’s footnote.

---

APPENDIX A:

ANCIENT GREEK DINING ROOMS
(ALPHABETICALLY BY SITE)
Permanent Dining Structures

Aegina (Aphaia sanctuary)
Agia Pelagia (andreion/prytaneion)
Argos (Heraion, west building)
Athens (Pompeion, South Stoa, West Stoa, Tholos, Agora, Propylaia, Akropolis)
Brauron (sanctuary of Artemis)
Cape Zoster, Vouliagmene (Apollo sanctuary)
Corinth (Asklepieion, Lerna rooms, sanctuary of Demeter and Kore)
Cyrene (sanctuaries and agora)
Delphi (Marmaria, priest’s house)
Dreros (‘Temple’)
Eleusis (prytaneion)
Ephesus (prytaneion, room 1)
Epidauros (‘gymnasion,’ rooms B-D, F-H)
Ikarion (Dionysos sanctuary, ‘Python’)
Isthmia (Northeast Cave, Theater Cave)
Kynouria (Kynthion, Zeus and Athena oikoi)
Kommos, Crete (Temple A, B)
Labraunda (Zeus sanctuary)
Larisa on Hermos (‘North Temple’)
Lato (prytaneion)
Magnesia (prytaneion)
Megara (Zeus sanctuary, rooms 7, 8, room A)
Nemea (Zeus sanctuary, section N 17, oikos, Xenon building, room 3)
Olympia (Leonidaion)
Paros (Delion, oikoi)
Pella (building 5, rooms Θ,Κ)
Perachora (hestiatorion)
Pergamon (Demeter sanctuary, West stoa rooms)
Prinias (Temple A, B)
Samothrace (rooms L and N)
Thasos (Aliki south building)
Thebes (rechteckbau)
Troizen (Asklepieion)
Vergina (palace rooms D, E, G, R, S, M1-M3)
Temporary Dining Structures

Adania
Athens
Cos
Delphi
Didyma
Elateia
Isinda, Lykia
Isthmia
Karia
Lebedos
Olympia
Samos
Sparta
Teos
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